On April 8, 1861, Samuel Eliot was solemnly installed as President of Trinity College. At 2:20 in the afternoon, a procession, headed by the Hartford Cornet Band and including the college community and Hartford public officials, formed at the State House and proceeded the short distance to Robinson’s Hall in Central Row. There, after an address by the mayor of Hartford, a salutatory oration in Latin by William B. Tibbits of the Senior Class, and an Address of Institution by the Right Reverend Vice-Chancellor, Eliot delivered his Inaugural Address. At 5:30, Evening Prayer was said in the College Chapel and after sundown the college buildings were illuminated and President and Mrs. Eliot held a levee.

In his address, which he declined to title, Eliot lived up to his reputation as one of the country’s “most finished orators.” There were, to be sure, the platitudinous generalizations which characterized the public addresses of the time, but there were also concrete statements of educational philosophy which, taken with his inaugural address as Professor of History and Literature delivered in 1856, suggested that the College was about to enter a new era. Repeatedly, Eliot reminded his audience that the work of the College was “an intellectual one,” and repeatedly he pointed out the College’s obligation “to form the characters of its members.” The greatest service Trinity could perform for its students would be to instill “the love or pursuit of learning, the multiplying ideas, the expanding conceptions, the objects of thought that tend to lift up our purposes and to purify our exertions.”

“Our Chapel services," said President Eliot, “are our pillars of cloud by day and of fire by night, forever guiding us from the land of bondage to the land of promise, forever leading us from ourselves to that Being, the Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, from whom the College takes its name.” And, finally, he urged that the College become a place for the molding of manly character.

Not that the Trinity of the past had never reckoned with these concepts, Eliot merely stated these as his guiding principles and declared that he meant to put them more noticeably into effect. But here it must be added that these newer, and perhaps fresher, ideas were hardly original with Samuel Eliot, no matter how they may have appeared to the Senatus Academicus of Trinity College. Eliot was a disciple of the late Thomas Arnold, for fourteen years headmaster at Rugby and, briefly before his death in 1841, Professor of Modern History at Oxford. Arnold was not a notable scholar, but he had been one of the most beloved of educators and was much respected by his students for his religious qualities. Placed in a larger historical perspective, Arnold was an early exponent of what came to be called “muscular Christianity,” a Broad Churchman, one devoted to "causes" for the moral improvement of the masses, and a staunch defender of that body of middle-class virtues and attitudes which later generations have called “Victorian.”

Before coming to Trinity, Eliot had attempted to put Arnold’s philosophy into effect through his educational work with the Boston immigrant working class. And at the time of his appointment to the Chair of History and Literature at Trinity, Eliot had demonstrated his preference for Anglican education in declining a similar po-
sition at Harvard," perhaps also suggesting by this choice that newer and smaller Trinity would be more receptive to his own educational philosophy than ancient and tradition-bound Harvard. Among the Trinity students, Eliot had been immensely popular.10 One of them, Maitland Armstrong, wrote of Eliot years later: "I loved this man—the finest gentleman, the best scholar, and the best Christian that I have ever known."11 Another, Samuel Hart, who later became a member of the Trinity Faculty, wrote: "Dr. Eliot brought to the College and set before the student an ideal of wise learning, [and] of true character."12 Eliot had had his part in curricular revision,13 but at that time Eliot's sole concern seems to have been to extend the offerings in his favorite discipline and his own "department"—History. Indeed, in his later public utterances in Hartford, there was much to suggest that there was little that was really revolutionary in his educational thinking14 and that Eliot was perhaps simply re-phrasing the traditional concepts.

At any rate, circumstances at the College would have prevented the Administration's embarking on any new educational ventures, for by the time of Eliot's installation in April of 1861, eight southern states had already seceded from the Union, the Confederate Government had been organized, and Fort Sumter was under siege. A war was about to begin, and the years to follow were ones in which the chief function of the College's President would be to fight for its survival—hardly a time to remake it.

There is an old Trinity tradition that when the Civil War began, the students responded to the call to arms and enlisted in the Union and Confederate Armies in such numbers as to seriously deplete the student body. And, an interesting part of this tradition is that the student losses were so exceptionally high at Trinity because of the large number of students from the southern states. Neither of these romantic traditions will be verified upon an examination of the facts.

In the first place, there had been considerable fluctuation in the student body for some time before the outbreak of hostilities. In the academic year 1856–57, the student body numbered 60, of whom only three were from states which were to secede from the Union.15 In 1857–58, there were 57 students, three from the South.16 In 1858–59, there were 56 students, two southern.17 The next year (1859–60) there were 62 students in attendance, 58 regular students and four "University Students," five from the South.18 In 1860–61, the year of Eliot's installation as President, there were 63 students. Pursuing the regular course (including two Juniors and a Senior listed as "not in full standing"), two "Scientific Students," and three "University Students"—a total of 70 undergraduates, of whom eight were from the South.19 By 1861–62, however, registration in the College had fallen to 43.20 Notable among the students then enrolled were David Lamb Peck of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, who remained until the end of the Trinity Term to receive his A.B.21 and to give a Commencement Address on "Labor's Destiny,"22 and Robert Agnew Benton of Little Rockfish, North Carolina, who remained in Hartford to graduate as valedictorian in 1864.23

For 1862–63, the Catalogue listed 47 students, but the actual attendance was somewhat smaller, for of this total eight were listed as absent "on leave in the National Service" and three others were listed simply "on leave." Thus, for 1862–63, the number of students in attendance was 36.24 In 1863–64, the total student listing in the Catalogue was 49, but again there were students on leave—six "in the National Service" and three others "on leave"—or a total of 40 young men in actual residence.25 In 1864–65, there were 49 students in actual residence.26 With the end of hostilities, however, there was no post-war upswing in enrollment, for in 1865–66 there were again only 44 students enrolled, and two of these were still listed in the Catalogue as "absent on leave."27 Not until 1866–67 did enrollment reach a more-or-less normal 59, with an all-time large Freshman Class of 28.28

To say that the student body was "depleted" either as to enrollment or actual attendance, would be grossly overstating the situation, for the one-third reduction in attendance from the
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average of 60 students in the 1850's to the low point of 40 students in 1863-64 was but little greater than the decline from an average enrollment of 80 in the mid- and late-1820's to the average of 60 for the following three decades. And the fallacy of the belief that an exodus of southern students contributed to the decline in enrollment is demonstrated in the fact that in the three academic years before the outbreak of the Civil War, the southern students never numbered more than eight, and in that year (1860-61) they constituted little more than ten per cent of the total.

All colleges suffered a decline in enrollment during these years, but it was the early age at which students then entered college that kept enrollments as large as they were. Freshmen were usually fifteen or sixteen years of age, and even though upperclassmen went off to war the American colleges were fairly well able to offer the first two years of the college course without serious disruption. And although after 1862 all able-bodied males between the ages of eighteen and forty-five were subject to conscription, many availed themselves of the legal provision for the hiring of substitutes and were thus able to remain in college.

But the decline in enrollment did not mean a proportionate decline in the number of students taking their first (A.B.) degrees from Trinity. Those who applied for leave “in the National Service” were carried on the college rolls until the graduation of their class, and at that time they were given their degrees honoris causa. In 1864, eleven Bachelor degrees were granted. This was not particularly out of line with the thirteen of 1857 and 1858, the eight of 1859, the thirteen of 1860, the twelve of 1861, the seven of 1862, or the eleven of 1863. What was exceptional, however, was that of the eleven A.B.'s granted in 1864 five of them were honorary and of the five, one was granted posthumously.

All but two of the southern students had withdrawn from the College at the beginning of the war, and those who had withdrawn permanently severed their connection with the institution. None of them ever returned to Trinity to complete his studies. Five of the southern members of the wartime classes served in the Confederate Army. Hamilton C. Graham of the Class of 1861 was a captain in the Seventh North Carolina Infantry; Walter E. Bondurant of the Class of 1863 was a surgeon in the Confederate Army; Edward Wooten was captain of Company B of the Fifth North Carolina Regiment; Armand Larmor deRosset, 1862, was a captain in Company V of the Fifth North Carolina Cavalry; and his brother, Edward S. deRosset, 1864, was killed in battle. In all, seventeen men (not all graduates) who attended Trinity College served in the Confederate forces.

Of the some fifteen undergraduates who left college to join the Union forces, Edward Crafts Hopson, 1864, (posthumous honoris causa) was killed at the Battle of Cedar Creek, Virginia; Franklin Hayes of the Class of 1865 died in Andersonville Prison; Edgar Bartow Lewis, 1865, died as a result of “exposure and hardship, September 6, 1864”, and Daniel P. Dewey, a Hartford man of the Class of 1863, was killed in Louisiana in April, 1863. Dewey had enlisted as a corporal and had been promoted to lieutenant on merit. His death prompted his classmate, Thomas Reeves Ash of Philadelphia, to publish a five-stanza eulogy in the Hartford Courant. Of the recent graduates, Griffin Alexander Stedman, 1859, entered the Union Army as a captain, was promoted to major, lieutenant-colonel, colonel, and, on his deathbed in Petersburg, Virginia, (August, 1864) to brigadier-general.

In all, seventy-six Trinity men served in the Union forces and, although the number of alumni at that time numbered but 550, the percentage of graduates is considerably below the one-third usually reckoned as the average for the New England colleges—a situation easily accounted for by the fact that almost half of the living graduates of Trinity College were clergy.

Even before the outbreak of hostilities, the students had declared for the Union. With the election of Abraham Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States on November 6, 1860, it was apparent that the South would secede. Immediately,
military companies were organized in Hartford and, within two weeks after Lincoln’s election, thirteen of the Trinity undergraduates had organized their own military company, the Graham Guard, named for the only southern member of the Faculty, Edward Graham Daves, Professor of Greek. The Graham Guard was instigated by several students who had prepared for college at military schools, and two of them acted as instructors in Hardee’s Tactics. The Parthenon Society donated the use of their society room for drill, and the Connecticut Adjutant General supplied cadet rifles from the State Arsenal. Professor Daves himself drilled with the company and presented the Guard with a company flag. 42

Despite this patriotic manifestation, there was considerable suspicion in Hartford that the College was not fully in sympathy with the Union cause, and these suspicions were to persist. Trinity had always had southern students, and these young men had distinguished themselves as campus leaders and had taken enough college honors to have exerted an influence somewhat disproportionate to their numbers. And, at the time of President Eliot’s taking office in April of 1861, there were still eight southern students in residence at the College.

What seemed to place the College in a most compromising position was President Eliot’s refusal to fly the national colors above the college buildings. Neither the Hartford townsfolk nor the Trinity undergraduates were in sympathy with Eliot’s stand. Angry talk was heard in Hartford, and rumors were rife that mobs were being organized in the town to march on the College and destroy the Chapel and dormitories. Eliot was aware of the public sentiment and had consulted the city authorities. The mayor assured Eliot that he had no reason to doubt the College’s loyalty, and that the City Guard was under orders to defend the College in the event of mob attack. 43

The students, perhaps prompted by both patriotic sentiments and a fear of mob violence, held a meeting on the Chapel steps and voted to insist that the College raise an American flag. William S. Cogswell, 1861, was elected to present the student request to President Eliot immediately. Eliot had been in downtown Hartford at the time of the student meeting, and the waiting students met the President upon his return at the corner of College and Trinity Streets.

Cogswell greeted President Eliot by stating that he had been delegated by the students to ask permission to raise “the stars and stripes, on a suitable staff, over a belfry tower of Seabury Hall.”

Eliot replied that he would “not approve of raising bunting of any kind over any building consecrated to the worship of Almighty God. Seabury Hall,” he continued, “encloses the college chapel, therefore I do not favor your request.”

“But,” replied Cogswell, “the belfry tower is over the chemical and philosophical rooms and not over the chapel.”

Eliot caught the line of reasoning and dismissed the protest by saying that he did “not wish to split hairs over the question,” but to Cogs-
well’s inquiry as to what the students were expected to do if the rumored mobs should attack College Hill, Eliot quickly responded, “Fight, fight them as long as you can.”

The students gave three rousing cheers for President Eliot and then returned to their rooms. No attack was ever made on the college buildings, and the Graham Guard was never called to home defense. A second student meeting was held, and the undergraduates presented a compromise proposal of erecting a flagstaff on Browne Hall rather than on Seabury. Eliot accepted this suggestion, and on April 23, 1861, “Trinity proved her loyalty...” by raising the national flag, thereby exemplifying her motto ‘Pro Patria et Ecclesia.’ As the flag was unfurled the greatest enthusiasm was manifested. National airs were sung and addresses made by Professors Hawkes, Brocklesby, and Stickney, and by Mr. Allyn for the students. Three cheers were given for Massachusetts, the Border states of the Union, and as the crowd dispersed, three more went up for old Connecticut.”

The College’s action was, of course, highly applauded in Hartford and, as a token of their approval, several ladies presented the College with a new flag. As may have been expected, those students who comprised the Graham Guard were the first to enlist. By June, most of the Guard had left the campus, and the state recalled the muskets. The southern students were ordered home by the state governments of the seceded states and, at the time of their leaving Hartford, they were escorted to the steamboat by a small number of the undergraduate students. Professor Daves asked for a leave of absence and in June, 1861, he was granted a year’s leave without salary. A year later he submitted his resignation.

The short-lived Graham Guard doubtless served a need, both as a means of releasing some of the students’ emotional tensions and of improving local public relations. With the dissolution of the Guard, the Trustees decided to introduce a course in Military Science, and the Catalogue for 1862–3 announced a proposed Department of Military Science which was to be organized by the beginning of the next academic year, “the course of instruction to include physical exercises, tactics, and such scientific studies as are fully adapted to secure the end in view.”

This was the only announcement of the proposed department, and the course in Military Science was never begun. But as a partial realization of the objective, a course in Engineering was offered in 1863. William C. Hicks, M.A., was employed as Lecturer on Mechanical Engineering, and the following year the instruction was expanded to include Civil Engineering, to be taught in the senior year as part of the work in Natural Science, along with Botany, Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Geology.

Those students who remained in college found the war uppermost in their thoughts. The Hartford newspapers carried detailed accounts of the military campaigns, and no one lacked for what the papers called “military intelligence.” Of eleven Commencement orations in 1863, six reflected either the Unionist sentiments of the speakers or an intellectual consideration of the institution of war. The topics were “Heroism of the Southern Unionist,” “Geography of our Country,” “Tendency of Christianity to Diminish War,” “Political Position of the Clergy,” “Centralization in Government,” and “Disinterestedness of the Statesman.” In 1864, the speeches at Graduation included “Uses and Abuses of Party,” “History—it repeats itself,” “Instability of American Life,” and “Government—Its Legitimate Action Founded on Organic Law.” In February, 1863, the College saw the military near-great when President Eliot headed the committee to welcome Major General George B. McClellan to Hartford.

These patriotic manifestations notwithstanding, there were some who continued to believe that the College was not wholly loyal. One student, briefly in residence, declared later that he left Trinity with “the intentions of going to a college where stronger Union sentiments prevailed” and as late as 1864, Sidney Stanley, a prejudiced, anti-Episcopalian Hartfordite, recorded in his diary that “all the officials
in this college here are copperhead except Professors Pynchon and Eliot." 59

As the November election day drew near, several of the students further subjected the College to the charge of copperheadism by forming a "McClellan Club" in support of General George B. McClellan, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency of the United States. But the good name of the College was soon retrieved by the formation of a larger and more articulate "Union Club" intended, as the Republican Hartford Daily Courant reported, to "wipe out the stain of disloyalty arising from the formation of the McClellan Club." The Union Club "members pledged themselves to support the Union and Abraham Lincoln for the Presidency." On November 3, 1864, the Trinity College Union Club had a prominent place in the Grand Torchlight Procession "of the Union Party held in Hartford, and the Club members carried banners with the legend 'Pro Libertate et Patria.'" 60

News of Lee's surrender reached Hartford on the morning of April 9, 1865. A procession immediately formed, and the Hartford citizenry marched down Main Street, headed by Christy's Minstrel Band, carriages, and fire steamers. The Trinity students came down from the Hill and joined the concourse, singing and blowing horns. That night the College buildings were illuminated. 61

During the four war years, a whole college generation had passed through Trinity College and despite the wartime distractions, undergraduate life was not remarkably different from that of the 1850's. The fraternities, because of the reduced number of men in the Junior and Senior Classes, perhaps felt the effects of the war most immediately. Beta Beta admitted a reduced number of men in the classes between 1861 and 1870: five from '61, two from '62, five from '63, four from '64, two from '65, none from '66 and '67, three from '68, and two from '69. Not until the Class of 1870, did the number of initiates reach nine. 62 Phi Kappa was at one time third of the Senior Class to its membership, but the reduced number of men taking earned A.B. degrees lowered the average number of annual Phi Beta Kappa initiations to four. 63

The literary societies seem to have been largely inactive and, of the student groups, the Missionary Society alone appears to have continued normal operations. Meetings of this organization were held regularly every second week, and occasionally joint meetings were held with the Missionary Society of Christ Church. Professor Pynchon served as chaplain to the society, and he and President Eliot frequently read papers (usually on historical subjects) to the members. The Missionary Society collected a small library; and a reading room, replete with missionary books and periodicals, was opened in one of the dormitories. 64

Washington's Birthday, as was natural in a time of patriotic emphasis, was one of the high spots of the college calendar. The celebrations held at the College were well-attended, and in 1864 the speaker, Joseph F. Ely of the Senior Class, so stirred his hearers with his address on "Patriotism" that he was "frequently encored," and repeated "the same speech fifteen or twenty times in succession to the same audience." On this same occasion there was read a poem by Robert A. Benton '64, "Alma Mater, the School of Loyalty." The German Quartette Club of Hartford also sang patriotic airs. 65

Commencement, during the war years, was still a public occasion in Hartford. The last graduation was held in Christ Church in 1860. In
1861, Commencement was held in St. John's Church and, because of the large crowd in attendance, in 1862 the ceremony was moved to Allyn Hall.\textsuperscript{67}

In 1862, the Commencement ended on a most definitely patriotic note. After the Benediction by Bishop Williams, Colt's Band, seated in the gallery, struck up "national airs." The audience perhaps expected the Academic Senate to leave their places on the platform and to march from the hall in recessional, but Bishop Williams made no move to leave his place. Instead, he approvingly "kept time with his hands." One of the clergy present "called for three cheers, which were given with a right good will."\textsuperscript{68}

But all of the students' interests and energies were not turned toward patriotic ends. The Sophomores no longer burned Conic Sections, but that was simply because the second-year mathematics course had been re-designated Analytical Geometry and the older Conic Sections had been incorporated in the new course, upon which the students vented their wrath in the "Burning of Anna Lytics." The "cremation and burial" of 1863 was described in the local newspapers as an all-night ceremony.\textsuperscript{69}

The single athletic team of the College, the crew, had, for all practical purposes, been a casualty of the war,\textsuperscript{70} and the students failed to take up any other sport. Josiah Blackwell '66 played on Hartford's first baseball club, the "Charter Oak Nine,"\textsuperscript{71} but no college baseball team was organized. Cricket was also being played by Hartford teams,\textsuperscript{72} but again the sport found no favor on College Hill.

The reduction in the number of students had had no positive effect upon campus decorum. By the summer of 1862, the undergraduates had shown an extraordinary propensity toward "hell-raising" – particularly in the dormitories, and especially late at night. So bad had the situation become, that the Trustees assigned the Faculty – including the senior members – to dormitory supervision, and made each professor responsible for "the good order of his section." Professors Hawkes, Mallory, Stickney, Pynchon, and Brocklesby were designated a "Parietal Board" with power to enforce the College Statutes on student discipline.\textsuperscript{73}

When the College opened in September, the Professors took up their new responsibilities, and even President Eliot spent one evening each week in the College. But this supervision had no appreciable effect upon the unruly students. After three terms under the system, President Eliot reported to the Trustees that, despite the efforts of the Faculty to maintain good order, the students had been exceptionally disorderly during the Christmas Term of 1863–64. In January, 1864, the Trustees, recognizing the unworkableness of a system of dormitory supervision which depended upon married men who were inclined to leave the dormitories early in the evening, voted to engage the Reverend Pelham Williams to reside in the College as "Proctor."\textsuperscript{74} Williams did not accept the appointment, but the fact that the position of "Proctor" was created was more than indicative that Samuel Eliot's ideal of "Christian manliness" had been far from realized.

At the Class Day in 1863, an event occurred which must have shaken President Eliot's faith in human nature. The custom of the Seniors of passing on the lemon squeezer to their favorite rising class had begun in 1857 when the Seniors awarded the trophy to the Class of 1859. Traditionally, it seemed, the squeezer had gone to odd-numbered classes: for '59 had passed it on to '61, and '61 had made the award to '63. As Class Day 1863 approached, the rumor was going 'round the campus that the odd-number tradition was to be continued and that the Class of '65 would be the recipients. The Class of '64 was determined to break the odd-number tradition and had secured an alliance with the Class of '66, perhaps holding out the proposal of an even-numbered tradition. The rumors were definitely based on fact, for '63 had indeed voted to present the squeezer to '65 and, at the proper point in the Class Day ceremonial, Richard French Goodman '63 rose to make the presentation speech. While Goodman was speaking, a rainstorm suddenly broke, and just as he was presenting the squeezer to Charles Wentworth Munro '65, rain began to fall in torrents. The
confusion which ensued enabled a Freshman to leap from the chapel portico, followed by the Juniors and Freshmen yelling like demons, and wrest the heirloom from Munro's hands. The audience fled in panic, leaving the graduate circle the scene of a battle between the two alliances. Faculty and city police joined in the mêlée while spectators, who had taken cover in the college buildings, watched from doorways and windows. With the help of the Faculty and police, the squeezer was recovered by '63 and '65 and carried by a policeman to the College Cabinet where the ceremony was completed.

Experiences such as this were more than President Eliot felt that he could endure, but there were other elements in his situation that made his position somewhat less than a happy one. With the students, the Trustees, the Faculty, the Hartford community, the Episcopal Church, with the wider academic circles, and, indeed, with everybody, Eliot had been more than eager to cooperate. His dealings with the students had been on an informal and certainly friendly basis, but this friendly spirit seems to have been rewarded with a total breakdown of student discipline. In the affairs of the Society for the Increase of the Ministry, an organization which Eliot had helped found, his well-intentioned enthusiasm had created the impression that the society was something of an adjunct of Trinity College—a notion which benefited neither Trinity nor the Society for the Increase of the Ministry. In the "College Association," an organization consisting of the presidents and a faculty member from each of the endowed New England colleges, Eliot had been active and, in October of 1862, Trinity College was host to the "Association." And, like his predecessors, Eliot had participated in the civic, literary, and religious activities of Hartford; but for Eliot these activities were, perhaps, burdens rather than pleasures. Scarcely a year had passed after Eliot's inauguration, when the President of Trinity College confided in his former colleague, Abner Jackson, then president of Hobart College, that the President's responsibilities were not altogether what he had expected them to be.

Eliot's status as a layman was something of a handicap. Each of his predecessors had been in Holy Orders, and by College Statute the President had been College Chaplain. Although the Trustees had declared, just before elevating Eliot to the Presidency, that the President of the College need not be in Holy Orders, and although the actions of the Trustees were confirmed by the revised Statutes of 1862 deleting any mention of the President's responsibility for conducting public worship, a lay president was something of an embarrassment to the College. There were, of course, pressures put upon Eliot to seek ordination, but Eliot would have none of it.

In June, 1861, the Trustees appointed Professor Pynchon as Acting-Chaplain to serve for the academic year of 1861-1862. Pynchon received no compensation for his extra services, but he remained in that capacity throughout Eliot's tenure at the College.

Pynchon conducted the daily Morning and Evening Prayer and the morning service on Sunday. But just as the wartime situation at the College had not led to an improved student decorum, neither had it led to greater religiosity. In fact, the students wanted less religion, or at least fewer religious observances. It is true that during the decade of the 1850's, Evening Chapel had practically disappeared from the daily schedule of the American colleges, and this fact was doubtless known to the Trinity students. The only deletion from the schedule of religious exercises was the Sunday evening service at the time of President Goodwin's leaving the College in 1861, but the students were determined that there should be more deletions. In July, 1862, the students petitioned the Trustees to make attendance at daily Evening Prayer voluntary. The governing board, however, had other plans and denied the request.

The plans of the Trustees centered around the erection of a new Chapel. From the beginning of the College, the Chapel had been a small room in Seabury Hall, 50 feet by 35, whose only real asset seems to have been the exceptionally fine organ which had been installed in 1850. On March 18, 1862, Nathaniel Wheaton, Trin-
Trinity's second President, died.\textsuperscript{86} Wheaton had made the College the principal beneficiary in his will. In addition to a residual legacy of $10,000 for the general use of the College, Wheaton had bequeathed $10,000 toward the erection of a new Chapel.\textsuperscript{87} And thus, with the probability of a new Chapel, the Trustees were in no mood to take kindly to a petition for a reduced number of chapel services. But the fact remains that Eliot had not brought the students to share his feeling that the Chapel services were an indispensable pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night!

Nor had the financial condition of the College improved under Eliot's direction. When Eliot took over the Presidency, the financial situation was far from sound, for although the Financial Statement issued on December 11, 1860,\textsuperscript{88} showed assets of $129,564, there were mortgages on the College property and other debts owed by the College amounting to $74,494. And although Eliot had, while a professor in the College, raised over $2,000 from his Boston friends for a Massachusetts Professorship, a second trip to Boston to secure additional funds had been futile. In fact, the Boston people had reminded Eliot that the support of the College from Connecticut had been so insignificant as to raise questions as to the propriety of seeking funds elsewhere.\textsuperscript{89} The College was, of course, the victim of wartime inflation, as in Hartford the prices of commodities, according to the local press, had more than doubled during the first eighteen months of the war.\textsuperscript{90} Even some of those who had previously pledged sums of money to the College were hard pressed, and the Trustees were obliged to "compromise" on the basis of fifty cents on the dollar.\textsuperscript{91}

As Eliot had been unsuccessful in his efforts to raise money, the Trustees, in July of 1862, appointed the Reverend Thomas Gallaudet '42 as Financial Agent for the College at a salary of $5.00 per day plus traveling expenses.\textsuperscript{92} But Gallaudet was no more successful in raising money than Eliot had been, and in March, 1863, he resigned as Financial Agent.\textsuperscript{93}

It was doubtless a combination of these factors - poor discipline in the College, an irreverent attitude toward the religious exercises on the part of the students, and the deterioration of the College's financial condition - which caused Eliot to feel that he had failed as a college administrator. On February 16, 1863, he submitted his resignation, reminding the Board of Trustees of the conditions under which he had accepted the Presidency, which had been on an experimental basis, and with the understanding that if the experiment should fail, he would be permitted to resign.\textsuperscript{94}

The Trustees were doubtless sympathetic with Eliot, but they were unwilling to accept his resignation. At a special meeting of the Board on March 23, 1863, there was no quorum, and the Trustees present declined to act on Eliot's resignation. Those who attended the meeting felt that the resignation would be injurious to the College, and they earnestly urged him to withdraw the resignation. Although they did not feel competent to act on the principal business of the meeting, the Trustees proceeded to transact other business which had more or less direct bearing on the resignation of President Eliot. Professor Mallory was appointed Financial Agent for the College and was given a leave of absence to perform his duties. The Reverend Pelham Williams was appointed to teach Mallory's classes at a salary of $50.00 per month. And to get the College through its latest financial crisis, the Trustees ordered the Treasurer to "sell and transfer" some of the College's bank stock to liquidate the mortgage debts of the College.\textsuperscript{95}

Mallory set to work at once, and by July 1, 1863, he reported to the Trustees that he had made considerable progress. The Board was so encouraged that they set a goal of $100,000 in permanent funds to be raised for the College.\textsuperscript{96} And with the improved financial prospects, Eliot was induced to withdraw his resignation.\textsuperscript{97}

Although Eliot probably agreed to continue in the Presidency with reluctance, it was a family tragedy which brought Eliot's administration to an end. At about this time, Eliot's youngest child, George, died, and Mrs. Eliot, as a consequence, suffered a breakdown. Her physicians prescribed a sea voyage and Eliot, at the same time he with-
drew his resignation, asked for a six-month leave of absence in order to take Mrs. Eliot abroad. The leave was granted, and President and Mrs. Eliot and their eldest son, William, sailed from New York for Cadiz, Spain, on the barque Evelyn in January, 1864.98

The College was careful to point out that Eliot was on leave, and that he had not resigned.99 The college news releases made much of the fact that Professor Emeritus Duncan Stewart would teach Eliot’s classes during his absence, and that Professor Brocklesby would be Acting-President.100 But what was not made public was the fact that shortly before his departure for Europe, Eliot had given the Trustees an option of a leave of absence or his resignation, as he was not certain as to when he would be able to resume his duties at the College.101

Eliot’s grandson, Harvard Professor Samuel Eliot Morison, states that according to the Eliot family tradition, “Eliot found that as a result of a faculty intrigue, things had become so unpleasant that he resigned.”102 At any rate, in June, 1864, Eliot wrote from Europe that it was still uncertain as to when he would be able to return to Hartford. The Trustees accepted Eliot’s resignation on June 29, and requested Eliot to sit for a portrait to be placed in the Library Room with those of his predecessors.103

It would be difficult to determine the nature of the intrigue, if such it were, that eased Eliot from the Presidency, for there is no reason to believe that the Trinity Faculty held Eliot in anything but the highest esteem. Nor did the College completely sever its ties with Samuel Eliot. At the time of his resignation, Eliot was made Lecturer on Political Science and Constitutional Law and although he does not seem to have ever given a course of lectures, he held this title until 1874.104 Eliot never felt any bitterness toward the College and, shortly after his return to the United States, he generously contributed $2,000 to the endowment fund.105

Eliot’s resignation had been expected for some time, and there is little reason to doubt that the European trip provided a comfortable way out of a difficult situation for both President and Trustees. And even before accepting Eliot’s final resignation, the Trustees had been sounding out a likely candidate for Eliot’s post. In mid-June, 1864, Dr. George C. Shattuck of Boston, the nominal Professor of Anatomy, Physiology, and the Institutes of Medicine in the College, went to Maryland to visit the Reverend Dr. John Barrett Kerfoot, Rector of St. James College in Baltimore County, and to inquire as to the possibility of Kerfoot’s accepting the Presidency of Trinity.107

St. James was the college of the Diocese of Maryland, founded in 1842 by Kerfoot, Bishop Whittingham, and the Reverend William Augustus Muhlenberg on the model of Muhlenberg’s school on Long Island, the Flushing Institute, later known as St. John’s College. The College of St. James had prospered until the outbreak of the Civil War, when Kerfoot’s pronounced Union sentiments caused a withdrawal of most of the students, the student body having been largely from the seceded states and Maryland. Several times the campus had suffered depredations by both Union and Confederate soldiers and, by the summer of 1864, it was certain that the institution would not be able to open in September. Kerfoot was a High Churchman, and the life of the college centered about the daily services of the St. James’ Chapel. Not only were there daily Morning and Evening Prayer, but also frequent Communion and regular observance of the Saints’ Days. Indeed, such was the emphasis on religious observance at the College of St. James, that the academic calendar was so arranged as to keep the College in session during the Christmas season “in order that they might be trained to keep the great festival religiously and properly.”108

Kerfoot may not have been known personally to the Trinity Trustees,109 but there was hardly a well-informed Churchman who was not familiar with Kerfoot’s educational work. And Kerfoot’s ritualism might have been just the thing to counter the students’ hostility toward Evening Chapel. And perhaps the elaborate ceremonial for which St. James’ Chapel was famous would be appropriate to the new Chapel which it was hoped could soon be erected at Trinity.

There was little doubt about Kerfoot’s feelings
about an offer of the Presidency of Trinity. As the founder of St. James, he naturally hoped that his own institution would continue, but as this seemed unlikely, the Trinity Presidency would enable him to remain in educational work, rather than force him into the parish ministry, which he regarded as an unpleasant alternative.\textsuperscript{110}

Kerfoot's friends strongly urged him to consider the Trinity proposition favorably, if elected. On July 23, 1864, Kerfoot left for Boston and arrived at Dr. Shattuck's home two days later. After discussing with Dr. Shattuck the situation at St. James and the prospects at Trinity, doubtless deciding in favor of Trinity, Kerfoot went to New York to visit his friend, Dr. Muhlenberg, and to await developments.\textsuperscript{111}

On the morning of July 28, 1864, the Trustees of Trinity College met at Hartford to elect a President. But before getting to that important duty, the Trustees adopted a resolution explaining their "views of the basis on which the College should be conducted, and in justice to all parties concerned[, direct[ed] them to be communicated to the gentleman who may be elected to the Presidency; in the end that there may be mutual understanding between the Board and the President." The resolution stated 1) that in the course of study, "the Course of Religious Instruction shall not be made so prominent as to overshadow the Course of Secular Instruction; nor shall any Course of Religious Instruction be made obligatory on Students not of the Episcopal Church"; 2) that in his dealing with the Faculty, the President shall rely on "his personal influence rather than on mere authority"; 3) "that the administration of discipline and supervision shall not be that of a School . . .", and 4) that until a chapel building can be erected and a congregation organized, the Sunday schedule of religious services shall be confined to Morning Prayer to be held at an early hour so as to permit students to attend the late morning service in Hartford. And having laid down the rules for the new administration, the Board of Trustees proceeded to elect the Reverend John Barrett Kerfoot President of Trinity College at a salary of $2,000 per annum.\textsuperscript{112}

That evening, Kerfoot received word of his election by telegram at the home of Dr. Muhlenberg in New York, and the next day (July 29) he received an official letter from Bishop Williams, who urged Kerfoot to come to Hartford immediately. Kerfoot set out by steamboat for New Haven and reached that city early the following morning. After a brief walk about Yale College, he took the train for Hartford, and at the station at Berlin he was met by Bishop Williams, who accompanied him the rest of the way. In the company of the Bishop and Professors Brocklesby and Mallory, he visited the College and called briefly on Bishop Brownell. Kerfoot was much pleased with his visit and the cordial reception which he received.\textsuperscript{113}

After two busy days in Hartford, Kerfoot returned to Maryland where, within a week, he was captured by Confederate officers and held prisoner. The Rector of St. James was held, not for his Union sympathies, but in order to effect an exchange of prisoners for the Reverend Dr. Hunter Boyd of Winchester, Virginia, who was being held by the Union Army. Kerfoot was immediately released on parole and sent to Washington to secure the exchange. After many delays and much red tape having been unwound by the Washington bureaucracy, the exchange of prisoners was completed, and Kerfoot returned to St. James, quickly wound up his affairs, and left for Hartford.\textsuperscript{114}