when the plans for the new campus were first announced, there were those who thought that the undertaking was much too ambitious. Bishop Williams would have preferred not to purchase an expensive new tract of land and to have "made do" on the College's own properties near the old campus and, indeed, there was much to be said from a strictly economic point of view for adopting the Chancellor's suggestion.

The cost of constructing new Seabury and Jarvis Halls had so far exceeded the original Trustees appropriation of $300,000 that before the work had been completed, the treasury was exhausted and money had to be taken from the general fund to pay the outstanding bills. Once more, the College mortgaged income-producing property - this time, the block of houses on Elm Street - to secure a $30,000 loan. Tuition and other fees were raised, and the President's salary was reduced.

Other problems of a financial nature embarrassed the College, too. In 1874, the Building Committee had asked for informal estimates on the stone work so as to enable the Trustees to anticipate the total cost of the buildings. The understanding was that the estimates were not to be final and that competitive bidding would not be opened until the total cost had been roughly determined. In 1878, however, one of the mason contractors sued the Trustees for the sum of $1,500, which he regarded as the cost of preparing his estimate. The contractor was awarded $200 by the court on the grounds that "the plaintiff was in poor circumstances, while the [Trinity College] corporation was wealthy." And when the time came for the final demolition of the old buildings, the financially-embarrassed Trustees refused to take them down until formally ordered to do so.

There was also a general feeling among the friends of the College that the Trustees were being carried away with grandiose ideas of splendid new buildings to the probable neglect of the primary function of the College - the education of young men. At the very beginning, the New York Alumni had expressed serious concern that the College's new wealth would be dissipated on bricks and stone and that nothing would remain of the $600,000 for permanent endowment. The Trustees had pledged to keep within the amount received for the old campus but this, as we have seen, was impossible.

The fears of the New York Alumni never abated, and the New Yorkers continued to offer left-handed suggestions through the New York press. In 1875, one of them wrote in the New York Independent that buildings and money alone do not make a College; and that "a single eminent scholar on the faculty would be worth more than a hundred-thousand-dollar hall for him to lecture in." The writer urged that the College use the opportunity "to strengthen its faculty and raise its intellectual tone." And two years later a similar item appeared in the New York World in which one signed "Paul" lamented that the College had spent all of its resources on buildings and was now poor.

The bitter suggestion that the Faculty left something to be desired was all too true. In 1875, the full-time Faculty consisted of nine men. Of
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the nine, five were Episcopalian clergymen and none had any real advanced academic training beyond the A.B. or a course in Theology. Although all were relatively young, they seemed to lack the enthusiasm and the intellectual interest which had characterized the Faculty some twenty years before. Samuel Hart, then Professor of Pure Mathematics, alone seemed to evidence any real scholarly interest.  

The Faculty themselves were not likely to have noticed their own deficiencies, for most of them were (in 1875) graduates of the College and had had little academic experience elsewhere. As a matter of fact, the Faculty was never before, nor after, as "inbred" as it was in 1875. The best that could be said for the system of faculty appointments was that the junior members had been "Optimus" graduates (i.e., with no grade in course lower than "90") and that at that time one-third of the Faculty (Professor Hart '66, Latin Professor George O. Holbrooke '69, and Modern Language Tutor Leonard Woods Richardson '73) had been graduated with the College's highest honors.  

Those Alumni of the College who had gone on for professional studies in the larger academic centers must have been able to make comparisons which were not necessarily complimentary to the College. In the years following the Civil War, a large number of Trinity Alumni pursued professional studies, particularly in Law and Medicine, at Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, and Columbia; and, as an unusually large proportion of these men attended Columbia and then made their homes in New York City, it is not difficult to understand why the New York Alumni should have been so articulate in expressing their misgivings about Alma Mater.  

Although the Faculty did not want, as one member is reported to have said in 1874, "any stranger coming here to wake them up," there had been at least one attempt to bolster the Faculty. When Abner Jackson first went to England in 1872 to engage an architect, he had made inquiry at both Cambridge and Oxford regarding a possible candidate for the Latin Professorship which was about to be vacated by Professor Austin Stickney. Stickney resigned in 1873 but instead of a Latin Professor being brought from England, George O. Holbrooke, who had been Professor of Modern Languages since 1870, was made Professor of Latin, and Leonard W. Richardson of the last graduating class was made Tutor in Modern Languages. James D. Smyth '94, who had been engaged as Tutor in Greek to assist Professor John T. Huntington, continued in that capacity until 1877, when he was advanced to Assistant Professor of Greek.  

Between 1874 and 1877, there had been no personnel changes in the senior ranks of the Faculty. In the latter year, however, a most important addition was made. Henry Carrington Bolton, Ph.D., was appointed Professor of Chemistry and Natural Science, and the selection was one which must have delighted even the most critical of the New York Alumni. Bolton was a native of Connecticut, a graduate of Columbia College in the city of New York, a Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Goettingen, and a member of the Faculty of the School of Mines at Columbia. Here was, indeed, a scholar of national reputation, for Bolton was president of the Chemical Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, secretary of the New York Academy of Science, author of many scientific articles and two standard treatises on Chemistry, and the country's foremost authority on the history of Chemistry. And the value which the College placed upon his scholarly attainments was attested to by his starting salary of $2,500, the largest the College had yet paid.  

Bolton spent the summer and fall of 1877 in gathering "specimens" in the South and West and, as the new Seabury Hall neared completion during the winter, Bolton occupied his time in supervising the equipment of the Chemistry Laboratory and the Cabinet. In May of 1878, he gave the first lecture on the new campus. Bolton was immensely popular with Faculty and students, perhaps proving to both that scholarly interests and attainments need not be a hindrance to good teaching.  

So successful was the appointment of H. Carrington Bolton that the next regular appointment
was also a Doctor of Philosophy, the Reverend Isbon T. Beckwith, Ph.D. (Yale), and a former instructor at that institution, who in 1879 replaced Dr. Huntington who had resigned as Professor of Greek. The appointment in 1883 of L. M. Cheesman, Ph.D. (Berlin), as Professor of Physics and of William Lispenard Robb, Ph.D. (Berlin), as Cheesman’s successor in 1885 confirmed the practice. The appointments of Robert Baird Riggs, Ph.D. (Goettingen), in 1888 as Professor of Chemistry and Natural Science and of Winfred R. Martin, Ph.D. (Tübingen), in 1890 as Professor of Oriental and Modern Languages, suggests that the Ph.D. had come to be assumed in the case of appointment to Professorships at Trinity College. In 1890-91, four of the eleven members of the Faculty were Ph.D.’s, each of them a distinguished scholar in his own academic discipline.

But 1890 was a long way from the mid-1870’s. In 1875, the Faculty was inbred, self-satisfied, parochial, petty, and (as events will more than suggest) with little to occupy its time. And, in a way, it was the death of Abner Jackson and the accession to the Presidency of Thomas Ruggles Pynchon which seems to have turned the Faculty in the direction of this pettiness.

There were, of course, two sides to the question of faculty attitudes, and the faculty side was that the students they were obliged to teach were both unruly and intellectually not very stimulating. Jackson had been able to inspire the undergraduates to maintain proper decorum, but Pynchon was never, somehow, able to gain their confidence and respect. Immediately after his assuming the Presidency, Pynchon (as some of his predecessors had been) was put to the test, and even the Tablet could describe the conduct of the students as “shameful.” Bonfires were frequently made in defiance of the College Statute and on an evening when the students were of a mind to make bonfires, one would hardly be put out by the college authorities before another would be lighted. The college bell was rung at night, and Prayer Books were removed from the Chapel and mutilated. The Freshmen “bums” became little more than brawls, and the “rushes” which preceded them were specimens of manly but unsportsmanlike conduct.

President Pynchon (called “Old Pynch” by the students) doubtless knew that he was somewhat less than popular among the undergraduates, and this knowledge kept the College’s head from any intimate contacts with the Trinity young men. The older members of the Faculty more-or-less followed Pynchon’s example and refused to be drawn into the day-to-day affairs of the student body. With the younger Faculty, however, it was a different matter. Professor Holbrooke was actively associated with the College’s athletic interests, and both he and Tutor (later Assistant Professor) Smyth attended an occasional college “bum.” Professor Hart, although not so much inclined toward participation in student activities as his colleagues Holbrooke and Smyth, was a friend of the undergraduates and much respected by them. But these three, and despite the fact that Hart was Secretary of the Faculty, were both outranked and outvoted when the senior faculty attempted to deal with the disciplinary problems which recurred throughout the Pynchon administration.

The Faculty had but one answer for any question of student behavior—punish the violator of the rule and, if possible, add another rule. But what the Faculty perhaps could not bring themselves to realize was that the student body was not made up of young and tractable schoolboys such as they themselves had been during their own undergraduate years. Whereas the pre-Civil War freshmen had been boys of fifteen or sixteen, the youngest member of the Freshman Class to enter Trinity in the fall of 1874 was seventeen. The average age of that Freshman Class was eighteen, and one member was twenty-one. And although there had always been a certain amount of “going on the town,” the undergraduates of the mid-1870’s regarded the social life and theatrical offerings of Hartford as an indispensable “second curriculum.” With Hartford’s several theatres offering a rich fare of “one night stands,” the Trinity men were at the theatre almost every night of the week. And the campus social life—the musical clubs, the
athletic groups, the fraternities, and the smaller informal interest groups which had developed during the Jackson era—had reoriented the student interest in such a fashion as to make the undergraduate feel that his entertainment and amusement were to be a paramount concern of the College. Card games were played in student rooms, banjos sounded through the halls, and when mild diversion would no longer suffice, the bonfires were lighted, the college bell was sounded, and bedlam broke loose. The undergraduates were remarkably noisy!

Matters came to a head in November, 1876, when the Faculty adopted a resolution forbidding singing on the campus or in the buildings at all times. The students were furious, and on the first Sunday after the faculty resolution had been announced they carried the edict to its logical conclusion by refusing to sing in Chapel. Professor Hart sang a solo, but that was all the music there was on that Sunday.

Newspapers throughout the country gave wide publicity to the faculty resolution and the students' reaction. The *Hartford Daily Courant* thought that the faculty resolution was unreasonable and editorially suggested that there be "some modification of the order." This publicity was, of course, embarrassing to the Faculty, and the Trinity Professors (again quite naturally, if not necessarily truthfully) denied ever having issued such an edict. They did admit, however, that several individual students had been reprimanded for loud and hearty singing but they were, at the same time, quite insistent that there was no rule against singing as such!

During the winter of 1877-1878, the students were an unhappy and sullen group. Perhaps taking revenge for the Tablet's unfortunate publicity of the singing edict, the Faculty "cracked down" with a strict enforcement of all College Statutes pertaining to student conduct. And whether the students vocally participated in the
College's public worship or not, the Faculty enforced chapel attendance (as well as class attendance) by lowering the class standing of those who "cut." Quite naturally, and perhaps correctly, the Tablet declared the Faculty to be acting in an arbitrary fashion,\(^{34}\) for on occasion the Faculty even broke up groups of students engaged in conversation on the chapel steps.\(^{35}\) Washington's Birthday, one of the favorite Trinity holidays, passed without celebration.\(^{36}\) The Grand Tribunal, formerly the proud upholder of college tradition, had passed into such a state of limbo that even the Tablet noted, albeit in error, that the institution had expired.\(^{37}\)

So the vicious cycle continued. As the Faculty became more severe, the students became more disrespectful.\(^{38}\) And since so much of the faculty-undergraduate controversy centered about the College Chapel, the students demanded the abolition of compulsory attendance.\(^{39}\) The Faculty not only denied the request, but they also struck their own blow against the students in directing that at the forthcoming Class Day, the Class Chronicle make no remarks "disrespectful to the Faculty," and that the Chronicle make no mention of any "exploits of the class, or any of its members, done in violation of established rules."\(^{40}\) This was an unqualified recognition on the part of the harassed Faculty that the matter of student discipline had gotten totally out of hand.

President Pynchon had a simple explanation for the situation. In his report to the Trustees for 1879,\(^{41}\) he explained that the Trinity Term of 1877 had been so disorderly because it was the last term the students expected to spend on the old campus and that normal academic life could not be carried on because of circumstances which could not possibly have been altered. With a corps of workmen busily and noisily engaged in constructing the new State Capitol, the "confusion had become so great as to interfere materially with the recitations and with the Chapel Service." The Faculty, said President Pynchon, could no longer enforce the "usual rules of order" and, consequently, "all parietal discipline disappeared." And to further complicate faculty supervision of the students, as portions of the old dormitories were torn down, the students were obliged to find quarters elsewhere. Supposedly the undergraduates moved across the street to the houses rented by the College for that purpose. Actually, however, there was a general dispersal. As President Pynchon reported, "all the more wealthy students, i.e., all those who especially required control, were living outside, not singly, but gathered in large bodies, in houses which they completely fitted and where they lived without direction from us."

On Friday, March 1, 1878, the students went on a rampage. The college bell was taken down and all sorts of depredations were committed. The next day, Saturday, all of the College "cut" Chapel and the three lower classes absented themselves from all recitations. That afternoon the entire student body marched through the town singing and a few days later, when the college bell had been returned to its place atop old Seabury Hall, the students silenced that noble old instrument by filling it with a mixture of plaster of Paris and nails.\(^{42}\)

The Faculty took swift action. One Sophomore was suspended for his part in the pranks, and a warning was issued by the Faculty that all who might participate in a demonstration against the suspension would themselves be suspended. When a Senior attempted to organize a class boycott, the Faculty sent him home per the warning. But the most dramatic action taken by the Faculty was to take away all scholarships from those who had participated in any way in the disturbances.\(^{43}\)

Now it was the students' turn, for hardly had the first series of offences been punished than the second began. The Freshmen engaged in the forbidden pleasure of a "hat rush" and the members of the class were each fined $5.00. To the fine, the Freshmen retaliated with all sorts of pranks -building bonfires, ringing the college bell (from which the plaster had been removed), and tearing down the college bulletin board. The poor Freshmen found unexpected friends in the Sophomores who once more filled the bell with plaster and nails and in the entire body of
All laws are subject to diverse interpretations, and a multiplication of ordinances is sometimes self-destructive.

The Rules.
Ye shall not stand upon the porch,  
To catch the evening breeze,  
Nor play the game of ball within  
The inner row of trees...

The Results.
The thunder-bolt comes leaping swift  
Amid the driving rain,  
But swifter runs the startled Fresh,  
His humble seat to gain...

The Rules—from The Trinity Tablet, 1878

Upperclassmen who made a "mass cut" from Chapel.

The storm subsided, or rather "blew itself out," for within a short time the Tablet reported that "a general calm seems to prevail throughout the College," not the calm before the storm, "but rather the inoffensive quiet which follows the subduing of the waves. Our instructors," lamented the Tablet, "have reduced us to order." Perhaps the students were taking comfort in the rumor which was going the rounds that Pynchon would soon be out as President.

President Pynchon was certain that the move to the new campus would in itself effect something of a reformation in undergraduate conduct. The students would be farther away from urban distractions, and once more all could be under the roofs of the college dormitory. But in this he was to be disappointed. Although the excitement of examining the new physical surroundings briefly put the students in excellent spirits, there was no permanent change in the attitudes of these students toward the Faculty nor in that of the Faculty toward the undergraduates. When the students arrived on the new campus, the workmen were still busy with the finishing
touched on the new Seabury Hall and there was no immediate settling down to serious business. 47

The Faculty and President persuaded themselves to believe that things were better—that the students studied more than previously and that "at least 20 per cent more work has been done... than ever before." President Pynchon also assured the Trustees that there was "much less dissipation than usual." But Pynchon was the first to admit that until all of those undergraduates who had lived on the old campus had been graduated, there would be no real change. 48

Pynchon's prophecy was fulfilled, for the students, although considerably farther from town than previously, did not immediately remold themselves into a new academic community far from the madding crowd. The handsome omnibus drawn by four horses which each day left the College at 2 P.M. and returned by 5:00 (with a repeated trip during the evening) was usually filled to its capacity of forty persons. 49 But why should the students have preferred to remain on the campus, however new and however splendid? The Faculty had not met the students the campus, however new and however splendid? The Faculty had not met the students the anticipated "half-way." All of the old rules, including the one against singing except between 3:00 and 6:00 in the afternoon (which had, after all, touched off the whole war between students and Faculty), were still rigidly enforced. Walking on the college lawn (presumably in the interest of protecting the new grass) was forbidden, and the Library was open to the students only between 2:00 and 3:00 each afternoon! 50

Nor had the Faculty evidenced the slightest confidence in the student body. No bell was hung on the new campus 51 and that precluded the noisy ringing which had caused so much disturbance during the last years on the old campus. Matriculation Day was moved up to September 16, by which action "the Faculty show[ed] their intention to crush class disturbances, and hold the offenders strictly responsible for any troubles which might arise. . . ." 52

The Faculty anticipated trouble and trouble soon came, for hardly had the first term on the new campus opened when the students took to the building of bonfires. 53 The Tablet carried brief accounts of these incidents as usual but the Faculty, doubtless hoping to convey the impression that student disorders were no longer a part of the Trinity tradition, demanded that no issue of the Tablet (nor, incidentally, the Ivy) be sent to press without approval of the Professor of English Literature. The students knew full well that there was more to this new regulation than an interest in literary polish. The Tablet board of editors protested the faculty edict and threatened to suspend publication of the Tablet until the restriction should be removed. The Faculty refused to rescind the order, and the next issue of the Tablet appeared one week late, 54 and apparently without faculty approval.

The Tablet made its point in publishing without faculty approval, but the next few issues following that of November 23, 1878, were unusually bland. It was probably during this period that the undergraduates published a mock catalogue for T. Pynchon's Select Academy for Children, 55 in which "Extracts from the Rules of the School" parodied the more restrictive Statutes and faculty regulations of Trinity College.

On January 23, 1879, the student body held a "protest meeting" and drew up a resolution asking that the "singing hours" be extended to 8:00 p.m. On February 1, the Tablet, which had briefly withheld criticism of the college policies, re-entered the conflict with a blast at the high cost and low quality of the food served in the College Commons and strong support for the student resolution on the "singing hours." 56

Just before Washington's Birthday, the students held another "College Meeting" and unanimously signed a petition requesting that singing be permitted until eight-thirty! The Faculty, as might have been expected, refused to change the rule. 57

Despite the rebuff, the students decided that faculty restriction on singing or no, the Washington's Birthday celebration should be revived. Although there had been no such celebrations in either 1877 or 1878, 58 the Glee Club scheduled a concert for the evening of Saturday, February 22, to be held in the College Cabinet. On the morning of the celebration, the Faculty met in special
session and ordered that all songs to be sung that evening by the Glee Club should be first submitted to the Professor of English Literature for his approval. When the edict was announced, Sydney George Fisher, a Senior, called a College Meeting in the Greek Room. With Fisher presiding, the students voted to hold the celebration in a hall in downtown Hartford and to ignore the faculty order. Nearly all who were present signed an agreement to stand together against any faculty action which might be taken against the Glee Club. At six o'clock the students again held a College Meeting and voted to disband the Glee Club.59

That evening the concert went on as scheduled. The singers were no longer officially the "Trinity Glee Club," but the young men who performed in Seminary Hall delighted a large audience which included a number of townfolk.60

On Monday morning there was immediate punishment of those responsible for the affairs of the previous Saturday. The Faculty met and suspended six students, including Fisher, of course, who had been leader of the student meetings. A reporter for the Courant visited the campus to get statements from both Faculty and students. The undergraduates simply recounted the circumstances which had prompted the vote to hold the Washington's Birthday Concert "off campus." The Faculty were less direct. One professor remarked that "the students never undertake anything without disgracing the college," and another described the students as "about half children and half men." The reporter felt that the students were in the right and that the faculty procedure was "an unjust and hasty act."61

At 12:15 P.M. the students held a College Meeting. A committee was selected to draw up a petition to present to the Faculty. When the College Meeting reconvened at 2:15, the committee reported that the Faculty had refused to listen to the petition. The students thereupon resolved "to absent themselves from all chapels, recitations, and college exercises in general" until redress had been made. The committee was ordered to prepare a pamphlet stating the whole case and to send copies of the pamphlet to the parents of all Trinity students and to the Associated Press.62

President Pynchon realized that the students had seized the initiative and that they enjoyed a considerable propaganda advantage. Consequently, on the following morning (Tuesday, February 25) he sent telegrams to all parents, calling them to the College. The telegrams read "Come at once. Your son needs you." By evening, many fathers had arrived in Hartford. A "parents meeting" was held at the Allyn House, and it was decided that the fathers would visit the College in the morning. On Wednesday, February 26, the College was called into meeting by the President. The fathers readily accepted the invitation to be present. Bishop Williams presided and after a brief explanation of the purpose of this meeting (as if it were not already known), he introduced a Mr. Carter of Baltimore (the father of Bernard M. Carter '82) who presented a "compromise" which had been worked out by the fathers at their meeting the night before.63

The "compromise" was a reasonable one—considering all of the circumstances. The undergraduates "frankly" admitted "disregard of their obligations," and the Faculty "voided all punishment in all respects as if the offense had not been committed." That evening there was a full attendance at Chapel, the congregation being swelled by the large number of parents who stayed over in Hartford until the following day.64

The Tablet's description of the "compromise" as one of Status Quo Ante Bellum was accurate indeed, but the "ante" referred to before February 22, 1879, and not ante the first real faculty "crack down" in November, 1876. As such, the "compromise" represented a mere "armed truce" without any real giving in from either side. The students continued to press for a reduction in the number of required chapel attendances,65 and the Faculty refused to move from its old position. One student who had been a week-end visitor at Vassar perhaps somewhat overstated the situation when he reported that "the students at Vassar have more liberty and fewer rules than the students of Trinity,"66 but in his prob-
able inaccuracy he doubtless expressed the feelings of his fellows.

Unexpectedly, the Faculty voted to extend the “singing hours” to eight o’clock, but any good will which might have resulted from this gesture was negated by faculty severity in the enforcement of other college rules. The following fall, when the Sophomores made a bonfire on campus, the entire class was reduced in standing. At about this same time, the Faculty broke up the Freshman-Sophomore Push Rush. And when the Sophomores asked permission to lay out a baseball field on the southeast corner of the college grounds, the Trustees (perhaps on suggestion from the Faculty) granted the request but with two conditions: 1) that there be no intercollegiate games, and 2) that “no gate-money be taken.”

In the petty squabbles between the students and their elders, public opinion generally seemed to favor the undergraduates. In the matter of the baseball field, this seemed certainly to be the case. The Hartford Daily Courant thought that the students’ efforts were praiseworthy and that the restrictions imposed by the Trustees were unreasonable, and it was doubtless such editorial comment which finally prompted the college authorities to permit the use of the athletic field for intercollegiate games.

Such forced “concessions” were regarded by the students as hardly “concessions” at all, and they certainly did little to improve the relations between the two camps. The “truce” lasted for exactly one year, for in February, 1880, the students began their old pranks. Early in the month someone broke into the President’s Office and stole the College Book of Rules. February 22, 1880, fell in Lent and also on a Sunday and that meant that there would be no Washington’s Birthday celebration. But student piety was not such as to demand a quiet observance of the Lenten Season. On Monday, February 23, the students once more were on the rampage, and for weeks there were fires and midnight revels of all sorts. The Tablet conveniently blamed the “spirit of mischief [which] seems to be rife among the students” on Lent, which had put an end to all social activities. Such may have, indeed, been the case, for between Easter and the end of the academic year there was no further disorder.

1880–1881 was relatively quiet. Other than a “letting off of steam” by the Freshmen in February, which the Faculty generously (for once) “considered . . . trivial and beneath their notice,” there were no “incidents.” Perhaps it was the interest in the new athletic field (if not in athletics) which “calmed” the students, for that fall the Freshmen even gave $75.00 toward the new field instead of having the traditional “bum.” And there had even been other gracious gestures on the part of both students and Faculty. The Faculty had joined the students in arranging a Washington’s Birthday dance, and the Junior Class had presented Professor Brocklesby with a gift of books as tokens of “the Dr.’s unvarying kindness, his patience, and the earnest-
ness with which he labored to teach those who were none too willing to learn.”

When the College opened in September the students were in better disposition than they had been for some years. Most of the old rules were still in force, and the undergraduates were somewhat unhappy that the restrictions upon singing had been re-imposed, but for a while it seemed that the life of the College would fall into the old ante-Pynchon routine. Freshmen were properly hazed by the Sophomores, and the Freshman-Sophomore Push Rush and the following “symposium ‘over the hill’” was enjoyed by all.

The students took understandable pride in the splendid set of elm seedlings which had been laid out in the form of a colossal “T” on the campus and in the new structure which was being erected as Northam Hall between Jarvis and Seabury. The completion of the horse-car line to the College caused the undergraduates to feel that the hourly car service would once more bring them back into the life of the Hartford community.

Several new student organizations came into being—almost suggestive of Abner Jackson’s day. The Cerberus Club, whose membership was “chosen irrespective of class, color or former conditions of servitude,” met secretly at short intervals to consume “large quantities of intoxicating beverages.” Several students formed a literary club, a small college orchestra flourished, and the Glee Club was revived. There was also a Coaching Club (to ride in stage coaches), a Cycle Club, and a new student publication, *Ye Jug*, whose single issue of eight pages of “spoof” appeared on Friday, April 1, 1881.

The Faculty graciously, if belatedly, reduced the number of required chapel services to six per week, and this long-hoped-for concession to student requests did much to bolster undergraduate morale. In fact, when the Christmas Term for 1882–1883 opened, the *Tablet* was defending both the morale and morals of the Trinity students: “Never was there a better atmosphere here in that regard. We will stake Trinity’s morality against any other college in the land, except perhaps Wesleyan, and we vow it is more noble and healthier than theirs.”

How had this remarkable transformation come about? Conceivably, it could be explained on the basis of President Pynchon’s prophecy that matters would improve when the students who had lived on the old campus had been graduated. Actually, the Class of 1882 was the first not to have been on the old campus, and this group seems to have been a model of propriety. And there was, of course, something of a relaxing of the severity with which college rules had been enforced. The students had “earned” this concession by improved behavior, but what had been the cause of this twofold “change of heart?”

After the difficult period of adjustment to life in the new surroundings, there was an acceptance on the part of the students of the advantages of the new campus. Commons kept all undergraduates together for the three daily meals—except for part of the academic year of 1881–1882 when the dining facilities did not operate and the students once more were sent out to eating houses. The horse-car line, too, was useful in providing continued contact with the society and institutions of Hartford and enabled students to disperse in the evenings rather than to crowd the college buildings.

Perhaps as significant as any other factor was the change in the makeup of the Faculty. Professors Bolton and Beckwith, both Ph.D.’s of wide experience in the larger academic world, doubtless pointed up by contrast the pettiness of the older members of the Faculty, and the retirement of Professor Brocklesby in 1882 reduced
the "Old Guard" to two: President Pynchon and Professor Edwin E. Johnson. But even the "Old Guard" was soon to pass from the scene, for Pynchon resigned as President in October, 1882, and Professor Johnson died in May, 1883.

Pynchon's immediate downfall was brought about by those guardians of the College's welfare, the New York Alumni. Self-appointed as they were in this capacity and meddlesome as their actions may have seemed in Hartford, there was no doubt that they were always acting in the best interest of the College and that they were able to succeed when others had failed. In 1880, for example, the House of Convocation had become concerned about the internal affairs of the College, and the unfavorable publicity which Trinity received in the national press prompted the Convocation to propose reform. But the only proposal for reform upon which Convocation could agree was for alumni representation on the Board of Trustees. When the request for alumni representation was presented to the Board, the Trustees postponed consideration of the request, and it was not until a year later (June, 1881) that a committee from Convocation was able to meet with a committee from the governing body of the College to even consider the matter. The Trustees were not convinced that alumni representation on the Board would be beneficial, and the Trustees urged that the office of College Fellow be, as the Trustees Minutes recorded, "restored to its intended former degree of usefulness." When the request for alumni representation was presented to the Board, the Trustees postponed consideration of the request, and it was not until a year later (June, 1881) that a committee from Convocation was able to meet with a committee from the governing body of the College to even consider the matter. The Trustees were not convinced that alumni representation on the Board would be beneficial, and the Trustees urged that the office of College Fellow be, as the Trustees Minutes recorded, "restored to its intended former degree of usefulness." When the request for alumni representation was presented to the Board, the Trustees postponed consideration of the request, and it was not until a year later (June, 1881) that a committee from Convocation was able to meet with a committee from the governing body of the College to even consider the matter. The Trustees were not convinced that alumni representation on the Board would be beneficial, and the Trustees urged that the office of College Fellow be, as the Trustees Minutes recorded, "restored to its intended former degree of usefulness." When the request for alumni representation was presented to the Board, the Trustees postponed consideration of the request, and it was not until a year later (June, 1881) that a committee from Convocation was able to meet with a committee from the governing body of the College to even consider the matter. The Trustees were not convinced that alumni representation on the Board would be beneficial, and the Trustees urged that the office of College Fellow be, as the Trustees Minutes recorded, "restored to its intended former degree of usefulness." When the request for alumni representation was presented to the Board, the Trustees postponed consideration of the request, and it was not until a year later (June, 1881) that a committee from Convocation was able to meet with a committee from the governing body of the College to even consider the matter. The Trustees were not convinced that alumni representation on the Board would be beneficial, and the Trustees urged that the office of College Fellow be, as the Trustees Minutes recorded, "restored to its intended former degree of usefulness." When the request for alumni representation was presented to the Board, the Trustees postponed consideration of the request, and it was not until a year later (June, 1881) that a committee from Convocation was able to meet with a committee from the governing body of the College to even consider the matter. The Trustees were not convinced that alumni representation on the Board would be beneficial, and the Trustees urged that the office of College Fellow be, as the Trustees Minutes recorded, "restored to its intended former degree of usefulness."
worked out for Alumni representation on the Board of Trustees, other committees were urging additional internal reforms. The New York Alumni, while in full sympathy with Convocation’s efforts to secure alumni representation, were also aware of the fact that the House of Convocation was no longer a really active body and that the annual meetings were usually poorly attended. During the spring of 1882, the New York Alumni appointed a committee to visit the College and to report on conditions.

The committee (Thomas McLean ’92, Luke A. Lockwood ’55, David B. Willson ’79, and William E. Curtis ’75) visited the College and were much dissatisfied with what they could observe. Commencement Week of 1882 was a busy one for the committee members. At the business session of the House of Convocation, the findings of the New York Committee were disclosed and the members of Convocation, shocked by the discouraging speeches of some of the College’s most loyal sons, adopted a resolution to present a petition to the Trustees. The petition, which was immediately prepared in pamphlet form, concerned itself largely with the size of the student body and the facilities for instruction. The petition, noting that the student body for 1881-1882 was somewhat smaller than in the previous years, urged that 300 or 400 students be admitted so that the College could compete, athletically and otherwise, with such colleges as Wesleyan, Amherst, and Williams. It was further suggested that a Chair of Biology be established; that additional apparatus be procured for instruction in Physics, Chemistry, and Natural History; that an Astronomical Observatory be provided; that the Library be enlarged; and that an endowment be raised for the dining hall. To secure these ends, Convocation urged a large-scale financial campaign among the “rich and generous Churchmen of the large cities.”

When the Trustees met on June 28, 1882, they received not only the petition from the House of Convocation, but they also were presented with an even more pointed petition from the New York Alumni. The New York petition asked for a full investigation into the affairs of the College with particular reference to “the competence of the present administration of the College.” Thus confronted with two demands for immediate action, the Trustees had no choice but to appoint an investigation committee as requested. Wisely, the Trustees selected the Honorable Henry J. Scudder of New York, Charles J. Hoadley and William Hamersley of Hartford, the Right Reverend Benjamin H. Paddock of Boston, and the Reverend George S. Mallory, former Professor at the College and then an active member of the New York Alumni Association.

Both committees (the Trustees Committee and the New York Alumni Committee) were active during the summer months of 1882. The Trustees Committee circulated a questionnaire among the Alumni asking their opinion of the Trinity education and of the situation (disciplinary and otherwise) while they were undergraduates. The questionnaire asked for practical suggestions as to solving the College’s existing problems. The New York Committee, too, continued its probe and, as evidence was accumulated, it seemed that the problems which plagued Trinity College could be attributed to “past errors in judgment in the administration of discipline” and to a “lack of administrative leadership.”

The activities of the committees could hardly have been kept a secret within the college community. An item in the Springfield Republican, for example, noted “that Trinity College has been rapidly degenerating of late years,” and it was doubtless such unflattering publicity which prompted Pynchon to confide in his friends that he had come to regard his administration as a failure and that he was “much mortified” because so much of the criticism of the College seemed to be directed to him personally.

Under the circumstances, it was hardly to be expected that Pynchon would hope to remain in office. When Pynchon told Chancellor Williams of his intention to resign the Presidency, the Bishop agreed that Pynchon had outlived his usefulness as head of the College. Williams, however, could not turn Pynchon out into the cold, so to speak, for the two had always worked together with a reasonable degree of harmony.
Williams had come to Pynchon's rescue before, and once more the Bishop was to make a suggestion which would have permitted the unhappy President to step down from his position and at the same time maintain his dignity.

Colonel Charles H. Northam, the donor of Northam Towers, died in 1881 and by his will gave $50,000 to establish a Professorship in the College. This sum, with the $127,000 given for Northam Towers, was the largest that the College had yet received from a single individual. Although it was intended that the Northam Professorship would be one of "Political Science and History," the Trustees were in no hurry to fill the chair. When Pynchon indicated to Bishop Williams his intention to retire, the Northam Professorship had not as yet been filled, and Williams found a convenient "out" for Pynchon in the vacant chair. Williams proposed that Pynchon should first resign the Presidency and that the Trustees should then elect him to the Northam Professorship.

But Williams made the mistake of first airing his proposal to William Hamersley, the Hartford Trustee. Hamersley was incensed, and rightly so, for Pynchon had been proposed for a position which it was hoped would be filled by an historian of wide reputation. Pynchon's academic experience had been in the Natural Sciences and, although he had occupied the less demanding chair of Moral Philosophy since 1877, he had experience in neither History nor Political Science, to say nothing of having a scholarly reputation in either. Hamersley agreed that the interest of the College demanded Pynchon's resignation, but at the same time he insisted that it would "imperil the interests of the College" either to bribe Pynchon to resign or to appoint him to a chair he was "not fit to fill," even as a favor to a personal friend! Hamersley's counterproposal was that some pecuniary aid should be given Pynchon for a year or two and that his connection with the College should then be severed.

On October 3, 1882, Thomas Ruggles Pynchon resigned the Presidency, but he was neither made Northam Professor nor "eased out" of the Trinity College Faculty. The Reverend Henry Ferguson '68 was made Northam Professor, and Pynchon was kept on as Professor of Moral Philosophy at a salary of $2,000 per year. Pynchon remained at the College in this capacity until 1902, and after 1888 he held the Brownell Professorship. From 1902 until his death in 1904, he held the title of Professor Emeritus.

Those who had been so critical of President Pynchon's administration hailed his resignation as a turning point in the history of the College. The elation of the New York Alumni, who had had such a considerable role in bringing about Pynchon's downfall, was evidenced by their resolve to raise an endowment for the College's presidential chair sufficient to pay a salary of $10,000 per year and this at a time when the President of Yale was receiving $4,000 and the President of Harvard $5,000.

All were agreed that the times demanded a president who could exercise unusual powers of
leadership. Because of the assumption that an experienced administrator would be chosen, the rumor was soon circulated that Dr. Eliphalet Nott Potter, President of Union College, had been elected. But when that rumor was proven to be without foundation, the names of several others who were well known in Trinity circles were also mentioned. Dr. Henry Augustus Coit, the rector of St. Paul's School who had declined the Presidency of Trinity College in 1866, was being mentioned as the Trustees' first choice. And others, it was said, were hoping that former President Samuel Eliot, then Superintendent of Schools in Boston, could be induced to return. But whatever the validity of these rumors, by April, 1883, the choice of the Trustees was the Reverend Dr. William Reed Huntington (A.B., Harvard, 1859; D.D., Columbia, 1873), rector of All Saints Church in Worcester, Mass., author of several important theological books, and widely recognized as a liturgical scholar.

Huntington had taken an “on again-off again” attitude toward the position. When the Trustees first inquired of him as to his interest in the position, Huntington refused to consider the matter. Later, however, he changed his mind and suggested that he would at least consider the offer if the vote of the Trustees would be unanimous. Bishop Williams was so strong a supporter of Huntington as a candidate for the Presidency that he urged the students to send Huntington a petition urging him to come to Trinity.

When it soon became apparent that Huntington had no real interest in the position, the attention of the Trustees was turned to the Reverend George Williamson Smith, whose candidacy was being advanced by the Right Reverend Abraham Newkirk Littlejohn, Bishop of Long Island, who described his protegé as a man of “ripe culture and fond of teaching.” Bishop Littlejohn further described him as “most amiable and without an enemy in the world.”

George Williamson Smith was graduated from Hobart College in 1857. During the winter of 1858-1859, he was principal of the Academy at Bladensburg, Maryland. Since graduation from college, he had studied Theology and in 1860 he was ordained Deacon in the Episcopal Church. From 1861 to 1864, he worked as a clerk in the U.S. Department of the Navy, and during these years he acted as assistant in several churches in Washington, D.C. In 1864, he took Priest's Orders and at that time became Professor of Mathematics at the Naval War College in Newport, Rhode Island. A year later, he became chaplain at the Naval Academy at Annapolis, where he remained until 1868. From 1868 until 1871, he was chaplain on the U.S.S. Franklin. In 1872, he became rector of Grace Church, Jamaica, Long Island, and since 1880 he had been rector of the Church of the Redeemer in Brooklyn, N.Y.

Actually, there was little in Smith's record to confirm Bishop Littlejohn's description of him as a man of “ripe culture.” Several of the Trustees, and especially Bishop Benjamin H. Paddock, were not sure that Smith was “quite the right man for Trinity College.” But despite the misgivings of several members of the Board, and although some of them would perhaps have liked to know more about George Williamson Smith's particular qualifications for office, Smith was selected as the successor to Thomas Ruggles Pynchon as President of Trinity College. When notified of his election, Smith was just a bit coy. He first visited the College and carefully inspected the facilities for instruction and then, upon his return to Brooklyn, issued a rather non-committal statement to a reporter from the New York Tribune in which he spoke most glowingly of the College and its prospects.

On May 17, 1883, Smith wrote to the Trustees accepting the position. There were, however, a number of conditions which would have to be met. Since receiving the offer of the Trinity Presidency, Smith reportedly had had “several invitations to accept important positions in the church,” and Smith was able to use these as bargaining points. First, he would not come to Trinity at the salary which had been paid to Pynchon—$3,500. The dignity of the office and the scale of living required of the head of a major educational institution demanded a salary
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of $5,000. Furthermore, if he were to accept the position, the Trustees would have to provide him with a suitable residence and to bear the expense of his moving from Brooklyn to Hartford. The Trustees accepted Smith's conditions and voted at once to provide a President's mansion on the campus.

Since his resignation from Trinity the previous October, Pynchon had continued as the official head of the institution, and the months that passed could hardly have been pleasant ones for him. On June 27, 1883, the Trustees formally thanked the out-going President for his services, voted him a six-month leave of absence effective July 1, 1883, and asked him, as was the custom, to sit for his portrait. Thus ended the short, unhappy reign of Thomas Ruggles Pynchon.