DR. NEWTON TO LECTURE ON ROSENBACK FOUNDATION

Dr. A. Edward Newton has been appointed the Rosenbach Fellow in Bibliography for the year 1935-'36, and will deliver a series of three lectures, open to the public, which will be published later by the University Press. The subjects and dates of the lectures are as follows:

January 14—Bibliography and Pseudo-bibliography.
January 21—Book Catalogs.
January 28—Essays and Essayists.

The lectures will be delivered at 4 p. m. on the dates mentioned, in Houston Hall Auditorium.

The Rosenbach Fellowship was established by a gift of $20,000. from Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, known as the Rosenbach Foundation Fund, for the endowment of a fellowship in bibliography designed to foster the fundamental interests of the Library by stimulating knowledge and appreciation of books. Previous lecturers on this foundation have been Christopher Morley, Lawrence C. Wroth, and Shane Leslie.
NEW ACQUISITIONS OF SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS

By Dr. W. Norman Brown

With the acquisition during 1935 of about 1800 Sanskrit and other Indic language manuscripts the University of Pennsylvania increased its total to about 2700 and now has the largest collection of such manuscripts in America. These documents have been purchased with funds contributed by Provost Penniman, Mr. John Gribbel, Dr. C. W. Burr, and the Library through the Colton fund. The securing of these funds has been the work of Dr. Penniman. The collection is kept in the Sanskrit seminar, where it is accessible on request to persons capable of using it; for the University has adopted the policy of permitting scholars from other institutions as well as members of its own body to study and publish from these original materials.

The 1935 additions were mostly obtained in India during the academic year 1934-35, and come chiefly from northern and central India, with a few from western, eastern, and southern India. By far the greater number are written on paper, which during the 15th century became the prevailing material for books in western India and quickly spread over central and northern India; the other manuscripts are on palm-leaf and come from eastern and southern India, where even today paper has not yet completely supplanted it as the surface for writing. With the exception of a few interesting Jain items the manuscripts are Hindu (Brahmanic) in character and exemplify a wide range of Sanskrit literature. Of dated specimens the earliest gives a date equivalent to 1505 A. D.; others range from then down into the 19th century.

Most of the purchases are of entire collections. This method has the great advantage of making funds go further than does the purchasing of selected items from collections. An owner, himself ignorant of the language and contents of manuscripts he has inherited from his ancestors, will usually sell a whole collection more cheaply than he will a selection.
In the latter case the focussing of a purchaser’s attention upon individual works makes the owner in his ignorance exaggerate the true value of those works and demand a price out of all reason. In one such instance I was asked as much as four rupees a couplet for a manuscript. Since the work contained about ten thousand couplets, the cost would have been 40,000 rupees (about $14,500); a fair price would probably have been not more than 200 rupees (about $72). But the owner had named so large a sum that it was obvious we could never come to an agreement, and I did not even attempt to do business with him but only thanked him for having allowed me to see and examine so valuable an object. The disadvantage of purchasing by an entire collection lies in the fact that every such collection contains material of second value, useful only as illustrations of works already satisfactorily published. In general, the purchase of manuscripts is best negotiated through an Indian, and the less a foreigner, especially an American, appears in the transaction, the more successful it is likely to be. Whenever possible I worked through an agent, sometimes a dealer, who would take a reasonable commission; the ideal arrangement was not to permit even my name to be mentioned. It was most important to pick agents familiar with the manuscript market, who would get for my inspection material which was worth the time and difficulty necessary to complete the purchase.

The 1935 acquisitions are especially strong in the Vedanta (the dominant philosophical system of Hinduism), mediaeval religious law, and grammar. A number of works have been acquired which are not mentioned in Aufrecht’s great Catalogus Catalogorum of Sanskrit manuscripts. There are many others which are represented in Aufrecht but still lack publication. There are still others in our collection which have been published but need better editing, and our examples may be useful when these works are being given definitive edition.

One of the least worked fields of Indic culture is that of mediaeval religious law. The oldest texts of religious law
have been well explored, but the mediaeval texts have been hardly touched. Although the latter build upon the older, they differ in many respects and amplify, and they are the norm for modern practice. All told our collection contains about 200 manuscripts of mediaeval religious law, covering the many ceremonies of a pious Hindu’s life, and in at least a fair number of cases our manuscripts and the texts they illustrate should be valuable in the development of this unexplored and important field. A doctor of philosophy from this University, Dr. Horace I. Poleman, has been working on the mediaeval death and funeral rites, and has in this collection further material for his research.

Among the rare works in the new acquisitions is the Ganitanamamala by Haridatta, an astrological work. Another is the Prayascittaviveka by Sulapani, a work on the rites of expiation. Still another is the Smritikaustubha, a text of death rites by Anantadeva, who wrote in the first half of the 13th century and was one of the earliest authorities on later Hindu ritual. A curiosity is an anonymous and probably incomplete text in dialectic Hindi on birds as omens, showing rude paintings of sixteen birds, some with onomatopoetic names not appearing in the Hindi dictionaries, and indicating whether these birds are favorable or unfavorable in connection with ten topics, such as starting a journey or entering into a business association. It was possibly a village soothsayer’s pocket guide.

The oldest dated manuscript in the new group is of the Nyayamakaranda by Anandabodhacarya, an unpublished work on logic, of which three other manuscripts are listed in Aufrecht’s catalog. The colophon of our manuscript gives a date equivalent to 1505 A. D., a very old date for paper manuscripts in India except in western India, and indeed old for manuscripts anywhere in India except western India and Nepal. The paper, style of page, and appearance of the manuscript are such as to make the date plausible. But there is a complication in that just below the original colophon is another line of writing, possibly a later addition, giving a date
equivalent to 1605 A. D., just a century later than that of
the first dating. Since the manuscript is rare, it becomes
worthwhile to decide which date is correct.

Of the score of palm leaf manuscripts from South India,
one was purchased last summer in London by Provost Penni-
man and presented to the collection. It is of a Tamil text
entitled Kanda-puranam, dealing with Hindu mythology, a
work which this manuscript may at some time be useful for
editing.

It is gratifying to be able to state that our entire collection
is being cataloged at this time. Without a catalog a
manuscript collection is of very little value. In the case of
previous accessions of Indic manuscripts, the library at once
had cards made for them. It happens that the American
Council of Learned Societies has been financing a census of
Indic manuscripts in the United States and Canada, and this
has been in the hands of Dr. Poleman, who has had the ad-
vantage of the facilities of the Library of Congress and that
Library's cooperation. It is hoped that when his cataloging
of Indic manuscripts in America is completed the final work
will be adequately published. Up to this time many of the
Sanskrit manuscripts in this country, including one very large
collection, were not even listed anywhere and could serve no
scholarly purpose. When Dr. Poleman's work is published,
all materials will at once become evident to scholars.
THE COVERDALE BIBLE

In commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the printing of the Coverdale Bible, the Library had on exhibition from November 11 to November 26 a noteworthy collection of Bibles. Most of them had been lent for this purpose by Dr. A. Edward Newton and by Dr. Josiah H. Penniman, and other valuable editions had been lent by Mr. T. Edward Ross, Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach, and Dr. Edward B. Krumbhaar. The following is a list of the volumes that were shown:

Vulgate Manuscript of the 14th century.
A Leaf of the Gutenberg Bible.
“A Noble Fragment;” a bibliographical essay by A. Edward Newton.
Latin Bible, on vellum, 1487.
Latin Bible, 1497, from the library of Robert Louis Stevenson.
Tindale’s first octavo New Testament (Facsimile), 1525.
Tindale’s revised New Testament, 1534.
Coverdale Bible, 1535. (The first complete Bible printed in English).
The Great Bible (Cromwell’s Bible), 1539.
Genevan Bible, 1560.
Bishops’ Bible, 1568 and 1572.
Greek New Testament, 1576, printed by Henricus Stephanus.
Rheims New Testament, 1582. (The first Roman Catholic version of the New Testament in English.)
Prayer-Book and Bible, 1607. (Superb example of “needlework” binding.)
The Douay Bible, 1609. (The first Roman Catholic version of the whole Bible in English.)
Authorised Version, 1611.
Book of Common Prayer. (Rare editions of 1549, 1671, and 1717.)
Proposed Book of Common Prayer, Philadelphia, 1786. (The only known copy with the Errata.)
A Leaf of the First American Bible (Eliot’s), 1663.
Eliot’s Indian Bible, 2nd edition, 1685.
Aitken Bible, 1782. (“The Bible of the Revolution.”)
Manuscript Letter of George Washington, relating to distribution of the Aitken Bible.
An American Version of 1808, by Charles Thomson, of the University of Pennsylvania.
Synopsis of the Four Evangelists, by Charles Thomson, Philadelphia, 1815.
The English Hexapla, London, 1848. (Six important English translations, with the original Greek.)
Book of Job, New York, 1856. (Common English version, Hebrew text, and an American revision.)
The Sacred Books of the Old and New Testaments, 1899. Edited under the supervision of Horace Howard Furness, and printed in colors.
Modern Reader's Bible, New York, 1901.
The Bible in Modern English. Perkiomen Press, 1909.
The Four Gospels. Translation by C. C. Torrey, based on Aramaic texts, 1933.

NOTES ON THE ENGLISH BIBLE

By Dr. Josiah H. Penniman

[Prepared in connection with the Library's exhibit commemorating the 400th anniversary of the Coverdale Bible.]

The Bible is composed of collections of ancient writings: (1) The Old Testament or Scriptures of the Jews; (2) The New Testament or early Christian writings; and (3) a collection of ancient writings known as the Apocrypha.

The influence of the Bible and its wide distribution are due to the nature of its contents and also to its intrinsic qualities as literature. Carlyle said: "David's life and history, as written for us in those Psalms of his, I consider to be the truest emblem ever given of a man's moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest men will ever discern in it the faithful struggle of an earnest human soul toward what is good and best."
The Old Testament is composed of three great collections of the sacred writings of the Jews. These are: (1) "The Law;" Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; (2) "The Prophets;" Joshua, Judges, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, II Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and (The Twelve), Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; (3) "The Writings;" Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, I Chronicles, II Chronicles.


The Apocrypha is a group of fourteen books which was included in the early Greek translations of the Old Testament (the Septuagint, third century B. C.). These books were not included in the Scriptures by the Palestinian Jews, but were included by the Hellenistic Jews. They are, with the exception of the Prayer of Manasses and First and Second Esdras, included in the Latin Bible (the Vulgate, fourth century A. D.). Archaeology has thrown much light on the writings of the Old Testament, particularly on the institutions, the art, and the society of Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt, and has brought to us a considerable amount of literature similar in contents and form to parts of the Old Testament. "The Sayings of Jesus" found in Egypt in 1892 and 1904 on two leaves of papyrus are of great importance, owing to their early date and their similarity to records in the Gospels.
The English Bible is a translation of the Jewish Scriptures, preserved in Hebrew, and the writings of the New Testament, preserved in Greek.

The most important Greek manuscripts are:

The Codex Vaticanus, brought to Rome in 1448 and believed to have been copied in Egypt in the fourth century. This is in Rome.

The Codex Sinaiticus of the fourth century, found in 1844-1859 in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai and now in the British Museum.

The Codex Alexandrinus, sent in 1628 by the Patriarch of Constantinople to Charles I as a gift. Since 1753 this has been in the British Museum. It is probably of the fifth century.

Each of these three Codices contains almost the whole Bible and the Apocrypha.

There are numerous other ancient manuscripts of portions of the Bible.

The English Bible now accessible in many versions is the result of scholarly work done by earnest and devout men through the course of more than six centuries. Each successive version has represented progress toward the complete expression in English of the thoughts of ancient writers. Itself a collection of what, in many cases, are composite books, the Bible now appears in English in a composite translation. To the original, as to the translation, there were many contributors in many different centuries. To the authors and editors, we may ascribe the single-hearted purpose to preserve for future generations the record of the dealings of God with man. To the translators, we may ascribe the single-hearted purpose to make accessible to men of English tongue that treasure-house of wisdom and beauty commonly known as the Holy Scriptures, contained in the Old and the New Testaments.

The most important of the English translations are: (1) the Wycliffite versions, 1380-1388; (2) Tindale, 1525-1535; (3) Coverdale, 1535; (4) the Great Bible (Cromwell,
Cranmer), 1539; (5) the Geneva Bible, 1557-1560; (6) the Bishop's Bible, 1568; (7) the Rheims-Douay Bible, 1582-1609; (8) the King James Bible (commonly called the Authorised Version), 1611; (9) the Revised Version, 1881-1885; (10) the American Revised Version, 1901.

The Bible contains many forms of literature in prose and poetry. History is represented in such books as Genesis and Exodus, and I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles. Biography is contained in the Gospels; Religious poetry in the Psalms; Wisdom literature in Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes; Prophetic oracles in Isaiah; Apocalypses in Revelation, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and in the Apocrypha in II Esdras; Stories in Jonah, Ruth, and Esther; Love poetry in an allegory in the Song of Solomon; Laws in Deuteronomy. Other kinds of literature are found in the various books, such as stories of heroes in Joshua. The fact that the Bible is an oriental book must always be borne in mind, for it differs from the literature of the western world. The Biblical writers were men whose modes of life and manner of thought were determined by their race and environment. The physical characteristics of Palestine and the customs of the inhabitants are the natural reasons for many of the modes of expression and figures of speech employed which present interesting questions, not only in regard to the source of the imagery but also in regard to the constant use of it.

Familiarity with the Bible derived from the reading of it in church service and in the family for several hundred years has made the contents and the language a part of our literature and also of our common speech.
Suppose you need to consult an important book and it is in accordance with your custom and convenience to use the Library of the University of Pennsylvania. You turn to the catalog, but fate is against you: the book is not in the University Library. Some hours or some days later, when you can manage it, you go hopefully to the Free Library, the Franklin Institute, the Academy of Natural Sciences, the Library Company of Philadelphia, perhaps also to the College of Physicians, but all to no avail. Fate is still against you. There are still some sixty important libraries in the metropolitan area of Philadelphia to which you have not gone, and it is highly probable that the book which you are seeking is available somewhere among them; but your time and patience are exhausted, you cannot go on. You return to the University and appeal to the kind and efficient person who is charged with the handling of inter-library loans, and a fresh search of a more far-reaching character is inaugurated. Perhaps the Union Catalog of the Library of Congress is appealed to. At any rate, the book is finally located for you, perhaps in some distant repository half-way across the continent, and in due course, though not improbably after a considerable delay, it is delivered to your hands. Your desire has at last been satisfied—but you still have to pay the carrying charges, and an uneasy feeling lingers in your mind that the book should somehow have been obtained with less trouble and expense much nearer home.

In this age of scientific progress—of modern conveniences—such things ought not to be. Philadelphia is an old community, long distinguished for her men of science and her men of letters, for her numerous institutions of learning, and for the extraordinary variety and richness of her culture. Inevitably she has become possessed of a great and precious
store of books and manuscripts. Among her many libraries, a surprising number are old and several are of unique, or all but unique, importance. All told they may contain four or five million volumes. Yet there is no single really great repository of books among them—comparable, let us say, with the Public Library of New York, Boston, or Chicago—where all but the more specialized needs of readers and researchers can be satisfied; and there is no ready means of determining promptly where, among these numerous institutions, any desired book can be obtained. It is probably no exaggeration to say that there is no other community in this country with library resources remotely approaching those of Philadelphia, where such serious difficulties and delays are encountered in the simple process of locating books.

Mindful of the unnecessary and intolerable difficulties of this situation, a group of scholars, librarians, and public-spirited citizens drew together more than two years ago and began to consider measures of amelioration. They promptly reached the conclusion that the first and most necessary step in the solution of these difficulties would be the compilation of a great union card catalog which would show at a glance the location, or locations, of any desired book which the community possessed. But so far as was known no such complete regional catalog had ever before been attempted anywhere in the world. No one knew how much it would cost or how long it would take to complete it—indeed, no one knew whether such a project would be practical or even possible, and the methods by which it might be attempted had all to be determined. The Union Library Catalog Committee of the Philadelphia Metropolitan Area spent more than a year in the investigation of methods. The experience of the Library of Congress in the compilation of a national select union catalog was studied, as was also that of other institutions in the making of more limited union catalogs or in the mechanical reproduction of existing catalogs. Much attention was also paid to the latest mechanisms which have been developed in connection with modern photography. Finally, by
the middle of last winter, the committee believed that they had devised methods which for the purpose they had in view, namely, the compilation of a complete regional catalog of many libraries, would be superior to anything hitherto developed elsewhere.¹ But they desired to make a test—a test not only of their methods, but a test which would demonstrate whether the proposed catalog would be possible and practical, and which might also provide a basis for at least an approximate estimate of the cost of such a catalog and of the time which would be required to compile it. Thanks to the generosity of a forward-looking Philadelphian, the cooperation of Dr. Ernest Kletsch, director of the Union Catalog of the Library of Congress, and the untiring industry of Mr. Paul Vanderbilt, librarian of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art, it has been possible to compile an experimental catalog of twenty representative Philadelphia libraries (ten being general and ten special) for the short section of the alphabet ALBERT TO ALGEM.² The experiment has now been completed and the resulting section of a union catalog may now be inspected by anyone so desiring in the Library of the Pennsylvania Museum of Art, Memorial Hall, Fairmount Park. A detailed report on the experiment has also been prepared and will gladly be furnished, so long as the supply holds out, to any one who may be interested.³

From the beginning of their efforts the Committee have been greatly heartened by the character of the endorsements

¹ The most important features of these methods were the use of a file of Library of Congress depository catalog cards as a foundation; the use of the Recordak camera and 16 mm. cinema film to record the holdings of local libraries at a low cost—with the least possible inconvenience; the use of Recordak projectors to read and compare the film records in a central workshop; and a device for making single photographic enlargements from film, on cards of standard size for filing in catalog drawers.

² The twenty libraries selected for the experiment are as follows: General: University of Pennsylvania, Free Library of Philadelphia, Library Company of Philadelphia and its Ridgway Branch, American Philosophical Society, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Bryn Mawr College, Haverford College, Swarthmore College, Temple University. Special: College of Physicians, Academy of Natural Sciences, Biddle Law Library (University of Pennsylvania), Dropsie College of Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia Commercial Museum, Franklin Institute, Pennsylvania Museum of Art, Lippincott Library of the Wharton School of Finance (University of Pennsylvania), Pedagogical Library of the Board of Education. Especial thanks are due to the librarians of all these institutions, who gave most cordial cooperation in carrying through the experiment.

³ Requests for this report should be addressed to C. W. David, Bryn Mawr College, or to Paul Vanderbilt, Pennsylvania Museum of Art.
which they have received. Locally they have had most encouraging letters from librarians very generally throughout the community, from the heads of a good number of institutions of learning, and from many individuals whose opinions they value. And from beyond Philadelphia they have received the endorsement not only of important individuals but of several national organizations which occupy positions of leadership in the intellectual life of the country. They have long been aware that the library problem of Philadelphia was not unique—except possibly in its extreme difficulty—that other urban centers were faced with a similar situation; but the requests which have come from almost every part of the country for the report above mentioned since it was first issued have caused them increasingly to realize that other communities are beginning to grapple with this problem, and that there is forming what may perhaps even now be regarded as a national movement, for the better integration of regional library resources. In such a movement it would seem that Philadelphia has an admirable opportunity to take the lead.

The Committee are of the opinion that the experimental catalog has demonstrated that their methods are sound, and that a complete union catalog of the libraries of the Philadelphia metropolitan area is both possible and practical. To make estimates of time and cost from experience with so small a part of so great an undertaking is perhaps hazardous, but it is believed to be very much better than a guess that the whole catalog could be compiled by four competent workers in four or five years (or by a larger force in a correspondingly shorter period) and that the total cost would be about $87,000—to which, of course, there would have to be added an annual charge of from $5,000 to $7,500 (depending upon circumstances) to provide for the service of the catalog and to keep it up to date after it had been completed in the first instance. To many, especially in these difficult times, such sums will perhaps seem discouragingly large. But it has to be realized that libraries and library service are really very
expensive necessities of the modern world, and that books are really of very little value except as they are made conveniently available to those who need to use them. Eighty-seven thousand dollars would be enough to add perhaps 20,000 or 25,000 ordinary volumes to existing collections in Philadelphia libraries, or it would be enough to acquire a very few important collector's items. As it comes increasingly to be realized how greatly the proposed catalog would enhance the usefulness of Philadelphia's existing rich collections; as it comes to be understood that the proposed union catalog would place under the worker's hand perhaps four to five million volumes, whereas at present the largest local libraries contain substantially less than a million volumes, it seems to the Committee inevitable that funds will be forthcoming for the achievement of this great undertaking.

In one respect, of course, the resources made available through a union catalog would fall substantially short of what might be provided by a single library of four to five million volumes: there is much duplication of the commoner books among the holdings of Philadelphia libraries. But that such duplication is far less extensive than is commonly supposed would seem to be one of the most striking results of the recent experiment. In the short section of the alphabet with which the Committee were concerned they dealt in all with 2,282 different books; and of this number, 1,844, or almost 81 per cent, were to be found in one library only, among the twenty with which they experimented. In the light of such a revelation as this, can anyone fail to agree that a union catalog of the rich and scattered library resources of this great community is not only highly desirable, but a necessity?
A university press has been described as the voice of the institution of which it is a part. It is a small voice, to be sure, as compared with the strident tones of a winning football team, but it has a certain advantage in that the written word remains long after football scores and scorers are forgotten.

Even in university circles there is a wide variety of opinion as to the function of the press, ranging all the way from the assumption that it exists solely for the purpose of publishing works which the commercial publishers refuse, to the belief that it should be a money-making institution which would bring both cash and credit to the university. The truth, as always, falls between these extreme views. A university press cannot make money from its publications alone, and its aim should be to publish books of permanent value, whether or not financially profitable. Its real function is to provide an outlet for the work of scholars, and to give their colleagues everywhere the opportunity of knowing what they are achieving.

Since 1927 the University Press has been a department of the University of Pennsylvania. It operates on an annual budget, and is controlled as to its publication program by a faculty committee of nine members appointed for three-year terms by the President of the University upon nomination by the Educational Council.

Speaking statistically, in eight and a half years of active operation the University Press, with an entire staff of three persons and a part-time shipping clerk, has published and marketed 171 books. In 1934, with twenty titles, it ranked sixth in output among the sixteen recognized American university presses. This probably establishes a record of some sort. Anyway it means that the manager doubles as editor, proofreader, salesman, and purchasing agent; that the designer is also the manufacturing and advertising departments; and that the secretary does the work of seven departments in
larger institutions. The Press has a mailing list of over eight thousand purchasers of its books, exclusive of libraries and the book trade.

Among the publications of the Press are the lectures of the Rosenbach Fellowship in Bibliography, the Johnson Foundation for Medical Physics, the Boardman Lectureship in Christian Ethics, and the Cooper Foundation of Swarthmore College. The Press has issued twenty-six volumes of the Industrial Research Studies, and acts as distributing agent for the publications of the American Philosophical Society, the University Museum, the American Schools of Oriental Research, and the Study of Population Redistribution, as well as the *Hispanic Review* and *Pennsylvania History*.

As the only organization of its kind in the Philadelphia district, the Press has issued a number of books by faculty members of neighboring institutions of learning. Among them are: Bryn Mawr, Bucknell, Delaware, Haverford, Lafayette, Rutgers, Swarthmore, Temple, and Ursinus.

Following the lead of the older university presses, the University of Pennsylvania Press has endeavored to maintain a high standard of design and workmanship in the books bearing its imprint. Now and then a volume is selected by the Institute of Graphic Arts as one of the Fifty Books of the Year, and reviewers frequently comment on the attractive appearance of its output.

Like all small publishing houses, the Press has its share of troubles—lack of funds, an occasional disgruntled author, a good book which refuses to sell in spite of favorable reviews and careful promotion; on the other hand it has the satisfaction of a steadily growing recognition by the reading public, and the incentive to justify the statement made recently by the *Cleveland Press* that it is "the most generally usefully productive of any university press in America."
PROVOST GOODWIN ON EDUCATION

Through the kindness of Mr. George E. Nitzsche we have recently received an uncompleted manuscript of Daniel R. Goodwin, Provost of the University from 1860 to 1868, entitled "Education: the System of Education adopted in the University of Pennsylvania defended. An Address before the Associated Alumni, delivered Friday evening, Nov. 23, 1860." The manuscript comes to an abrupt end, but we print it here as an item of interest in the history of the University:

Mr. President and Gentlemen,

Alumni of the Univ. of Penn.

It is about a week since that your Committee extended to me an urgent invitation to make an informal Address before you this evening, in addition to the regular Oration to be delivered by my Reverend brother from New York. At first I felt compelled to decline the undertaking upon so brief a notice. But on further reflection I was unwilling to seem to slight an Invitation proceeding from such a Source, or to miss an opportunity, however suddenly presented, of forming an acquaintance and opening a communication of thought and sympathy with the Alumni of the University. I have therefore consented to appear before you this evening; but I come, after all, in such a physical condition that a prudent regard for my health as well as my reputation would have required me to stay at home. I must therefore ask your generous indulgence.

Gentlemen, I rejoice in this opportunity of presenting to the Sons and friends of this University my cordial Salutations. I rejoice to feel that I am part and parcel with yourselves in this noble Institution. I rejoice in the ties of scholarly sympathy and a common culture. I rejoice in the Catholicity of the fellowship of learning and Science. Other ties there are stronger than these in their power of attraction, but they serve also as the conductors of a still stronger repellent influence. The tie of patriotism and common citizenship is
strong; but patriotism degenerates into party-spirit, and is desecrated by the brawls and rancour and selfishness of the political arena. Men come to love their common country less than they hate their party's opponents. The tie of religion is strong. Christianity would teach us to recognize as a brother and take lovingly to our hearts every one who bears the image of Christ, every one who loves our common Lord; but, alas, Christians are divided into schools and parties and sects; and so violently are they opposed to each other that the *odium theologicum* has become a by-word, and I fear that practically their mutual antipathies and animosities are felt to be stronger than the bonds of their common Christianity. Every interest, therefore, however slight, every tie, however slender—though it be but as the thread of the spider's web—that may tend to draw these discordant elements together in harmonious action on common ground is to be hailed with delight, to be embraced, improved, strengthened. Whatever will give us a fuller, a more genial, consciousness of our common humanity will neither weaken our sense of common citizenship nor adulterate the truly Christian Spirit of our religion. The cities of Greece—Athens, Sparta, Corinth, Argos, Thebes—had their separate governments, their conflicting interests, their ships, their armies, their colonies, their conquests, their plans of aggrandizement and claims of pre-eminence; and yet the Olympic games—mere games though they were—preserved a sense of common Greek nationality, amidst all their mutual conflicts and political jealousies and animosities; at least they probably contributed more to preserve it than any other fact or institution whatever.

Our common interest in the University of Pennsylvania is the chord which I would strike this evening. We have reason to take a generous pride in the largeness of views which characterizes our University in her idea and plan of culture—in her schools of Medicine, Law and Mines on the one side, and her Charity foundations on the other, added to the training of her Academical Department. Her origin, his-
tory, and great names have no partizan odour. Franklin and Rittenhouse, Mifflin and M’Kean, White and Ingersoll, Smith and Ewing, Rush and Wistar are identified with the reputation and culture of this city and State, of our whole country, of our common religion and our common humanity; but they can be appropriated by no clique or party. Our University welcomes Science, she cherishes Classical learning, she reverences religion;—but she has no "hobbies."

Precisely on this ground it is that the University has to meet with opposition and objections.

It is objected that she gives too much space and prominence to the Sciences. I answer that the character of our present civilization, whether it be good or bad, is such that the study of the Sciences is absolutely indispensable to a truly liberal education. I hope that arrangements may be made for enlargement rather than retrenchment in this direction.

On the other hand, it is objected that too much time and attention are devoted to the Classics. I answer that they are essential to the Department of Arts. You cannot have a College without Classical Studies. A College is a College, whether it be a desirable thing or not; and the degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts, whether worth anything or not, have a definite meaning. I would rather see the attention to Classical Studies increased than diminished in our curriculum. If they were abolished or much restricted in the University, one of two things would happen,—either the city would be compelled to establish for its accommodation a proper College independent of the University, or its sons would, in still greater numbers, be sent abroad for a Collegiate education. It is a great mistake to suppose that Classical Studies are unpractical. On the contrary their true design and proper effect are eminently practical. The classics are to be studied as improving models, and not as store houses of learned and pedantic quotations. If the latter were their object a Dictionary of quotations would be more directly to the purpose than all the Classical authors together.
That speaker or writer shows, in my opinion, most of the truly classical character, form, and spirit, who, disdaining all tawdry and needless ornament of whatever kind, goes most directly and effectively to his point. Such a man brews no ragouts from the fragments of other men’s dinners, gathers no nosegays of dead and faded flowers; but presents to us the living tree, blooming it may be in its season—and then the more beautiful—but blooming only that it may bear fruit. No speaker or writer was ever more simple and straightforward, more studiously plain, pointed, practical and business-like, than Demosthenes. And yet he is, by common consent, the greatest orator of antiquity; and precisely for this reason was he the greatest. Cicero excelled him in copiousness of words and pomp of diction and what is too commonly but abusively called eloquence; and precisely for this reason is rightly reckoned his inferior. Yet even Cicero scarcely quotes a line of Greek in all his business orations.

But the grand objection alleged against the System of our University is—"the want of religion."

It is unfortunate that the remaining part of Dr. Goodwin's address is not available, for it undoubtedly constituted the more important part of his remarks. The following account of the address and of the meeting at which it was delivered is taken from the Public Ledger of November 24, 1860:

The anniversary meeting of the Alumni of the University of Pennsylvania was held last evening in the College building. After music by the orchestra, Dr. Goodwin, Provost of the University, was introduced, and addressed the audience, mainly in reply to a criticism upon certain remarks made by himself on the occasion of his inauguration to the Provostship, which appeared in a religious journal some time since.

The paper in question took exception to the system of instruction as at present practiced in the University, and more particularly to a fanciful allusion to Heenan and Sayers, made by the Provost at the time alluded to. He said that his statement had been somewhat perverted, but what he had asserted relative to the subject of physical development properly attained, he was prepared to prove the truth of,
and maintain. He further demonstrated the desirableness of physical strength and beauty, and believed that the improvement and beautifying of any one member of the human body lent additional vigor and beauty to the whole. Various incidents were narrated by the speaker, contrasting the characters and standing in society of students who had received collegiate educations apart from religious training and those who had been religiously instructed; and while the former could not be said to be more evil disposed than the generality of young men, among the latter had too often been found lamentable evidences of a want of Christian spirit and a decided proneness to sin.

On the conclusion of his address, Dr. Goodwin was loudly applauded. The Rev. H. E. Montgomery, of New York, then delivered the annual oration, taking for his subject, the importance and value of religion in every vocation of life.

It thus appears that religion was the predominant topic of the anniversary meeting of the Alumni in 1860, and that Dr. Goodwin's address followed closely the general lines of his inaugural address, delivered on September 10 of that year, a copy of which is preserved in the Library.
RECENT GIFTS

The following books have recently been presented by members of the Friends of the Library:

By Dr. E. B. Krumbhaar

Thomas à Kempis, *De Imitatione Christi*, Antwerp, The Plantin Press, 1607. (From the library of William Penn, with an inscription, probably in his writing, on the back cover. Laid in are some anonymous lines of verse, inspired by the inscription, written by someone who was not one of Penn's admirers.)


By Dr. C. Ross Smith


By Mr. Eric Morrell


An autograph letter of Hartley Coleridge and one of Derwent Coleridge.

By Dr. C. W. Burr


*Dionysius Areopagiti praeclarum opusculum de divinis nominibus*. Venice, 1501.