I have been asked to record my recollections of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania from the autumn of 1887 when I matriculated as a student down to the date of the dedication of the present building in February 1901.

To comply with this request I have refreshed my memory by a study of the thirteen University Catalogues in which appear the official announcements concerning the school during the period in question. The result is a record in outline of the process by which a university department designed merely to supplement office instruction became a self-sufficient law school of the type familiar to the law student of today.

As in 1887 the courses of instruction in the School presupposed simultaneous office training, it seems proper to begin this sketch with an account of my own experience in the office of my preceptor. This experience may be regarded as typical.

After I had received in June of 1887 the degree of bachelor of arts, I was accepted as a law student by the firm of Biddle & Ward. The senior members of the firm were George W. Biddle and Henry Galbraith Ward. The other partners were five in number: Mr. Biddle's two surviving sons, Algernon Sydney and Arthur Biddle, J. Rodman Paul, Charles Merrill Hough and Henry LaBarre Jayne. Mr. Biddle's eldest son George had died shortly before I entered the office and I never had the privilege of knowing him. The firm had an office in New York as well as at 208 South Fifth Street, Philadelphia. The Philadelphia office was a dwelling house converted to office use. It
stood on the spot out of which issued the ground rent that had given rise to a notable litigation. This was the case of *Ingersoll v. Sergeant*, 1 Wharton 337 (Pa. 1836), in which the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania decided that feudal tenures are a part of the law of the Commonwealth, and that a ground rent is a feudal "rent service" and not a contractual "rent charge."

Messrs. Ward and Hough were the New York partners and I saw them only at infrequent intervals. In the course of time both of them became judges of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Thereafter the firm no longer retained the New York office.

I was one of ten students in the Philadelphia office. We were expected to observe the office hours which began at nine and ended in time to attend late afternoon lectures at the Law School. In the interval the students could be drafted for any clerical service deemed within their capacity. The educational work of the office was supervised by one of the partners, Mr. Paul, who himself did some of the quizzing. Some of it was done by Sydney Biddle but most of it by John J. Wilkinson, a trusted associate. We were expected to study all of the second book of Blackstone and selected portions from other parts of the *Commentaries*. Other text books were also on the required list—notably Stephen on Pleading and Bispham on Equity. Great emphasis was placed on Blackstone. During the quizzes there was little discussion of problems suggested by the text. The questions merely put into interrogative form the didactic statements of the author of the text and the best answer was the one that approximated verbal accuracy. I accordingly adopted various mnemonic devices—such as "crip with two c's"—which helped me to remember the essentials of a good custom at common law: it must be certain, continuous, reasonable, immemorial and peaceable. Similarly I framed a ten word sentence ("a terrible catastrophe will overwhelm dynasties founded contrary to all right") which fixed in memory the ten incorporeal hereditaments, following the Blackstonian order. That such exercises were good for the memory is evident from the fact that they still come to mind sixty-five years later. But I doubt whether they served any other useful purpose.

I knew enough about student life in other offices to justify the statement that, as centers of instruction, they were all pretty much alike. There were, of course, differences due to the peculiarities of different preceptors. The many students registered in F. Carroll Brewster's office emulated in later years the dignity and poise of their preceptor. George W. Biddle's brother-in-law, Richard C. McMurtrie, was his warm friend. Together they annotated an edition of the English Common Law Reports and had many other intellectual interests in common.
Each regarded the law with the loyal affection due by a knight to his liege-lady. Mr. McMurtrie shared an office suite with Mr. Morton P. Henry, an admiralty lawyer of distinction. Some of my friends (among them George Stuart Patterson and Francis H. Bohlen) were registered with Mr. Henry. Mr. Henry’s quizzes were occasionally interrupted by the unexpected appearance in the doorway of Mr. McMurtrie, who was wont to say “Morton, it may be none of my business—but I cannot remain silent when I hear you misinforming these young men.” An edifying, if somewhat heated, discussion would ensue.

I doubt if the encomiums justly heaped upon the Inns of Court in London could with equal justice be paid to the offices of the Philadelphia Bar as of my day. It must be conceded, however, that our preceptorial system produced many lawyers of the first class and, on the whole, exercised a wholesome influence upon the young Americans who came within its range.

The tie between office and Law School was particularly close in the case of Biddle & Ward because in 1887 Sydney Biddle had recently become a professor in the Department of Law of the University. The Law School at that time offered a two-year course leading to the degree of LL.B. I matriculated in the School in the fall of 1887 and thus became a member of the first year (or junior) class. “The aim of this Department,” said the then current University Catalogue, “is to aid students who are preparing for admission to the bar, as well as others who are desirous of acquiring knowledge in any branch of legal learning. The conveyancer or the merchant may attend with profit the particular lectures appropriate to his pursuits.” The function of the Law School was thus declared to be auxiliary to the instruction given in the offices of the preceptors with whom the students severally were registered. “Students,” so ran the announcement, “may matriculate in this Department at any stage of their professional preparation. No entrance examination is required.” It should be added, however, that in order to be officially registered as a student of law it was necessary for an applicant to satisfy the examiners appointed by the Board of Judges that he possessed “a good English education.” Examiners were wont to accept, in lieu of examination, the diplomas of approved colleges and universities. A rule of court provided that a student who had met the requirements for registration and had received the degree of LL.B. from the University of Pennsylvania might in virtue thereof be admitted to practice as an attorney. When in due course I appeared before the Board I exhibited my college diploma. This was accepted as sufficient evidence of qualification, and I forthwith became a registered law student. My friend Abram H. Wintersteen, somewhat older than I,
had had a different experience when he appeared for preliminary examination. He presented the diploma of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg, but was informed that this was not acceptable and that he must pass an examination. A member of the Board was assigned to conduct it. The first directive given to the student was "Decline the present indicative of the Latin verb amo." "I do not know," said Wintersteen, "what is the custom at colleges whose degrees you recognize, but at Gettysburg we do not decline verbs; we conjugate them." The examiner felt that further examination was unnecessary and Wintersteen was registered.

The total number of students enrolled in the School for the academic year '87-'88 was 149. There were six members of the faculty: the Honorable J. I. Clark Hare, Professor of the Institutes of Law, including, inter alia, International, Constitutional and Commercial Law; James Parsons, Professor of the Law of Personal Relations and Personal Property; George Tucker Bispham, Professor of Equity Jurisprudence; C. Stuart Patterson, Professor of the Law of Real Estate and Conveyancing; and A. Sydney Biddle, Professor of Practice, Pleading and Evidence at Law, and Criminal Law. P. Pemberton Morris was listed as Professor Emeritus. I and my classmates never had the pleasure of sitting under his instruction.

The six professors listed above did all the teaching except that Dwight M. Lowrie assisted Professor Parsons and sometimes lectured in his place. Professor E. Coppeé Mitchell had been Stuart Patterson's predecessor in the field of Real Property. After his death his lectures for the year '87-'88 were delivered by Robert Ralston who later served with distinction as a judge of the Court of Common Pleas No. 5. The courses were so arranged that lectures on all subjects were delivered to seniors and juniors sitting together. This meant that a junior would take in his first year courses which were new not only to him but to his fellow students who were members of the senior class.

The prevailing method of instruction was the forensic lecture. It has been said that this method of instruction was the process by which matter on the notes of the lecturer was transferred to the notebook of the student, without passing through the mind of either. Judge Hare made frequent references to his own book on the Law of Contracts and to his treatise on Constitutional Law. Professor Biddle expected his students to be pretty nearly letter-perfect in Stephen on Pleading and in Sir James Fitzjames Stephen's textbook on Evidence. Professor Bispham adhered closely to his treatise on Equity. There were occasional quizzes on specified subjects. There were also many unofficial quizzes conducted by groups of students. Law clubs in the
School, supplemented by the Law Academy of Philadelphia, gave opportunity for practice in the argument of cases. In these moot courts a member of the faculty or some distinguished member of the bar presided. They were conducted with suitable decorum. I remember only one exceptional case. Professor Biddle was sitting to hear argument on a question of "general average" growing out of the jettison of a cargo of sugar on a small sand island in the Indian Ocean. A nervous student who had made elaborate alcoholic preparation for the argument was addressing the court. He observed in a thick voice and with an expression of great solemnity that from the way the captain of the freighter had mixed sand with sugar the court might infer that he had been trained for the grocery business and was not competent to navigate a ship. When Mr. Biddle grasped the situation he, with great urbanity, excused the advocate from further argument.

A consequence of the lecture system was that numbers of students clubbed together and retained the service of an accomplished stenographer whose ample notes were in due course manifolded and sold to the several subscribers. This stenographer (who shall be nameless) was an habitual drinker and found it essential to stimulate himself during the delivery of the lectures. He accordingly provided himself with a good-size nursing bottle which he kept filled with whiskey and equipped with a rubber tube and nipple. With this reservoir of refreshment in his breast pocket and the tube so adjusted that the nipple protruded from the buttonhole in the lapel of his coat he would with one hand take down professorial utterances and with the other so adjust the lapel that he could suck the life-giving fluid without attracting the attention of the lecturer. The students in his part of the room watched this performance with envious interest.

A significant incident marked the examination of my class in Common Law Pleading. I entered the room with supreme confidence prepared to answer in the very words of the text book whatever question was asked. When I looked at the examination paper my heart sank. The paper confronted me with a series of ten problems, each concisely stated, like the head-note to a reported case, and each followed by the question "Judgment for whom?" Nothing in the course had prepared us for this type of examination and only a handful of students scraped through. Inquiry revealed that in the interval between the end of the course and the date of the examination Mr. Biddle had visited the Harvard Law School, had been captivated by Ames's method of teaching Pleading and had used some of Ames's examination questions as tests of our erudition. He quickly realized that this was not cricket and gave the whole class a re-examination but warned that there-
after he was going to adopt the Harvard method of teaching. Unhappily he soon afterward fell ill and died. The Bar thus lost an able lawyer and the School a teacher with contagious enthusiasm.

This incident will illustrate the transitional process which was beginning to influence the whole life of the School. It should be said, however, that the Faculty of that era was composed of extremely able men most of whom had a natural aptitude for teaching. Judge Hare, by his erudition and urbanity, excited the admiration of his students. In Constitutional Law he frequently astonished us by citing from memory not merely the name of the case under discussion but the volume and page of the report. To this day I recall that *Swift v. Tyson* appears at page 1 in "the Sixteenth of Peters." I may say in passing that it was the emphasis laid in this case by Judge Hare that led me to choose for my graduating thesis "The Borderland of Federal and State Decisions."

Mr. Parsons aroused deep interest by his course on Partnership but only among a very few students. His exposition was obscure. The effort required to understand him was correspondingly great but most rewarding. In opposition to Ames, Parsons insisted upon emphasizing the individuality of each partner and refused to recognize "the firm" as an entity distinct from its members. In his estimation partnership is part-ownership and the partners co-proprietors. The test to be used in determining whether or not a man is a partner is to look for the indicia of ownership and not the presence or absence of subordinate factors—such as participation in profits. In later years, when I had the advantage of close friendship and intimate contact with Mr. Ames, I vainly tried in friendly discussion to dislodge him from his position both with respect to the nature of the partnership and of the corporation. Lamenting to Mr. Parsons my failure, I said, "If only you and Mr. Ames could meet and exchange ideas I am sure that you could convince him, although I cannot." "No," he replied, "discussion between two men of our settled convictions would be useless. We must compete for the allegiance of the next generation."

Mr. Bispham's pluck was a thing to admire. He was so badly crippled that he had obvious difficulty in walking. It was generally understood that he was often in great pain—but nobody ever heard him complain. He expressed himself with clarity and brevity. His mind was orderly and both his oral and written statements were models of precision. He had a keen sense of humor and he sometimes smiled grimly at the very classifications which he commended to the class. "Bills in equity," he would remark, "are of several sorts: original bills and bills not original; bills in the nature of original bills and bills in the
nature of bills not original." In citing English equity decisions he emphasized the individuality of the chancellors who decided them—sometimes in a humorous vein. "This case," he would say, "was the decision of Charles Christopher Pepys,—afterwards elevated to the wool-sack under the name of Lord Cottonham." In explaining the structure of a bill he once observed (quoting some well-known authority) that the prayer for general relief is in point of efficacy second only to the Lord's Prayer. The students respected and greatly liked him and he was affectionately referred to as "Chancellor Bispham."

C. Stuart Patterson became Dean of the Law School in 1888. In this office he followed Mr. Bispham who had resigned in 1887. The Law School was very near to Mr. Patterson's heart and he gave to its service the best that was in him. He was a just and efficient administrator but was content with the School as it was and looked somewhat askance at efforts to systematize instruction and to raise the educational standard of the School to higher levels. On the educational side he was well-read and his lectures on Real Property gave evidence of careful preparation. He made no claim to scholarship and was content to reduce to communicable form material which he had assembled as a result of the study of standard textbooks. While not himself a leader in the effort to develop the School, he encouraged free discussion of the subject and was ready to cooperate loyally with younger men without himself being a convert to their points of view. His administration of the office of Dean must be regarded as the period during which plans for the future of the School began to receive careful consideration.

Sydney Biddle was a man of culture and wide reading. He had laid a firm foundation for his legal training, and he had a genuine enthusiasm for the profession of the law. When he entered the service of the Law School he had given little thought to problems of legal education, and began his teaching by attempting to combine the lecture system and the textbook method in a somewhat conventional way. As indicated by the incident above described, he was quick to perceive defects in the existing system and quite ready to make such changes as were advocated by Dr. Langdell and Professor Ames and the other men who at that time constituted as great a faculty as any Law School ever possessed.

Biddle and his colleagues in 1887 and 1888 worked under great disadvantages. The School had no home of its own. The law lectures were delivered in College Hall at the University—usually between the hours of four and six P. M. During those hours very few students were to be found in the offices, as the great majority were registered in the Law School and made daily pilgrimages to West Philadelphia.
In 1889 Dean Patterson and his colleagues made a determined effort to improve the conditions under which the work of the School was done. The entire sixth floor of the office building of the Girard Trust Company at the northeast corner of Broad and Chestnut Streets was leased by the University and thereafter for several years was occupied by the Law School. It was at this time that the Law School course was extended to three years, with the consequence that in 1890 there was no graduating class. In the academic year 1889-90 three changes in the teaching force took place. Samuel S. Hollingsworth became Professor of Contracts, Corporations and Pleading at Law; George S. Graham was elected Professor of Criminal Law. Upon my graduation from the Law School in 1889 I was appointed the first Teaching Fellow. Mr. Hollingsworth, though in active practise, was a man of studious habits. I think he would have preferred to combine the duties of a judge with those of a law teacher, but his judicial aspirations were not realized. His name was pressed upon President Harrison in connection with a vacancy in the District Court of the United States. Among those of his sponsors who waited on the President to urge his appointment was Mr. McMurtrie, who in his zeal for his cause characteristically forgot where General Harrison had himself practised law. “It is well known,” said Mr. McMurtrie, “that nobody west of the Alleghenies knows any commercial law.” “There may be two opinions on that point,” observed the President. “Possibly,” rejoined Mr. McMurtrie, “but only one of them is correct.” Hollingsworth was not appointed. His career as a teacher of law was cut short in June of 1894 by his untimely death.

George S. Graham made a notable record as District Attorney of Philadelphia County. He was not of scholarly type but he was a clear thinker and spoke with compelling force. He was one of the few really great cross-examiners that I have ever heard in action. He was well versed in the law of crimes and when lecturing on that subject his dominant personality compelled the attention of students as he had been wont to influence jurors.

The course assigned to me in the academic year of 1890-91 was Pleading at Common Law and under the Codes. My teaching experience somewhat resembled Sydney Biddle’s. I began by attempting to teach the course as it had been taught theretofore (with Stephen on Pleading as a textbook) but I soon discovered that in spite of the best expositions of which I was capable the students were learning little or nothing. I asked for and received a few weeks’ leave of absence, went to Cambridge and spent my time in the classrooms of the Harvard Law School, noting with attention the methods of instruction there employed.
I made myself familiar with Professor Ames's Cases on Pleading and to prepare myself to discuss them effectively, I wrote for the *American-English Encyclopedia of Law* the article on Pleading at Common Law and under the Codes, which was afterward reprinted in textbook form. Thereafter I did no lecturing but discussed the assigned cases with the class and encouraged students to deduce from them the principles underlying the common law system.

Sydney Biddle having died in 1891, the Honorable George Mifflin Dallas, of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, was elected Professor of Torts, Evidence and Practise at Law. He began his teaching in the academic year '91-'92. At the same time two more Teaching Fellows were elected—Charles Cooper Townsend and George Stuart Patterson.

Judge Dallas, before his elevation to the federal bench, had been a leader of the Bar. He was at his best in the argument of questions of law before the court in banc. He was a clear thinker and forcible speaker. In politics he was an ardent Democrat and much in demand for political speeches. He was highly esteemed by all who knew him and his accession to the Faculty enhanced the prestige of the School. As far as I know he had never given much attention to problems of legal education and he readily conformed to precedent in his method of instruction. He combined lectures with the use of textbooks. His courtesy and urbanity greatly impressed the students and his lectures were always well attended.

Charles Cooper Townsend was a man of solid attainments and attractive personality. He quickly gained the confidence of the students and his courses were generally regarded as among the best that were given. He used decided cases as the basis of classroom discussion and was skilful in obtaining intellectual response from his students. My judgment is that he would have developed into a great teacher had his health not failed. His early death following his retirement was a definite loss to the School. Unquestionably he made a great contribution to its development and must be counted as an effective force during the period of transition.

George Stuart Patterson had a keen mind and a ready wit. He instantly attracted students by the soundness of his learning and his admirable classroom manner. The success of his teaching while a Fellow had properly resulted in his election to a professorship. He had all the qualities that endear a teacher to young men. In his course on Constitutional Law, which he taught in succession to his father, he quickly demonstrated both the thoroughness of his preparation and his mastery of the technique of teaching. It may be mentioned incidentally
that he excelled in outdoor sport and in the heyday of Philadelphia cricket he was a player of international reputation. He was much in demand as an after-dinner speaker and when he was toastmaster the success of the occasion was assured. He used the Socratic method in the classroom and secured a maximum of response from the students. Like Townsend he made a great contribution to the development of the School.

During the academic year '92-'93 I was styled the Algernon Sydney Biddle Fellow and was assigned to prepare courses on Corporations and on the Law of Insurance—both to be given in the following year. At the same time Francis Herman Bohlen was elected to a Fellowship, thus increasing the number of Teaching Fellows to four.

In the academic year '93-'94 I became Algernon Sydney Biddle Professor of Law. The subjects of instruction assigned to me were not specified in the title of the professorship but actually the courses which I gave were those on Corporations and Insurance which I had been preparing.

In '94-'95 Charles Cooper Townsend and George Stuart Patterson were elected Professors of Law—the latter serving as Sub-Dean under his father. At the same time two additional Fellows were elected—Charles Henry Burr and Reynolds Driver Brown.

Burr early attracted attention by the brilliancy of his intellect. In his college days at Haverford he had attained high academic distinction and in the Law School the ability which he displayed in classroom discussions and in moot-court arguments made him a marked man. If he had deficiencies as a teacher it was because his mental operations were abnormally rapid while his impatience in dealing with less gifted students could not be concealed. He was a master of the subjects which he taught but failed to obtain results commensurate with his ability.

Reynolds Driver Brown was the embodiment of thoroughness both in preparation and in teaching. This quality, combined with obvious integrity, soon gained the respect of students. Like Patterson he was a fine cricketer and, withal, an eminently wholesome and manly person. He was less adept than Patterson and Townsend in getting results from classroom discussion, but the ability with which his courses were conceived and prepared gained general recognition. He may be said to have been a "wheel horse" in the Law School team, and his contribution to its advancement was considerable.

It may be well to pause at this point in the narrative in order to indicate the changes that were taking place in the scope of the subjects of instruction and in their distribution during the three years of the course. The courses given in the first year were as follows: Principles
of Real Property by C. Stuart Patterson; Elementary Equity by Bispham; Criminal Law by Graham; Contracts by Townsend; Torts by Dallas; and Pleading at Common Law by George Stuart Patterson.

The second year subjects were Real Property and Conveyancing taught by C. Stuart Patterson; Partnership by Parsons; Equity by Bispham; Municipal Corporations by Graham; Contracts by Townsend; and Evidence by Dallas.

Third year subjects were Constitutional Law taught by C. Stuart Patterson—Judge Hare having become Professor Emeritus; Wills and Administration by Parsons; Practise and Pleading in Equity by Bispham; Evidence by Dallas; Corporations and Insurance by Pepper; and Practise at Law by Burr.

It is to be noted that in the catalogue for '94-'95 casebooks began to be mentioned as books which the student must acquire. It should also be noted that the growth of the School in numbers made it impracticable to print each year the list of matriculates. In the catalogue for '94-'95 these lists were omitted.

In the catalogue for '95-'96 Professor Hampton L. Carson appears for the first time as a member of the Faculty and William Nelson Lofland West as an additional Fellow. No changes were noted in the first year courses except that the course in Contracts was taught by Professor Carson. In the second year Professor Townsend gave a course on Property; I gave a second year course on Bailments and Carriers; George Stuart Patterson a course on Quasi-Contracts and Carson a second year course on Sales. In the third year a distinction was first made between compulsory and elective courses. The compulsory courses were Equity and Practise and Pleading in Equity by Bispham, and Evidence by Dallas. The electives (not to exceed six and a half hours per week) were as follows: Decedents' Estates, Parsons; Constitutional Law, George Stuart Patterson; Corporations, Pepper; Insurance, Pepper. I also began a course in the Analysis of Cases and the Use of Authorities in Argument. The course was based on the then well-known collection of Smith's Leading Cases. The course in Practise at Law and a course on Bills and Notes were given by Burr, and courses on Suretyship and Mortgage and on Domestic Relations were given by Brown. Professor C. Stuart Patterson, whose administrative work had largely been done by his son, resigned the Deanship at this time, and the teaching work which he had theretofore been doing in the field of Constitutional Law was taken over by his son. Under the caption in the catalogue of "Methods of Instruction" there is a hint at the changes that were taking place. The announcement was to the effect that there was no settled rule in the School and that
some of the instruction was given by lectures, some by textbook, some
by textbook and illustrative cases, and some on the basis of the case
system.

William Nelson Loftand West, the new Fellow mentioned above,
was a Haverford graduate who had won academic distinction. His
election as Fellow was a recognition of the marked ability which he had
displayed during his Law School course. During the three years of his
Fellowship (1895-1898) he served as an assistant to Judge Dallas in
his courses in Evidence and Torts. He fully justified his choice and
was one of the Fellows who helped to commend the School to the
favorable consideration of the rising generation.

The academic year '95-'96 brought no faculty or other changes
but '96-'97 proved to be an eventful period in the life of the School.
In that year William Draper Lewis was elected a professor of law and
made Dean of the School. His administration must be regarded as
of capital significance. The project of an adequate building for the
School was being pressed with earnestness by Provost Harrison, and
there was in many minds the conviction that the standards and work
of the School must be made worthy of a new home. Moreover the
Girard Trust Company had made plans to move to its new building
and to dispose of the old one. Thus the desirability of the School's
removal was reinforced by the necessity of the situation. The class-
rooms in the Girard Building had for several years served their purpose;
but the growth in the student enrollment and in the size of the library
made it necessary to secure larger quarters in the interval before the
new building would be available. The Courts of Common Pleas and
the Criminal Court had by this time vacated the wings of Independence
Hall and moved uptown to the City Hall. The new Dean at once
perceived the adaptability of the vacated court rooms for temporary
Law School use. He and Provost Harrison ascertained that munici-
pal permission for such a use was obtainable and both Faculty and
Trustees readily gave their approval. The University Catalogue for
'96-'97 accordingly announced a temporary removal to the new location
and coupled the announcement with a definite statement that the long-
projected Law School building would shortly become a reality.

It is difficult now to make clear to a reader the immense sig-
nificance which in that day the younger friends of the School attached
to these changes. Their sustained effort to develop a modern Law
School was about to be rewarded with success. The many misgivings
felt by older men had generously been subordinated by them to what
they came to recognize as an inevitable development. The strained
personal relations which often characterize such transitional periods in
institutional development were happily avoided. This fortunate outcome was in large measure due to the pacific influence of Provost Harrison, who from the first gave to Dean Lewis's administration his unflagging support. The fact that the office building headquarters must needs be vacated and that quarters in Independence Square happened to be available for temporary use was itself a happy circumstance. Members of the Faculty, both old and young, were susceptible to the sentimental influence of such historic surroundings; and something of the flavor of Inns of Court was imported by the occupancy of the very rooms out of which the courts themselves had recently moved. In record time the so-called "New Court House" in Independence Square was adapted for library use while the court rooms were equipped with desks and otherwise made ready for classroom use. I vividly recall the satisfaction felt by everybody when classes first assembled in the new environment and the administration of the new Dean "got off to a flying start."

William Draper Lewis was one of the most unforgettable characters I have ever known. He was by nature a student and his mind was subtle and capacious. His industry was exceptional, and he not only prepared himself thoroughly on the subjects which he taught but did much extra-curricular work as well. When, after many years of service as dean and teacher he resigned to become Director of the American Law Institute, he supplemented his school equipment by acquiring a comprehensive knowledge of pretty much every branch of the common law. I doubt whether, at the time of his death in 1949, any American lawyer could be found who had a firmer grasp of legal principles or a more encyclopedic knowledge of decided cases than he.

At the outset of his career he was so absorbed in matters of substance that he seemed indifferent to matters of form. Spelling was something he never stopped to consider, and his mixed metaphors were the delight of successive generations of students. Somehow these eccentricities which would have weakened the influence of most teachers served only to endear him to his students. Few teachers have been more beloved than was "Uncle Billy."

The new Dean was a busy man. There were many details in connection with moving to Independence Hall. The matter of entrance requirements needed attention. His ultimate ideal was the requirement of a college degree as a condition of admission. As the time was not ripe for such a regulation it was announced that for 1897 the diplomas of approved high schools would be accepted in lieu of examination in those subjects covered by the diploma. The several courses in the School were scrutinized and some changes made. In
the first year the Dean himself gave a course in Elementary Law, and Reynolds Brown gave courses in Domestic Relations and in Agency. For the second year, a course by Professor Bispham on Trusts and injunctions was projected. The compulsory courses in the third year remained the same, but two additional elective courses were given—one on Bills and Notes by Professor George S. Patterson, and one on Pennsylvania Practise. The policy was adopted of omitting from the official title of professorships any designation of specific subjects of instruction: all professors were thereafter to be “professors of law.”

In the catalogue for 1897-1898 it was announced that Professor Graham was absent on leave; that Reynolds Brown had been promoted to professorial rank; that John W. Patton had been elected a professor; that John A. McCarthy and William H. Carson (of the New Jersey Bar) had been appointed lecturers on subjects to be announced; that William E. Mikell, of South Carolina, had been made an instructor; and that, in addition to Mr. West, two new Fellows had been appointed: Joseph Gilfillan and Arthur G. Dickson.

By this time the Library, the important nucleus of which was the gift of the Biddle family, had grown to considerable size and now included more than 20,000 volumes. The catalogue also set forth a long list of diplomas acceptable for admission; and one notes with interest that Greek was included among the electives offered to those who must needs take the entrance examinations. This catalogue contained a discussion of the educational ideals of the School and of the preparation deemed most appropriate for realizing them. There was also an announcement of the purchase by the Trustees of the site at 34th and Chestnut Streets and of the definite plans for the new building. Meanwhile Independence Square continued to provide a most inspiring, if temporary, home.

John W. Patton was, with the exception of Dean Lewis, the first “full-time” professor. He was given the responsibility of systematizing and developing the teaching of Practise in all its branches. Long experience at the Bar had equipped him for his task, and he was a teacher whose fatherly interest in each of his students predisposed them to appreciate his constructive work in a most difficult field.

John A. McCarthy had had wide experience in “coaching” students for the examinations. He had an alert mind and an inexhaustible supply of Irish humor. He was most popular with his colleagues and with the students. He was always ready at short notice to take over such emergency work as had to be provided for in consequence of illness, leaves of absence and similar contingencies.
With his appointment as an Instructor, William E. Mikell began a series of services to the School the value of which can scarcely be overstated. He had come to Philadelphia from South Carolina to assist Lewis and me in the preparation of the Digest of Pennsylvania Decisions. His character and ability, combined with a remarkable capacity for inspiring friendship, had made a deep impression on all of us who had come to know him. His successive promotions to be an Assistant Professor, a Professor and, finally, Dean were made in recognition of meritorious service. They marked important stages in the life of the School.

William H. Carson was in many respects the antithesis of McCarthy. If he had a sense of humor he kept it under strict control. He took his work very seriously and during his short tenure of office served acceptably in the field of New Jersey law.

Joseph Gilfillan had as alert and capacious a mind as any student I ever knew. His was an impressive personality. He had begun life with few educational advantages and without influential backing of any sort. As a student in the School he had impressed all his teachers as having marked ability. He seemed to have an intuitive capacity to find the essential point in the cases that were subjects of classroom discussion. When he was appointed Fellow I took him to Cambridge to observe the work of the Harvard Law School as I had previously myself observed it. The visit was for him a great cultural experience—largely as the result of the personal interest taken in him by Professor Ames.

Arthur Gillespie Dickson had "made good" as a student—as his elder brother Erskine Hazard Dickson had done a few years before. Their father, Samuel Dickson, was a man of ability and culture, a president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association and reckoned among leaders of the Philadelphia Bar. He had a proper respect for members of the Pennsylvania Bar who had attained professional distinction in their several localities. On Arthur's graduation from the Law School his father commended him to his friend William U. Hensel, of Lancaster, and the son served his clerkship in that stimulating community and under the influence of that remarkable man. Following his selection as Fellow he gave several courses in the School—the one that I recall most clearly being a course in Admiralty.

The catalogue for 1899-1900 recorded some notable additions to the teaching staff. The Honorable John B. McPherson, a federal judge of distinction, became a Professor of Law, while Mikell was advanced to the grade of Assistant Professor. Francis H. Bohlen and Norman Grey were appointed Lecturers—the one on Negligence and
the other on New Jersey Practise. Four new names were added to the list of Fellows: Owen J. Roberts, Roy Wilson White, Arthur E. Weil and Thomas Raeburn White. This catalogue also contained the long-awaited announcement that the School would take possession of the new Law School Building on February 21, 1901.

Judge McPherson, before his translation to the federal bench in the Third Circuit, had served with distinction as a Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Dauphin County. He was a sound lawyer, of studious habits, highly esteemed by his fellow judges and by the Bar. To him was later assigned the course on Insurance which for some years I had been giving.

Through the appointment of Francis H. Bohlen the School gained the service of a man who in time became one of the most notable law teachers of his day. His mental operations were lightning-like both as respects their rapidity and their power to illuminate. His mind was subtle; and his interesting personality quickly commended him to the students. He, like George Patterson and Reynolds Brown, was a first-class cricketer whose play gained international recognition. His course on Negligence was the nucleus of his course on Torts, which later gave him nationwide academic distinction.

Norman Grey was a rising young member of the New Jersey Bar. His father had served with distinction as Chancellor in that home of able lawyers and the son had in his own right earned the esteem of all who knew him.

The four new Fellows differed greatly from one another, but each had his own distinctive claim on recognition. Destined to become the most notable of them all, Owen Roberts addressed himself to his teaching work with characteristic earnestness and ability. He had already attained eminence at the Bar and in time became a leader. He had wide trial experience—in the criminal as well as in the civil courts—and served as an Assistant to the District Attorney for Philadelphia County. These early responsibilities not only gave him poise and effectiveness as a teacher, but also trained him for service of nationwide importance—first as a special prosecutor in the so-called Teapot Dome cases, and later as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Roy Wilson White and his brother Thomas Raeburn White were graduates of Earlham College in Indiana and of our own Law School. Both had shown marked ability in their student days. Roy began his teaching career in a way that promised well. He would doubtless have commanded universal recognition but for the fact that his career was cut short by a violent and untimely death. "Tom" White was destined to make steady progress not only in the teaching field but as a prac-
tioner of wide experience and unusual effectiveness. His service as a Fellow was continued for five years. He taught Common Law Pleading, Contracts and Agency and a course on the Constitution of Pennsylvania.

Arthur Weil is now what he was when appointed—a diligent and thoughtful student with a well-stored mind and great earnestness of purpose. He was assigned the task of editing the then recently-acquired periodical, *The American Law Register*, which later assumed its present title, *The University of Pennsylvania Law Review*. Weil did an excellent piece of work, and laid the foundation upon which the Review now securely rests. He held his Fellowship for two years.

The addition of these men, especially the young men, to the teaching force was designed to implement the curriculum which the Dean was constantly revising. A first year course in Equity Jurisprudence, given by the Dean himself, covered most of the ground theretofore included in Bispham's courses. The Dean and Brown also taught courses in Property; while Mikell had two first-year subjects—the one Crimes and the other Blackstone. In the former subject Mikell was destined to become a recognized authority.

The second year course remained the same as theretofore: Trusts being taught by the Dean, Practise by Patton, and Property by Roberts.

The courses of the third year included Admiralty (Dickson), Insolvency (Roberts), Conflicts (R.W. White) and Pennsylvania Statutes (T.R. White). Advanced instruction was given by Mikell in the History of the Common Law and by Roy White in the Civil Law, his course being based on the French Code. My third year course on the Law of Association was the outcome of an effort to break down artificial partitions between related subjects. I had become convinced that Partnership and Corporations could be more effectively taught and studied if it were recognized that they alike presented problems growing out of the association of two or more persons in various fields of activity but with varying degrees of complexity of organization. There was also at this time an announcement of the inauguration of college courses preparatory to legal study.

The reader of this sketch will rightly infer that by the time the Nineteenth Century ended the School was seething with intellectual activity and that the members of the teaching force, old and young, were full of confidence that the institution was about to enter upon an era of greatly increased effectiveness.

In preparation for the dedication of the new building it was determined to hold the exercises in February of 1901 and, in the meantime, to extend invitations not only to American educators but to representa-
tives of the English Bench and Bar and of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. I was assigned the pleasant duty of presenting in person invitations to English guests. I have written (in Philadelphia Lawyer) an account of my trip to England and I cannot do better than reproduce here what is there recorded. Mrs. Pepper and I sailed for England in June of 1899. I was armed with letters of introduction to various distinguished people including the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice and the Master of the Rolls. Some of these letters were from my father-in-law's great friend, Edward J. Phelps, whose then recent service as our Minister at the Court of St. James had made for him many friends in London.

I presented to Ambassador Choate a letter from John Hay, then our Secretary of State, and he went out of his way to help me. There may be compensations in the life of a diplomat, but they must needs be ample if they can make up for the dreary round of services which he must render to importunate fellow countrymen. If in my case Mr. Choate was bored he exhausted the resources of diplomacy to conceal it. He took me to the House of Lords to call upon the Lord Chancellor, Lord Halsbury. The plump and somewhat pompous jurist, splendidly bewigged and begowned, explained it would be impossible for a Lord Chancellor to make a trip to America at a time when Parliament was in session, but he somehow managed to satisfy me that he would have enjoyed an American experience.

The various eminent jurists whom I approached all felt or feigned pleasure at the invitation I tendered, but like the Lord Chancellor they said it would be out of the question to absent themselves from London during February. Sir Nathaniel Lindley, Master of the Rolls, was pleased when, in discussing with him a case I had heard argued in his court that morning, I cited a former opinion of his in Simm v. Anglo-American Co. "God bless my soul!" he exclaimed, "Are my judgments known in America?" I did not recall at the moment—and happily neither did he—that his judgment in the Simm case had been reversed on appeal. Anyway the reference earned me an invitation to dine at his house. There I met among other guests Sir Edward Fry, a distinguished Lord Justice and a member of the Privy Council. He too was able to resist my invitation. As it seemed impossible to lure representative judges across the Atlantic, I turned to the Universities—and with better momentary success. Pleasant contact with Sir William and Lady Markby at Oxford and with Professor F. W. Maitland at Cambridge brought from both men an acceptance of our invitation. It seemed as if my mission had at last been crowned with success. I accordingly came home with a light heart. Unhappily illness shortly
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overtook both these distinguished men. Maitland was exiled to the Canary Islands and died not long afterward. Both Universities sent substitutes, but I was grievously disappointed that so much effort should have failed to secure the guests whom we particularly wanted.

My visit to Maitland at Cambridge was a memorable experience. The way was made easy for me by a letter from James Barr Ames, between whom and Maitland there was a long-standing friendship. Maitland was Downing Professor of the Laws of England and as charming as he was learned. He and Sir Frederick Pollock had produced that monumental work, Pollock and Maitland's *History of English Law*. I suspect that it was Maitland who supplied the scholarship while Pollock lent his name. I was studying in connection with my law-school work the historical development of the corporation. Maitland had lately published his translation of Gierke’s *Political Theories of the Middle Age* and had prefaced it with a brilliant essay on the evolution of the corporation. With these writings I was familiar, and we quickly established a community of intellectual interest. On pilgrimage to the various colleges at Cambridge, Maitland was an ideal guide. At first he was a bit doubtful of my capacity for appreciation and, with English naïveté, made his anxiety clear. “Here,” he said at one point, “you will see that King’s and St. Catherine’s are neighbors.” Then, looking at me searchingly, he added, “I wonder if you can catch the point of this:

‘They say that cats
May look at kings—but that’s
No reason in the world why King’s
Should not look down on Cat’s.’”

“A verse,” I suggested, “more often repeated by the men of King’s than by the students of St. Cat’s.” “Precisely,” he said, with evident relief; and after that treated me almost as if I were a Britisher. I left him with keen regret. We promised ourselves a reunion in America which, unhappily for me, never took place.

An account of the dedication is not within the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that the exercises were as successful as they could be in the absence of Sir William Markby and Professor Maitland. We (and the law books) moved into the new building with immense satisfaction and the work of the School was carried on with new vigor.

Happy as I was that the School had at last found a permanent home, I had a feeling of real regret at leaving Independence Square. The sojourn in that historic area had had a stimulating influence alike upon teachers and students. The atmosphere was such that it was
found practicable to arrange a daily chapel service which was regularly attended by a considerable number of students—the service being conducted by members of the teaching staff. I recall that Owen Roberts was particularly helpful in this enterprise. Out of it grew a Bible class which I continued for several years to conduct after we had moved into the new building. At one stage I presented to each member of the class a copy of that great English classic, William Law's *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. During the ensuing half century I received from time to time letters from former students, then scattered all over the United States, recording their happy recollections of the fellowship thus engendered.

One of the developments which I shall not live to see is such adequate provision for the common social life of faculty and students as will make of the School not merely a center of educational effort but a place in which concern will be manifested for the all-round development of both teachers and students. After all, it is the Man Behind the Lawyer that is the most important product of the educational process. I commend this aspect of the matter to the attention of the next generation.