the other hand, is the mercurial, restive type, who hasn't even a word in his vocabulary with which to translate *gemuetlichkeit,* and who labors medically in a strenuously competitive atmosphere. The essence of the matter is simply this, that up to now the German clinical professor has, as a rule, needed little or no protection against himself, whereas the American clinical professor has so frequently demonstrated the need of such protection as to call forth that forcible truth from Dr. E. P. Lyon, who characterized clinical professorial selfishness by the phrase "lying full length in the trough as he eats." If a sufficiently large number of American private practitioners had demonstrated their capacity to combine teaching and practise as the Germans combine them, there would probably be no call for the full-time clinical professor. They have failed to demonstrate this, and they can not explain that failure on the basis of German example.

Indeed, this failure on the part of the clinical teachers to teach as intensively as do the instructors in the fundamental branches is alone responsible for the agitation for the full-time clinical instructor. Whether they accept it or not, the burden of proof lies upon those who argue against a plan that attempts to do for clinical teaching exactly what has been recognized as essential in practically every other branch of education. For many of us it is difficult to see how the introduction of full-time clinical instruction can possibly fail to accomplish most of those things which we hope to see result from it, for all of us who are interested in seeing the reform meet with warm, broad support, there is much chagrin and disappointment in contemplating the half-hearted support and whole-hearted opposition accorded it. This chagrin and disappointment may be considerably tempered, however, if we bear in mind the truism spoken by President Lowell in his address before the New England Association of Colleges, last year. Said Mr. Lowell:

> Education is the last of all things to follow the stream of human thought and progress. It is still mainly in the deductiv stage.

If Mr. Lowell be correct in his statement, we may seek solace in the thought that we have at least an explanation for the fact that so many well-meaning clinical men experience difficulty in accepting an inductive syllogism the conclusion of which is "The teaching of clinical subjects should be under the guidance of exclusive clinical teachers."

MAJOR G. SEELIG
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

CHARLES E. BESSEY

THE death of Professor Bessey removes a conspicuous figure from among the group of older American botanists. No botanist was better known personally among his colleagues. for he was eminently social, and enjoyed the various scientific meetings that brought his friends together. It is certain that no member of the botanical fraternity will be more missed at these meetings than Professor Bessey, for he was always the center and life of any group of which he happened to be a member.

The usual biographical data dealing with birth, training and official positions may be obtained from "American Men of Science," and need not be repeated here. The writer wishes to speak of him as an old acquaintance, and of his place in the history of American botany.

Professor Bessey first became known to botanists in general in connection with his position in the Iowa Agricultural College at Ames, and during his fourteen years (1870–84) of service there, his reputation as a botanist became established. In 1884 he began his long period of service at the University of Nebraska, where for thirty-one years (1884–1915) he was not only a commanding figure in his subject, but also in the university and in the state.

In the history of American botany, Professor Bessey stands for the introduction of a new epoch. Before 1880 the study of botany was practically bounded by the taxonomy of the higher plants, with such gross morphology as enabled the student to use a manual. In any event, the collecting and naming of plants was the chief botanical pursuit. For nearly thirty years before 1880, morphology as we understand it now had been developing in Germany, under the original stimulus given

by Hofmeister. The belated introduction of American students to this new field of botany was brought about by Professor Bessey, when in 1881 his "Botany" appeared. This volume not only brought the atmosphere of Sach's *Lehrbuch* to American colleges, but also compelled the development of botanical laboratories. For the first time, all plant groups became available, and cells and tissues became materials for study. The original "Botany" was the first of a long series of texts, and for many years "Bessey's text-books" set the standard for modern work. If Professor Bessey had made no other contribution to American botany than the publication of this book at the psychological moment, he would have made for himself an enduring place in the history of American botany.

The qualities that led him to discover and introduce to American colleges the new botany, also suggest that he was a great teacher. Perhaps no American botanist has left his mark on so many students as did Professor Bessey. He was certainly "apt to teach," and this was shown not merely by his neverfailing enthusiasm for his subject, but also by his stimulating companionship with his students. He lived in his subject and lived with his students, and his "dingy and cramped quarters," as they were called, seemed to cultivate the spirit of camaraderie in the whole department. The students of Professor Bessey are scattered everywhere in responsible positions, and the writer has never met one of them who has failed to pay the warmest tribute of loyal affection to the man who taught him.

Professor Bessey was not merely a great teacher, both through his text-books and in contact with his students, but he was also a public-spirited citizen. He felt that the whole state of Nebraska was entitled to his services, and he gave of his time freely to organizations of all kinds that were seeking to develop the various interests of the state. The plant life of the state, the agricultural possibilities of the state, the teaching of agriculture in the schools, all engaged his attention.

Recognition of Professor Bessey by his colleagues throughout the country came as a matter of course. He was not only a member of the various national organizations, but he was elected to almost every office to which an American botanist can aspire, culminating in the presidency of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. One of the characteristics of Professor Bessey most frequently remarked among his colleagues was his refusal to speak unkindly of any one. No one ever heard from him the sharp and occasionally envious criticism that too often mars the fine qualities of scientific men. Even in his work as a reviewer, where criticism is invited, he always searched for the pleasant things to say, and left the unpleasant things unsaid. Those of us who knew him best realize that he did not even think of the unpleasant things, but that his kindly nature was always seeing the good in every botanist.

Professor Bessey was a voluminous writer, as a man full of ideas, energy and of the teaching spirit is apt to be, so that it would be impossible to cite his bibliography here; it will doubtless appear in fitting form in some more appropriate connection. The present purpose is simply to express an appreciation of a great teacher of botany by a colleague who has known him intimately throughout almost his entire public career.

JOHN M. COULTER

FRANK OLIN MARVIN

PROFESSOR FRANK OLIN MARVIN, dean of the school of engineering of the University of Kansas, died in San Diego, Calif., on February 6, 19155. Dean Marvin was born in Alfred Center, N. Y., in 1852. He was the son of Dr. James Marvin, for many years professor of mathematics in Alleghany College, and later chancellor of the University of Kansas.

Graduating in 1871 at Alleghany College, Professor Marvin devoted several years to practical engineering work. and was in 1875 appointed instructor in mathematics and physics at the University of Kansas. In 1883 he was appointed professor of civil engineering, and when, in 1891. the university was reorganized and a school of engineering was established he was elected to the position of dean. He was untiring in his labors for the upbuilding of this most important school, from this