Almost Died A’borning

WASHINGTON COLLEGE had been conceived in the ecclesiastical strife which accompanied the overthrow of the Standing Order in 1818, but the granting of a college charter by the Connecticut Legislature in 1823 did not put an end to the opposition. Those who had previously attempted to prevent the incorporation of an Episcopal college next turned their efforts toward hindering the Trustees in raising the $30,000 necessary for the Charter to go into effect, and finally they tried, in a last effort, to dissuade parents from sending their sons to the new institution.¹

The “Bishop’s Bonus” controversy had been a heated one, but the outcome was determined, not by the logic of the pamphleteers, but by the Standing Order’s control of the Connecticut General Assembly. The Washington College controversy was a different story, for here the sides were more evenly matched; the Congregationalists no longer reigned supreme, and there were several influential newspapers willing to champion the cause of an Episcopalian college. The New Haven Pilot and the New Haven Columbian Register were ardent in their support. The Connecticut Mirror, while carrying fewer column inches than the other papers on Washington College, reprinted pro-college material from the New Haven papers and, although somewhat reserved in its support, carried no “items” opposed to the College.

Many of the arguments on both sides of the Washington College controversy were those of the “Bishop’s Bonus,” and these need not detain us. A long and bitter exchange in the Connecticut Courant, however, will bear some examination, for this running fight between proponents and opponents of the College continued, in one form or another, until some time after the College had actually opened.

On March 2, 1824, when the controversy was raging in most of the newspapers of the state, a writer to the Connecticut Courant, signing himself “Alumni of Yale,” stated “strong claims for patronage” for the College “upon people of every denomination,” insisting in no uncertain terms that the College “controverts no man’s religious creed.”² A week later “Alumni of Yale” again appeared in the Courant, urging the location of the College in Hartford, and in the same issue “Alumni” was joined by “E” who urged support of the College as tending “to enlarge our business, increase our wealth, and promote among us a spirit of enterprise.” But in a neighboring column “A Citizen of Hartford” took up the challenge laid down by “Alumni” a week before. Seeking to ridicule the friend of the College by impugning his Latin grammar, “Citizen” wrote that there must be some mistake in the signature, for certainly there would not be two or more Yale graduates who would bring the ridiculous charge of anti-Episcopalian sentiment at Yale.³

Now the whole matter might have been allowed to drop at this point on a rather amusing grammatical question, had not “Alumni” on March 16 returned to restate the overworked complaint of religious discrimination in New Haven, and had not Bishop Brownell and Harry Croswell seen fit to publish a resolution adopted by the College Trustees on March 24, attempting to correct “the erroneous impressions [which] are entertained in relation to the religious character of Washington College.” To prove their point,
they also printed Article 7 of the Charter in full and, in addition, they pledged for the Trustees that Washington College would be conducted “on principles as truly liberal in this respect as any other institution in our country.” And with that, the fat was in the fire.

On April 20, 1824, appeared “Honesty No. 1,” the first of three of the most bitter denunciations of the college founders that had yet been seen in print. The three tirades argued as follows: 1) The interests of literature and science do not require a second college in Connecticut, a fact made perfectly clear by Bishop Hobart in England. 2) “Exact and solid learning” would be impeded by a second college, as one good college is better than many poor ones. 3) To preserve the quality of education in America, the existing colleges should be more adequately endowed, for academic degrees granted by small and inferior colleges (of which Washington College was sure to be one) would make all degrees—even those of the respectable colleges—“thoroughly despicable.”

4) The “College mania” is a passing fad. So have been the “turnpike mania,” the “manufacturing mania,” and the “bank mania.” 5) Much of the interest in the College is “worldly interest” in the hope of bringing economic prosperity to the college town.

6) The “managers” of the new College operate in a spirit of duplicity and guile. The object of the College has been presented in different terms in Connecticut and England, and the “managers” have made promises they will be unable to keep. The promise to name the College for a wealthy benefactor cannot be kept, for the name of the College has been fixed by the Charter. 7) Article 7 of the Charter does not prevent the Trustees from imposing a religious test, and the Trustees would not be likely to appoint a non-Episcopalian to the Presidency of the institution. And the implication by the “managers” that all denominations of Christians are to be represented in the management will certainly not be the case. The Episcopal Church inherently possesses a persecuting spirit which (as in England) may soon be manifested in America.

It is hard to imagine how much further in charging the Connecticut Episcopalians with perfidy and fraud “Honesty,” could have gone. The fact is, however, that more was yet to come, and the editor of the Courant had on his hands several additional numbers which he charitably withheld from publication, since the issue which carried “Honesty No. 3” also carried the announcement of the Trustees’ fixing the location of the College. The editor thus brought this phase of the literary war to a close by “suggest[ing] to the authors the propriety of discontinuing the discussion of the subject for the present.”

The closing of the pages of the Courant to “Honesty” did not end the attacks upon the nascent College, for Chauncey Allen Goodrich, a member of the Yale faculty, dipped his pen in venom to compose the pamphlet which he published anonymously under the title of Considerations Suggested by the Establishment of a Second College in Connecticut, in which was said all that could be said, or to paraphrase John Henry Newman’s remarks on his “Life of St. Kentigern,” more than could be said against Washington College. To reproduce, or even to summarize, the Considerations would be painful indeed, and it may be said that the charges were essentially those made by “Honesty” in the Connecticut Courant, and that they were both probably written by the same person. The only really new element in the pamphlet was that Washington College was without adequate financial support ($100,000 or more being needed to successfully get a college started), and that the College would soon turn to the state legislature for a large appropriation of money.

By the time Nathaniel Wheaton returned from England, the Considerations had been read in all parts of Connecticut, although, it might be added, with no visible results. Wheaton had had no part in the newspaper controversy of the past year and he doubtless welcomed an opportunity to cross pens with the College’s detractors. He therefore issued, early in 1825, a pamphlet, Remarks on Washington College, and on the “Considerations” Suggested by its Establishment, in which he took up, one-by-one, the points raised by Dr. Goodrich in the Considerations and in
which he made much of what he regarded as contradictions and deceptions of the anti-college pamphlet.

Washington College was not, said Wheaton, organized to weaken Yale or to proselytize. It was organized because of the need for a second college in Connecticut and because of the Episcopalians' right to have a college under their own control. To the charge that the college founders misstated the facts when they declared that there was no college in the United States under Episcopalian control, Wheaton answered that Columbia College was then headed by a Presbyterian, the Reverend Dr. Mason, and that he knew of no college at Geneva, New York, then in operation. To the charge that the College was offered to the towns as a "mercantile speculation," Wheaton replied that even Yale had been located in New Haven because of similar considerations. To the charge that Washington College was "an instrument of Proselytism," Wheaton asserted that Washington College had not a single Professor of Didactic Theology, whereas Yale had three! To counter the charge that Washington College was "sectarian" in teaching and control, Wheaton pointed out that one of the Faculty and a fourth of the Trustees were from outside the Church. Finally, as an appendix to this pamphlet, Wheaton published what might be regarded as the first catalogue of the College, a somewhat elaborated edition of the College Prospectus which had been issued on August 10, 1824, thus showing both friend and foe that the College was in full operation and that the unkindnesses of men of ill will had not prevented its opening. Only one question did Nathaniel Wheaton fail to answer. How was the College to succeed without generous additional support from either Church, State, or general public?

The Remarks on Washington College had doubtless refuted most of the charges brought in the Considerations, but, as in most of the exchanges in the Washington College controversy, in writing to one point, the author had let slip several sentences which were seized upon by Chauncey Goodrich and distorted out of context in his rejoinder, An Examination of the "Remarks" on Considerations Suggested by the Establishment of a Second College in Connecticut. This document, which could have been no more bitter than Goodrich's first, concluded with the warning that Washington College was doomed to early failure because the Trustees would be unable to raise the $100,000 to $150,000 needed to finance it. This dire prediction, happily, was not fulfilled, but, as we shall soon see, Goodrich had struck at a problem which was to vex the College during the early years of struggle, and which was almost to cause the College to die a-borning. Much to the enhancement of the dignity of both Washington College and the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, Wheaton did not deign to reply, and thus ended the pamphlet controversy which had begun ten years before with the incorporation of the Phoenix Bank.

During the months of these bitter and fruitless exchanges in pamphlet and newspaper, the Trustees had been occupied with the immediate affairs of the College, none of which was more important than that of devising a course of study for the new institution. What exactly was Washington College to be? Was it to be merely another New England college? Was it to be set out on some new and untried path in the interest of attracting public attention and patronage? Was it to be an improved and enlarged Episcopal Academy? Or was it to be an American facsimile of the English university college?

Already it must be apparent to the reader that the founders of Washington College had no notion of "Anglican" education as distinct from any other. They did, however, have a definite notion of "Church" college in the sense of a college under Episcopalian control and support in which Episcopalian loyalties would be strengthened rather than weakened. Perhaps even Bishop Brownell and Nathaniel Wheaton, who had observed the English universities first-hand, had no concept of the content of "Anglican" learning, if there were then, or ever, such a body of knowledge or intellectual method. On the other hand, to offer the conventional collegiate program under Episcopalian auspices was, for the College's founders, not enough, and the experience of the
Episcopal Academy of Connecticut had demonstrated that truth only too well. The "Church" college, as it was understood by Bishop Brownell, was more than a "minor seminary" or a boarding school for postulants for Holy Orders. Rather, the "Church" college was for him to be as influential in its intellectual ideals as the Church in its spiritual ideals, and related to the American Church and people as Oxford and Cambridge were related to the English Church and people—high, broad, and deep, neither self-centered nor committed to a narrowly exclusive sect. The motto later adopted by the College, "Pro Ecclesia et Patria," was already in the minds of the founders as they gave thought to devising a course of study which would provide useful education for Christian people.

Bishop Brownell, it will be remembered, had been Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy at Union College, and Union had been one of the first American institutions of the higher learning to recognize the impact of the early phases of the scientific and industrial revolution upon American society. Union College was the pioneer in offering degrees in scientific studies, and even during Brownell's years in Schenectady the Natural Sciences were given special emphasis. There is no doubt that Bishop Brownell conceived of a college in which scientific and "practical" studies would share the dignity of the Classics and in which young men could be prepared for "the full life" in mercantile and industrial pursuits as well as in the learned professions.

Washington College was free to strike out in new directions without being bound by the fetters of tradition, and Brownell allowed his fancy to roam. The New England colleges still taught by textbook; i.e., courses were taught largely by recitation on the content of selected authors. Bishop Brownell determined that this would not be the practice in his College and, in his attempt to vitalize the instruction of Washington College, he entertained plans for a curriculum which, had they been put into practice, would have been indeed revolutionary. One scheme was to divide the course of study into eight categories—Political Economy, Belles Lettres, Science, Politics, Metaphysics, Mathematics, Morals, and History—and to have the content of the academic disciplines selected by "topics" rather than according to textbook. History, for example, he divided into nine subjects: the French Revolution, the Pilgrims, Charles II of England, the French and Indian War, Cicero's Lives, Chivalry, the Spanish Inquisition, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the History of Mohamet and the Principles and Progress of his Religion. Fortunately, the curriculum thus outlined did not get beyond a piece of foolscap, but the jottings at least indicate that the learned Bishop was desirous of moving out of the traditional channels of New England collegiate education.

Brownell's refreshingly new approach to higher education did much to win friends for the College and, as his ideas were made known, some who were at first not convinced of the need for a second college in Connecticut became rhapsodic in their endorsement of Brownell and his bold educational policies. Indeed, one of these disciples took up the Bishop's suggestions and carried them to what was to him a very logical conclusion. "Nestor," writing in the New Haven papers, was intrigued by the suggestion of courses in Engineering and Political Economy (with instruction in Government, Commerce, and Finance), both new branches "loudly demanded by the circumstances of our country." America, said "Nestor," does not call for a number of men to be educated for "literary leisure," but rather for "the practical business of life." As the curriculum took shape at the hands of Bishop Brownell and his committee, it became increasingly clear that Washington College was not to be the traditional New England College. If there were any conscious model, it may have been Union, but neither was Union "typical" of the colleges of the time. And it may be surprising that so few, if any, elements were borrowed directly from the English colleges. This may be explained, in part, by the fact that the New England college was merely a New-World adaptation of the English university college, and from the first conscious effort at Harvard, throughout the Colonial period and beyond, the debt to the
English collegiate system was fully understood and needed neither explanation nor apology. And thus the English curriculum would have had little to suggest beyond what was already in use at Yale, Dartmouth, or Williams. The Continental universities, however, were neither widely known nor understood in the United States during the 1820s. The early plans for the Episcopal Academy had called for "Faculties" in Arts, Law, Medicine, and Theology, and this may have been the influence of the German system, or the German system as it was understood in Connecticut at the close of the eighteenth century. In the summer of 1824, Charles Sigourney wrote to Thomas Jefferson asking him for a description of the University of Virginia and, in particular, for an outline of the course of study. Sigourney had learned that Jefferson had made a study of the European universities and he inquired especially of the "Protestant German Universities," whether there was anything in their curricula which might be worthy of imitation.22

But with all the talk of courses in Surveying, Engineering, and Agriculture, and the farm on which the students of Agriculture were to "labour in person,"23 when the Prospectus of the College was issued in August, 1824,24 the regular course of study differed very little, in its broadest outline, from that of the other New England colleges;25 and, allowing for local differences of detail, the curriculum was remarkably similar to that of Amherst, founded just before Washington College, and an institution which had made every effort to reproduce the program of studies which had long been offered at Yale.26

The freshman year (each year was divided into three terms) covered Latin, Greek, Geography, and Arithmetic. The Sophomore Class continued the study of Latin and Greek and began the more advanced branches of Mathematics with Algebra and Geometry. In the third term, the Sophomores were also exposed to Natural Theology, and in the course in Logic they were given opportunity to write literary compositions. The Juniors took Mathematics through Trigonometry, Solid Geometry, Spherical Trigonometry, Descriptive Geometry, Differential and Integral Calculus, and Conic Sections. Indeed, except for Moral and Natural Philosophy and Greek, that year was to be devoted almost entirely to Mathematics. Likewise, the senior year was quite specialized and strongly emphasized the Natural Sciences with Chemistry, Mineralogy, Geology, and Botany. Perhaps the chief contrast between

Excerpt from letter of Thomas Jefferson to Charles Sigourney, August 15, 1824
the curriculum of Washington College and that of her neighbors was not in the specific courses, but in the emphasis which was placed upon the several academic disciplines. Mathematics and the Sciences received perhaps more attention than at Amherst or Williams, but the content of the courses (except for "Navigation, Surveying, Leveling, &c.," apparently taught as a part of Plane Trigonometry) was still pretty much traditional. The scientific interest and emphasis may be further illustrated in the fact that of the first six appointments to the Faculty three were in the Sciences, and the ratio of Professors of Mathematics and the Sciences to Professors of the Humanities remained essentially the same for many years. Thus, the regular course of study at Washington College differed only in degree from the other New England colleges, and such differences were in emphasis rather than in content. And despite Bishop Brownell's aversion to the "textbook" type of course, the college Prospectus was replete with the standard college textbooks of the day: Paley's Evidences, Butler's Analogy, and Vattel's Law of Nations, volumes which had long been studied in both Old England and New England by Anglican and Dissenter alike. Certainly there was nothing here that was distinctively "Anglican" or even particularly "practical."

But it was in the provision for the admission of students for the "Partial Course" that Washington College departed from tradition. For those who did not care to follow the four-year regular course and who preferred to study French and Spanish rather than Greek and Latin, a two-year program was offered in which the "partial" student would attend lectures on Ancient Literature and Belles Lettres, Natural Philosophy, Anatomy, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Agriculture, Political Economy, and Botany. Those who were prepared to do so were to be admitted to the higher classes of the regular course, but the program was essentially one leading to an "English Diploma," which was to be merely a testimony of good behavior and pursuit of selected studies for a period of two years.

Ostensibly, the purpose of the "Partial Course" was to give something of the collegiate experience to young men who were anticipating mercantile or similar careers. There may have been, however, less altruistic reasons for the institution of this course. Candidates for admission to the regular program were to be examined on Caesar, Cicero, Virgil, Greek New Testament, English Grammar, Arithmetic, and Geography. The requirements for admission to the "Partial Course" were merely that the students "be qualified to pursue, to advantage, those studies to which they mean to devote their attention." Thus, the inclusion of the "Partial Course" as an alternative to the traditional one may have been a means of competing for a student body by lowering the entrance requirements. The emphasis upon the Sciences and Political Economy in the "Partial Course" would also suggest that the student could prepare for the study of Medicine or Law without subjecting himself to the rigorous disciplines of the Classical learning. Whatever the purpose of the "Partial Course," the offering of instruction in Agriculture and Political Economy placed Washington College in the ranks of the educational pioneers, and the appointment of Horatio Hickock as Professor of these two disciplines was the basis of the College's later claim to having had the first chair of Political Economy in the United States.

When the nine young men who formed the first student body met in the rented quarters at Market and Temple Streets on September 23, 1824, they found that they outnumbered the Faculty by only three, a faculty-student ratio never since equalled. The Faculty was regarded as one of exceptional brilliance. Bishop Brownell had already proven his abilities as teacher of Latin, Greek, Belles Lettres, Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Pastoral Theology, and at Washington College he was to teach Natural and Moral Philosophy with equal acceptance. The Reverend George Washington Doane, A.B. and M.A., Union College, a student of Bishop Brownell during the latter's tenure at Union and a graduate of the General Theological Seminary, was Profes-
sor of Belles Lettres and Oratory until 1828. During his short stay at Washington College he composed several hymns, published a volume of poems, *Songs by the Way*, and co-edited the *Episcopal Watchman*. Frederick Hall, a Dartmouth graduate of 1803 and formerly of Middlebury College, served with acceptance as Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy until 1828. Horatio Hickock, a Yale graduate, the only non-Episcopalian on the original Faculty, a brother-in-law of Bishop Brownell (he and the Bishop having married sisters), taught for but one year, as his duties did not begin until May, 1825, and he resigned at the close of the College's second academic year. George Sumner, A.B., Yale, and M.D., University of Pennsylvania, a local physician and beloved in the community, was Professor of Botany. The Reverend Hector Humphreys, A.B., Yale, with title of "Tutor," was the faculty member with whom the Freshmen came into most immediate contact, for it was he who taught the Latin and Greek which occupied so much of the program of the first two college years.

The Faculty was not only proportionately large and exceptionally learned, it was also ridiculously underpaid! Bishop Brownell apparently did not even receive any remuneration until after the College had been in operation for a full year, and the annual stipend then voted him by the Trustees was but $500. Doane received $600 per year, Hall received $750 per year, and Hickock received $600. Humphreys, who had to bear the chief instructional burden, was paid a mere $500, and Dr. Sumner who, it was assumed, would teach only one course to the Senior Class, gave his services gratis.

Fortunately, so far as keeping the wolf from the faculty doorsteps, each of the Professors had outside employment, and these arrangements were fully understood by Faculty and Trustees at the time of their appointment. Bishop Brownell received $1,500 from the Diocese of Connecticut. Doane served as rector of St. John's Church at Warehouse Point in East Windsor, Humphreys was rector at St. Luke's Church, Glastonbury, Dr. Sumner had his medical practice, and Professor Hall supplemented his salary by giving public lectures on Chemistry.

The first students were mere youngsters. The minimum age which the Trustees had set for admission was 15 for the regular course and 14 for the "Partial Course." Most of the boys were little over the minimum age. Various parts of the country were represented, and the first student body came from five states. Although the College *Prospectus* was specific in the entrance requirements, the preparation was inferior. Several were graduates of academies - two were from the Episcopal Academy, one of whom was admitted as a sophomore - and the others may have been prepared by tutors. The students were the sons of clergymen, physicians, merchants, and farmers.

The daily schedule was rigorous. Morning Prayer at 6:00 (at 5:30 during the summer term) was attended by both Faculty and students, and from 6:30 to 7:30 A.M. the first classes met. Breakfast was followed by the long morning recitation and study period from 9:00 until noon. Between 1:30 and 4:30 P.M. were study hours, recitations again, and Evening Prayer. From 6:00 P.M. until "lights out" at 10:00 P.M. students were to be in their rooms, and the Faculty were to be available in their studies in the College for personal help. As the rented building used by the College was not equipped to serve meals to so large a number (there were fourteen students by the end of the first year), the Trustees had made no provisions for dining. Students, consequently, had to find board in nearby homes which were approved by the College, and there must have been much confusion in the shuttling back-and-forth between the College and the boarding houses.

As was perhaps necessary for boys so young, discipline was severe. The Faculty regarded itself as exercising "a kind and parental government over the students," but the severity of the College "Laws" drawn up in 1826 by the Faculty upon the direction of the Trustees perhaps gave the students reason to wonder. Freshmen were admitted on probation until the end of the first term, when, if their conduct had been satisfactory, they were "Admitted to Matriculation" and...
were permitted "to sign, in a book . . . kept for that purpose, the following declaration: I do promise and engage, that I will conform to the laws and regulations, made for the government of Washington College." 46

Now the "laws and regulations" to which the student pledged obedience were most complicated. For a student's absence from any of the college exercises or for deficiency in preparing his routine classwork, the President, on the first offense, gave "admonition and advice." Persistence in wrongdoing called for "solemn admonition" by the President with a record of the admonition "on the Books of the Faculty." If "solemn admonition" failed to change the student's attitude, "public dismissal" was the last resort.

Non-academic delinquencies were of two degrees: "high offences" and "misdemeanors." High offences were offences against the law of the land; unlawful combinations; gross violations of respect due to the Faculty or other officers of the College; riotous and noisy behavior; refusing to obey any summons to appear before a member of the Faculty; disobedience to the sentence of the Faculty; refusal to give testimony when required to do so by the Faculty; obstructing or resisting the Instructors or other officers of the College in the discharge of their duties; maliciously endeavoring to injure another student; maliciously defacing college property; throwing objects in or near the college buildings; throwing objects from college windows or down the stairs; profane language; intoxication; possession of spirituous liquors; indecency in language, dress, or behavior; dissoluteness; playing at games for money; association with persons under sentence of dismission, rustication, or expulsion; keeping a gun, pistol, sword, or any other offensive weapon except in case of military exercises authorized by the Faculty; being concerned in any bonfire, fireworks, or unauthorized illumination; being an actor or spectator at a theatrical entertainment during term time; and participating in any festive entertainment or public celebration without faculty permission. For these "high offences" the punishment was expulsion, rustication, sus-

pension, public or private admonition, or fines, the specific penalty to be imposed at the discretion of the Faculty. 47

All other offences not enumerated as "high" were punishable as "misdemeanors." Among these lesser transgressions were "being present at any ball, assembly, or party of pleasure in term time without leave of the President"; going to any tavern or "victualing house" except in the company of parent or guardian; playing at cards, dice, or any other unlawful game; buying or selling furniture, books, or wearing apparel without leave of the Bursar; disobedience to any college rule or regulation; "idleness, negligence, and, in general, all behavior inconsistent with the good order, peace, and prosperity of the College." Misdemeanors were punished by any penalty below suspension and, "if repeated or persisted in, with some higher punishment." 48

Each student had a minimum of three recitations a day, and during the remainder of the class and study periods the boys were expected to keep to their rooms. Entering a classroom or the Chapel before the proper bell had sounded was not permitted and, likewise, no one was allowed to remain in either classroom or Chapel after the period had ended. Even the Library was open for but a brief period each day, and the complicated system of borrowing books 49 probably discouraged reading for pleasure. Indeed, until the books gathered in England by Nathaniel Wheaton arrived, the Library must have been practically nonexistent.

What, then, could the students do other than study, recite, and attend Chapel? Certainly, not much! How could they? First of all, they had no money. The College, hoping "to prevent dissipation and extravagance," forbade the sending of money to the students by parents or guardians. Funds for the students' use had to be sent to the College Bursar who applied them "with a parental discretion, to the payment of their necessary expenses." 50 Even Sunday, the only day on which there were no recitations, was not the student's own. Public worship was mandatory either at Christ Church or at a church of the parent's choice. But even the remainder of the day was
hardly to be regarded as a holiday; students were required to “abstain from their usual diversions,” whatever they may have been, “on the Lord’s Day, and also from playing on musical instruments except when employed by permission of the President, in the performance of sacred music,” and especially was the rule against “loud conversation, singing, or playing on musical instruments, and the like” enforced on Sunday.\(^5\)

One wonders how much the life of the supposedly worldly young Episcopalian at Washington College could have differed from his “indigent and pious” counterpart at Amherst.

And yet, the small College with its Spartan discipline, much work, and supposedly no play, could not have been as dismal a place as the Prospectus had promised and the College Statutes threatened. There were few “drop outs,” and new admissions throughout the year had more than doubled the student body by the end of the third (summer) term. Main Street in Hartford in the 1820’s was a busy place, and the Washington boys must have caught a bit of its excitement during the fairly long noon recess in coming and going from their eating houses. Organized sports there were none, but the College’s down-town location practically precluded any formal outdoor exercises. Nor was the much-publicized farm to offer any diversion from the routine of what we would now call an “urban” college. The farm, as such, never really materialized anyway, even when the College moved to its permanent quarters. Did the boys sometimes snatch a few minutes for a game of “fives” in the “back yard” of the Main Street “campus”? Did they have any clubs — clandestine or otherwise? Was it all work and no play? Probably not.

While classes were grinding away in the Baptist Meetinghouse, and while the students were reciting Livy, Horace, and Cicero, work on the college buildings on West Street was progressing. At first it was hoped that the new Chapel and “College” would be completed by May 1, 1825,\(^5\) but there were the inevitable delays, and the buildings were not ready for occupancy until just before the opening of the fall term in mid-September. By the standards of the day, the buildings were imposing. The “College” was 148 feet long and of four stories. The Chapel was 87 feet by 55 feet, three stories in height,\(^5\) and graced at the front by a columned portico and at the rear by a square bell tower.\(^5\) Both were of brownstone and, according to later description, followed “the Ionic order of architecture, [were] well proportioned, and well adapted to the purposes for which they were designed.”\(^5\)

Although originally called simply the Chapel and the “College,” in later years the Chapel (which also provided recitation rooms, library, and “cabinet”)\(^5\) was designated Seabury Hall and the “College” came to be known as Jarvis Hall. The grounds, naturally beautiful on their eminence, were at once improved by elaborate planting in hedges, shrubbery, and trees.\(^5\)

Granted that the college buildings were the pride of Hartford and possibly second to none in academic New England, why was the “Ionic order” selected for the architectural style? In the Diocese of Connecticut hardly a year had passed during Bishop Brownell’s Episcopate in which at least one new Episcopal church edifice had not been erected. In his Episcopal Addresses to the Convention, the Bishop commented at some length on the churches which he had consecrated during the past year, and invariably he
had words of high praise for those built in the "Gothic style," or what then passed in Connecticut for Gothic. Now, if Gothic was the most acceptable architectural style among Connecticut Episcopalians, why was a Classical form used instead?

The college founders, unfortunately, left no record of the reason for their choice, but a bit of speculation (guided speculation, of course) may be of some profit. It is not necessary to assume that the Building Committee regarded Gothic, which American Episcopalians have traditionally regarded as the style most suited to the Anglican temperament, as particularly suited to academic buildings. There was then no Gothic college building in the United States. Bishop Brownell, in his visit to England, may also have noted that the newer buildings at Oxford and Cambridge were Classical rather than Gothic or Tudor. And Bishop Brownell may also have unconsciously let his experience at Union College influence his judgment, for the oldest buildings on the Union campus, designed in 1813 by the French architect Joseph Jacques Ramée, were markedly Classical in spirit. Charles Sigourney was regarded in his time as a man of cultivated tastes and, during the period in which the selection of architectural style was being made, Sigourney had some correspondence with Thomas Jefferson who is regarded, although erroneously, by some as the Father of the Greek Revival in America. There is thus the possibility that the buildings of the University of Virginia, which were then nearing completion, may have served as a model. Nor must it be forgotten that in 1824 and 1825 Greece was engaged in its war for independence from the Turks, and scarcely an issue of a Hartford newspaper failed to carry an account of the war in Greece or to advertise schemes for charitable relief of the suffering Greeks. Charles Sigourney was, furthermore, a member of the "Greek Committee" of Hartford. Finally, the buildings were simple in design and construction, and this factor may have been the deciding one. Now let the reader take his choice of these possibilities or add whatever he will of his own. The "College" and Chapel of Washington College were the showplaces of the city of Hartford for fifty years, until their destruction to make room for the present State Capitol.

Someone once remarked that when Episcopalians build, they build for all eternity. Such was probably the case in the erection of the college structures. No expense had been spared. The architect was one of the best the country had to offer, and the materials used in construction were the finest that could be obtained. Almost $40,000 of the $50,000 which had been raised during the first year following the College’s incorporation had been spent for land and buildings and, by the end of the College’s first full year of operation, the Trustees found that the new institution’s financial situation was far from enviable.

Income from student fees was negligible. Tuition was only $11.00 per term, or $33.00 per year. The library fee was $1.00 per term, and the fee collected for such miscellaneous services as sweeping the rooms, ringing the bell, fuel for the students’ rooms, printing, and "other incidental expenses" was $2.00 per term. Room rent was $3.00 or $4.00 according to the situation of the room, but the "College," although built to accommodate 100 students, was at first largely unoccupied, and thus was hardly "self-liquidating." The "College," unfortunately, had no commons and the students continued to eat at boarding houses, an arrangement which was to be continued for many years. Even had the College undertaken to board the students, it could hardly have been a source of income, for the rate then charged in the private homes was only $1.25 to $1.75 per week, as late as 1835. With expenses at the College so unbelievably low, many students still found them beyond their means. The college officers had difficulty in settling outstanding accounts, and the Trustees in May, 1825, authorized the President and the Standing Committee "to extend such indulgence to necessitous students in payment of term-bills as they may deem proper."

How was the College to continue? To whom
could the Trustees turn for assistance? Much of the original $50,000 had been contributed by the citizens of Hartford,\textsuperscript{68} and it would hardly have been wise to solicit gifts in Hartford so soon again. The other larger Connecticut towns were still smarting from the loss of the College to their communities, and to have turned to them would doubtless have brought a curt “we told you so.” The General Convention of the Episcopal Church had, of course, given its blessing to the collegiate undertaking in Connecticut, but it had neither assumed any responsibility for its support nor given any other form of direct encouragement. The Diocese of South Carolina, while it had formally endorsed the College to its members\textsuperscript{69} and had sent several of the first students to Hartford,\textsuperscript{70} regarded financial support of Washington College as the primary responsibility of the Diocese of Connecticut.\textsuperscript{71} An appeal to the public or to the State Legislature of Connecticut would have suggested that Chauncey A. Goodrich had spoken the truth when he said that Washington College could not hope to succeed without an endowment of at least $100,000.

Two possibilities seemed to offer at least a temporary solution to this embarrassing problem. Rigid economies could be practiced, and money could be borrowed to tide the College over until a better day. But to what extent could the Trustees economize? Salaries were already far below those paid elsewhere, and there were commitments to adjust them to the salaries paid at Yale as soon as the number of students would justify the increase. And from the beginning, the Trustees had decided to leave the Professorships of Ancient Languages, Modern Languages, Mathematics, and Natural Philosophy vacant until additional funds could be secured. Meanwhile, the other members of the Faculty taught these courses.\textsuperscript{72} It is worth pointing out as a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATIONS</th>
<th>DEGREE OF ATTAINMENT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Prayers</td>
<td>Conduct 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Recitations</td>
<td>Attendance 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Room in study hours</td>
<td>Labor 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Public Worship</td>
<td>ImprOVement 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greek 77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Receipt for tuition and fees
matter of passing interest that, had these Professorships been filled by the opening of the College, the Faculty would have outnumbered the students. Also, the Tutor in Languages had been appointed to serve until a Professor could be appointed for the Classics, and such an appointment would call for a larger salary. The meager library had to be supplemented, and the special emphasis on the Natural Sciences demanded additional philosophical apparatus. The state of the College seemed to demand more expenditures rather than fewer.

In this troubled situation, several of the Trustees seem to have lost confidence in their own College. Elisha Cushman, Asa Chapman, and Thomas Macdonough were quick to resign. Cushman, of course, had a special grievance against the College, as he had been a part of the “window dressing” of placing non-Episcopalians on the original Board of Trustees. Although he was well aware of the circumstances under which he had come on the Board, he felt that the College was too much under Episcopalian control and he was glad to find an excuse to resign. Cushman was a Baptist, and he sharply resented the tone of the letter of introduction provided for Nathaniel Wheaton’s English mission and the pamphlet which Wheaton had issued in England. Although he insisted that he had not seen Brownell’s letter before Wheaton’s departure for England, he did not submit his resignation until May, 1825, when the unfortunate financial situation of the College became obvious. Commodore Macdonough resigned at this same time, as he had been assigned to active Navy duty, and his resignation may have had nothing to do with the state of affairs at the College. Samuel Merwin moved from Connecticut and his seat on the Board was declared vacant. Elias Perkins resigned a year later. Perkins’ name had been added to the Board when the bill for incorporation passed the Senate of the Connecticut Legislature and his interest in the College may have been slight. But what must have been most distressing was the resignation of David Watkinson, one of Hartford’s most respected citizens. These resignations reduced the Board to a “hard core,” and those who remained not only made excellent appointments of successors for those who had resigned, but they also made additional appointments in an effort to raise the number of Trustees to twenty-four as permitted by the Charter. The new appointees were the Reverend Tillotson Bronson, D.D., Principal of the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut; the Reverend Samuel Luckey, a Methodist minister; the Reverend Daniel Burbans, one who had long been identified with the educational interests of the Episcopal Church; William H. Imlay and Samuel Tudor, both Hartford merchants and active Churchmen; and Seth P. Beers of Litchfield, recently appointed Commissioner of the Connecticut School Fund. The hope of raising the number of Trustees to twenty-four, however, was not immediately realized, for in addition to these five who served, six others had been elected but declined the honors. No new Trustees were elected between 1826 and 1830.

With the “dead wood” pruned from the Board (no pun intended), the Trustees set to work to save the College from dying in infancy. First of all, there could be no “cut-back.” There was nothing to cut. The demands of the College were for increased operating expenses, rather than decreases, and these demands were met bravely. On May 31, 1825, the Trustees authorized the purchase of $2,000 worth of scientific equipment, and on April 26, 1826, they again ordered the purchase of additional apparatus, this time authorizing Trustees Wheaton and Imlay to borrow $400.00 to cover the cost. Professor Hickock’s resignation in 1826 presented an opportunity to ease the budget, as the Department of Agriculture had been a failure and no successor was to be appointed. The Trustees, however, raised Tutor Humphreys to rank of Professor of Ancient Languages and increased his salary to $750.00. Professor Doane’s salary was also raised to this amount, and Professor Hall was given an additional allowance of $150.00 in consideration of the contribution of his mineral collection to the College. Also, as the students who had entered as Freshmen in the first year of the College were about to begin their major work in Mathe-
mathematics, the President and Standing Committee were directed to find a Professor of Mathematics for a salary of not more than $600.00 per year. And while in this bold mood, the Trustees appointed Mr. Norman Pinney, A.B., a candidate for Holy Orders, as Tutor in Languages at an annual salary of $500.00.

Now how would the money for these additions in equipment and personnel be raised? The number of students was increasing with each term, and it was hoped that most of them would be able to pay their fees in full, or that some form of outside scholarship aid would make it possible for each student to have his way paid for him. In 1827, the Connecticut Church Scholarship Society came into being and this benevolent organization, founded expressly to provide assistance to candidates for Holy Orders at Washington College, did at least something to keep tuition fees from falling in arrears. Several other scholarships were created in 1830. But useful as were these efforts to help individual students and to guarantee a minimum in tuition payments, they could never be the salvation of Washington College.

In April, 1826, the Trustees appointed a "Committee to increase the funds of the College" consisting of the President and Trustees Loomis, Tudor, Smith, and Wheaton. It was probably the recommendation of this committee that prompted the Trustees at an adjourned meeting on June 14, 1826, to authorize Trustees Sigourney, Tudor, and Imlay to borrow up to $12,000 "at the best possible rate" and to execute a mortgage deed on the College buildings and the land on which they stood as security. Several of the Trustees came to the rescue and lent enough money to meet the most pressing obligations and to erect a house for the President. And Trustee Seth P. Beers, in spite of what must have seemed a case of conflict of interest on the part of the Commissioner of the Connecticut School Fund, used his good offices to permit the College to borrow $8,500 from the Fund. But these were loans and not gifts, and the interest thereon was considerable. At last, and probably quite shamelessly, the Trustees turned, as had been predicted, to the Legislature of the State of Connecticut.

In May, 1827, a bill was presented to the Legislature asking for an appropriation from the public funds for the use of Washington College. The General Assembly was meeting in Hartford (sessions then alternated between Hartford and New Haven), and during the session the personnel of the College were very much in evidence. Daily sittings of the House of Representatives were opened with prayers by Bishop Brownell, Professor Doane, Professor Humphreys, and Trustee Nathaniel Wheaton. In his message to the Legislature, Congregationalist Governor Gideon Tomlinson remarked in passing: "They [the citizens of Connecticut] must see our Colleges, and other seminaries of learning patronized." And with Trustee John S. Peters as Lieutenant-Governor and Trustee Nathan Smith in the Senate, there was some reason to believe that the request for money would be favorably received. A legislative committee consisting of the Honorable Samuel Church of the Senate and Representatives Kilbourn, Bassett, Thompson, Raymond, Hubbard, Burrall, Carter, and Abbot was directed to visit the College and to ascertain the true status of the College's finances and also to report on the management and instruction of the institution. The Trustees and Faculty were, quite naturally, cooperative. The books of the College were opened for the committee, and no effort was spared to impress the Legislature that Washington College was academically sound, even if financially insolvent.

The committee's report was most favorable. The Faculty was praised as being both able and diligent. Also noted were the respectable library, the mineralogical collection, the physical apparatus, and the "other means necessary for facilitating a liberal education." But most encouraging of all was the observation by the committee that the instruction was not of a "sectarian character" and that the Faculty and Trustees represented "different denominations of Christians," that there was no Professorship of Divinity, and that "no literary institution in New England [could] be less liable to the imputation of a sectarian char-
The vote against an appropriation for Washington College was quite one-sided. The Episcopal press, however, refused to allow the matter of state aid for the College to rest, and the Episcopal Watchman urged the Trustees to renew the request for funds at the next session of the Legislature. Meanwhile, the Trustees were obliged to struggle along as best they could. Small borrowings still tided the College over the extraordinary expenditures, and tuition fees from seventy-odd students netted a little over $2,000 per year.

The several debates in the Connecticut Legislature of 1827 and the elaborate report of the committee which investigated the College gave the institution some not altogether undesirable publicity, but the committee’s report also made public the fact that Commissioner (and also Trustee) Beers had lent Washington College $8,500 from the School Fund. The editor of the New Haven Herald severely censured Mr. Beers (May 29, 1827) for what he described as “unfaithfulness to the trust reposed in him by making a loan to a ‘favorite institution’ ... without sufficient security.” It seemed for a time that the pamphlet war was to break out once more. A writer to the Connecticut Courant, signing himself “Veritas,” was able to give such forceful reply that the matter was allowed to drop. “Veritas,” of course, deplored the violent attack upon one so universally trusted as was Mr. Beers. The transaction, he wrote, was strictly in order. The treasurer of the state had appointed Messrs. Ward Woodbridge and John Russ to appraise the college property, and the appraisers fixed the cash value at $20,000. Beers had made the loan of $8,500 on a mortgage with the college buildings insured for $10,000, the policy being held by the State of Connecticut.

The College sent the Legislature no petition for a grant from the public funds in 1828, but this was simply a matter of marking time. Those favorably inclined toward the College made every effort to give the appearance of well-being to the struggling institution and, in elaborately reporting the second Commencement of the College, held in August, 1828, the Connecticut
Courant commented that “perhaps at no former period have the prospects of the institution been more prosperous and encouraging than at present.”98 The Church Register, published in Philadelphia, endorsed the College to the Episcopalians of the Middle Atlantic states and commented on the institution’s prosperity. Certainly much more suggestive of the true situation at Washington College—to say nothing of the College’s immediate hope—was the use as “filler” in the pages of Connecticut’s Diocesan paper, statistics indicating the generosity of the New York Legislature to the colleges of that state.99

When the Connecticut Legislature convened in May, 1829, Washington College was on hand once more with a request for aid. Governor Tomlinson, in his message to the Senate and House of Representatives, made passing reference to the Connecticut colleges, describing them as “the just pride and ornament of the state.”100 A formal petition from the “Committee of Finance” of Washington College was referred to a committee of the House of Representatives. Yale, too, made application for an appropriation, and the Yale petition was referred to this committee,101 a move which might have seemed to be to the advantage of Washington College. The committee recommended that the two colleges jointly be given 150 shares of stock of the Hartford Bank then held by the state.102 This recommendation was incorporated into a bill which was defeated in the House of Representatives on June 3. The Senate, however, had acted on a bill of its own, and had voted Washington College semi-annual payments of $1,500 for a period of five years. Although the House of Representatives refused to alter its stand against any immediate aid for either Washington or Yale, they did vote to continue the resolution of the Senate until the next session of the Legislature.103

Once again the state of Connecticut had withheld the assistance which the college Trustees thought might mean the difference between keeping the institution open or admitting defeat. But there was some comfort to be derived from the belief that the sought-for assistance had again been denied only because of the depleted condition of the State Treasury.104 The next legislative session was only a year away, and if at first you don’t succeed, etc.

In May of 1830, the College for the third time petitioned the Legislature for an appropriation, this time only to have the petition “die in committee.”105 By 1831, however, the petition for aid was sent to the Legislature under most favorable circumstances. Trustee John S. Peters had recently been elected Governor of Connecticut, and in his message to the Senate and House of Representatives, Governor Peters sounded a most pleasant note. “Our Colleges,” he said, “are in want of funds. Their present high standing is preserved by the character of their respective Faculties; and the prudence and careful management of the Trustees. Unless the fostering hand of government is extended for their relief, they must languish.”106

This time the friends of the College were not to be disappointed in their hopes. The bill which passed the Senate in 1829 granting semi-annual payments to the College of $1,500 was taken up by the House of Representatives and was strongly defended by a Mr. Brace, the chairman of the House Committee on Colleges. Brace urged the passage of the bill on grounds that the very existence of Washington College depended upon a favorable vote. He also made clear that he was not an Episcopalian and that only “blind prejudice” could prompt any member of the House to deny the College to continue. Speeches both pro and con indicated by the time of the bill’s second reading that some sort of appropriation would at last be made to Washington College. The quickly-diminishing opposition turned from outright refusal to permit any appropriation, to attempting to make the grant as small as possible. Amendments were voted upon and quickly defeated. One such vote was to limit the semi-annual payment to $550; a second was for $750; and a third was for $1,000.107 These amendments were clear indication that the appropriation to Washington College was no longer being op-
posed on an all-or-nothing basis. But by the time the bill was passed, the grant was limited to the $8,500 which the College had borrowed from the School Fund. The final vote in the Senate was 13 to 5 and in the House, 95 to 88. Part of the cut in the amount, however, was restored when the Legislature voted to give the $10,000 bonus to be paid to the state of Connecticut by the incorporation of the Connecticut Bank to Yale and Washington Colleges—$7,000 to Yale and $3,000 to Washington. Thus, the total amount voted for Washington College in 1831 came to $11,500.108

There can be no doubt that the granting of this money saved the College from an early demise, as the amount almost took care of the entire college debt. But the granting of $11,500 by the Connecticut Legislature had its psychological value, too. During the legislative session the press had been wholly sympathetic, and in the debates on the bill at its several readings many legislators had spoken encouragingly. In at least those speeches reported in the public press, not a single opponent of the bill spoke directly against the College. Several representatives were of the opinion that a legislative grant to a private corporation was class legislation, as it would require all taxpayers to contribute to the education of a favored few. Others felt that education should be paid for by those enjoying it and that students should be prepared to seek an education on a pay-as-you-go basis. These arguments, plus the old one that there were no surplus funds in the treasury, probably were taken lightly. One point made by the opposition, however, was not to be overlooked. A Mr. Frudden expressed the idea that all colleges should look to their own support.109 The suggestion, but thinly veiled, was that the Trustees had done little to relieve their own financial distress, and that they were simply waiting for the Connecticut Legislature to give them a happy issue out of all their afflictions. Such, however, was certainly not the case.

During the period of struggle for mere existence, the Trustees had lent money to the institution and had made small personal financial contributions. Every effort had been made to enlist the support of the Episcopal Church, and direct measures had been taken to endow both professorships and scholarships and to otherwise strengthen the College’s financial structure.110

In August of 1830 the Trustees had made two faculty appointments. The Reverend Smith Pyne, Rector of Christ Church, Middletown, was made Professor of Moral Science and Belles Lettres, and the Reverend Francis L. Hawks of Trinity Church, New York, was made Professor of Divinity. The understanding was that the two should not begin their professorial duties until the fall of 1831, and that in the meantime they should act as “agents to solicit subscriptions” toward a fund of $50,000 for the permanent endowment of the College. The salary for the year of the “agency” was to be $1,000 each—considerably above that paid to the Faculty then active—$1,200 for Hawks when he should begin teaching and the amount for Pyne to be fixed “by mutual agreement between himself and the Trustees,” provided it should not be less than $750, the highest salary then paid to any other professor.111

Now the object of these “agencies” was to gather funds for scholarships, for professorships, and for the “general purposes” of the College. The “agent” was a familiar figure of the time, and no self-respecting college had the slightest hesitation in employing such an officer, and, indeed, it was, more often than not, the President himself who was sent out as “agent.”112 Hawks was successful in raising two scholarship funds. In Troy, New York, he received $1,000 from several members of St. Paul’s Church for a scholarship of $60.00 per year for “pious and indigent young men” preparing for the priesthood. Also in Troy, he received a similar amount for the same purpose from Philip Heartt, Esq.113 These funds were the first substantial aid received by the College from outside the Diocese of Connecticut. How much more Hawks might have been able to raise would be an interesting point of speculation, for in January, 1831, he was elected rector of St. Stephen’s Church in New
York City,\textsuperscript{114} and on February 7 he submitted his resignation to the Board of Trustees.\textsuperscript{115} Pyne was able to raise some funds, apparently for current operating expenses, and he generously declined any compensation for his services.\textsuperscript{116}

The success in securing scholarships encouraged the Trustees to undertake the endowment of Professorships. Just ten years before, the Diocese of Connecticut had attempted to endow a "Seabury Professorship" in the General Theological Seminary, and a considerable sum had been pledged. The removal of the Seminary to New York meant the end of such a chair at General, but the idea of honoring Connecticut's first Bishop persisted, and the Trustees resolved to repeat the appeal which had previously met with such encouraging response. The plan adopted by the Trustees was to secure $20,000 through twenty pledges of $1,000 each, the pledges to be secured by bond, and payable at the decease of the subscriber, or sooner at his option. And as an inducement to subscribe, a tablet was to be erected in the College Chapel to record the names of the "Founders of the Professorship . . . with their intention thus to perpetuate the memory of Bishop Seabury." The responsibility for securing twenty "Founders" was entrusted to Bishop Brownell and, in view of the extraordinary nature of the task, the Right Reverend President was to have five per cent of all subscriptions obtained.\textsuperscript{117}

But to endow a Professorship, even as a Seabury Memorial, was a most formidable undertaking, and the Trustees soon came to realize that a Professorship somehow lacked the appeal of the scholarship. Pledges toward the Seabury Professorship were slow in being taken up, and it was not until 1837 that the first Seabury Professor was appointed. By that time only $14,000 had been raised, and a $2,000 bequest from Nathan Warren, Esq. of Troy, New York, had imposed the condition that the nomination to this chair be approved by the Bishop of Connecticut,\textsuperscript{118} a stipulation probably not displeasing to Bishop Brownell.

The Trustees at once sensed the resistance to contributing to the endowment of Professorships and the relative willingness to support scholarships. In their next move they attempted to combine both objectives, and they wisely turned to the wealthiest Episcopal Church in the United States, Trinity Parish in the city of New York. Trinity Church had given generous support to the college at Geneva, to the General Theological Seminary, to Columbia College, and to Church-related secondary schools in the Diocese of New York. And in view of the fact that Bishop Brownell was well known in the parish, one may wonder why the Trustees of Washington College had never before approached the Vestry of Trinity Church for a financial contribution. In the spring of 1831, and emboldened by their success at St. Paul's Church in Troy, the Trustees deputized Nathaniel Wheaton to call upon the Vestry of Trinity Parish. To give the mission (or "agency") the appearance of one of a more general nature, Bishop Brownell wrote a letter of introduction authorizing Wheaton to solicit the financial support of "the friends of the Church in New York."\textsuperscript{119}

When Nathaniel Wheaton appeared before the Vestry of Trinity Church in May of 1831, he also presented a detailed account of the first seven years of the College's history, in which were emphasized the large number of graduates who had taken Holy Orders, the large number of students then in the College who were candidates for Orders, the "Episcopalian" character of Washington College, and the embarrassing debt which then stood at almost $10,000. He expressed the hope that Trinity Church would render some form of financial assistance and even suggested that an "annual appropriation for a certain number of years would be nearly as advantageous to the Institution as relief administered in any other way."\textsuperscript{120}

The Vestry of Trinity Church was unprepared for this sudden demand upon their generosity and quickly resolved "that while so many urgent claims on behalf of churches in this state [New York] upon the bounty of this Corporation remain unanswered, the Vestry cannot in the present state of its finances grant its aid to that [Washington] College."\textsuperscript{121} Unofficially, however,
A Churchman from New York, and probably a member of the Trinity Vestry, proposed the endowment of a Hobart Professorship similar to the Seabury Professorship then being created in Connecticut. The instigator of this plan offered $2,000, provided the entire $20,000 could be raised within one year.  

Acting upon this promise, the college Trustees, on September 27, 1832, "Resolved that this Board found a Professorship in Washington College to be denominated the Hobart Professorship; provided the sum of twenty thousand dollars shall be obtained for that object," and on November 14, 1832, the proposed chair was further designated the "Hobart Professorship of Belles Lettres and Oratory."  

On June 10, 1833, the Vestry of Trinity Church voted $5,000 toward the endowment of the Hobart Professorship in Washington College with the provision— as originally suggested by Nathaniel Wheaton—that the Vestry should have perpetual right to five scholarships in Washington College, the beneficiaries to be nominated by the Vestry. With a nucleus of $5,000, it was not too difficult a matter to raise the balance of $15,000. In Troy and Albany $3,605 was contributed; Stephen Warren, Esq., pledged $750; miscellaneous smaller contributions in New York amounted to $9,955; Dr. Hawks, of recent but short service as professor in the College, gave $400; and Nathaniel S. Wheaton assumed personal responsibility for the balance of $290 to complete the subscription.  

The last of the legal papers setting up the Hobart Professorship and the Trinity Church Scholarships was signed on June 3, 1834, and the first Trinity Church Scholar entered Washington College in September, 1834. By the fall term of 1837, the full number of Trinity scholars was in attendance, and the ranks were henceforth to remain filled. At the time of the endowing of the Hobart Professorship, it seemed that with tuition at a mere $33.00 per year and with all college charges except board, washing, light, and fuel still not exceeding $50.00 per year, the Trinity Church Endowment of $5,000 was munificent indeed. Fortunately, the Trustees did not make any other agreements on this basis for, as tuition and room fees began to rise in later decades, the relation of the annual scholarship grants to the original endowment came to be increasingly unfavorable. Consequently, in 1909, the college authorities prevailed upon the Vestry of Trinity Church to reduce the number of scholarships from five to two. Of course, the Trustees could have had no idea of the long-range consequences of the arrangement regarding the Hobart Professorship and the Trinity Church Scholarships, and the ties made between the College and the Episcopal Church in New York were to prove most beneficial throughout the years. Parishioners of Trinity Church, New York, have been noted for their liberality in support of the College, and the example set by the New York Churchmen was doubtless a factor in stimulating contributions in Connecticut. In 1832, for example, at a meeting of the clergy of Fairfield County, "it was resolved that each Clergyman should endeavor to raise an annual sum, equal to one tenth of his salary, to be appropriated to the support of indigent young men at Hartford [Washington] College."  

In a way, the year 1831 marked the end of Washington College's infancy, the end of the struggle for merest survival, and the beginning of a short period of reasonable financial stability. The appropriation by the state of Connecticut in June of that year had virtually liquidated the college debt, and the steps taken toward endowing scholarships and professorships—in their promise, if not yet in their realization—suggested that the College would no longer have to live from hand to mouth.  

Bishop Brownell had labored without ceasing for the preservation of the College and, indeed, he had done so somewhat to the detriment of his Diocese, for with meeting his classes at the College, officiating at the Chapel services, and raising funds, parishes in the more remote parts of Connecticut began to complain of a lack of Episcopal oversight. At the Diocesan Convention of 1831 the Bishop was urgently requested to devote full time to his Episcopal duties—especially, it was pleaded, in view of the large number of...
vacant parishes in the Diocese. Brownell had probably expected that sooner or later such a request would be made, and he at once replied that he would “withdraw from the active charge of Washington College . . . as soon as a suitable person can be obtained to take charge of the Institution. . . .”132 On September 5, the Bishop informed the Trustees of his intention to resign “at no distant point,” and a “Committee of enquiry after a suitable successor” was appointed.133 A month later (October 4) Brownell’s resignation was submitted to the Board by whom it was immediately accepted. In his letter of resignation, the Bishop informed his colleagues on the Board that he was leaving the administration of the College with full confidence in the institution’s future. The Trustees at once proceeded to the unanimous election of Nathaniel S. Wheaton as Bishop Brownell’s successor in the Presidency.134

On December 16, 1831, Bishop Brownell delivered a farewell address to the students in the College Chapel. Briefly he rehearsed his own part in the inception of the College, and in a most pastoral fashion he advised the young hearers to be careful to choose good companions, to avoid idleness, and to use their leisure time for cultural pursuits. The address, surprisingly brief for an age of verbose pulpit oratory, concluded with the Episcopal Benediction, and thus ended the beginning chapter of the history of Washington College.135