

Chapter 7

THE MOVE TO WEST PHILADELPHIA

THE OLD AND THE NEW

THE renaissance of the University, the first stirrings of which were discernible long before the middle of the century, and which became a vigorous movement after the Civil War, was a gradual development; but if a definite date for the beginning of a larger life for the University must be chosen, none probably is more defensible than the entrance into office in 1868 of Charles J. Stillé, the tenth Provost, followed closely, in 1870, by the migration of the University to its third home, in West Philadelphia. Dr. Stillé was the first Provost, barring the short and obscure incumbency of John McDowell, who was not a clergyman. He was a member of an old and well-to-do Philadelphia family, going back, as his name indicates, to the oldest racial stock, at least of those of European origin, in this region, the Swedes. He had been a student in the Academy, but had gone to Yale for his college course and was graduated there in 1839. He studied law with J. R. Ingersoll, was admitted to the bar, traveled in Europe, carried on private business in Philadelphia, wrote influential pamphlets in support of the Northern government during the Civil War, and achieved recognition as an executive by his administration of the Sanitary Fair. He was appointed Professor of Belles Lettres and English Literature as successor to Professor Coppée in 1866, and was elected Provost on the resignation of Dr. Goodwin in 1868. His somewhat stormy career as Provost will be summed up later. It was in his provostship, during the sixties and seventies and early eighties, that the University passed from its local and little-known status to a recog-

nized position among the greater educational institutions of the country.

It may be proper to observe, as this narrative follows the history of the University out from the narrower waters of its early existence upon the broad sea of its later career, that no man who graduated from it at any period is justified in a disparagement of his academic inheritance. Those who taught him were real scholars. Even a hostile critic, who in the middle of the century complains with some exaggeration of "the absence of any pride in the institution or any interest shown by the public" and points to the fact that only one donation—of \$5,000—had been made to it in the preceding eighty years, while other colleges had received numerous liberal gifts and bequests, as an obvious indication of lack of public confidence, at the same time describes the professors as "competent men and some of them excellent teachers." Graduates of the College Department were well educated as college education went in their time. Nor need any alumnus deplore the associations of his student days. Small as the group was at that time, and limited as were the opportunities for social intercourse compared with the community life of those who lived at college, there were quite enough classmates to provide congenial spirits for a variety of tastes and dispositions. The students, moreover, were for the most part drawn from families of intellectual interests and often of social position, and, as has been before remarked, many of them rose to eminence in later life.

Then why this note of depreciation so often to be found in contemporary criticism of the College, internal and external? Why was it so often and so fairly described in the first half of the century as "a small and local institution"? And how shall the sympathetic historian write of it?

Notwithstanding its long history, the thread of intellectual excellence that ran unbroken through that history, its freedom from religious restrictions and the eminence of its administrators, neither its actual condition, its recent progress, or its reputation could be considered satisfactory.

The title "university" is neither here nor there. In the American sense of "a college of liberal arts to which one or more

professional schools are adjoined," the term had been justly applied to Pennsylvania ever since it had first been claimed by Provost Smith and Dr. Morgan in 1771, subsequent to the introduction of the medical courses in 1765, and even more properly since it had been so denominated officially in the law of 1779; but this did not, unfortunately, make it great any more than it did those other American universities whose best men questioned their own use of the term. Since the raising of the college course in 1824 to four years, and the establishment of an age limit for entrance in 1826, the course of studies at Pennsylvania was not appreciably different from that of the New England and other large colleges and universities. Its teaching of the classics, of mathematics, of moral and intellectual philosophy and even of literature and history was, in the first half of the century, as advanced and as thorough as that of any other American college or university of the time. Nor were the numbers of its students and Faculty insignificant. Small as were, in comparison with modern times, the hundred or so students who were usually in attendance as undergraduates in the College, and the twenty or thirty who received their A.B. degrees each year, when reinforced by the medical and law students they made a body of some six hundred, differently distributed, it is true, but approximately as large as the student bodies of other universities. There has been in all periods at Pennsylvania too much of a tendency to identify the University with the College, and so to credit it with too small a student body.

It was neither numbers nor studies that kept Pennsylvania, before the close of the Civil War, from ranking in public estimation as equal with the most advanced colleges or universities of the time. The cause was rather a certain rigidity, a devotion to old established practice, a complacency of Trustees and Faculty in the routine that had long been followed, a lack of imagination and of boldness of conception and action that had made it indifferent to new proposals and alien to the community that surrounded it. This had held the University back. It had seemed unaware of and uninterested in the possibilities of the world around it. Dr. Horace Howard Furness, trained in the study of the most discerning of all critics of human nature, some time

later described the University as "sedate, conservative, respectable, quiescent in the belief that the methods of education which were wholesome for the fathers must be wholesome and all-sufficient for the sons and grandsons."

An enthusiastic professor on taking up, in 1866, his duties at the University, suggested to the Provost of the time that a certain change might secure for the University a wider influence in the community. The Provost replied that there were only about one hundred young men in Philadelphia who wanted a college education, that this number was not likely to increase very much even with an increase in population, and that any modification of the present system to meet the demands of public opinion was unlikely to be agreed to by the University authorities. They were doing their work well, and if this was not appreciated in Philadelphia there was nothing to be done about it. "Sad and discouraged," as he tells us, the questioner put the same suggestion before one of the older professors, who informed him that no enlargement of the present plan of education to make it more attractive to young men could possibly be attained. His advice was the same as that of the Provost, to attend to his teaching and let other things alone. Such an attitude was bound to keep the University "small and local," however thorough the drill imposed upon its students.

Although the Medical School, which largely governed itself independently of the Trustees, was less rigid, the majority of its Faculty were, in the middle of the century, opposed to the progressive ideas concerning medical education that were already, in the sixties, being urged by a group of younger men inside and outside that school.

Much of this was now to be changed. The period from 1868 to 1880 saw the move to a new and more spacious location, the establishment of new departments, a marked increase in the number of students and Faculty, and new cultural and physical interests. It saw the collection of considerable sums for the extension and support of the University; above all this period saw the emergence from its own midst of new projects, and a more ready responsiveness to those suggested from without. Bridges were built which led later to a vastly wider area of interest. At

the same time, externally, the University was emerging from its relative obscurity and developing new and original activities that gave it consideration in the larger university world and in the surrounding community.

THE THIRD HOME

By 1870 the University was ready again to leave the shell that had begun to constrict it. Its location on Ninth Street had, by the middle of the century, become much as that on Fourth Street had been at its beginning. The College and Medical buildings, notwithstanding their quiet dignity, were antiquated and inadequate. The region in which they lay had become disreputable and was still deteriorating. Some hundreds of college and medical students crowding boarding houses and finding their amusements in the very center of a large city were not conducive to the respectability of the locality. Provost Stillé noted that it was "a vile neighborhood, growing viler every day." He pleaded also for the vivifying influence that would come from new and more appropriate physical surroundings. Above all the tract of land now at the University's disposal was too small, and could not well be increased in that congested neighborhood. Increasing numbers, new departments, additional subjects of teaching, all of which were either existent or anticipated, required more elbow room. The endowed School of Agriculture and Industrial Arts, if it had eluded the grasp of the Trustees, had stretched their imaginations. The University was already straining at its physical bounds. There must be space for an expanding future.

Just west of the Schuylkill, in Blockley Township, lying between the high land on which ran the road to Darby (now Woodland Avenue) and the strip of swampy land along the river, was a tract of some two hundred acres, known as "Blockley Farm" or the "Almshouse Farm." It had been purchased by the city from the Hamiltons, the proprietors of "Woodlands," in 1830, at \$275 per acre, as a site for the city almshouse, which had to be moved from its downtown location. The almshouse buildings were erected there between 1830 and 1834, but, although well designed and finely located on the highest ground,

they occupied only a small part of the tract. In the growing recognition of the limitations and requirements of the University for more land, an interested alumnus, Nathaniel B. Browne of the class of 1838, a lawyer active in political and financial affairs, later a Trustee, living in West Philadelphia, called the attention of the Trustees to this vacant land and expressed the belief that the city would sell a sufficient amount for the University's needs at a favorable price. Indeed his idea was that the University should buy much more than it needed, selling off some for endowment purposes, while enhancing the value to the city of what it retained.

This proposal brought up the old question recurrent since the first meeting of the Trustees, in November 1749: should the University remain a city college, with the advantages and disadvantages of such a position, or should it establish itself in some rural locality or small town such as Princeton, Harvard, and Yale had adjusted themselves to and to which in turn they had given distinction? This course was the proposal of one of the most vigorous of the Trustees, Mr. McCall, who urged a complete change of location, even if it involved some other changes of plan. The West Philadelphia location seemed to offer a compromise, and after much discussion steps were taken for the purchase from the city of a large part of the West Philadelphia property. The city government was less generous than it had been when its annual grant to the College had been so helpful to it in its infant days, and indeed less liberal than it has frequently shown itself since, when it has at last become proud of the University. After prolonged negotiation ten acres were purchased in 1870 at \$8,000 per acre. This began the process by which the University has added "house to house and field to field," nibbling at the old almshouse tract and adjoining property, obtaining possession of it on every variety of consideration, till it has now more than a hundred acres, for the most part covered with buildings for purposes not conceived of in 1870. But for a time the four buildings erected in the four immediately following years gave adequate space for the academic needs of the University and for the hospital which completed the equipment of the Medical Department.

Of these four greenstone structures, so distinct from later buildings, which formed the nucleus of the University's third home, T. W. Richards, Instructor in Drawing in the old building and soon to be made Professor of Architecture in the new, was chosen as architect on September 20, 1870. His designs were severely restricted by the requirements of economy, but with the constant watchful interest of Provost Stillé and of William Sellers, chairman of the building committee of the Board of Trustees, one after another the buildings were brought to completion. The corner stone at the northeast corner of the first and main building, College Hall, was laid with the usual picturesque ceremonial, January 15, 1871. The silver trowel, used to spread the mortar, the property of Mr. Struthers, the builder, had already done service in laying the corner stone of the old Ninth Street buildings, the United States Bank, the Mint, the Merchants' Exchange, and other public buildings. Mr. John C. Cresson of the Board of Trustees deposited the leaden box, containing a curious collection of academic, public, and personal memorials, in the hollow of the stone, where presumably they still lie, drew over it a marble slab and pronounced it "true, square and level." The building was completed and inaugurated with much public ceremony, October 11, 1872. The students had already deserted the Ninth Street building and had gathered in this the previous month for the opening of the College term.

Tragedy stepped in for a moment when in the midst of the celebration of the opening Professor Frazer, for almost thirty years the most active professor in the field of science and now showing his friends around the new rooms, suddenly staggered, sat down, and passed away in a heart attack, a precursor of a disproportionate number of college professors who have died with similar suddenness from the same cause.

THE TOWNE SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL

In the general discussions in 1867 and 1868 that led to the adoption of changes in the Department of Arts and to the plan of removal to West Philadelphia a strong belief was expressed in the desirability of reorganizing the dormant Faculty of Sci-

ence. From this proposal emerged in 1869 an altogether new scientific department. The cumbrous old name, School of Agriculture, Mines, Manufactures, and the Mechanic Arts, which endeavored to describe all its objects, like an old-fashioned title page, was abandoned, and it was described simply as the Department of Science; later, on the announcement that it was to receive the residuary estate of John Henry Towne, one of the Trustees, this was changed to Towne Scientific School, the name it still retains. In the new building and as to much of its curriculum it was arranged to be parallel to the Department of Arts. One end of the College building was appropriated to each of the two departments, with common rooms—library, chapel, assembly room, and gymnasium—in the center. The Faculty of Science, like the Medical School and the Law School, had a Dean, leaving the Arts Department under the direct supervision of the Provost. So with its Faculty consisting of eight professors and instructors in scientific subjects, and six common to both Faculties, teaching subjects of general culture taken by Arts and Science students alike, the third Department of Science started on its career. It was the fourth University school to be founded, in succession to Arts, Medicine, and Law.

The Faculty included as its Dean J. Peter Lesley, Professor of Natural Philosophy; as professors of Chemistry and Mathematics Professors Frazer and Kendall, of Architecture Professor Richards, all of whom were from the old school; and, as new appointees, Genth, a noted German chemist, and Professor Franck, a civil engineer. Professor Robert Ellis Thompson and Professor McElroy were already in the Arts Faculty. Seidensticker and Brégy gave the German and French courses, and Samuel Cleveland became Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory. Provost Stillé taught history and English literature. By September 1872 the new school was ready to issue an announcement of its organization and to receive students in its rooms in College Hall. The plan, much better worked out than in either of the two earlier attempts to construct a scientific course, contemplated devotion of the first two years to general culture subjects scarcely different from the Arts course except that they required modern instead of ancient languages and gave some preparatory

scientific work. The third and fourth years were given strictly to practical scientific preparation for later professional life respectively in chemistry, mining, civil and mechanical engineering. Architecture was soon added to the other four professional objectives.

Their rooms in College Hall—the basement and all three stories of the eastern half of the building—for some years gave these courses the requisite facilities, though as the school grew, one branch of its work after another was destined to move to more spacious quarters. At the same time the western end was not only the home of the Department of Arts but provided rooms for the scientific subjects of a more cultural nature, such as lecture courses on chemistry, physics, and mathematics. After 1874 most of the third floor was the lecture hall of the Law School. All these subjects have for the most part emigrated to more specialized homes. The intellectual foundations, so to speak, of a large proportion of the buildings now on the campus were laid in College Hall.

Few academic buildings have seen more varied use. The basement, which was the scene of "corner fights" and other relaxations of young barbarians at play; the chapel, which was only too often the scene of forced attendance at services worthy a better acceptance, and of petty disorder, was also the stage for the picturesque prayers of Professor Thompson, the haunting echoes of Professor Clarke's voluntaries, of Dr. Furness' inimitable readings from Shakespeare, and of scores of lectures and talks by famous men from abroad; the rooms of "Philo" and "Zelo," just under the roof, where regular meetings of the societies and occasional interminable talks with congenial spirits suggest a leisure that seems to have disappeared from the world—these in the backward look compare not unfavorably in value with the classrooms in which the students were, or were supposed to be, getting their college education.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COURSE IN MUSIC

The same impetus that had led to the decision to move to West Philadelphia and to the erection of the new group of buildings

there made the Board of Trustees responsive to the suggestion of introducing new subjects and indeed to the establishment of what soon became new departments. In 1875 appeared one of the earliest of these new departments in the form of a Professorship of the Science of Music.

There had always been an appreciative attitude toward music at the University. Payment for music at the colonial College Commencements was one of the most constant items in the treasury accounts. Formal musical affairs were not infrequent. Among the varied requests for the use of the old Hall, after the move to Ninth Street, those for musical purposes were never refused. Rather suddenly, however, in 1875, the science of music came on the stage at the University through a letter to the Provost in 1874 from Rev. C. D. Hartranft, a graduate of the class of 1861. He was a clergyman of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Brunswick, N.J., where he had been given by Rutgers the degree of Doctor of Music in 1871, as a recognition of his introduction of music of a high grade in his church and in that city. He now proposed the creation of a Faculty of Music at Pennsylvania, possibly with the expectation of himself filling a position in it, for he was a candidate for election the next year.

The Provost and Trustees were sympathetic with the proposal, and a modest professorship was established in the year 1875. It was to be experimental, for the term of three years. Compensation was to be only what the professor obtained from the sale of tickets for his course, and if it proved that the room in the new College building set apart for his use had to be altered, the alterations were to be made at his expense. He was allowed at first to set his own price for his teaching, but later it was established at \$30 for each course. In addition to Professor Hartranft, J. Kendrick Payne, Michael Cross, who later became the first leader of the Philadelphia Orchestra, and Hugh A. Clarke were candidates. Professor Clarke was elected, and long remained the whole faculty. He came of a musical family. His grandfather was an English composer; his father held a degree in music from Oxford, emigrated to Canada, and was long Professor of Music in the University of Toronto.

Although Professor Clarke's appointment was for only three

years, successive reappointments made it in effect permanent, and he continued to hold the position for more than fifty years. In the beginning control was kept over his work by requiring that a syllabus of each course he proposed to give must be first submitted for approval to the Executive Committee of the Department of Arts, to which the new professorship was administratively attached, although its holder was not a member of the Faculty. The plan grew; the next year, 1876, the Trustees resolved to grant the degree of Bachelor of Music, requiring for it a thorough study of harmony and counterpoint, history and analysis of classical compositions, and the production of a musical composition that should meet all standards of criticism. The science of music remained for many years one of those subjects on the fringe of college training, taken seriously by a handful of students under the supervision of one teacher, to become, much later, part of a strong department and itself to be broadened and strengthened to its present distinguished position. Professor Clarke was the mentor of the University in all matters musical. He played the organ regularly in chapel during the days of compulsory attendance and on all special occasions. He composed the music for the Greek play, *The Acharnians*, given by the students in 1886, and the next year was given the degree of Doctor of Music in recognition of that difficult and distinguished service. Ten years later he composed the music for the second Greek play, *Iphigenia among the Taurians*. He was a cultured man; he put pressure on his students to take courses in English literature, and himself wrote many books about music. The later development of the extensive and popular Department of Music at the University owes much to the long and dignified career of its founder.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DENTISTRY

The fifth major department of the University to be founded, the School of Dentistry, was a child of the Medical School. At a meeting of the Medical Faculty December 1, 1874, "the propriety of associating certain Dental branches with the instruction of the School" was considered, and two distinguished names, those

of Dr. Agnew and Dr. Leidy, appear as a committee to confer on the subject with some of the prominent dentists of the city. Dentistry was already taught in professional schools and had been since their inauguration in Baltimore in 1839; there were two dental colleges in Philadelphia; so presumably it was rather with the idea of extending the functions of the Medical School than a sense of need for such action on their part that interested the Medical Faculty in the matter. Their committee reported in February 1875, and a recommendation on the subject was pressed upon the Board of Trustees, but at that time unsuccessfully. Dr. Wood, chairman of the Trustees' committee on the Medical School, did not think well of the proposition, and after some further consultation it was dropped.

Two years later, December 1877, the Medical Faculty took the matter up in a different form. They made overtures to the Pennsylvania College of Dental Surgery, which had been in existence since 1856, with a view to the union of the two institutions—or rather, as it was bound to prove, the absorption of the Dental College into the University. This probable absorption was resented by some members of its Faculty, but two, Dr. Darby and Dr. Essig, favored the plan, and in later conferences intimated that they would willingly resign from the old school and accept positions in the University. The Trustees of the University now favored the plan, and in March 1878 resolved to establish a Dental Department with a Faculty of eight, six to be present members of the Medical Faculty, two to be the members of the Dental College already named. They were thereupon elected March 12, 1878, resigned their old positions and became the nucleus of the new Dental Department of the University. A third, Dr. Truman, was soon afterward secured, and became, at first, Secretary, then Dean of the school and so remained for many years. In November 1878 it was resolved that graduates of the Dental School should receive the degree D.D.S., the sixth regular degree in course provided for in the University statutes. The professors were promised lecture and operating rooms in the Medical Building. It is indicative of the lack of administrative coördination at that time that neither the janitor of the building

nor even the Provost, Dr. Stillé, knew anything of these arrangements.

However, the pioneers of the new department were given some dark rooms in the basement and gathered around them a little group of thirty students, mostly men who had followed them from their old school. A supply of patients for their clinics, the principal need in dental instruction, was obtained from the adjacent University Hospital, "patients who were," according to the records, "sick men who smelled of iodoform"; others from the almshouse, "paupers who were dirty and ragged," and still others from the growing population of West Philadelphia, whose maids were induced to come by announcement cards distributed from door to door. Classes were begun in the unfavorable surroundings described above, but they were successful from the beginning.

Two needs called for the erection of a new building: first a change in the method of medical instruction, second the demand for more accommodations for the rising Dental School. Medical instruction had formerly consisted merely of the delivery of lectures, illumined in a few cases by showing of plaster casts and illustrations by the lecturer and to some extent improved by clinical observation when there was opportunity. This instruction was supplemented by work under privately paid quiz-masters, recognized by the Faculty. Now changes had been introduced into the curriculum, as will be later explained, that required laboratory instruction. For this there were no facilities in the new medical building which had been put up in West Philadelphia. The course was also in 1876 lengthened to three years. The Medical Faculty, in a communication to the Trustees dated March 1878, described their difficulties. "The present Medical Hall [now Logan Hall] is well adapted to the old plan of teaching, which required no laboratory instruction, but it is totally inadequate for the new plan of teaching which calls for elaborate personal instruction of each student." The medical professors could not carry out the new curriculum "without a separate building specially constructed for laboratory purposes." With the growing dental courses demanding better facilities and

the Medical Faculty requiring additional space, the Trustees determined to erect a new building in conjunction with the Medical Building, the fourth building of the original West Philadelphia group, to be used jointly for the Dental School, the chemical and other laboratories, for the Medical School, and later for its dissecting rooms and storage rooms for cadavers. Fortunately there was available a sum of \$50,000 which had been collected as a guarantee fund for professors' salaries, in case the extension of the course from two to three years and the alteration by which medical professors were to receive salaries instead of enjoying the fees of their students, should leave the old Faculty in a worse position. There was, however, no appreciable diminution of numbers of students, so the guarantee fund was not needed and could be used for building purposes. The Medical Faculty also subscribed.

To the Dental School, thus provided, for the time at least, with rooms and equipment, students came from other states and foreign countries in constantly increasing numbers, so that the Faculty of the school were in a position to increase their requirements from students on the one hand and to ask better facilities from the Trustees on the other. American dental schools were in a particularly favorable position so far as applicants from abroad were concerned. The reputation of American dentists was high in Europe, South America, and the Orient, and students naturally came from those regions to obtain their training in this country. The University dental courses have shared more than proportionately in this popularity from the time of their foundation. It may be questioned whether the graduates of any other department are so widely distributed over the world. The "American Dentist" so frequently announced on doorplates in foreign countries is more than likely to be a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania.¹

The fortunes of the school cannot, unfortunately, be traced down through the later periods, in which it came to occupy more and more imposing quarters and to rise to higher and higher

¹ Some facts concerning the earliest days of the Dental School are to be found in *The Dental Alumni Annual*, Vol. 16; and in R. E. Koch, *History of Dental Surgery*, Chicago, 1909.

requirements for entrance and for graduation. It was fully abreast of the Medical School, from which it was, as has been said, an offshoot, and in some respects it led it.

THE MEDICAL SCHOOL AND THE HOSPITAL

Again the Medical School and the College failed to keep step, for during the middle years of the century when the College was showing signs of advance and struggling into greater activity and a wider recognition, the Medical School was losing its position of preëminence and for a while decreasing in numbers and possibly in excellence of teaching. This was not through lack of interest on the part of the Trustees, for in the spring of 1836 three members of the Board resigned in protest against what one of them described as devoting the resources of the institution to the building up of the Medical School at the expense of the College proper. A weak College and strong Medical School seemed to him an inverted pyramid, but he found the influence of the Medical Faculty too strong to permit the changes in the institution he thought desirable.¹

The old medical course occupied only four months of the year, from early in November to the first of March. In 1844 an attempt was made to lengthen the term on the ground that attendance upon so many lectures a day put too much strain on the students; to this, objection was made that remaining in the city for a longer term would put them to greater expense. Therefore at that time only two weeks were added to the medical course.

In 1859 things were going badly. Rival medical institutions were growing and drawing students away from the University. Jefferson greatly outnumbered Pennsylvania and was sending out more graduates yearly. An upstart southern institution, Nashville, had for the current year 442 students while the University had only 409. Students no longer "crowd the benches of our school," as the Medical Faculty explained in a memorial to the Board of Trustees. They described the gloomy condition and prospects of the school, the diminution of the income from their professorships and their apprehension of further "retro-

¹ C. C. Binney, *Life of Horace Binney*, Philadelphia, 1903, p. 134.

graduation." In the attempt to resist this decay the price of "tickets" for the courses had been reduced from \$20 to \$15 and the graduation fee from \$40 to \$30. Nevertheless the profits of a chair in the Medical Department had been reduced by half, not now reaching on the average more than \$2,500 annually, as compared with the \$5,000 or \$6,000 of earlier times. There was fear that as vacancies arose the University would not be able to secure the most valuable type of physicians to fill them. One critic speaks of the occasional attempts at reform as "the bright bubbles that burst upon the stagnant waters of medical education."

The Civil War was a serious crisis for the Medical School, with its preponderance of southern students already referred to, and for a few years it was almost broken up. On the other hand the year 1865 saw a great addition to its equipment in the foundation of the Auxiliary School of Medicine. This was supported and eventually endowed by Dr. George B. Wood, long a professor in the Medical School but now a Trustee. It was intended to supplement the short term of the regular medical courses, which were still only four and a half months long, by a series of allied courses given in the spring. Its Faculty consisted of professors of zoölogy and comparative anatomy, botany, mineralogy and geology, hygiene and medical jurisprudence and toxicology. All students and graduates of the Medical School could take these courses free, others paid \$10 per ticket for each course, or \$35 for all five courses. Many of the best students took these courses immediately after the regular course was over. In 1877 there were 436 matriculates, and eleven received degrees in June of that year.

It impresses a modern reader as anomalous that to graduates of the Auxiliary School of Medicine the degree of Doctor of Philosophy should be given. About a hundred men hold or have held this degree from this school, in addition to their medical degree. It was conferred between 1876 and 1881. At first those who took the courses auxiliary to medicine received no degree, but in 1870 the Faculty petitioned the Trustees that one should be granted after the medical degree had been obtained, two full courses pursued, and proper examinations passed. They sug-

gested the Doctor of Philosophy. This was a German degree, practically unknown in America or in England, and there seemed no impropriety in adopting it and adapting it to American uses, especially as this school involved some general culture besides the technical medical courses. "Philosophy" had stood as much for natural science in University history as for more abstract studies.

In 1876, however, the use of Ph.D. for advanced work by Johns Hopkins University, in imitation of the German degree, called attention to the anomaly, and in November 1879 its use was ordered to be suspended. Dr. George B. Wood, the founder of the school, to whom this suspension would probably have been unwelcome, had died in the summer of 1879. Those already entered received the old degree. Subsequently the degree of Bachelor of Sciences Auxiliary to Medicine was given. In 1898, when the regular term of the Medical School had been lengthened and advanced work provided for in other ways, the courses auxiliary to medicine were suspended and the income of the endowment, some \$44,000, diverted to various purposes analogous to its original use.

The ten years from 1870 to 1880, the last ten years of Dr. Stillé's administration, the first ten years of the University's life in West Philadelphia, formed a period of striking progress in the history of the medical interests of the University. This progress was much encouraged, in some cases it was initiated, by the Medical Alumni Society formed in 1870. It was from this body that the plan of the University Hospital and of the Dental School emanated. Year after year the excellent addresses before the society, given by the most progressive and thoughtful of the professors, or graduates who had obtained distinction, called attention to the needs of American medical scholarship and, with almost utopian hopefulness, to the possibilities of Pennsylvania fulfilling those needs. The addresses of Dr. Alfred Stillé in 1873 and of Dr. Norcom of South Carolina in 1878 were especially notable.¹ During 1873 and 1874 the new Medical Hall in West Philadelphia, the building now known as Logan

¹ See the collection of these addresses and proceedings of the Medical Alumni Society in the University Library. 378.748.PZMT.3

Hall, and the University Hospital on its five-acre lot between Spruce and Pine and Thirty-fourth and Thirty-sixth streets were going up on plans carefully worked out and conforming in design to College Hall. Since the old buildings in Ninth Street had been sold to the United States government in 1873, the Medical School bade fair to be homeless for the winter of 1873-74. After fruitless attempts to secure permission from the government for one more year's use of the old building, quarters at Ninth and Locust streets were rented and there the medical lectures and as much as possible of the other work of the school was carried on during that year. The Hospital was dedicated June 4, 1874, and the new Medical Hall was occupied for the first time at the opening of the succeeding term, October 12, 1874.

In July 1875 the Medical Faculty, freed from the inhibition of want of space by the conveniences of the West Philadelphia buildings, submitted to the Board of Trustees a memorial indicating their desire that extensive changes should be introduced into the school, and asked for the appointment of a conference committee. As a result a special committee under the interested chairmanship of Fairman Rogers, already mentioned in connection with the Scientific School, was appointed with the duty of working out along with the Faculty a new curriculum and organization of the Medical School. This joint committee, after a number of weekly meetings and correspondence with the Faculty through the winter of 1875 and 1876, proposed that the teaching year should be prolonged to five months, the course be extended to three years, studies arranged in a graded course, with entrance examinations, yearly examinations, and a final examination for the degree at the close, and that the fees of students "should be paid to the Treasurer of the University, the expenses of the school [estimated that year at \$11,000] should be borne by the Board of Trustees, and the professors should be paid fixed salaries."¹

It was anticipated that the lengthened course would reduce the number of students, and it was therefore agreed that both for the sake of the professors and the Trustees the changes should

¹ See the Report of Special Committee of Medical Department in the University Library. 378.748.PZMB.2.

be postponed till a guarantee fund to cover the professors' salaries up to \$3,000 each should be collected. This was achieved within the next year to an amount approximating \$50,000. In 1877, therefore, for the first time since the foundation of the school in 1765, medical professors received their salaries from the University, instead of from their students. At the same time it was announced in the catalogue of 1877-78 that the medical course would in the future be of three years. The fee was established at \$140 for each of the first two years, \$100 for the third year. But strangely enough the number of entering students under these conditions was greater than before. The guarantee fund, therefore, with the consent of the subscribers, lay in the hands of the Trustees available for other purposes. About the same time Mrs. John Rhea Barton left a bequest of \$50,000 to endow a chair of surgery.

The circumstances under which these funds were drawn upon to erect the fourth building of the original group, at Thirty-sixth and Spruce streets, to meet the crying demands for laboratories and operating rooms for the new Dental Department have already been referred to in the description of the foundation of that school. For a long time there had been a growing interest in laboratory teaching, a desire to bring the students into more direct contact with the objects of their study. Even before 1870 we hear of work, not only in the laboratory of chemistry, which had been especially equipped in the earlier medical buildings, but in laboratories of anatomy, physiology, pharmacy, pathology, general histology, and even in manipulation of the microscope, though where these laboratories were tucked away remains a mystery. The University Hospital doubtless provided some room and the new medical building offered more. But still there was demand for more space until the dentistry laboratory building of 1878 offered two whole floors for chemistry and pharmacy, and the third for a physiological and histological laboratory. Somewhat later the upper floor became the general dissecting room of the department and the basement the storage room for cadavers.

The culmination of this ten years of progress was in the establishment in 1878 tentatively, and in 1879 definitely, of post-

graduate medical teaching. In the first of those years several of the laboratories and certain clinics were opened to advanced students and graduates, offering postgraduate instruction at a general matriculation fee of five dollars. In 1878-79 a regular postgraduate course for bedside and dispensary instruction was organized consisting of two terms, each of three months, one beginning in November, the second in April, two lectures weekly in six branches, the fee for the whole course being \$100, or \$24 for each branch elected separately. Much had now been accomplished, and in 1879 an alumnus could refer to the University Medical School as "our rejuvenated Alma Mater." Of what has been accomplished in the half-century and more that has passed since, no continuous narrative, unfortunately, can be given in this book. Only where it is momentarily a part of the general stream of University history will it emerge again.

THE CLOSE OF DR. STILLÉ'S ADMINISTRATION

With all these events Dr. Stillé was closely concerned. He had an active administration of twelve years; few men have been more devoted to their task. He was anxious to put the University in the position he thought it should hold in the local community and in the nation, and had certain specific reforms he wanted to introduce. His attitude was quite similar to that of Dr. DeLancey forty years earlier, though his outlook was broader and his conception of the proper functions of the University higher. Indeed, in the long list of Provosts there are few who have not begun their administration with lofty hopes and plans, none who have not labored devotedly to do their best in the office, and few, it is sad to think, who have not closed the period of their service with disappointment and sometimes under criticism. This was markedly true of Dr. Stillé, the tenth Provost.

It was he who, as a newly appointed professor, had come away, as already told, from his first interview with the former Provost "sad and discouraged" at his fatalistic attitude. On the question then at issue, before he had become Provost, his advocacy had won success. This was the proposed introduction of the elective system, a plan much discussed in colleges at the time, and recently

introduced at Harvard and elsewhere. On his initiation it was approved by the Faculty in December 1866, by the Trustees in January 1867. It is hard to realize, now that self-determination in the choice of studies has gone so far, how revolutionary this disruption of the prescribed curriculum was considered to be. College students might now, although still bound to the old curriculum for the first two years, choose for their junior and senior years between the ancient and certain modern languages, and between certain scientific studies and history and English literature, and would still obtain their A.B. degree. It was taken so seriously by the College Faculty that they issued a special printed description of the new system.

It was doubtless this activity of Dr. Stillé that suggested, as told above, his election as Provost. He was inaugurated and gave a notable address on September 30, 1868. He entered immediately upon an active program of change and development. He was heartily in favor of the move to West Philadelphia, and worked strenuously for it and for obtaining the required land from the city authorities. He was much interested in the establishment of the new scientific department; with one of the Trustees he visited Lehigh University with the idea of obtaining suggestions for this organization and persuading Dr. Wetherill, Professor of Chemistry there, to become head of the new school at Pennsylvania. It was a day of university reorganization under the initiative of individual leadership. President Eliot of Harvard, President White of Cornell, and President McCosh of Princeton all began their transforming labors at about the same time, and Dr. Stillé was ambitious to do the same at Pennsylvania.

Much of what was in progress required more funds. The elective system involved professorships of the modern languages, the new buildings in West Philadelphia had to be paid for, the reconstruction of the Scientific School involved teachers on salaries, not as before dependent on the fees of their students. In 1875 it was announced that the residuary estate of one of the Trustees, Mr. John Henry Towne would eventually come to the Scientific School, but although it induced the Trustees to give his name to the school it produced no funds for many years. All this extension meant endowment, and it was with a realiza-

tion of this that the Trustees in 1868, at the same time they decided on the move to West Philadelphia and the resuscitation of the Scientific School and other changes, appointed a committee to endeavor to raise a fund of half a million dollars, much the most ambitious effort since Dr. William Smith had been sent to England in 1756 to ask subscriptions for the colonial College. It was a difficult undertaking; the inertia of a somewhat stolid community, lack of local knowledge of and pride in the University, and many competing demands had to be met. John Welsh, a devoted Trustee and an influential citizen, was made chairman of the committee, but in the midst of his labors he was in 1870 made United States minister to Great Britain, and for a year and a half was absent from the country. The endowment fund dragged. There was also a rival fund. A vigorous group of professors in the Medical School had obtained the approval of the Board of Trustees for the collection of funds for the erection of the Hospital, and secured an appropriation from the state Legislature dependent on matching its amount or somewhat more from private sources. Their extreme and successful efforts to get private subscriptions made the endowment of the College and Scientific School no easier to secure. The erection of the new buildings had been begun with money borrowed on a mortgage on all the University's property, but the fortunate sale of the old Ninth Street property, largely through the efforts of Mr. Welsh, to the United States government as a site for their new post office, soon put money in the hands of the Trustees. This came near to paying for all new buildings, but provided no funds. For a while the University was out of debt, but the College had no endowment.

In all these proceedings Provost Stillé had been deeply involved, but he had found much to criticize in what was done and what was left undone by the Board of Trustees. He early became convinced, like some of his predecessors, that what he called "the torpor and decay which had settled down on the University" was "due to the fatal defect in its organization . . . without a recognized and efficient head." He believed that the objects and needs of the University could be more authoritatively explained and that subscriptions could be more successfully obtained if

the Provost were made really the responsible head of the University. Soon after his installation he proposed to the Trustees that this should be done by so changing the charter that the Provost should be President of the Board and head of every Faculty, just as were the Presidents of Harvard and Yale. A committee of the Board to which the proposal was referred somewhat surprisingly reported favorably in March 1871. To the adoption of the change there was one evident obstacle. The Faculty of the Medical School were as yet semi-independent, receiving the fees of their students and paying from these their own salaries and the expenses of their department. They were of course subject to the Trustees, but with the Provost they had only the most tenuous relation. The proposed change would make the Provost actual head of the medical as well as of the other Faculties, and to that extent reduce their independence. In deference to that department and, according to rumor, in fear of losing a prospective bequest from a wealthy medical member of the Board, the proposal was defeated, and the University remained as before, merely a corporation governed by a board, or, rather, as the Provost pointed out, by committees of that board.

Despite the refusal of the request for powers to introduce reforms, many excellent achievements date from Dr. Stillé's provostship: the definite establishment of the Scientific Department, the reorganization of the Department of Arts, the foundation of free public-school scholarships in return for the land given by the city to the University, and the admission of women to certain courses of lectures. But these achievements were not effected without friction. His defeat in the proposed increase of the powers of his office left him embittered, and more than ever convinced of the "fatal defect of a vicious organization in the governing body [the Trustees] that made itself felt in every department of the University." He had staunch friends on the Board, such as Mr. Welsh and Mr. Fraley, and, as he acknowledged, some valuable new men had been elected, but this did not change the system, so he made another effort to achieve leadership in 1874. This resulted only in his admission to the Board meetings to give information and to enable him to act as a medium of communication between the Trustees and the

Faculty. After this the limitation of his powers became more or less an obsession with him.

In all his actions he created more antagonism than was necessary. For all his devotion and foresight concerning the needs of the University, Dr. Stillé was contentious, tactless, and irascible. The writer of this chronicle, a freshman in Dr. Stillé's last year, can see him still, white and glowering with anger at disorder in the college chapel which, however exasperating, was hardly of sufficient importance for such a tragic display of speechless wrath.

His final conflict with the Trustees was not merely personal, but one in which he represented the Faculty. Discipline, the bane of college life in early days, was one of those subjects which lay on the border line between the powers and duties of the Board of Trustees and those of the Faculties. Its history had been inconsistent; sometimes the Trustees had asserted their superior powers, then for long periods they had, by resolution or by connivance, left such matters entirely in the hands of the Faculty. Even the latest by-law on the subject, that of 1877, providing that each Faculty should govern its own students "under the general supervision, control and order of the Board of Trustees" was ambiguous. The Provost and Faculty interpreted it as leaving questions of discipline entirely in their hands; it might well be interpreted as recognizing the right of the Trustees to consider appeal as part of their "general supervision."

In the fall of 1879 two students were expelled on the recommendation of the committee on discipline of the College Faculty. The parents of both appealed to the Board of Trustees against what they considered undue severity in the punishment. There was no question of the facts of the cases. Both were referred by the Board to a committee of their own members, much to the surprise of Dr. Stillé, who expected the Trustees to decline to intervene and to refer the petitioners back to the Faculty. The committee in the first case stated their agreement with the action of the Faculty, but referred the second back to the Faculty for a rehearing and report to the Trustees, with the intimation that the Board would then take such action as they thought best. Against this resolution of the Board Dr. Stillé protested vigor-

ously, and determined in his own mind, as he says, to resign if the determination of the Board was insisted on.¹

The case was not made any easier by the fact that the student concerned was grandson of a member of the Board.² At the meeting at which the Provost's protest was received, strong statements of the powers of the Board were made; among others, that the authority of the Board was absolute over all acts of the Faculty in matters both of instruction and discipline, and consequently that the appeal in this case was quite justifiable. At the request of the Provost, on the other hand, a committee of the College Faculty, of which the Vice-Provost was chairman, drew up and submitted to the Trustees at their meeting in January 1880 a long "Report on the Constitutional Relations of the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania to its Government and Discipline," insisting that all disciplinary powers had been delegated exclusively to the Faculty; this elicited no comment from the Board. The Provost then announced his intention to resign.

He wrote at the same time a long letter to the Board, devoted partly to a defense of his own policy, partly to recommendations for changes in the system of government of the University. He called attention to the fact that the University had now six departments, each under a different Faculty, and more than a thousand students; and that it could not be expected that Trustees giving an hour once a month, or somewhat more if they were serving on committees, should understand or appreciate the problems of so large and varied an institution. He pointed out that

¹ Is it beneath the dignity of a history of the University to print in the obscurity of a footnote the piece of doggerel which, sung in the basement of College Hall and overheard by the Provost, put Provost, College Faculty, and Trustees, by the ears and caused the expulsion of the composer? "Pomp" was the colored college messenger.

"Pomp and Stülé had a fight,
They fit all day and they fit all night,
And in the morning they were seen
A rollin' down the bowlin' green."

² The culprit, Eli K. Price Jr., who was graduated from College in 1881 and from the Law School in 1883, seems to have borne no malice, for in 1899 he was instrumental in securing from members of his family a gift of \$25,000 toward the cost of the Law School building, and in 1921 he became a Trustee.

The system which now prevails is not one that would ever have been adopted as a method of government of a University if the question of organization presented itself now for the first time. . . . Under changed conditions of the present day it has survived its period of usefulness.

He gives his ideal of an effective head.

We shall never succeed as others have done until we find a man whom we shall recognize as an organizer, a leader, whom we shall trust, because we know he has been specially trained, and that he will give all his energy and capacity to this work in which he is engaged.

He then drew up a list of six points on which he believed the charter of the University should be revised. The Faculty at the same time addressed to the Trustees a letter signed by all the professors and instructors in the departments of Arts and Science expressing the hope that Dr. Stillé might be induced to withdraw his resignation, and endorsing the proposals for the increase of the powers of the Provost that had come so near adoption in 1871. Notwithstanding this appeal and expostulations and efforts on the part of a number of the members of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Stillé did not withdraw his resignation and it was finally accepted.¹

¹ He gives an account of his administration in a privately printed pamphlet, *Reminiscences of a Provost, 1868-1880*. It is not necessary to accept all that is said in this bitter statement as fair or even as correct. Dr. Stillé was not an accurate historian in matters involving his feelings. His memoir of Dr. Smith, the first Provost, was, like the *Reminiscences*, a partisan pamphlet, written to indicate what he thought the proper position of the Provost. Inaccurate in several places and biased in its interpretation of the act of 1779, it has been the source of much misunderstanding. Dr. Stillé wrote several historical works of a less partisan character, and published some of his University lectures in an interesting volume, *Studies in Medieval History*.