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Introduction

It is truly remarkable that Trinity College has actually reached the rather venerable age of one hundred and forty-four years without ever having undertaken an institutional history comparable in depth and magnitude to this present work. In view of the important and interesting part that our College has played in the history of higher education in the State of Connecticut, and in light of the increasingly important role that Trinity is at present forging as one of the nation's leading exponents of education in the liberal arts, it would indeed be a shame if the many fascinating details of our College's long history should ever be lost to posterity. I therefore am extremely happy to welcome this excellent history of Trinity which Dr. Weaver has labored so diligently and so effectively to produce. It is a work of which the College has been in vital need.

When, a few years ago, it was determined that Trinity should commission a qualified individual to prepare a history of the College, we found ourselves uniquely fortunate in having on our faculty a person ideally suited to undertake this arduous and very demanding task, Trinity's Associate Professor of History, Dr. Glenn Weaver. Not only a skilled teacher of history, Dr. Weaver is well known in his field as a talented author and historian. Moreover, his two major interests have long been early America and the history of the American Church. Consequently it is not surprising that Dr. Weaver was able to undertake with the utmost enthusiasm the writing of the history of our Church-related College, which had its beginning so early in the life of our country.

This history is both interesting and readable. It is also highly authoritative and accurate. True historian that he is, Dr. Weaver spent countless hours during the past several years gathering source material for this book. He has checked and rechecked all available sources of "Trinitiana" and has consulted many people, including knowledgeable alumni and other friends of the College. It has, I am sure, been a labor of love. I am confident that no matter how conversant the reader has previously been with the early years of the College "'Neath the Elms," he will not be able to read Dr. Weaver's history without learning a great deal more concerning Trinity that will be of real interest to him.

It is planned that this present history will be the first of two volumes, which together will completely cover the life-span of our College from its founding in 1823 to the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that founding in 1973. This present volume starts with the founding and carries the history of Trinity well into the period of Dr. Remsen Brinckerhoff Ogilby's tenure as Trinity's president. The second volume will carry on from that point, and publication is planned during the College's 150th anniversary in 1973.

One feature of Volume II will be a complete chronology of the College's history and of the multitudinous campus and student organizations. This work is being compiled by Robert S. Morris '16, M.S. '19, LL.D. Honoris Causa '65, and Trustee Emeritus of the College. Mr. Morris has spent many years of research to plot the significant events and to trace the history, often interrupted, of student and athletic organizations. This "Time Table," as he calls it, will prove a most valuable
source of reference for us all. We are indeed indebted to this loyal alumnus for his love of Alma Mater and for permission to include the "Time Table" in our second volume of The History of Trinity College.

For me, one of the most fascinating features of this history has been the excellent choice of illustrations. The reader will observe that, at the beginning of each chapter, there is a picture of one of the pew-ends in Trinity's Chapel which has been selected because of its appropriateness to the chapter's subject matter.

It is quite fitting that the publishing of this important history of our College should be one of the first tasks of our new Trinity College Press.

ALBERT C. JACOBS
President
Preface

THE MARCH, 1960, issue of the Trinity College Alumni Magazine carried a brief announcement of the decision of the College to publish a full-scale history of the institution and of the present writer's assignment to the task of preparing a manuscript. Under the title of "Let's Write the College History," I earnestly sought the assistance of faculty, administration, alumni, and friends of the College in gathering source materials. At that time I assured the readers of the Alumni Magazine that an institutional history could never be the work of a single individual, and that, were the author to rely solely upon archival sources, the product could hardly approach lively, readable history. Little could I then anticipate that in the following years literally hundreds of persons would provide assistance in one form or another.

One of my most pleasant experiences of the past seven years has been to carry on an extensive correspondence with a number of the older Trinity alumni. Almost countless letters were exchanged, and the information therein provided for this volume is gratefully acknowledged in the footnote section beginning on page 306. Much of the material supplied by my many correspondents will be properly credited in the second volume of this work. I must also thank those who so kindly granted interviews and those who from time to time permitted me to probe into their memories in informal conversations either in person or on the telephone.

To trace the history of a small college such as Trinity from its inception, through many years of growth, sometimes faltering, up to the point where it now occupies a significant place in the realm of higher education, has been for me a most interesting and rewarding assignment.

My research has taken me to several important libraries, and I have the pleasure of thanking the staffs of The Connecticut Historical Society, The Connecticut State Library, Sterling Memorial Library of Yale University, the New York Public Library, the Watkinson Library, the Archives of the Episcopal Diocese of Connecticut, and, of course, the Library of Trinity College. I am especially indebted to the Trinity College Librarian, Donald B. Engley, for whom no request for assistance seemed too trivial nor any demand too great.

Colleagues at Trinity College have assisted in various ways. Several of the administrative offices made their records available for my perusal, and faculty members—Professors D. G. Brinton Thompson, Robert C. Black III, and Stephen P. Hoffman, Jr.—read and criticized considerable portions of the manuscript. Dr. Goodwin B. Beach, Lecturer Emeritus, kindly translated more than forty pages of Latin from Abner Jackson's Private Journal. During the academic year of 1961-1962, the Department of History granted me a reduced teaching load, and always my schedule was so arranged as to provide a day or two each week for uninterrupted research and writing.

Miss Priscilla Davis and Mrs. Florence Morrow had the difficult task of typing the several drafts of the manuscript. Theirs was not an easy task, for the author's calligraphy leaves much to be desired. Mrs. Margaret R. Zartarian performed admirable service in aiding me with the long and difficult task of compiling the index. My student as-
assistants—William Bunnell ’62, James R. Sweeney ’62, Kenneth Fish ’64, Robert Steptoe ’66, Harry Wood ’67, and Jeffrey Thomas—rendered invaluable service in proofreading the several drafts of the manuscript as well as the galleys.

John A. Mason, Alumni Secretary, has been a constant counselor and friend. He has read a considerable portion of the manuscript, and his suggestions on the organization of the text were always most welcome.

Kenneth C. Parker, Director of Publications, has served in the dual capacity of editor and publisher. His keen eye has detected numerous opportunities for literary refinement, and his impeccable taste has added immeasurably to the physical details of the book. All of the non-literary mechanics of publication were capably handled by Mr. Parker and his assistants.

My family, too, contributed greatly by kindly and patiently enduring the inconveniences resulting from the long hours and irregular working schedule which such an undertaking as this, of necessity, demands.

To all of these, and to many others not specifically named, I owe my thanks.

GLENN WEAVER
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Try, Try Again

Connecticut had been founded by tough-minded Puritans who were determined to build a new English Canaan from which Episcopacy was to be forever excluded. And for a while it seemed as if the Congregationalist alliance between minister and magistrate would keep both Anglican and Papist from ever gaining a foothold in the “Land of Steady Habits.” For over half a century the Congregational Establishment was not seriously challenged, but when opposition finally came it was of such a nature as to bring violent reaction, the effects of which were to be felt well into the nineteenth century.

In 1707, the first Anglican mission was organized in the colony, and during the next seventy years there was much missionary activity by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, the great Anglican missionary society which had been incorporated in 1701. By the outbreak of the American Revolution, there were over forty missions, twenty clergy, and between 2,500 and 3,000 Church of England families.1

The growth of Episcopacy in Connecticut had been in spite of difficulties.2 In 1708, the Connecticut Assembly passed an “Act of Toleration,” which in many of its details resembled the English Act of 1689 in that it gave much the same immunities to non-Congregationalists as the English had given to non-Anglicans. Although they recognized the legal existence of Anglicanism in the colony, the Connecticut authorities still were allowed to collect the ecclesiastical taxes for the support of meeting house and minister. Those who refused to pay were fined, jailed, and often roughly handled on the way to prison. Thus, what was labeled an “Act of Toleration” was the law under which Anglicans were actually persecuted. Also, there were more subtle ways to embarrass the Churchmen, for the numerous “public days of humiliation and prayer” fell by more than mere coincidence upon the great feast days of the Christian Calendar. Needless to say, Anglican instruction—whether religious or secular—was discouraged.

True, there were slight relaxations of the law during the century, but these hardly made first-class citizens of the Anglicans. In 1727, the Anglicans were permitted by legislative act to pay the ecclesiastical taxes to the support of their own church. The act, however, specified that only such parishes as had a “resident minister” could claim the exemption and, as the S. P. G. missionaries invariably served in a number of places, the church of the missionary’s town of residence alone seems to have benefited.

Whatever may have been the official attitude, Anglicanism was attractive to many Connecticut people. The “Great Awakening,” the great revival of religion which reached its high point in the winter of 1740–1741, had split the Congregationalists into two mutually hostile factions: the New Lights who favored the emotionalism of the revival and the Old Lights who opposed it. Many Congregationalists, wishing a plague o’ both houses, found a more peaceful spiritual home among the Anglicans.3 But the most compelling attraction was to those Congregational ministers who, having read deeply in Anglican History and Theology, came to doubt the validity of their orders and undertook the long sea voyage to England where they were ordained priests in the
Church of England and then returned to Connecticut to take up the missionary work of the S.P.G.

These “converts” were the backbone of the Church in Connecticut and, in attempting to justify their new position to their former ministerial brethren, they ably stated the special claims of the Church to which they had been led by intellectual and rational processes. These “converts” brought much to Connecticut Anglicanism and, having been brought up in a tradition of an educated ministry, it, too, soon became part of the Anglican attitude of Connecticut.

As Yale College was the institution which had trained most of Connecticut’s Congregational ministers, it is not difficult to understand that at the close of the American Revolution more than two-thirds of the fourteen Anglican clergy in Connecticut were Yale graduates. Nor, in view of the situation just described, should there be any difficulty in understanding that these men had little affection for Alma Mater.

But Yale College had a major, albeit accidental, role in the early successes of Episcopacy in Connecticut. In the early 1720’s, several members of the Yale community were introduced to Anglican theology through a collection of books which had recently been gathered for the college by Jeremy Dummer and Sir John Davie. Rector Timothy Cutler, Tutor Daniel Browne, and Samuel Johnson and James Wetmore, Congregational pastors at West Haven and North Haven, respectively, had met together to discuss the writings of the Anglican divines and had been led to declare for the Church of England. Each was dismissed from his post and the four went to England where, early in 1723, they were priested by the Bishop of Norwich. Although Johnson was the only one to return to Connecticut, the “Yale defection,” as it was called, “shook,” as a Congregationalist writer put it, “Congregationalism throughout New England like an earthquake, and filled its friends with terror and apprehension.” In language less dramatic, it may be said that the “defection” caused the Congregational authorities at Yale to exercise a new vigilance lest the disaster be repeated. The books that had whetted the appetite of Cutler and the others for Anglican learning were kept under lock and key, and in 1753 a stringent test was fixed by the Yale Corporation by which the president, tutors, and all other officers were obliged to attest to the orthodoxy of their beliefs. Thus, Yale proclaimed her understandable hostility to Episcopacy! And the hostility was not soon to abate.

Yet, a lack of enthusiasm for Yale College did not cause the Anglican clergy of Connecticut to return discourtesies. They could have hardly afforded to, for where but to Yale could they send their own sons for collegiate education? In 1748, there were at Yale ten candidates for degrees who were members of the Church of England. Of these, one was the son of Samuel Johnson and another was Samuel Seabury, Jr., who was later to become the first Bishop of Connecticut. At Yale, the instruction was from an orthodox Congregationalist point of view and attendance at the worship of the Congregational meeting house was obligatory, but these disadvantages were small compared with any practical alternative. The English universities were 3,000 miles away, and the expense of sending a son to Oxford or Cam-
bridge was too great for a missionary who was trying to make financial ends meet on the modest salary granted by the S. P. G. The College of William and Mary in Virginia, although an Anglican establishment, was also too distant to be of real service to Connecticut Churchmen, and King's College (now Columbia) in New York, also an Anglican institution from its founding in 1754, had remained quite small and appealed chiefly to a local clientel.

With the possibilities for a distinctly Anglican education on the collegiate level thus precluded, the clergy of Connecticut made the most of their opportunities to offer instruction with an Anglican "slant" at both the pre-college and post-college levels. Many clergymen followed the Congregationalist practice (one learned from their own experience) of preparing some of the more promising boys from the parish for college. In like fashion, the ordained clergy directed the theological training of candidates for Holy Orders for a period of time before their going to England for ordination; and, although the course of study was perhaps more-or-less perfunctory and often a matter of only several weeks or, at best, several months, the candidate was at least exposed to some of the Anglican classics and enjoyed a close association with a priest of both learning and conviction.

Before the Revolution there were parish schools at Stratford, North Groton, and Fairfield. The parish school, of course, had its limitations, for the instruction was divided between the overworked S. P. G. missionary and a poorly-paid and perhaps not-too-well educated lay schoolmaster. Nevertheless, such church families as were able to avail themselves of the parish schools must have had some satisfaction in the knowledge that their children were being indoctrinated in the tenets of the Anglican faith. But useful as were the parish schools (in such communities as could afford them), they did not provide the secondary, collegiate, and theological education which the well-being of the Church in Connecticut demanded.

Not until after the consecration of Samuel Seabury as Bishop of Connecticut in 1784 was any serious thought given to the establishment of an Episcopal college in Connecticut. By 1788, however, Bishop Seabury was able to write to the Bishop of Edinburgh that plans were under way to raise £1,400 or £1,500 so that by the summer of 1789 an academy could be established in Connecticut "for the education of our own clergy . . . and for fitting young gentlemen for the various occupations of life." Although a committee was appointed by Bishop Seabury to outline a curriculum and to devise a plan for the school's government and, although a subscription list had been opened, the pledges fell far short of the goal and the project was, for the time being, abandoned. Bishop Seabury and his clergy continued to agitate for an Episcopal school and to point up the uncongenial atmosphere at Yale.

While the promoters of an Episcopal institution of the higher learning invariably referred to their objective as an "academy," the real plan was to establish a "college" which would offer preparatory, collegiate, and theological education.

In 1792, the matter of an "academy" was again brought to the attention of the Church when on February 15 the Convention at East Haddam appointed a committee to consider plans for establishing such an institution. This committee never functioned, but a new committee – this time made up of some of the most ardent promoters of an academy – was appointed on June 4, 1794. This group immediately set to work and, in response to the committee's request, a permanent committee of three clergy and six laymen was appointed to carry out the resolutions of the Convention. The committee canvassed the several towns of the state as to interest in locating the school. In June, 1795, Cheshire was selected by the committee as the location, probably because Cheshire had made the most generous offer to provide land, buildings, and support for the school's faculty. As principal of the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut, the committee appointed the Reverend John Bowden, who had for several years conducted a successful school at Stratford.

Because of Congregationalist opposition, however, no attempt was made to incorporate the
Episcopal Academy. Already the Connecticut Anglicans had been thwarted (and were to be thwarted again) in their efforts to secure a charter for a fund for the support of the Bishop of Connecticut,\textsuperscript{22} and the Connecticut legislators, having spoken against the Bishop’s Fund, would most certainly have denied a charter to a potential rival of Yale College. It was this fear which also prompted the decision to call the institution an “academy,” and this despite the strong feeling in some quarters of the Church that, as “Seabury College,” the new institution would have been a fitting memorial to the Bishop who had died in February of 1796.\textsuperscript{23}

In lieu of a charter, the Convention of May 6, 1796, drew up a “Constitution,”\textsuperscript{24} but a strange document it was for an institution to be known as an “academy.” Article 7 of the Constitution provided for instruction in “the English language, Philosophy, Mathematics, History, and every other science usually taught at colleges,” likewise the dead languages such as Greek and Latin. Even more ambitious was Article 8 which provided that “the principal may at any time . . . procure any gentleman, eminent in Divinity, Law, or Physic, to read lectures in these branches respectively, provided a fund be secured for the purpose.” Thus, all that would prevent the “academy” from becoming a full-fledged “university” of the European style with faculties of Arts, Medicine, Law, and Theology would be the “fund” for the purpose.

When the fall term opened in 1796, however, the “Academy” was in reality a much more modest institution than the Constitution had assumed. The Academy boasted a tract of land, one small building, a faculty of two, perhaps a score of students, and a small collection of books, some of which were labeled “Seabury College in Connecticut.”\textsuperscript{26}

Pupils were admitted to the Episcopal Academy without reference to age or previous preparation, and the range of instruction was upward from the most rudimentary branches. Many of the students were in the English Department, in which were taught Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Spelling, Geography, English Grammar, the Episcopal Catechism, Bookkeeping, Greek Grammar, and Latin through four books of Caesar and Virgil. In the Classical Department – the heart of the school which was really a combination of preparatory school, New England academy, and junior college – were taught (as the principal put it in 1819) “all the branches of Literature commonly taught in colleges.” The Classical Department’s curriculum paralleled the offerings of the New England colleges of the time and included the major Latin authors, Greek, Mathematics, Natural Science, Philosophy, Rhetoric, Logic, Moral Philosophy, and Geography. Theological study was also offered by the principal to those who had completed the classical course or its equivalent.\textsuperscript{27}

The founding of the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut was not a perfect solution to the problem of providing Episcopalian higher education on the collegiate and theological levels. Perhaps the name “Episcopal Academy” was the institution’s greatest obstacle to success, but of little less significance was the fact that whatever the quality of the instruction, and on whatever level instruction was offered, the Academy could confer no degrees. In 1804, the Trustees, in their annual visitation of the school, examined the students and declared themselves well-satisfied that the work of the advanced courses was of college calibre.\textsuperscript{28} The colleges, too, recognized the work of the Episcopal Academy by granting the graduates of the Classical Department full sophomore or junior class standing and here Yale was, for once, generous, for the college which was the greatest opponent of Episcopalianism and Episcopalian higher education granted “advanced standing” to no fewer than seven Academy graduates between 1799 and 1823.\textsuperscript{29} William A. Beardsley further observed that before 1826 forty-nine Episcopal clergymen received either all or part of their formal education at the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut.\textsuperscript{30} Actually, a number of the graduates of the Classical Department who did not immediately (or ever) go on to degree-granting colleges stayed on at the Academy to read Theology for a year or two before being presented for Deacon’s Orders.\textsuperscript{31}
The success which the Episcopal Academy enjoyed as an institution of the higher learning was, thus, obviously limited. Although college work constituted an important part of the school’s offerings, the institution remained an academy. Always there was the problem of raising sufficient funds even to operate on the secondary level. Tuition fees were ridiculously low, and the school received little direct support from either the Cheshire community or the Episcopal Church. Consequently, the Academy Trustees were forced, on occasion, to resort to house-to-house solicitation, to a lottery, and to appeals to public benefaction. None of these was sufficient to put the institution on a sound financial footing. Scientific apparatus was usually in short supply, and, as late as 1819, the Academy library consisted of 177 volumes of “odds and ends” which had been donated from clerical libraries.

This lack of support, which was both cause and effect so far as the academic success (or lack of success) of the school was concerned, was not the only factor in preventing the full development of a college or university in Cheshire. The Congregationalist opposition, which had obliged the Academy promoters to begin their school without benefit of charter, persisted, but the Connecticut Episcopalians were just as persistent. To each session of the Connecticut General Assembly they submitted requests for charters for a Bishop’s Fund and for the Academy. In view of the legislators’ dread of “Prelacy,” the Bishop’s Fund fared better than the Academy. In 1796, a bill to incorporate the Bishop’s Fund passed the Lower House but failed in the Council, and in 1797 a similar bill was defeated. In 1798, however, and perhaps to the surprise of many, the Assembly voted the incorporation of the Bishop’s Fund. The success of the Bishop’s Fund was the opening wedge, and in 1801 the Connecticut legislators granted the much-desired charter for the Academy. But again the success was a partial one, the charter being, unfortunately, for an “academy” and not for a “college.” The Connecticut Episcopalians, however, accepted their limited victory and immediately took steps to have the charter amended. In 1804, the Convention recommended that the Academy Trustees “apply to the General Assembly at their next session, for a Charter empowering them to give degrees in Arts, Divinity, and Law, and to enjoy all other privileges usually granted to Colleges.” The Assembly turned a deaf ear to the plea, but in 1810 the Trustees again petitioned the legislature for a college charter, and this time they added the further request that the institution’s name be changed to the “Episcopal College of Connecticut” so that it might be in name what it had long been in fact. Again, the wishes of the Connecticut Episcopalians were ignored and the petition was denied.

In June of 1811, the Convention once more directed the Academy Trustees to petition the General Assembly for a college charter for the Academy. Although the petition was again in vain, the Church was about to set out on a more ambitious course, and one entirely independent of the Academy. Even though the Diocese of Connecticut had given little material support to the Academy, the school was definitely a Diocesan one. The Diocesan Convention elected the...
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Trustees and, from time to time, the Convention concerned itself with the internal affairs of the institution.44 Now the fact that the interest in the Academy had been purely local within the Diocese was not by design. Attempts to raise funds for the Academy’s support in New York45 and in Europe46 had met with no success and it was, thus, more-or-less by default that the Academy remained a Diocesan, rather than a General, institution.

The first hope of a wider recognition of the Academy came in 1811 when the General Convention of the Episcopal Church held in New Haven noted “with satisfaction that the Convention of the Church in Connecticut are engaged in obtaining for the Episcopal Academy in Cheshire a charter, empowering the Trustees to grant degrees; and this Convention do express their earnest wish for the success of this measure.”47 If it seemed at the time that General encouragement for an Episcopalian college was to be forthcoming, such, unfortunately, was not to be the case. Rather, the General Convention turned its attention to the establishing of a theological seminary and this diverting, albeit laudable, interest occupied the educational attention of the General Convention48 until the founding of the General Theological Seminary in New York City in 1817.

Meanwhile, within the Diocese, but without Diocesan direction, several perhaps not altogether unrelated steps were taken toward the establishment of a new Episcopal college. At a parish meeting at Christ Church, Hartford, on “March 3, 1813, Charles Sigourney, Samuel Tudor, Jr., and Thomas Glover were appointed to confer, advise, or correspond with any other committee or body of persons interested, on the subject of an application which is to be made this spring to the legislature for liberty to establish an Episcopal College in this State.”49

The other step taken at almost this same time was much less obvious, but it was directed toward the same end. A number of well-to-do Episcopalians were working out a rather grandiose plan whereby both their own economic ends and the cause of higher education in Connecticut could be served. Bishop Jarvis’s death in May, 1813, had brought an end to the efforts to raise the Episcopal Academy to college level50 and, in a sense, the Bishop’s demise had cleared the way for action independent of the Diocese. The plan devised was a most ingenious one and was an attempt to bypass both elements in Connecticut hostile to the idea of an Episcopal college (the General Assembly and Yale College), and the scheme centered about, of all things, a bank!

The Phoenix Bank was founded at Hartford early in 1814 by Episcopal laymen. In their petition to the Connecticut General Assembly for a charter of incorporation, the officers of the Phoenix Bank offered to the state of Connecticut a “Bonus” of $50,000 which was to be divided between the Medical Department of Yale College, the Bishop’s Fund, and “any purpose whatever, which to your Honours may seem best.”51 The proposal was not one intended primarily to benefit Yale, but the officers of the Phoenix Bank realized that without generous provision for the institution of the Congregational Establishment the legislators would not act favorably in the
case of the Bishop's Fund and the other "purpose" of the petition which was really an Episcopal college.\textsuperscript{52}

In May, 1814, the General Assembly granted a charter to the Phoenix Bank. The capital stock was to be $1,000,000 and as shares were purchased, payments to total $50,000 were to be made to the state of Connecticut.\textsuperscript{53} Immediately, the Yale Corporation and the Trustees of the Bishop's Fund applied for financial grants from the state to be paid from the money coming into the Treasury from the Phoenix Bank. The Assembly promptly voted $20,000 to Yale. Although a bill to give $10,000 to the Bishop's Fund passed the Upper House, the Lower House refused to concur and the Episcopalians found that this elaborate scheme of legislative bribery had brought them absolutely nothing!

The outcome of the Bishop's Bonus affair led to a violent newspaper controversy which was carried on through late 1815 and early 1816 in the pages of \textit{The Connecticut Herald}, a Federalist journal of secondary rank\textsuperscript{54} published by Oliver Steele in New Haven. Of the fifteen exchanges in the Herald, both Episcopalians and Congregationalists stated their cases. The Episcopalians made clear that to deny the Bishop's Fund its share of the Phoenix Bank "bonus" was a gross miscarriage of justice and a flagrant disregard of the Anglican minority in favor of Congregationalist-controlled Yale.\textsuperscript{55} The Congregational polemists vigorously defended the religious test at Yale and the favored position of the Congregational Churches in the state.\textsuperscript{56} Much heat was generated in the course of the controversy and, fortunately, too, much light was shed upon the ecclesiastical situation in Connecticut. The Episcopalians insisted that as citizens of a republic they had full right to provide instruction on the collegiate level, and that unless provisions were made for Anglican education similar to that enjoyed by the Congregationalists at Yale, justice was being denied.\textsuperscript{57} The Congregationalists, on the other hand, insisted that no Episcopalian should object to the Yale test—and this despite the fact that the test kept Episcopalians from accepting appointments to the Yale faculty—and that nothing would induce the Establishment to retreat from its refusal to permit the creation of an Episcopal college.\textsuperscript{58}

The ramifications of the Bonus controversy were many, but it was, perhaps, in the matter of Connecticut politics that the most immediate effects were felt. Traditionally, the Episcopalians—representing, of course, a conservative element in Connecticut society—had supported the Federalist Party, and it was the conservative Anglican support which had enabled the Federalists to remain the dominant party in the state long after Federalism had disappeared elsewhere. In a way, the Episcopalians had been the dupes of the Congregationalists, as Connecticut Federalism was the political pillar of the Congregational Establishment. The failure of the Episcopalians to receive the Bishop's Bonus, however, turned the Episcopalians from their former Federalist support to a fusion of Republicans and Protestant sectarians known as the Tolerationist Party. By the summer of 1816, the Tolerationist Party was a well-organized group. The Republican minority provided the working organization, Episcopalians supplied the leadership, and Methodists and Baptists gave voting strength. So effective was the new political alliance that in the September election the Tolerationists won 87 seats in the Assembly to the Federalists' 114.\textsuperscript{59}

The Tolerationist victory at the polls in 1816 frightened the Congregational Federalists, and the Standing Order adopted a conciliatory policy. The Assembly immediately passed a Bonus Act, "an Act for the Support of Literature and Religion," which appropriated $14,500 due Connecticut from the Federal Government for Connecticut's expenses incurred in the national interest during the recent war with Great Britain. As divided among the religious interests and Yale College, the Congregational Societies in the state received one-third; the Trustees of the Bishop's Fund received one-seventh; the Baptists, through a committee of trustees named for the purpose, received one-eighth; Methodist trustees received one-twelfth; Yale received one-sixth; and the remaining one-sixth was to remain in the Treasury. Obviously, this was an attempt
by the much-reduced Federalist majority in the Assembly to salve the wound of the loss of the Phoenix Bank bonus. Yale, however, was the only party to be satisfied. The Congregationalists thought that their share was too small in consideration of their large numbers, the Episcopalians regarded their $2,070 as poor compensation for the Phoenix loss, and the Baptists and Methodists regarded their small share as an insult. The whole “Bonus” plan merely accentuated sectarian bickerings, and the disorders actually hastened the ultimate Federalist downfall. In the state election of 1817, all religious elements outside the Congregational Establishment united forces, and the Tolerationists won both the governorship and a large majority in the Assembly. A year later the Council, too, passed into Tolerationist control.65

While these political developments were unfolding, the movement toward establishing an Episcopalian college was gathering momentum. In June, 1816, the Diocesan Convention appointed the Rev. Philander Chase, the Rev. Daniel Burhans, Charles Sigourney, Asa Chapman, and Nathan Smith, Esqrs., as “a committee to prepare a petition, in the name and behalf of the Convention, to the General Assembly, at their next session, to obtain an act of incorporation and charter for an Episcopal College, to be erected in this Diocese, and to pursue all proper measures for the obtaining a grant of said petition, provided they should think it expedient to present it at said session.” 66 For some reason, however, the committee did not find it expedient to present the petition, and the committee was continued by the Convention in 1817.67

Now the same Convention which appointed Philander Chase to head the committee to petition for a college charter also invited the Right Reverend John Henry Hobart of the Diocese of New York to perform the Episcopal Offices in the Diocese of Connecticut pending the election of a successor to Bishop Jarvis. Chase was a member of the Evangelical party of the Episcopal Church, and Hobart had already lent his name to what was known as “Hobartian High-Churchmanship.” Chase decided that even with Hobart as visiting Bishop the Diocese would not be large enough for the two of them. Wherefore, he resigned the rectorship of Christ Church, Hartford, and set out for the missionary field in Ohio.68 Perhaps the reason for the committee’s failure to carry out its instruction to petition for an Episcopal College may be found in Chase’s hasty departure from the Diocese. On February 16, 1817, the rector of Christ Church submitted his resignation, and on March 2 he celebrated the Holy Communion for the last time.69 Thus, the committee’s chairman was winding up his affairs within the Diocese at the time when his services were most needed. It might be added, too, that the second member of the committee, the Rev. Daniel Burhans, was occupied during much of this time with the interests of the General Seminary, having been appointed to visit churches in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Connecticut in the interest of the Seminary.70 Although sickness and a death in his family prevented his carrying out the mission, he accepted a time-consuming appointment to the Seminary’s Board of Trustees in addition to his place on the Board of Trustees of the Episcopal Academy.71 Perhaps the three laymen who comprised the remainder of the committee did not feel competent to speak for the Church.

The Convention continued the committee for still another year in 1818.72 By then, it would seem, the chartering of an Episcopalian college would have been an easy matter. The Episcopalians and their Tolerationist friends were in a majority in the legislature, and Jonathan Ingersoll—the first Episcopalian to hold an elective office in Connecticut—was lieutenant-governor. Also, the new State Constitution, which marked the completion of the internal revolution in the state, once and for all disestablished the Congregational Churches and at last made full citizens of all Christians. Nevertheless, the committee still did not carry out its instructions. Apart from the absence of Philander Chase and the preoccupation of Daniel Burhans, there were still other events which may account for the committee’s inactivity. In 1819, the Reverend Thomas Church
Brownell of Trinity Church, New York, was elected Bishop of Connecticut, and the committee may well have preferred to learn the wishes of the new Bishop before proceeding with their petition. Then, too, the Diocese had once more become involved in the affairs of the Episcopal Academy at Cheshire. The Convention in 1819 had heard a detailed report on the academic and financial situation at the Academy and the committee of the Convention which had conducted the investigation urged the "united and zealous patronage" of the Diocese. In the spring of 1820, Bishop Brownell, as one of the first acts upon his arrival in the Diocese, visited the Academy, and in his Episcopal Address to the Convention of that year he commented on the industry and fidelity of the faculty. Indeed, it may have seemed that the plan to secure a collegiate charter for the Academy was about to be revived. Once again, however, Diocesan interest in the Academy was a passing one, for in September of 1820 the relocation of the General Seminary in New Haven gave Connecticut Churchmen a much more exciting challenge than either a struggling academy or a college yet unborn.

The General Convention had located the Seminary in New York, but for some reason the institution failed to flourish. In 1820, General Convention voted to move the Seminary to New Haven. Strangely enough, the principal reason given for the transfer was the hope of making use of the Yale College library and of the Seminary family attending the public lectures of the College. The removal of the Seminary to Connecticut had an immediate effect upon the educational plans of the Diocese. Bishop Brownell, who had been serving as rector of Christ Church, Hartford, resigned his Hartford rectorship for that of Trinity Church, New Haven. As Bishop of the Diocese in which the Seminary was located, Bishop Brownell enjoyed a favored place on the Board of Trustees and, as he had previously taught at Union College in Schenectady from 1805 to 1811, he welcomed the opportunity to teach gratuitously in the new Seminary. In his Episcopal Address to the Diocesan Convention of 1820, Bishop Brownell urged Connecticut clergy and laity to take the lead in patronage and support of the Seminary. The Diocese responded quickly to the Bishop's urgings. Measures were at once taken to endow a Connecticut Professorship, and the Convention resolved that societies be established throughout the Diocese to provide scholarships for needy seminarians. Toward the Connecticut (or Seabury) Professorship, several Connecticut Churchmen had pledged $3,700, one of the subscriptions being for $1,000 and four for $500 each.

But the Seminary had hardly been opened in New Haven when the General Convention returned the institution to New York City. Jacob Sherred, a vestryman of Trinity Church, had bequeathed $60,000 for the benefit of an Episcopal theological seminary to be located in New York City and his will stated that the sum, a large one for 1821, could be given to a school under control of either the General Convention or the Diocese of New York. Bishop Hobart had resented the removal of the General Seminary from his diocese and, under his direction, a small diocesan institution had been opened as a rival to the General Seminary. The Sherred bequest, however, resulted in a compromise. Bishop Hobart was eager to have the General Seminary return to his diocese, and both the General Convention and the Seminary Trustees lost no time in voting to return to New York. Bishop Brownell was, of course, obliged to end his short career as a Professor of Theology, and he doubtless had regrets upon seeing the immediate supervision of the Seminary pass into the hands of Bishop Hobart. In his Episcopal Address of 1822, however, he expressed to the Diocesan Convention his hope that the new location would "have a tendency to harmonize all discordant opinions" on the subject of the General Seminary. Much as the Episcopalians of Connecticut may have wished to keep the General Seminary within the bounds of the Diocese, the return to New York was of benefit to both the Seminary and the Diocese. In view of the strained relations between Yale and the Episcopalians, it is doubtful whether the hoped-for advantages could have been realized. In justifying the return to New
York, Bishop Hobart pointed out that New York City was the logical location for the General Seminary where, because of its proximity to Columbia College, there would be advantages to be found in no other place.80 This was, indeed, a much better hope than with hostile Yale.

So far as the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut was concerned, the presence of the General Seminary in the Diocese brought an end to the theological instruction at Cheshire, and theological study was never revived at the Academy when the Seminary was relocated in New York.81 Collegiate instruction at the Academy had been perhaps strengthened by its proximity to the Seminary; and among the students at the Seminary while it was in New Haven were four graduates of the Academy.82

So far as the prospect of an Episcopal college for Connecticut was concerned, the Connecticut Legislature had granted a charter for the Seminary without any serious opposition, and there was little reason to believe that a college charter could not be received with the same ease. Furthermore, the Seminary's short stay in the Diocese had demonstrated that Connecticut Churchmen would give generous support to an educational project, provided the undertaking be enough of a challenge to capture the public imagination and provided the object of benevolence be close enough to serve, through its actual operation, as a reminder of the need. Three thousand and seven hundred dollars had been pledged toward the endowment of a professorship in the Seminary. The subscribers, however, made their gifts dependent upon the Seminary's remaining in Connecticut and the pledges were, because of the institution's removal from the Diocese, not paid.83 At least the money had been offered to the Church's educational effort, and this was a generosity such as had never been shown the Episcopal Academy. It was probably these unfulfilled pledges, more than anything else, which in 1822 started Bishop Brownell and several of his friends on the course which was to lead to the founding of what is now Trinity College.
A Dream Is Realized

THOMAS CHURCH BROWNELL was the one man in the Diocese of Connecticut who could bring an Episcopalian college into being. The Bishop of Connecticut had attended Brown University and Union College in Schenectady, New York, from which he was graduated as valedictorian in 1804. Brownell had been brought up in the Congregationalist faith, and it was his intention to enter the ministry of that church. But as has been the case with so many other Protestant candidates for the ministry, extensive reading in church history soon turned his attention to the special claims of the Episcopal Church. Brownell had been brought up in the Congregationalist faith, and it was his intention to enter the ministry of that church. But as has been the case with so many other Protestant candidates for the ministry, extensive reading in church history soon turned his attention to the special claims of the Episcopal Church. In order to resolve his unsettled thoughts, he abandoned plans to study Theology for the time being and in 1805 he accepted a tutorship in Latin and Greek at Union College. Two years later he was appointed Professor of Belles Lettres and Moral Philosophy and in 1809 he was made Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy. These were new disciplines for that day, and Brownell decided to go to England to study the Natural Sciences. For a year he visited the great English centers of learning and there he met some of the eminent men of science of the time. Upon his return to America in 1811, he married Charlotte Dickinson and, as his bride was an Episcopalian, he once more turned his attention to the Church which had so fascinated him as a college undergraduate. Such leisure time as his busy professional schedule afforded was spent in the study of Theology. In April of 1816, Brownell was admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons by Bishop Hobart and in August of that year he was advanced to the Priesthood. In 1818, he became assistant at Trinity Church, New York, and on June 3, 1819, he was unanimously elected Bishop of the Diocese of Connecticut.

Bishop Brownell was an educational enthusiast. Teaching in Union College and in the General Seminary had occupied over six of the years since his graduation from college. Bishop Hobart had once taught at Princeton, and he was every bit as interested in education as was Bishop Brownell. The removal of the Seminary from New York to New Haven had prompted Hobart to establish his own diocesan theological school and, with the return of the General Seminary to the Diocese of New York, Bishop Hobart had used his every effort to expand and strengthen the Seminary, even to the creation of a "Branch" of the Seminary at Geneva, New York. And it was the matter of the "Branch" which was to bring the question of a church college to a head in the Diocese of New York and also, indirectly, in the Diocese of Connecticut.

It had been the hope of several of the leaders in the movement to establish the General Seminary that the Seminary should form the nucleus of an Episcopalian university and that there should be, as soon as possible, a college in conjunction with the theological school. At Geneva there was the old Geneva Academy, founded in 1796 by Presbyterians but since 1813 under Episcopal influence. From that date on, the story of Geneva Academy somewhat resembles that of the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut, the only difference being, of course, the "happy ending." On September 23, 1818, Bishop Hobart met with a number of up-state New York Churchmen at Geneva and outlined plans to raise the Geneva Academy to college level. The Bishop's proposal
was that the Trustees of the Academy surrender control of the school to the vestry of Trinity Church, Geneva, and that the Diocesan Convention of New York endow the institution as a Diocesan college under a charter to be granted by the New York Board of Regents. The Trustees of the Academy obligingly acceded to Bishop Hobart's request and, on April 10, 1822, the Regents granted a provisional college charter on condition that the Trustees of the college raise, within three years, a permanent fund of $50,000 or a fund sufficient to yield $4,000 per year. Thus, in a period of less than four years, the Episcopalians of New York performed a feat which Connecticut Churchmen had been unable to do after decades of serious effort.

Geneva College (known as Hobart College after 1852) opened its first session on August 5, 1822. The ten college students were soon joined by several seminarians who comprised the student body of the "Branch" of the General Theological Seminary. The college flourished and in 1825 it received a permanent charter. The "Branch," however, failed to prosper and it was discontinued in 1826.

From his vantage point on the Board of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary, Bishop Brownell was able to observe the educational developments in the Diocese of New York. The progress made by Bishop Hobart in Geneva spurred Bishop Brownell to action. A few days before Christmas, 1822, the Bishop of Connecticut met at his home in New Haven with eighteen clergymen whom he had called together to draw up a petition to the Connecticut General Assembly for a college charter. The last Diocesan Convention had granted no authority to take such a step. Indeed, the matter of a college had not even been considered by the Convention at its June meeting and, if the meeting in New Haven
had any Diocesan sanction whatever, it was the vote to continue the committee to petition the Legislature which had been taken in 1818. Nevertheless, the preliminary steps were taken and the Bishop, two clergy, and three laymen were appointed to draw up a memorial to present to the Legislature.9

By March 20, 1823, the committee had prepared its petition which was to be presented to the General Assembly the first Wednesday in May. In order to give the proposed college the broadest base of support, copies of the petition were sent to every parish in the Diocese and all “male Episcopalians, of lawful age” were asked to affix their signatures.10 The petition itself was most moderately worded. The petitioners expressed the hope that the establishment of a second college in Connecticut would be of great benefit to the state and that it would “meet with a liberal patronage” without lessening the usefulness of “the important Literary Institution at New-Haven.” As Episcopalians, and while disclaiming any exclusive privilege, they stated that as there was not a single college under control of the Episcopalians and that, because of the large number of their Communion, an Episcopal College would soon be established somewhere, they were “desirous that the State of Connecticut shall have the benefit of its location.” Especially, they pointed out, would Connecticut benefit by a second college because of the reliance of the South and West upon New England for the education of their sons. A second college would carry Connecticut one step further toward becoming “the Athens of our Republic.” As to the location of the second college, the petitioners asked that it be either Hartford, Middletown, New Haven, or New London and that final selection be left to the discretion of the Trustees. And as to the endowment of the college, the petitioners asked that the act of incorporation should take effect as soon as $30,000 should be raised. Implicit was the suggestion that the college’s location would be determined by the generosity of the four possible towns, and explicit was the request that the portion of the endowment of the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut which had not been contributed by the Cheshire community should be applied toward the initial endowment of the college, provided the Trustees of the Academy and the people of Cheshire should give their consent to the transfer of funds.11

The petition was circulated widely. Apparently the clause regarding the appropriation of a part of the endowment of the Episcopal Academy met with objection from the Academy Trustees and the Cheshire community, and this portion was deleted.12 Certainly the petition had been read in New Haven for, on the day before its presentation to the legislature, the Yale Corporation abolished the requirement that all officers of that college subscribe to that ultimate test of Congregational orthodoxy, the Saybrook Platform.13 This was doubtless done to weaken the Episcopalian claim of discrimination against them at Yale, a point of which much had been made in earlier efforts to establish an Episcopal college. Bishop Brownell and his asso-
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Associates had planned well, and every effort had been made to avoid anything in either their propagandizing or in the petition itself which would jeopardize their case. Thus, once more the suggestion that the college be named for Bishop Seabury was passed over and the name “Washington” was chosen instead. The first President of the United States had, it was true, been an Episcopalian, but the name could have given offense to no one. And even though the petitioners referred to themselves as members of the Episcopal Church, care was taken to include non-Episcopalians among the original incorporators.14

These disclaimers of partisan self-interest notwithstanding, it was no secret that the new college would be distinctively Episcopalian. In the April, 1823, issue of the Churchman’s Magazine, official publication of the Diocese of Connecticut, appeared the first public notice of the college project. Here again were the oft-repeated arguments that the predominant influence in the American colleges was either Calvinistic or Unitarian and that the Episcopalians were equally entitled to a college in which the main object would be “not to propagate the peculiar tenets of the Episcopal Church, but to establish an institution where Episcopalians, and all who agree with them in the great points of Christian doctrine, may educate their children without the hazard of their acquiring a strong bias against their own religious principles.”15

Great care was taken in the selection of the signers of the final petition as it was presented to the General Assembly. Bishop Brownell had become an Episcopalian because of the particular claims of the Episcopal Church, but it was well known that he had once been a Congregationalist and that he regarded other communions with respect and that, while he never missed an opportunity to state the special claims of Episcopacy, his inter-church relations were always conducted on a “live-and-let-live” basis.16 The Reverend Harry Croswell was rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, and was so well thought of by the Standing Order that in 1817 he was invited to preach the “Election Sermon” before the General Assembly, an honor which had previously been enjoyed only by Congregationalists.17

Elijah Boardman, a wealthy Episcopal layman, was United States Senator from Connecticut.18 The Honorable Samuel W. Johnson of Stratford had long been a member of the Upper House of the Connecticut legislative body and had on numerous occasions served on important committees of the Diocesan Convention.19

The Reverend Birdsey G. Noble was rector at Holy Trinity Church, Middletown, one of the larger and more prosperous parishes in the Diocese.20 The Reverend Nathaniel S. Wheaton was rector of Christ Church, Hartford. The Reverend Elisha Cushman was pastor of the Baptist Society in Hartford. The Reverend Samuel Merwin was a Congregationalist minister of New Haven who had been a guiding figure in the organization in 1815 of the Charitable Society for the Education of Indigent Pious Young Men for the
Ministry of the Gospel, an organization whose purpose was to provide scholarships at Yale College.21

Charles Sigourney was one of Hartford’s leading merchants, president of the Phoenix Bank, senior warden of Christ Church, a gentleman of cultivated tastes, and a devotee of the classical learning.22 David Watkinson, a Congregationalist, was also a prosperous Hartford merchant. One of the most public-spirited men of the day, he invariably lent his support and patronage to enterprises for the public good, whether of a commercial, charitable, or educational nature.23

Richard Adams was a leading member of Christ Church, Norwich, and had long evidenced his interest in the affairs of the Church by his service as the perennial delegate from his parish to the Diocesan Convention.24 Ebenezer Young of Killingly was a practicing attorney and the operator of a cotton mill.25 Commodore Thomas Macdonough, U.S.N., was a distinguished naval officer and a hero of the War of 1812.26 Jonathan Starr, Jr., was of an old Episcopalian family of New London and was a warden of St. James Church.27 Nathan Smith of New Haven, the last of the petitioners, had long served Episcopalian interests in the Connecticut Legislature as a leader of the Tolerationist Party.28

These men represented a wide spectrum as to place of residence, politics, occupation, and ecclesiastical connection. Although the greater number of them came from Hartford, all sections of Connecticut were represented, except the extreme western counties. Among them were clergy, merchants, attorneys, government officials, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, and a Baptist. The Congregationalists, to be sure, were of the more irascible sort, but so too were the Episcopalian petitioners. Conspicuous by his absence was Samuel Tudor, Jr., of Hartford, one of the early promoters of a church college,29 vestryman of Christ Church, one whose generous contribution headed every pious subscription list, but one who was described as “a Churchman, because he believed in the Church, and possibly also because he did not believe in Congregationalism.”30

So well had Bishop Brownell and his associates planned their strategy that the bill passed both houses of the Connecticut Legislature without incident, and the Charter for Washington College was granted on May 16, 1823. Great was the rejoicing in Hartford, and that evening cannon were fired and bonfires were lighted.31 All that remained to be done was to raise the sum of $30,000 demanded by the Charter, select the site, gather a faculty, and open the College for instruction. An Episcopal college in the Diocese of Connecticut at last existed on a piece of parchment and, in terms of the petition and the general feelings of Connecticut Churchmen of 1823, little more could have been desired.

And it is in terms of the petition, as contrasted with the earlier plans to raise the Episcopal Academy to college level, that it must at once become apparent that in 1823 the Church in Connecticut had set a goal somewhat more realistic than when in 1810 the Diocesan Convention asked the General Assembly for an act changing the Episcopal Academy to the Episcopal College of Connecticut. The Academy was a Church-controlled institution with trustees and officers elected by the Convention and responsible to the Church. Washington College was placed under a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees, and the Charter made no mention whatsoever of sponsorship by, or relation to, the Episcopal Church.32 Section 7 of the College Charter forbade the “making of the religious tenets of any person a condition of admission to any privilege in said college; and [provided] that no president, professor or other officer shall be made ineligible for or by reason of any religious tenet that he may possess, or be compelled by any by-law, or otherwise to subscribe to any religious test whatever.” Furthermore, when the bill passed the Senate, the Legislature had added to the petitioners as College Trustees, John Thompson Peters, Asa Chapman, Elias Perkins, Luther Loomis, and John S. Peters, M.D., of whom only John T. Peters and Asa Chapman were Episcopalians. Thus, the question might well have been raised as to whether Washington College was truly a church college. The relationship of the College to the Diocese and to the Church at large would
have to be worked out in the early months of the College's corporate existence.33

In his Episcopal Address to the Convention of the Diocese of Connecticut held in Meriden just three weeks after the granting of the Charter, Bishop Brownell proceeded to rationalize the establishment of Washington College and to outline the relationship of the College to the Church. As was his wont, the Bishop rehearsed the past experience of Connecticut Churchmen in having to send their children to schools and colleges whose instructors "dissent from our religious views." But the new element in Brownell's argument was his deploring "a spurious liberality much in vogue at the present day, which, if it do not reach absolute latitudinarianism, professes to regard it as a matter of indifference, or at most, of expediency to what particular denomination of Christians any one belongs. . . . We are Episcopalians," he said, "not from any slight preference, but as I trust, from examination and conviction, and from an imperious sense of duty." And then followed the oft-repeated claim of Episcopalians to the right to educate their children in such fashion as not to have Episcopalian youth "acquire a positive bias" against the Faith of the Fathers. These considerations, argued Bishop Brownell, had happily resulted in the recent incorporation of Washington College which, the Bishop rejoiced, was "to be under the patronage and principal direction of members of our Church." In view of the Charter's condition that $30,000 be raised to get the College under way, the Episcopal Address ended with an "earnest [financial] appeal . . . to the friends of the proposed Institution . . ." and the hope that "it will be met with that liberality which the importance of the object demands."34

A month later, on Tuesday, July 8, 1823, the first meeting of the Trustees was held at Bulkley's Hotel in Middletown.35 Officers were chosen and Bishop Brownell was becomingly made chairman. Nathaniel Wheaton was made secretary and Samuel Tudor, although not then a Trustee, was made treasurer. After the organization of the Board, a "Committee to devise ways and means to procure funds for the institution" (comprising Trustees Brownell, Merwin, Crosswell, Cushman, and Noble) was directed to appoint fund-raising agents and to superintend the money-gathering operation. Finally, it was voted that future meetings of the Trustees be advertised in the New Haven and Hartford papers and that the secretary notify the members by sending them a copy of the newspaper in which the announcement appeared. And then was adjourned the first meeting of the Board of Trustees of Washington College.36

Immediately, the "Committee to devise ways and means to procure funds for the institution" set to work. Subscription papers were sent out to the several parishes, and the benevolent spirit of the people of Connecticut was appealed to. The subscription papers were made out in two forms: one form permitting pledges to be made upon condition of the selection of a particular location of the College and the other form for pledges to be made without regard to location. As New London had been eliminated from the choice of locations in the petition's final form,37 the possibilities of the College's location had been reduced to three. A large number of the pledges from New Haven, Middletown, and Hartford were, of course, made dependent upon a particular location, and this was to be the determining factor in the selection of Hartford as the site of the College.

Although there was much enthusiasm throughout Connecticut for the College, the committee was not confident that the entire $30,000 could be raised within the Diocese, or even within the United States. They therefore appointed one of their own number, the Reverend Nathaniel Wheaton, to go to England to solicit donations of money, books, and philosophical apparatus.38 Christ Church generously granted Wheaton a leave of absence in order to perform this mission, and in September, 1823, he sailed from New York,39 armed with a letter signed by Bishop Brownell as President of the College and addressed "To the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church of England."40

Now this document was a curious one, and one which brought forth both benefit in England and
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Acworth, Ephraim 200
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Barnard, Nathan 150
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The controversy in Connecticut. While the Charter for Washington College was still pending (and, indeed, ever since the drawing up of the petition for a Charter), the college promoters had been careful in their public statements to play down the Church influence which may be exerted upon the College and also to assure non-Episcopalians that it was not their intent that the College should proselytize among the students who might attend. In the letter carried to England by Nathaniel Wheaton, however, a different spirit was evidenced, and the document exposed the Episcopalians of Connecticut to the charges of political disloyalty and religious bigotry.

The letter to the English Church (and an elaborate additional “Statement” which Wheaton felt obliged to issue upon his arrival in England) outlined briefly the history of Episcopacy in America and emphasized the extremely difficult position of the Church in Connecticut, “planted in the midst of Dissenters from her ministry and worship, and opposed by many prejudices, numerous difficulties have heretofore retarded her progress.” A college had been founded and called by the name of Washington. (“It was necessary that some name should be given it in the Charter. Should some munificent benefactor to the institution be found, it is intended to honor it with his name.”) The needs of the College were frankly stated. Aid from England would place the College on an equal footing with the other literary institutions, and “no measures could be better calculated to promote the prosperity of the Church in this country, and to oppose an effectual barrier to those spreading errors, which are dividing and destroying the other religious communions.” And then was mentioned the common bond of religion which united England and America: “The best friends which Great Britain has in America, will be found among the members of the Episcopal Church; and every thing which conduces to the extension of this church, will be found to strengthen the bands of relationship and amity which connect the two countries.”

The College Trustees, of course, had no idea that this letter of introduction for Nathaniel Wheaton should be circulated in Connecticut. Even if they had, there was little that could have been changed and the statement of the case still be clear to the English Church. When it is remembered, however, that the Episcopalians, who had been completely discredited in Connecticut for their Toryism during the American Revolution, were referring to strengthening “bands of relationship” – political and ecclesiastical – the recently-defeated Standing Order had full reason to believe that their earlier suspicions of Episcopalian political loyalties were justified. And, likewise, when it is remembered that to the Congregationalists, who had enjoyed legal Establishment until only five years before, Episcopalian references to themselves as members of the Church and to all others as Dissenters (both correct in English usage) could not help but revive the old fear of Prelacy. Copies of the letter did fall into unfriendly hands and were printed in the Connecticut Courant for March 2, 1824. The inevitable consequences followed – but that is part of another story, of which more later.

Nathaniel Wheaton arrived in England on October 3, 1823. During the thirteen months he was abroad, Wheaton traveled the length and breadth of England, visiting almost every possible site of historical or literary interest, paying his respects to the most eminent leaders of Church and State, and inspecting almost countless educational and philanthropic foundations. During this period he even found time to visit briefly in France and Scotland. The account of his travels, which he serialized in weekly three-column installments from June 18, 1827, to August 1, 1829, in the Episcopal Watchman, the newspaper of the Episcopal Diocese of Connecticut, reads like the breath-taking adventures of one who, marveling that such wonders could be, rushed from one new wonder to the next. Indeed, it would seem that few were the corners of England into which Wheaton did not peek on his many crossings of the country. Particularly did he pay attention to the great English universities. There he was able to indulge his taste for music and architecture and to meet the intellectual luminaries of Oxford and Cambridge. On occasion
he attended the lectures of the universities, and in each of the university towns he was entertained by the officers of the several colleges.43

But the pleasant sojourn in England was more than the mere junket Wheaton's published description of it would suggest. He had been sent to secure the assistance of the English Church in setting up an Anglican college in what before the American Revolution had been English missionary territory, and much of Wheaton's coming and going was incidental to the most serious purpose of re-establishing the ties between the Church in America and that of the Mother Country which had been, to all intents and purposes, severed with the War for American Independence.

The task thus assigned to Nathaniel Wheaton was a difficult one, and one which under the best of conditions would have demanded the most happy combination of boldness and tact. But the situation was seriously complicated by the fact that two other American Churchmen were also endeavoring to revive the mother-daughter relationship between the two branches of the Anglican Communion, and for precisely the same immediate purpose as was Nathaniel Wheaton.

Philander Chase, once a prominent figure in the Diocese of Connecticut but by now Bishop of Ohio, had plans to open a theological seminary to train clergy for service in the territory west of the Appalachian Mountains. His clergy were few, his people poor, and Ohio without the financial means of what Bishop Chase regarded as a necessity for his Diocese. The Church in the East had shown no disposition to offer any assistance, and Bishop Chase's thoughts turned to England where he was sure funds could be raised to carry out his project. Requests for endorsement by the American Bishops had been disappointing. The Presiding Bishop, Bishop White of Pennsylvania, expressed strong disapproval of what he described as "begging."
Bishop Hobart of New York was even more pointed. The Church already had a General Seminary and, if and when Ohio had need of theological instruction, the General Seminary would establish a “branch” there. Hobart was successful in preventing any Church agency or Bishop from providing introductory credentials or endorsement, but Henry Clay, induced to do so by a mutual friend, wrote a letter for Bishop Chase introducing him to Lord Gambier, a distinguished British admiral and Evangelical Churchman with whom Clay had become acquainted when the two had helped negotiate the Treaty of Ghent, which concluded the War of 1812. With this single letter of introduction, Chase sailed for England and arrived in Liverpool on November 3, 1823, just one month after the arrival of Nathaniel Wheaton.

Meanwhile, Bishop Hobart, who had not been able to prevent Chase’s leaving for England, wrote letters to his friends in Great Britain and distributed widely a pamphlet of his own composition in which he declared that Bishop Chase did not have the approval of the Church for his mission nor, for that matter, of his own Diocese. But even this was not enough for Bishop Hobart, for within a few months he, too, was in England, traveling, as he wanted it to be understood, for his health, but really to gather funds for the General Theological Seminary. In England, Hobart continued his efforts to discredit Bishop Chase’s cause, and soon Nathaniel Wheaton found that he, too, was being denounced by the Bishop of New York, who, perhaps jealous for the success of his own Geneva College, spared few pains to point out that Washington College was a strictly Diocesan undertaking without the sanction of the Church at large.47

Wheaton was genuinely sympathetic to Chase, and well he might have been. Hobart was the common enemy, and Chase had been Wheaton’s predecessor, once removed, at Christ Church, Hartford. Upon the urging of several Englishmen, however, Wheaton undertook to mediate between the two Bishops by proposing a joint solicitation for the General Seminary, Chase’s theological school, and Washington College. Hobart was willing to enter into the scheme, but Chase, who had already made considerable progress among his connections in the Evangelical party, could see no advantage in the arrangement. With Chase confidently going his own way, Bishop Hobart softened in his attitude toward Wheaton and Washington College and, much to Wheaton’s surprise, even proposed that the General Seminary and Washington College bring forward their claims “in conjunction” and that the proceeds of the appeal be shared equally by the two institutions. And on that basis Hobart and Wheaton operated during the remainder of Hobart’s stay in England; that is, until Hobart left for the Continent in a huff.48

Although the three American Churchmen found additional competition with the arrival of Bishop Inglis of Nova Scotia and Dr. Stewart from Upper Canada, both in quest of English money, the proceeds in each case at least justified the mission. Chase fared somewhat better than the others, for as Wheaton reported, “The giving people are enlisted in the Ohio cause.”49 Thus the Bishop of Ohio returned to his Diocese with $20,000 and the promise of more.50 Bishop Hobart forwarded to the General Theological Seminary $9,466.72,51 and Nathaniel Wheaton, in accordance with his instructions, invested $1,843 in books and several hundred dollars in scientific apparatus and then returned home.52

By the time of Nathaniel Wheaton’s return to Connecticut in November, 1824, Washington College was already a going concern. The thirty thousand dollars needed to begin the College had been raised, buildings had been started, a faculty had been appointed, instruction had begun, changes had been made in the Board of Trustees, and the Congregationalists and Episcopalians of Connecticut were once more engaged in a pamphlet war into which Wheaton was to throw himself as a leading champion of his Church and College.

If Wheaton’s fund-raising campaign in England was conducted in a hit-or-miss fashion, that of Bishop Brownell in Connecticut was a well-directed and highly-organized affair. The entire Diocese was divided into districts, more-or-
less on a county basis, which were placed under agents who were responsible to the Bishop as Chairman of the “Committee to devise ways and means to procure funds.” Each agent was provided with a file of promotional literature which consisted of letters from the Bishop and newspaper clippings favorable to the cause, and the agents were required to report weekly to the Bishop on their progress. Although the Board of Trustees had decided that there should be two forms for the subscription papers, the committee first circulated only the “general” subscription form for pledges not dependent upon the particular location of the College. The close of January, 1824, was set as the date for the end of this phase of the campaign, and it was hoped that the entire sum of $30,000 could be raised by the middle of March.

Henry Watson of East Windsor was made principal agent for the Hartford district; the Reverend Daniel Burhans acted for the New Haven district; the Reverend Stephen Jewett, rector of Christ Church in New Haven, acted for the New London-Norwich district; and Bishop Brownell himself assumed responsibility for Litchfield County. The Bishop, however, did not confine his fund-raising efforts to the district to which he had assigned himself. Jewett had fared badly in eastern Connecticut, and the Episcopalians there, perhaps angry because New London had apparently been deleted from the latest list of the College’s possible locations, had given him, as Bishop Brownell put it, the “go-bye.” On September 10, 1823, disgruntled Churchmen from Norwich and New London held a mass meeting at Kinney’s Hotel in Norwich to consider “such measures as may be deemed necessary for fixing the location of Washington College in this town.” The gathering unanimously expressed approval of locating the College in Norwich, many having been swayed by the argument that the farmer of the region would find in the College a “good and ready market for his surplus products.” A committee composed of leading men from the area, including Richard Adams, a Trustee of the College, was appointed to solicit donations for the College with the understanding that it should be opened in Norwich.

Although there was no “follow-up” on the Norwich meeting, eastern Connecticut remained sullen, if not hostile, and the agent received no pledges. Brownell personally went to Norwich, New London and, while he was at it, to Middletown. In both New London and Norwich he received pledges from the “principal churchmen” and in Middletown he immediately added $500 to the “general” subscription and received a firm promise of two or three hundred more. By March, 1824, the “general” subscription amounted to about $10,000.

But beyond this “general” subscription, another $20,000 had to be raised before the College could be put into operation, and the location of the College would depend upon the result of the “particular” subscriptions. Bishop Brownell had great hope for a generous contribution from Hartford, and he urged that the Hartford district be canvassed first, for well he must have known the open purses of such men of Christ Church as Charles Sigourney, Samuel Tudor, and William H. Imlay, whose largess had always supplied the Diocesan charities. Certainly these men would be Washington College’s greatest hope.

In his hope for Hartford, Bishop Brownell was not to be disappointed. When Hartford’s “particular” subscription was opened, the list was headed by three pledges of $1,000 each by Tudor, Sigourney, and Imlay. David Watkinson and David Porter subscribed $500 each, and Caleb Pond and John Russ put their names in the book for $400. Two commercial houses, Stedman & Gordon and A. D. Cook & Sons, pledged $900 and $500, respectively. In all, the pledges in money amounted to $10,865. But what perhaps Bishop Brownell had not expected even in his most optimistic moods was the response from the artisans, laborers, and shopkeepers of Hartford, many of them not members of the Episcopal Church. Goods and services, translated into monetary value for the subscription list, were pledged in excess of $4,000, and the great variety of the skills and materials offered must have convinced everyone that the building of Washington Col-
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The locating of the College in Hartford was to be truly a community enterprise. Included in this amazing list were promises of bricks, lime, hay, timber, lumber, stone, seal skins, groceries, leather, window sashes, cards, gold leaf, nails, dry goods, paint, hardware, tin spouts, boots and shoes, fan lights, beef, hats, blacksmith work, bookbinding, mason work, carpenter work, plaster work, painting, joiners work, team work, paper hanging, cabinet work, lathe work, and just plain labor. How the College finally made use of several of these items would be an interesting speculation. These pledges “in kind” ranged from James M. Goodwin’s $150 worth of groceries to Amariah Knox’s dollar’s worth of labor. 59 Although over $600 of this part of the subscription was not collected — and even Amariah Knox defaulted on his “widow’s mite”60 — Hartford’s generosity seemed virtually to assure the town’s being chosen as the location of Washington College but, to make doubly sure of favorable action, the town fathers called a town meeting for Tuesday, April 20, 1824, to consider an appropriation of money for the purchase of land for the College. The attendance was unusually large, and the “debates for and against were numerous and long.” When the matter came to a vote, however, a large majority voted in favor of a grant of $5,000,61 and this brought the total of the Hartford pledge to almost $20,000.

The locating of the College in Hartford was no mere formality, for the other towns were still regarded as “in the running.” When the Trustees met in Middletown on Thursday, April 22, 1824, the Board at once addressed itself to this delicate problem. Representatives of the several towns put in their appearance at the meeting, and the Board decided to proceed at once to the selection of the College’s location. The town representatives appeared before the Board in person with written proposals for the completion of the endowment. Hartford, of course, was well prepared, but Middletown also put forth her claims and New Haven also (through Trustees Smith and Croswell) was not to be denied. The Trustees proceeded to debate the merits of the several claims, and the argument (which raged until 11:00 P.M.) was resumed the following morning at 7:30, only to end in a deadlock between Hartford and Middletown.62 The New Haven Trustees sought to resolve the impasse by moving the debate to neutral territory, and thus the meeting was adjourned to New Haven until May 6,63 when the Trustees were to make the final decision on the location of Washington College.64

When the Trustees met again in the Assembly Room in New Haven on May 6, 1824, John S. Peters, who had been delegated at Middletown to examine the proposals from Hartford and Middletown, presented a report in favor of Hartford. Whereupon Nathan Smith of New Haven
immediately made known that New Haven was still regarding herself as a contender, and that additional money had been promised to the New Haven subscription greatly in excess of the sum previously announced. The New Haven Trustees could point to the fact that the New Haven newspapers had intensified their campaign to have the College located in New Haven and that the Episcopal editor of the New Haven Pilot had chided both the New Haven townspeople and the College Trustees, the former for subscribing over $100,000 for the Farmington Canal and the latter for giving more consideration to the local subscription than to the desirability of location. The Pilot had argued that two colleges in New Haven would result in a healthy competition such as was found among the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge.65

The situation was further complicated by the rumor started in the pages of the Connecticut
Mirror that the townspeople of Wethersfield had offered the village green as the site of the College so as to compromise between Hartford and Middletown interests. The New Haven claim, however, was not seriously considered, and the rumor of Wethersfield's offer of a site for the College was discounted. When the ballot was taken, voting was along lines of local self-interest. Hartford received nine votes, Middletown received five, and New Haven received two, and the Trustees voted that whereas the sum of $30,000 had been raised it was to be paid to the Treasurer and that the College be established in the town of Hartford. Whereupon the Trustees proceeded to organize the institution.

In his letter to the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Church of England, Bishop Brownell had already signed himself as President, but the title was now formally bestowed upon him by vote of the Board of Trustees. Charles Sigourney was elected President of the Board of Trustees and Samuel Tudor was made Treasurer. Bishop
Brownell and Trustees Cushman and Wheaton were appointed to a committee to devise a course of study and to outline a plan for the government and discipline of the College. The Hartford Trustees were constituted a committee to advise and assist the President. President Brownell, John S. Peters, and Richard Adams were authorized to select the site of the College. And William H. Imlay, Samuel Tudor, and Michael Orcott were appointed to superintend the erection of the college buildings.68

Each committee set to work at once. The men appointed to select the site of the College chose a splendid tract on West Street fronting on Buckingham Street about one-hundred rods west of the South Meetinghouse.69 The college site, known in Hartford as the Whiting-Seymour place, was purchased for $4,000.70 The college grounds, somewhat expanded, are now occupied by the State Capitol and Library buildings.

The Building Committee at once solicited bids for the erection of a “College” (or dormitory) and a chapel.71 The architects secured by the Trustees were among the best of the day. The College (later to be called Jarvis Hall)72 was designed by Solomon Willard, who had drawn the plan for the Bunker Hill Monument73 and, according to Trinity tradition, the Chapel (later to be called Seabury Hall) was executed by Samuel F. B. Morse, known by later generations as the inventor of the telegraph but regarded in his own day as a skillful portrait painter.74

The “Curriculum Committee” of the Trustees prepared an outline of the course of studies, and a Prospectus, signed by Charles Sigourney as Secretary of the Board, was issued on August 10, 1824, and reprinted in the Connecticut Courant for September 7 of that year. The Prospectus announced the Faculty for the College, consisting of the Right Reverend Thomas Church Brownell, President; The Rev. George W. Doane, A.M., Professor of Belle Lettres and Oratory; Frederick Hall, A.M., Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy; Horatio Hickock, A.M., Professor of Agriculture and Political Economy; George Summer, M.D., Professor of Botany; and the Reverend Hector Humphreys, A.M., Tutor. Classes were scheduled to begin on September 23, 1824, but as the college buildings had scarcely been started by that date, instruction began in the basement of the Baptist Meeting House at Temple and Market Streets, and a private house on Main Street was taken over as a dormitory. Nine students – one senior, one sophomore, six freshmen, and one young man enrolled for a “partial course” – comprised the first student body.75

Washington College, an Episcopal College in Connecticut, was at last a reality. A dream had been realized.
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'born. 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 fools cap, 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 1820's. 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; 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. 28

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

I have been given you, Sir, as full a view of our ingenuity and laborious for the education of our citizens as can yet be given, much is left to be filled up of the remaining chapters of their history, of which a few verses only will be included in this discourse, the eye and use of 1824. I thank you for the report on the deaf and dumb, nothing can interest more the feelings of benevolence, as well as accident, has rendered in my opinion, to me, too laborious and painful, that I decline it as much as possible. But the subject of your letter is so very near my heart that I must offer it as an apology for so lengthy an answer, with every wish, therefore for the prosperity of your undertaking, be pleased to accept the assurance of my great esteem and respectful consideration.

W. Jefferson

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 out-numbered 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
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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.”

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 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.\textsuperscript{51} 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 \textit{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,\textsuperscript{52} 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,\textsuperscript{53} and graced at the front by a columned portico and at the rear by a square bell tower.\textsuperscript{54} 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."\textsuperscript{55} Although originally called simply the Chapel and the "College," in later years the Chapel (which also provided recitation rooms, library, and "cabinet")\textsuperscript{56} 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.\textsuperscript{57}

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 extremely popular in the United States. The Greeks were then engaged in their 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{58} 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
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 Burbanks, 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-
matics, 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 shame-facedly, the Trustees turned, as had been predictable, 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." 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.

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." 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, 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. 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.

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. 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." 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."

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. 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, and on February 7 he submitted his resignation to the Board of Trustees. Pyne was able to raise some funds, apparently for current operating expenses, and he generously declined any compensation for his services.

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.

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, 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."

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."

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."

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 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. . . ." 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. 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.

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.
Old College Days

The Carpenters had scarcely swept up the last of the woodshavings when the students moved into the new College in September of 1825. In contrast to the cramped quarters on Main Street, the building was both spacious and palatial. With fifty students to occupy a building designed to accommodate one hundred, there was little trouble involved in assigning rooms. Indeed, it was soon found that the rooms were not to be assigned—they were merely to be appropriated on a sort of first-come, first-served basis, with the upperclassmen claiming the upper floors and the Freshmen taking what were left on the ground floor.

Student rooms were 12 x 20 feet. Heat was provided by a small Franklin stove which rested on a hearth of bricks around which lay a pair of tongs, a fire shovel, and broom, poker, and bellows. Furniture, provided by the students themselves, consisted of a bed, several chairs, a bureau, a boot-jack, a table, and a bookshelf. Walls were hung with pictures according to the taste of the occupant, and one early student’s room boasted busts of both Washington and Franklin. The broad window seat was a sort of catch-all for the student’s collection of mineral specimens and his books, papers, dirty laundry, and umbrellas.

With their fresh paint and papered walls, the rooms in the new College had great potential for comfort. But half a hundred and more boys in their late teens could quickly make even the grandest of quarters look shabby, and so before two full generations of undergraduates had completed their four years at Washington College, the buildings were already showing signs of wear. Plaster had become stained and cracked, paint was chipped, and window-jams were badly splintered from students’ indulging in the forbidden sport of throwing logs in the rooms, hallways, and entries. As students had to provide their own furniture, most of them chose to purchase their necessary equipment at the lowest possible price. One either purchased what had been used by the previous occupant of the room (in this case much dilapidated) or else procured “reconditioned” furniture in town, which, except for several coats of varnish, was little better than that which passed from class to class without leaving the College.

Now it was hardly expected that the abodes of the Washington College undergraduates could have been models of order and cleanliness. Faculty supervision was lax, and janitorial service was practically non-existent. The Statutes of the College required that the Faculty live in the College and that they inspect the rooms regularly, but the regulation was one honored more in the breach than in the observance. In his farewell address, Bishop Brownell, virtually admitting that during his own administration he had been unable to enforce the letter of this law, announced that henceforth all officers of instruction would live either within the college walls or in the immediate vicinity. The College Catalogue for 1835 carried a similar statement, but escapades soon to be described suggest that the Faculty were never forced to implement the College Statutes.

What we would now call the “Buildings and Grounds Staff” consisted of three persons: an Irish gardener and two Negro janitors. None of
them was really efficient, and the janitors performed their duties in a most perfunctory manner. "Professor Jim," the "assistant janitor," or as he styled himself, "Professor of Dust and Ashes," had been a family servant in Bishop Brownell's household. James Williams, for that was his real name, entered the College's employ at the opening of the College and at first his duties were merely to ring the morning bell. Then, for a while, he divided his time between Bishop Brownell's house and the College, where it was his duty to sweep the rooms and each day make up some sixty beds. Professor Jim was a garrulous fellow and easily distracted. Professor Jim seldom got very far on his appointed rounds and the students themselves were obliged to sweep, carry water, and empty slop jars. For the Yankee students, this was a hardship; for the southern students, it was worse, for, used to having such services performed for them at home, they refused to accommodate themselves to the inadequacies of Professor Jim, and their rooms were notoriously dirty and smelly.

Almost from the beginning, the undergraduates divided themselves into cliques. At the top of the scale stood the young men from well-to-do (and usually Episcopalian) families, and it was they who "set a certain tone" to the College. A young New Yorker, who in the early 1830's identified himself with this group, described them as having some superficial polish, little interest in religion, and generally given to practical jokes, hazing of Freshmen, making life miserable for the Faculty, and "sustaining the traditional reputation of the roistering student." And, if we may believe the same self-styled "roisterer," it was these blades who were wont to steal out at night to drink in taverns or to hold bacchic sessions in their rooms where they mixed punch in washbasins and drank from soap-boats. It was doubtless the antics of this group which prompted the Connecticut Legislature to pass an act forbidding any person to give credit to any minor student at the College without the consent in writing of the student's parent or guardian or the officers of the College. Although violation carried a fine of $20.00 to $300.00, various tradesmen of the town succumbed to the persuasions of the "roisterers," and the "dead-beat" student had the advantage in that the tradesman and not the student had violated the law and it was impossible to collect.

At the bottom of the social scale of Washington undergraduates were the pre-theological students who were attending college on scholarships provided by the Church Scholarship Society. These fellows, contemptuously called the religiosi, were older than most of their classmates. Many of them had worked at trades before entering college, and it was believed by the other students that they had met with little success in their former callings and that they had decided to study for the priesthood merely to enjoy the bounty of the Scholarship Society. By their more worldly contemporaries, they were regarded as being boorish in their manners and slovenly in their appearance. They associated very little with the other students and kept much to their rooms.
In contrast to the fashionable dress of their juniors, the *religiosi* invariably wore long, loose gowns of printed calico to class, to chapel, and to their meals.12

In between these two extremes fell two other groups: the self-supporting pre-theological student who usually absented himself during the winter term to teach in a district school and the “solid citizen” of little social pretension and much scholarly ambition who at least set the *academic* “tone” if not the social.

But it probably was the “roisterer” rather than the “solid citizen” who set the tone of the College. Not that the pranks and practical jokes were essentially different from those perpetrated in Washington’s sister colleges, there probably was something just a bit different about the atmosphere of the campus on Hartford’s college hill. First, an Anglican college in Puritan Connecticut was something of an anachronism. Secondly, other than Harvard, Yale, and Brown, the other New England colleges were rural, and the students who attended Amherst and Williams were, themselves, mostly farm or village boys. The students at the country colleges shared something of the “reform spirit” which characterized the decades of the 182o’s and 183o’s, to say nothing of having been subjected to the supposedly restraining influence of the “revivals of religion” which occasionally swept over the college towns to the north.13 Of the young men at Washington College nothing of this sort was expected, and the occupants of Jarvis Hall did little to disappoint those who may have thought them well on the way to perdition.

Probably none of her rivals had so cosmopolitan a student body as had Washington College. In 1830, for example, of the eighty-six students, thirty-three were from Connecticut, six were from Massachusetts, five from Rhode Island, three from New Hampshire, two from Vermont, and one from Maine. Almost a third of the student body was from outside New England; nine were from New York, eight from North Carolina, four from Maryland, three each from Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, two each from South Carolina and Louisiana, one from Florida, and one from Greece.14 The twenty students from south of the Mason and Dixon Line exercised an influence altogether out of proportion to their number, and it has sometimes been assumed that it was the presence of the southern students at Washington College that, to a degree at least, set Washington College apart from Middlebury, Williams, or Amherst.15 Like Princeton, Washington College was considered “safe” by the southerners who feared an Abolitionist influence at the New England Congregationalist colleges. At Washington College slavery was not a topic of polite conversation, and the single Negro student who was enrolled during the early decades never associated with his fellows, receiving instruction in the evening at the professors’ homes and never appearing either at chapel or on any public occasion.16 In such an atmosphere, the young southerner could feel pretty much at home, and could even tolerate the inefficiency of “Professor Jim” and the persistence of the Puritan Sabbath to which the College was obliged to accommodate itself even to the extent of inscribing “No Admittance on Sundays” upon the college gates.17

Although the college rules were severe, discipline was laxly enforced.18 Students were, to be sure, admonished,19 rusticated,20 and dismissed,21 but offenders were usually given the benefit of every doubt. Both Bishop Brownell and his successor, Dr. Wheaton, have been described as firm yet patient.22 Remembered episodes will suggest, however, that both were probably more patient than firm.

The college calendar was one which invited trouble. The academic year was divided into three terms. The fall term began in late September and had a recess of two weeks from the Thursday preceding Christmas. In the spring term there was a three-week recess from the Thursday preceding the twelfth of April. Summer term ended with Commencement the first Wednesday in August.23 It was during the summer term that most of the trouble occurred, and it was usually on Saturday afternoon before sundown when the Puritan Sabbath settled down on Hartford that groups of students ran afoul of
the law both on Main Street and on the campus. The summer of 1828 was one of particular disturbance. Students had committed what the authorities described as "great depredations" in Hartford, and the magistrates had subpoenaed every student to purge himself by oath. The magistrates received the full cooperation of the Faculty, and all of the undergraduates except Hugh Peters, the son of Judge Peters, the College Trustee, complied. The students who had obeyed the summons may have perjured themselves during their appearance at court, and by the time they returned to campus student feelings were at a very high pitch, and much resentment was felt that the Faculty had supported the law rather than the students. Immediately the undergraduates barricaded the two college buildings. The Faculty rose to the occasion and attempted to dislodge the defenders. Bishop Brownell succeeded in breaking down a door with a fence post, but when Professor Doane was showered with unmentionable refuse thrown from an upper-story window, the Faculty withdrew. At the usual time the bell rang for Evening Prayer, the students filed into the Chapel, and that was the end of the whole affair. This was at least one occasion on which the good Bishop was patient. Perhaps the want of any organized program of what would now be called Physical Education may have contributed to the riotous activity on College Hill. There were, of course, no organized sports, but occasionally the students themselves provided entertainment less destructive than the episode just described. Among the oldest of the college traditions was "Burning Conic Sections," a "secret" ritual performed by the Sophomores at midnight after the end of the first term. The course in Conic Sections was the "Jonah" of the Junior or Mathematical year, and the course was the one with the greatest mortality rate in the College. At first the ceremonial may have consisted merely of consigning a copy of the textbook to a funeral pyre, but with each year the ritual became more elaborate. Additions were made to the ceremony and each "Burning" became more splendid. A song was always composed for the occasion, and two stanzas of the
soften the feelings against Conic Sections, and the song for 1855 (rendered in both Latin and English to the tune of “Happy Are We To-night”) was even more deprecatory:

Come, stand up in a circle,
Ye gay and happy Sophs!
Old Conics now is burning,
The darling of the Profss;
He loved to call us classmates from
Our beds at early morn;
But now, he, dead and smoking hot,
To Hades will be Borne.

CHORUS
Happy are we to-night, Sophs,
Happy, happy are we,
Conics has taken his flight, Sophs,
And we shall jovial be.27

Actually, the young men on College Hill had a definite aversion to formal games. Croquet was regarded as beneath the dignity of college students,28 and baseball, basketball, football, and soccer were not yet invented. In summer the students bathed in the “Hog,” as they named the Little River which flowed by the foot of the hill, and several of the more venturesome sailed on the “Hog” in small boats.29 In the fall, and despite the proscription of firearms, an occasional student went hunting in the nearby hills. In winter there was some skating on the “Hog” and on the Connecticut into which it flowed, and on really cold winters skaters sometimes ventured as far as Middletown. One student, Park Benjamin 1829, owned a horse and rode daily.30

Perhaps the Washington students exercised no less than those of other American colleges of the time. In comparison with the students at the English universities, however, moralists thought that the Washington men (and, for that matter, all
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American collegians) came off badly. In 1829, Nathaniel Wheaton noted in the Episcopal Watchman that while he was in England he had been impressed by the importance which was attached to such outdoor sports as rowing. It was his further observation that the Oxford or Cambridge undergraduate was much more healthy than his American counterpart and was much less fraught with the ills, mental and physical, which result from too sedentary a life. The editor of the Watchman suggested that had Wheaton turned from the river banks of Oxford and Cambridge to the "silent chambers of the more diligent students" he might have found there, too, some who could have profited by his advice. It is seriously to be doubted, however, that the editor intended to imply that the Washington undergraduates were more interested in work than in play. At any rate, the sedentary life seemed to agree with the students, for the College Catalogue for 1835 boasted that "in evidence of the salubrity of the climate [of Hartford],... during the ten years the [College] premises have been occupied, no death has occurred among the inmates."32

The inattention of the students' physical exercise, it must now be pointed out, was rather by default than by design. The original plan for the College called for considerable outdoor activity, for it was hoped that students would work actively in farm and garden and would learn Surveying and Mineralogy through direct outdoor experience. And not only that — Bishop Brownell had hoped that military exercises and drill would find an important place in the curriculum. In his early planning, the Bishop had sought to engage a Professor of Mathematics and Engineering who had been trained at West Point "with a view of his employing the students in military exercises, during a portion of their leisure hours; as conducive to their health, and as subservient to their better government."33 Now the Bishop did not have in mind just any officer who had been trained at West Point. Specifically he meant to engage, if possible, Captain Alden Partridge, who was not only a graduate of the United States Military Academy but who had been professor and superintendent (1815-1817) at West Point before he opened his own military school, the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy, at Norwich, Vermont. And Brownell had more in mind than the mere securing of a Professor of Mathematics and Engineering; he hoped to engage Captain Partridge for Washington College and at the same time acquire the Captain's already-assembled student body. Early in 1824 Brownell visited Captain Partridge in Vermont and made the Captain an offer of appointment,34 but the Captain had other plans. Partridge moved to Connecticut and he brought his students with him — not to Hartford, but to nearby Middletown where on August 22, 1825, the Literary, Scientific, and Military Institute reopened with nineteen faculty and two hundred cadets.35

The independent opening of Captain Partridge's school so close to Washington College did not necessarily preclude the merging of the two institutions or of Partridge's ultimately joining the Washington Faculty, and the College kept the Professorship of Mathematics open until 1828 when the Reverend Horatio Potter was appointed Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.36 In the meantime, Captain Partridge had attempted to secure a college charter for his school. Failing in this, he returned in 1829 to Vermont, where the Institute was subsequently chartered as Norwich University.37

Bishop Brownell certainly had no intention of making Washington College a mere military academy or even something approximating Captain Partridge's Institute, and it was probably the Bishop's respect for Partridge as an individual which led him to plan for military drill at the College. If Captain Partridge would not come to Washington College, Washington College would not have military drill. And yet, if military drill were to have value under the Captain, it must have some merit without him. Bishop Brownell could not quite dispel the idea. The first Prospectus announced that military exercises would "be embraced in the system, as a healthful occupation for some of the hours usually devoted to recreation," and that "as a further preventative
to extravagance, and to promote a proper esprit de corps and responsibility of character, an uniform dress will be prescribed; and after the first of May next, no other dress will be permitted to be worn in the College.”

As was true of so many of Bishop Brownell’s not-too-carefully-laid plans, the uniform dress was not adopted. The fops wore their brocaded waistcoats and the religiosi their calico gowns. For a while it seemed that the idea of military exercise, too, would be abandoned. During the College’s first year on Main Street there were no facilities for drill, and by the time of the removal to College Hill, the character of the College as “non-military” had become fixed. In 1826, the Connecticut Legislature passed a bill exempting from military service the President, the Professors, the undergraduates, and all graduates residing in Hartford until taking their second (Master’s) degrees. But this exception in no way reflected a pacifist spirit, for Bishop Brownell, despite the loss of Captain Partridge’s services, had gone ahead with a more restricted plan for military drill and had organized the “Washington College Phalanx” shortly after instruction had begun on the new campus. The Phalanx was a sort of military company, or what would now be called a “drill team,” the members of which carried pikes and wore uniforms consisting of at least plumed caps. The Phalanx’s first appearance in Hartford was in the Fourth of July parade in 1826. In June of 1833, President Andrew Jackson visited Hartford, and his tour of the city included a brief glimpse of the College. The Phalanx was not among the score or more of military companies which marched in the parade which was the high point in Hartford’s elaborate welcome, but the College’s military company had the honor of escorting the President of the United States from the State House to the Presidential boat at the time of his departure from the city.

From the Phalanx emerged a more formal company, the “Washington College Archers.” This group came into being about 1834 and comprised a considerable portion of the student body. The “Archers” wore striking uniforms, “modeled,” as contemporary description had it, “somewhat after the Swiss.” Green turbans with black plumes and green frocks and white trousers represented the first use of the old Washington College colors - green and white. The officers, who were elected by the members, wore swords at their belts. The “cadets” carried long bows of lance-wood and black quivers filled with arrows. Dashing fellows were these! Each summer the Archers marched in parades in Hartford and in nearby towns, and everywhere they appeared they caught the eyes of the local belles. The Archers so impressed Thomas H. Seymour, then a resident of Hartford and later to become Governor of Connecticut, that he assumed responsibility for instructing the company in “fancy movements.”

The uniform of the Phalanx and the “Archers” was worn only on parade and it never threatened to become the uniform of the College. Only once was there anything approaching an attempt at uniform dress— and that by the students themselves and with rather ludicrous results. In the late 1830’s, at the suggestion of Richard Henry Kil lip, an English student briefly in residence at the College, the Oxford cap was introduced to the campus. Suddenly becoming sensitive to the niceties of academic attire, the students adopted the cap as the ordinary wear for the campus. Soon it was worn both on campus and in town, where it incensed the youth of the city. To deflate the aristocratic pretensions of the young academics, several young men of Hartford hired a “burly Negro topped with a monster Oxford cap, to follow the sauntering students, whenever they appeared in academic cap.” With that, the short-lived fad came to an end.

No American college in the first half of the nineteenth century would have thought itself worthy of the name of college without its having at least one literary society, and Washington College was, if anything, “collegiate.” While an undergraduate at Brown, Bishop Brownell had been a member of the Philermenian Society, a secret society with a membership limited to forty-five. This group was primarily a literary and debating society, and Brownell had always been proud
of his membership in the Philermenian. While on the faculty of Union College, Brownell had also been elected to Phi Beta Kappa as an alumni member. Professor Doane, too, had had pleasant association with literary groups, for before his coming to Washington College he had belonged to two debating societies in New York City: the Greenwich Club and the New York Literary and Philological Society. Late in 1824, Bishop Brownell formed a committee consisting of Professor Doane and three undergraduates to plan a society which might offer the students something of the opportunity for debate which both he and the Professor of Belles Lettres and Oratory had enjoyed. The committee drew up plans for a literary and debating society which formally came into being on June 4, 1825, as the Athenaeum Society. At its first meeting, a seal, motto, and constitution were adopted, and sixteen undergraduates, Bishop Brownell, Professor Doane, Professor Humphreys, and Dr. Sumner were constituted the society's membership. The constitution declared the purpose of the society to be "the literary improvement of its members, especially in Declamation, Composition, and Extemporaneous Debate" and, in a college in which the opportunities for diversion were so limited, the appeal to the students was immediate. In 1826, the society received official recognition by College Statute, when the Faculty declared that "the literary society, styled 'the Washington College Athenaeum,' is hereby recognized; and no new society shall be established in the College, without permission of the Faculty."

But faculty recognition did not confer exclusive rights to the direction of the undergraduate literary and forensic activity of the College. In 1827, nineteen men withdrew from Athenaeum to form a friendly rival, the Parthenon Society. This was done, of course, with full faculty approval, for on American college campuses during this period two societies usually existed side-by-side, and it was in this friendly rivalry that the societies were stimulated to strive for excellence.

Membership in the societies was virtually open to all comers, and most of the undergraduates found their way into one or the other. Faculty were admitted as honorary members, each society receiving the new appointees in turn. Both societies elected honorary members from beyond the Washington College community. Athenaeum was partial to Bishops, and her Honorarii included Bishops De Lancey, Philander Chase, McIvaine, Whittingham, B. T. Onderdonk, Eastburn, McCorsky, Carlton Chase, Henshaw, and Freeman. The rolls of Parthenon were graced by the names of political leaders including James Madison, Henry Clay, Harrison G. Otis, Daniel Webster, and Isaac T. Tocquey.

The literary societies maintained club rooms (or halls) in Jarvis. Here were housed the libraries which the societies gathered. By 1844, Athenaeum had accumulated well over one thousand volumes, among which were the usual religious, historical, and philosophical works and a considerable collection of poetry, dramatic works, novels, tales, and romances, areas in which the College Library was rather weak. Although the use of the society library was theoretically limited to the society membership, the College regarded the society collections as an integral part of the College Library and, until at least the Civil War, the combined society collections exceeded that of the regular College Library in size.

Saturday morning was "Society Morning," for on that day the schedule of classes included only the recitation following the Morning Prayer and preceding breakfast. The long Saturday morning (9:00 to noon), on other days taken up with study and classes, was set aside for the weekly meetings of Athenaeum and Parthenon at which papers were read and at which the members engaged in debate on literary, social, and political topics of the day. Only religion was not regarded as a proper subject for debate or discussion. On Saturday afternoon there were debates between the societies, and in alternate years the societies held "Exhibitions" — Parthenon two days before Commencement in August, and Athenaeum in early April — consisting of Latin orations, English declamations, poetry, and satire.

In these "old college days," other societies
than the Athenaeum and Parthenon flourished with faculty sponsorship and encouragement. In 1826, under the direction of Professor Doane, a "large proportion" - as Doane put it - "of the undergraduates formed themselves into a society styled 'the Washington College Association Auxiliary to the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.'" Dues were $1.00 per year, and the members were expected to solicit donations for the Seminary. Although the financial situation at the College at that time would have suggested soliciting funds for Washington College rather than General Seminary, the object of the "Auxiliary" was not entirely disinterested, for it was expected that the money contributed from Washington College would be used for a scholarship to be enjoyed by an alumnus of the College.60

The "Auxiliary" lasted but a short while, and its place was soon taken by the Missionary Society which was founded in 1831. This society was to have an influence far beyond the Washington College campus, for from the Washington College Missionary Society, through the efforts of Augustus Foster Lyde of the Class of 1830, came the establishment of the Foreign and Domestic Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the first president of which was George Benton of the Class of 1833. The Missionary Society met weekly "for religious exercises, serious reading, and the discussion of theological subjects." Each year "a considerable fund" was "raised and applied to missionary objects."61
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HABITS OF LITERARY MEN.

The habits of men, in the different ages and varied circumstances of life, constitute a distinguished feature in their history. In whatever employment we are engaged, habits of one kind or other are sure to be formed. They steal upon us unnoticed, and like the lapse of time, unmarked, save by the changes they effect. In the
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The Missionary Society had a history of "ups and downs," but it at least existed until 1920, no mean record for any student organization. Of much shorter duration was the Temperance Society, which in 1835 made its appearance on the Washington Campus and which, for a while, included, according to an official report, "most of the students."62

In these "old college days," Washington College had her "Golden Age" of student journalism in the regrettably short-lived *Hermethenean,*63 publication of which was announced on July 22, 1833. In a *Prospectus* of that date it was announced that the *Hermethenean* would be published monthly by a number of undergraduates of the College, and that the journal of thirty-two pages per number would "be devoted to the encouragement of youthful talent, the cultivation of refined taste, and the promotion of polite literature." Seldom have editors more faithfully kept their promises to the public. The first issue (October, 1833) contained several pieces of fiction, verse, and "Literary Notices." The second issue (November, 1833) included several argumentative essays ("English Poets of the Fifteenth Century" and "Thoughts on Education"), in addition to stories and poems. The fifth and final issue (February, 1834) was honored by the contribution of a poem by Mrs. Lydia Huntley Sigourney, "the Sweet Singer of Hartford," and wife of Trustee Charles Sigourney.

Whatever its literary merits, the *Hermethenean* was not a financial success. The price was one dollar per volume of six issues, payable upon delivery of the third number, and perhaps too few dollars were received. It is hoped that the earnest young men did not suffer too great a loss in settling their account with the printer.

From the beginning, the Faculty of the College had encouraged academic excellence, albeit in ways which may seem strange to us now. To a considerable degree this was the purpose, so far as the Faculty was concerned, of the literary societies, and so it was, too, of the *Hermethenean.* Much of what would now be called "academic ceremonial" revolved about literary and oral expression. Bishop Brownell was deeply attached to the discipline of Belles Lettres, the object of which he conceived to be the cultivation of the art of expressing one's "thoughts with clearness, strength, and elegance."64 Most of the College's public occasions consisted chiefly of putting the students "through their paces" in oral literary expression. In 1826, the Faculty ordered that "premiums will be offered for excellence in the particular branches of scholarship, and in the performance of such literary exercises as may from time to time be appointed."65

An early manifestation of this competitive academic exercise was the "Junior Exhibition," the first of which was held in the College Chapel on August 3, 1826. Juniors who had debated in Athenaeum were now to be put to the test before an audience, and the crowd which came to witness the performance was large. Professor Doane had taught his students well, but the fine points of elocution were perhaps lost on some of the observers and hearers. A reporter for the *Connecticut Mirror* gave what was perhaps the first critical review of a literary performance at the College. "We were somewhat surprised," he wrote, "that the speakers should so soon have got the peculiar tone and gesture of Collegians - the falling inflection at the end of every period - that sameness of tone and monotony of gesture that shew how much the fear of an audience injures the interest which the speaker takes in his own theme. . . . The exhibit certainly did great credit to the instructors as teachers, and to the performers as scholars, but not to the scholars as performers."66

This epigrammatic "damning with faint praise" may not have pleased the orators, but it could hardly have discouraged them. Junior Exhibition had taken the place of a College Commencement for that year, and the college custom came to include Junior Exhibition as part of the Commencement festivities, being held the day preceding graduation on the first Wednesday in August. Academic ceremonial has a way of becoming increasingly elaborate, and the Junior Exhibition at Washington College was no exception. Not content to recite in their "Sunday best," the Juniors rented black silk gowns from Mr. Stockbridge,
Hartford’s modish tailor. The gowns were of the design worn by doctors and had full “pudding sleeves.” The custom of wearing gowns was pleasing to all of the undergraduates except John Bernard Gilpin of the Class of 1831, an English student who asserted his superiority over his fellow students by parading his sensitivity to the academic incongruity. 67

Junior Exhibition was also another occasion for sophomore pranks. In addition to the regular printed program for the Exhibition, the Sophomores distributed “mock programs,” some of which represented the ultimate in sophomoric crudity. 68 Perhaps it was to offset this rude sport of the Sophomores that public competition for prizes in declamation was instituted for the Freshman and Sophomore Classes in 1827. 69

Until 1845, when the College received a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, the declamation prizes, plus the senior salutatory and valedictory honors, were the only means of academic recognition. Phi Beta Kappa was, of course, a coveted honor,
and for some while after the chapter’s organization the upper third of the rising Senior Class was admitted to the society. Again, incidentally, even sacred Phi Beta Kappa became the object of parody, for the lowest third of the class formed its own “dishonor” society, Kappa Beta Phi, the motto of which was “Probability the Guide of Life.”

But the formal student groups of the “old college days” – the Athenaean, the Parthenon, the Missionary Society, and the Temperance Society – were just a bit too tame to fully satisfy the Washington collegians, and soon secret societies found their way to the campus. Perhaps the earliest of these archetypical fraternities was that known as Theta Beta Phi, which was begun at least as early as 1828. The membership in Theta Beta Phi was largely, if not entirely, made up of students from the southern states and, at a Society “Exhibition” held on December 18, 1828, the eleven “performers” were all from the South: six from North Carolina, two from Maryland, and one each from Virginia, South Carolina, and Louisiana. In 1829, I.K.A. was organized, and this group ultimately became Delta Phi, which at Washington College (and later Trinity) made the claim of being the oldest local fraternity in the country. In 1832, a rival society, Phi Kappa, was organized. Phi Kappa, too, had a large number of southern students, particularly from North Carolina and was sometimes called the “Great Southern Society.” It has even been suggested that Phi Kappa was a re-organization of Theta Beta Phi. In 1877, Phi Kappa became a local chapter of Alpha Delta Phi. The fourth secret society of the “old college days” was the Black Book, founded in 1842 with the stated purpose of the “promotion of scholarship and friendly relations.” This group, as was probably true of other societies, was literary as well as social in purpose, and at least a portion of each society meeting was devoted to delivering orations on classical and literary subjects and to discussion of theological and philosophical prob-
lems. Black Book, also known as Beta Beta, became a chapter of Psi Upsilon in 1892.  
Membership in the Washington College fraternities was small. Between 1835 and 1859, Phi Kappa admitted an average of six students per year, as few as one, and as many as eleven. The societies began as upper-class groups, but eventually Freshmen were permitted to join. As may have been expected, the fraternity men were the more prominent of the campus leaders.

With the fraternities, the literary societies, the rude pranks of the Sophomores, the “Archers,” and the do-it-yourself brand of sports, life on College Hill could hardly have been dull. Although Robert Tomes, one of the College’s most ungrateful sons, wrote in later years that he “would gladly have dropped a veil of oblivion over those important but wasted years,” his account of the “old college days” more than suggests that they were far from unpleasant.

The four years on College Hill culminated (if the years were well spent) in graduation at the Commencement held the first Thursday in August. Although lacking in the almost carnival atmosphere of a Yale or Harvard “Graduation Day,” Commencement at Washington College was a gala affair. The College had no auditorium large enough to accommodate any sizeable group. Seabury Hall was technically the College Chapel, and during the first years on the Hill that building was called by the more informal name. Only one room, however, (and that but 35 by 50 feet) was used as the Chapel, and the rest of the building was taken up with classrooms, the library, and the cabinet (or museum). Christ Church would have been the logical place to hold graduation exercises, but by the time of the first Commencement on August 1, 1827, the original building of Christ Church was in a bad state of repair, and ground had scarcely been broken for the new structure. In a gracious gesture of inter-church comity, Central Congregational Church offered the use of their spacious building.

August 1, 1827, was a beautiful summer day. At about 9:00 A.M., the academic procession formed at the State House, and shortly thereafter a concourse consisting of the students, the candidates for degrees, Trustees, Faculty, the governor and lieutenant-governor of the state of Connecticut, and “an extended retinue of Clergy, Citizens, and Strangers” made its way to the brick Central Church. The large crowd which had already gathered was treated to a voluntary on the organ, prayer by Bishop Brownell, a Latin salutatory address, an English oration, a selection of music, a disputatio on Roman Catholicism in Ireland, several more musical selections, more orations and another voluntary on the organ. But that was not all; an afternoon session followed, and again there were organ voluntaries and other musical selections, an English salutatory address, disputations, orations, a dialogue, the conferring of academic degrees (ten bachelor’s degrees in course, one A.B. out of course, two A.M. degrees, and an honorary LL.D. on Governor Gideon Tomlinson), an address by the Right Reverend President, a valedictory oration, an Episcopal Benediction, and a final organ voluntary.

The fourteen recipients of degrees on August 1, 1827, were the first Alumni of Washington College but one, for already the College had an honorary alumnus, the Right Reverend Alexander Jolly, Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness, who was voted a Doctorate in Divinity by the Trustees on April 26, 1826.

On August 7, 1828, the Washington College Commencement was again held in Central Congregational Church. Again there was the imposing procession from the State House and morning and afternoon exercises of orations, music, and prayers. Commencement for 1829, held on August 6 in Central Church, was marked by the large number of out-of-state visitors who included the Bishop of Ohio, the Reverend Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Reverend Professor of Biblical Literature in the General Theological Seminary. By the fall of 1830, the new Christ Church had been completed and for many years thereafter Commencement was held there, and despite the considerable inconvenience, the parishioners of
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Order of Exercises.

VOLUNTARY.

Prayers by the President.

Latin Salutatory: and
English Oration, — "Genius," 1
J. H. Williams, New York.

"Light of the Dark Ages;"
John Scarborough, New York.

The Barbarism of the 19th Century,
Rufus Emery, Massachusetts.

MUSIC.

 Hear Us, Songs by URL.

Christianity and Civilization,

The Spasmodic School in Poetry,
C. S. Leffingwell, Ohio.

Relics of our Heroic Age,
G. A. Easton, California.

MUSIC.

Quartetto... Young Men's, by Kreutzer.

The Passionless and the Impassioned Man,
John Milton Peck, Massachusetts.

* = =
J. H. Williams, Connecticut.

The Profession of Medicine,
J. Hooper Dick, Pennsylvania.

MUSIC.

The Peals of the Lion by Beethoven.

The Philosophy of Ruins,
Townsend Scudder, New York.

"Nothing New;"
James M. Hicks, Vermont.

The Coming Age,

MUSIC.

The Song, by Kreutzer.

The Jesuits in the Early History of North America,
J. H. Hodges, Vermont.

* = =
David Gregg, New York.

*Readed from speaking.

Loyalty,
Samuel Hall, Connecticut.

MUSIC.

Quartetto... Strong Questions, by Kreutzer.

Symbolism of Nature,
Cornelius B. Smith, New York.

The Arts of Life: and Valedictory,
George B. Johnson, Connecticut.

Masters' Oration.

The Laws of the XII. Tables,
Mr. Charles J. Hoadey, Connecticut.

MUSIC.

My Country, by Kreutzer.

Degrees Conferred.

Music, Old Hundredth.

Prayers by the President.

Benediction by the Chancellor.

Concluding Voluntary.

Early Commencement Program
Christ Church were always proud hosts. The new Christ Church was a stone Gothic structure with stained glass windows and beautiful appointments. Each year, however, the churchly appearance was altered by the erection of a large platform which covered both altar and pulpit, and upon this platform sat the Trustees, the Faculty, and the student speakers.85

The Washington College Commencement was the social high point of the summer for proper Hartford and, as such, it became the occasion for the display of the latest in feminine fashions. In announcing the graduation to be held at Christ Church on August 4, 1831, the Connecticut Courant suggested that "it would be very desirable that the Ladies, who design to attend the exercises at the Church, would, in conformity to the practice at Cambridge and other places on such occasions, prepare themselves to lay aside the unwieldy bonnet of modern fashion for a headdress of more commodious dimensions, and which, if the day be hot, as at this season must be expected, it will be as much for their own comfort to do, as it will contribute to the convenience of other spectators."86 We can imagine the disappointment which must have been caused by the postponement of the Commencement of 1832 because of the cholera epidemic.87

Commencement time was one for the exchange of academic courtesies, and the faculty of other
colleges who were in town for the occasion were invited to march in the procession with the Washington Faculty. 88

On August 3, 1831, an Association of the Alumni was formed, and one of the first A.B.'s of the College, Isaac Edwin Crary '27, was elected president. 89 To the "Commencement Week" activities, the Association of the Alumni added a business meeting, held in the College Chapel at 11:00 A.M. the day before Commencement, and an afternoon session in Christ Church at which an Anniversary Sermon was preached and an Anniversary Poem was read. 90 Both readers were distinguished graduates of the College, and more often than not they were clergy. The Commencement festivities, from 1831, were brought to a grand conclusion with a Commencement Ball held on the evening of Commencement in one of the public halls in Hartford. 91
Some institutions are regarded as the projection of the shadow of a single man. Kenyon College was, for example, the creation of Bishop Chase, and the entire history of that institution has reflected the personality of the founder. Williams was influenced for more than a century by the educational philosophy of Mark Hopkins. Brown will probably always reflect to some degree the influence of Francis Wayland. And Union has always borne the identifiable stamp of Eliphalet Nott.

Washington College (and later Trinity) has never been the reflection of a single personality. Presidential tenure has generally been comparatively short, but as every president of the institution has been a communicant of the Episcopal Church and as eleven of the first twelve presidents have been clergymen of this Church, the stamp placed upon the College has been that of an ecclesiastical body rather than that of an individual.

To be sure, each president has had his influence so far as the immediate circumstances of the College were concerned, but most of these influences reflect as much an accommodation to the academic spirit of the times as they do the personal interests of the presidents. In 1893, Bernard C. Steiner in his History of Education in Connecticut accurately indicated the influence of the several presidents of Washington College so far as curricular emphasis was concerned. Bishop Brownell, it will be remembered, attempted to fashion a course of study which would be responsive to the needs of a nation which was rather timidly moving toward urbanization and industrialization, and this he endeavored to achieve through placing Mathematics and the Natural Sciences on at least an equality with the traditionally respected Classics. Nathaniel Wheaton (1831-1837), although himself an excellent Classical scholar, followed Bishop Brownell's policy of developing the mathematical and scientific departments. Silas Totten (1837-1848) paid greater attention to Political Economy, Constitutional History, and International Law. John Williams (1845-1853) re-directed attention to the Classics and gave the study of Languages the same attention as that given primarily to Philosophy and the Sciences. Daniel Raynes Goodwin (1853-1860) gave impetus to the Modern Languages, and Samuel Eliot (1860-1864) and Abner Jackson (1867-1874) gave greater encouragement to History and Philosophy, respectively. The institutional history of the College, as we shall soon see, was largely a step-by-step accommodation of curricula to changing times and a re-defining of the institution's educational philosophy. That this should have been true would in no sense make Washington College unique, for this process is the history of all higher education in America. But what is unique in the story of Washington (Trinity) College is that at any point in the College's history the officers of the institution could declare their own educational ideals to be the same as those of the college founders—and that without any real mental reservation.

The first course of study for the A.B. degree under which instruction at Washington College began was unusual but not revolutionary. The Partial Course, although revolutionary, failed from the beginning to fulfill its expectations. Both were intended as "practical" approaches to
higher education, but one course (the Arts Course) was soon revised, and the other (the Partial Course) never attracted any large number of students. Popular prejudice against “book farming” doomed the course in Agriculture to early failure, and students interested in the serious pursuit of scientific studies found the regular degree course of sufficient scientific emphasis to satisfy their tastes. Occasionally, a student used the Partial Course as one preparatory to the study of Medicine, but admission requirements at even the best medical schools were so low that no back-door course was even necessary. The “English Diploma” of the Partial Course was occasionally granted, but the diploma seems to have carried no particular prestige, and its recipients were not listed among the graduates of the College. Few students enrolled for the Partial Course and, although in 1839 the course was made still more “Partial” by permitting a one-year program consisting of junior and senior subjects, the offering still found few takers. And for the academic standards of the College this was, perhaps, just as well, for with the requirements for admission to the Partial Course virtually nonexistent, those who elected this program could have contributed little to classroom recitation.

Before the completion of the College’s first academic year, the Trustees had decided that a revision of the A.B. course was necessary, and the Faculty were instructed to make recommendations for changes in the curriculum. The Faculty undertook the proposed revision, and a new course of study was submitted to the Trustees a year later. The Trustees approved the changes, which were more or less in keeping with the Trustees’ emphasis on the “practical” and the “useful.” Essentially, the curricular revision represented a substitution of courses in Modern Languages for several of the Mathematics courses of the junior year and the introduction of French in the first term of the freshman year. In announcing the addition of the courses to the public, the Trustees particularly emphasized the value of Spanish because of American commercial interest in South America and the West Indies.

Instruction in the Modern Languages was far from common in the American colleges at this time and, even at Washington, French and Spanish were not quite accepted as the equals of the older disciplines, even though both languages could then be offered toward graduation. M. P. Gellineau, who was hired as “teacher” of French and Spanish, was really an adjunct to the Faculty in that he was regarded as neither Professor nor Tutor and thus had no faculty status. Furthermore, M. Gellineau received no salary, and students who elected the Modern Languages paid the teacher for the instruction in addition to the regular term fees which were paid to the College Bursar. The teacher of French and Spanish attempted to augment his meager “take” in student fees by offering Spanish instruction to the public but, as literate Hartford apparently did not share the College’s belief in the importance of Modern Languages, M. Gellineau soon left the city, and instruction in French and Spanish at Washington College came virtually to an end. For several years the College Catalogue carried the option of Modern Languages as a substitute for Junior Mathematics and the required freshman course in French, even though the courses were seldom actually taught. In 1828, the Trustees authorized the Standing Committee to employ an Instructor in Modern Languages at a stipend not to exceed $200 per year but, because of the paltry salary offered, no instructor could be found. In 1831, M. Joseph De Noris came to the College as “teacher” of French as an “optional” course for which the students were to pay a fee not to exceed $10.00 per term. When it is remembered that the tuition fee at that time was but $11.00 per term for the entire regular course of study, it is easy to explain De Noris’ early departure from College Hill. The Trustees, too, had come to doubt the necessity of French as a part of the regular curriculum, and in 1831 they had specifically designated French as an optional course, such it remained until 1849. Until the appointment of Charles H. Berlin as Instructor in French in 1852 and of the
Reverend Daniel R. Goodwin as President and Hobart Professor of Modern Languages and Literature in 1853, French was taught—when it was taught—by adjunct teachers without faculty status or by Professors from other departments. Spanish was occasionally taught in the same fashion, and it was not until the twentieth century that credit was given for the study of that language.22

Several other curricular changes were made from time to time, some of which were designed to utilize the services of persons then available to the College, and some of which reflected the general educational trend. In 1830, courses in Modern Greek were introduced, and the College made the probably accurate claim that Washington College was the only institution of the higher learning in the United States in which such instruction was then being offered.

Hartford, it will be remembered, was one of the most active centers in the enthusiasm for the Greeks in their struggle for independence, and the Hartford townspeople had been notably generous in their support of charities for Greek relief. Indeed, much of this pro-Greek feeling was generated by those who were connected with the College either as Faculty or Trustees. Bishop Brownell, even before he had come to Hartford at the opening of the College, had "sponsored" several Greek refugees. Professor Doane had translated the "Greek War Song" of Rigas Phe­ raisios, the proto-martyr of Greek independence, and had included the translation in his own book of verse, Songs by the Way. Professor Hall was in correspondence with American missionaries in the Levant and with officers of the Mediterranean Squadron of the United States Navy, and the Professor of Mineralogy was especially proud of the specimens of Greek minerals in the collection which had been sent to him by his friends. But it was the Sigourneys—Trustee Charles, and his wife Lydia Huntley—who were instrumental in giving the College its brief day of glory as the Athens of America.23

Mrs. Sigourney was secretary of the Women's Committee for Greek Relief in Hartford, and in 1826 the Committee had gathered a large quantity of clothing and other necessities to send to Greece. The good ladies of Hartford had composed a "Letter from the Ladies of Hartford, in Connecticut, to the Ladies of Greece" which was to accompany the gift, and to translate the letter into modern Greek, Mrs. Sigourney called upon Gregory Perdicaris, a young man of twenty-four who had come to America in 1826 and who was then teaching at the Mount Pleasant Classical Institution in Amherst, Massachusetts. Young Perdicaris obligingly translated the letter which was taken with the gifts to Greece by Judge Samuel Woodruff of Granby, Connecticut.24

In Greece, Judge Woodruff met Demetrios Stamatiadis, a refugee from Samos, and so impressed was he with the young man's qualities that he arranged to have Stamatiadis live with the Sigourneys while continuing his education in Hartford. In March, 1829, Stamatiadis came to the Sigourney home, and in the fall of that year he was admitted to the Sophomore Class at Washington College. In 1832, Stamatiadis was graduated from the College with the A.B. degree.25

Meanwhile, Perdicaris had cultivated his friendship with the Sigourneys, and his friendship was to prove his means of professional advancement. In 1830, he was given an honorary A.M. degree by the College, and with the opening of the fall term of that year he was appointed to the Faculty as Tutor in Greek.26 For a while Perdicaris was the sensation of Hartford. Frequently he was invited to address public gatherings, and once he gave an immensely popular series of lectures on "The Moral and Intellectual History of Modern Greece" in the lecture room of Central Congregational Church.27 In the larger academic world, too, Perdicaris created quite a stir. At the Second Literary Convention at New York in 1831, he proposed the teaching of the modern Greek pronunciation in the American colleges, and the suggestion was so seriously regarded that the Convention appointed a committee consisting of the Presidents of Yale and Wesleyan and a Professor at Princeton Theological Seminary to consider the proposal. Both Perdicaris and Stamatiadis were active in the abortive
Admission, Instruction, etc.

Requirements for Admission.

Candidates for admission to the Freshmen Class must sustain a thorough examination in the following studies.

English Grammar, Geography, Elements of Ancient History, Arithmetic, Algebra (Loomis's) to Quadratic Equations.

Latin Grammar and Prosody, Virgil, Sallust or Caesar entire, Cicero's Select Orations, writing Latin.

Greek Grammar and Prosody, Jacob's, Colton's, or Felton's Greek Reader entire, one Book of Xenophon's Anabasis, the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, and writing Greek.

They must be able to translate with facility any part of the required authors, or others which shall be deemed equivalent; and an intimate knowledge of the principles of Grammar and Prosody, will be strictly required.

Candidates for an advanced standing, must sustain a further examination on those studies which have been read by the class they propose to enter.

No student can be admitted to the Freshmen Class before he has completed his fifteenth year.

All candidates for admission must present satisfactory testimonials of good moral character; and those who are from other Colleges must produce certificates of dismissal in good standing.

Course of Study.

Freshman Year.

Advent Term. Xenophon's Anabasis, second and third books.

Livy, two Books.

Writing Latin.

Algebra, (Loomis's.)

Mythology and Classical Antiquities.

English Translations and Readings.

Lent Term.

Herodotus.

Writing Greek.

The Odes of Horace, with Latin Prosody.

Writing Latin.

Plane Geometry.

Mythology and Classical Antiquities.

English Translations and Readings.

Trinity Term. Xenophon's Memorabilia.

Writing Greek.

The Epistles and Satires of Horace.

Writing Latin.

Solid Geometry.

Latham's English Grammar; English Composition and Declamation.

On Monday mornings throughout the year, there may be a lesson in the Greek Testament, from the Gospels.

Requirements for admission and Course of study for freshman year

Efforts of the early 1830's to establish an American college in Greece, which, had it materialized, would have antedated Robert College in Constantinople by some thirty years. 28

But despite the local Greek enthusiasm, few students elected the study of Modern Greek, and it was soon found that the Tutor in Modern Greek with a salary of only $400 per year was still an expensive luxury. In 1832, Perdicaris was made College Librarian, but even this arrangement could not justify his retention by the College, and at the end of the summer term of 1833 his career on College Hill came to an end. 29 After leaving Hartford, Perdicaris lectured in a number of American cities and contributed to American literary magazines. In 1838, he was appointed American Consul at Athens and in 1843 he returned to America and married a lady from Charleston, South Carolina. His later life was spent as a businessman in Trenton, New Jersey, where he died in 1838. 30

The brief offering of instruction in Modern Greek was nothing more than a manifestation of the "Greek fad." Sympathy with the Greeks did not evoke any widespread desire to learn their language. And it would have been difficult to justify a preference for Modern Greek to either French or Spanish at the time those two
languages had been, to all intents and purposes, abandoned. Because of the importance of Classical Greek in the curriculum, Modern Greek had little to offer. Doubtless, it gave the College international publicity, but beyond that it served no useful purpose.

In view of the fact that neither French, Spanish, nor Modern Greek met with any success at Washington College, it may seem strange that Hebrew should have been among the early course offerings and that a Professor of Oriental Languages should have been listed in the College Catalogue for nine years. Even though the course in Modern Greek served no useful purpose, the offerings in Hebrew did, for with the appointment of the Professor of Oriental Languages, the College was able to list among its Faculty one of the most distinguished names in the Episcopal Church, to avail itself of one of the most unusual libraries in the United States, and to take the first step toward developing a Faculty of Theology.

In the summer of 1826, the Reverend Dr. Samuel Farmar Jarvis, who was about to leave for an extended stay in Europe, deposited his library at the College.31 Dr. Jarvis, and he was always known as "Dr. Jarvis," was the only son of the Right Reverend Abraham Jarvis, the second Bishop of Connecticut. Dr. Jarvis was doubtless a man of some considerable talent, and in certain quarters of the Episcopal Church he was regarded as an accomplished linguistic scholar and ecclesiastical historian. From 1819 to 1820, he had been on the Faculty at the General Theological Seminary, and until 1826 he had been rector of St. Paul's Church in Boston. No one could ever be indifferent to Dr. Jarvis; one either greatly admired him or intensely disliked him.32

In 1825, St. Paul's Church, Boston, found the parish torn by internal conflict between the disciples and the opponents of the rector.33 Jarvis resolved the unpleasant situation by submitting his resignation but only after he had distributed a bitter pamphlet in which he attempted to vindicate himself. Jarvis thereupon decided to go to Europe with his family in order to provide a European education for his children and to devote some time to writing a large-scale work on Church History,34 and it was at this point that the Jarvis library came to College Hill.

Before the arrival of Dr. Jarvis' books at the College, the Washington Library consisted of the volumes which had been gathered in England by Nathaniel Wheaton. These thousand-odd volumes were probably selected with little care, and many of them were quite old. The Wheaton Collection hardly represented a working college library,35 and the Jarvis library, rich in literature and history, was a recent selection of leading authors. There was some ambiguity, however, about the arrangement whereby the books had been placed at the College. Jarvis wrote that he had "deposited his library with Bishop Brownell,"36 but the College authorities probably assumed that the College had at least limited use of the volumes, and they were placed in the library room in what a student later described as "great foreign-looking cases." The librarians attempted to forbid the undergraduates' use of Dr. Jarvis' books but use them the undergraduates did without "signing out" for them. Needless to say, many were never returned.37

With the Jarvis library, the College had a collection of 5,000 volumes,38 and the College in 1826 boasted that the Washington College Library was "second in magnitude and first in value of all [libraries] in the country."39 With the beginning of the libraries of the literary societies, the total of volumes on the Washington campus increased rapidly. Dr. Jarvis, while in Europe, indulged his expensive tastes in the purchase of books which he sent on to the College40 with a view, some people believed, of avoiding the payment of customs duties.41 By 1835, the number of books housed on College Hill had increased to 12,000,42 and by 1837 the collection had grown to 14,000 volumes.43 For his own collection, Jarvis purchased four hundred volumes from the library of the late historian Edward Gibbon and thousands of books from several princely and ecclesiastical libraries.44 Late in 1832, he urged the College Trustees to purchase a handsome library "formerly belonging to the late Cavaliere de Ocheda." The Trustees were receptive to the idea, and they authorized Dr. Jarvis to purchase
the library for the College at a sum not to exceed $5,000. The Standing Committee of the Board of Trustees was authorized to advise Dr. Jarvis to make the purchase,65 but either the library had already been sold or the money could not be found. At any rate, the collection never got to Washington College.

Among the Trustees and Faculty of Washington College, Samuel Farmar Jarvis had many friends, chief among whom was Bishop Brownell. Thus, it was more than mere gratitude for the use of his splendid library which prompted the Trustees on August 1, 1828, to vote "that it is expedient to establish in the College a Professorship of Oriental Languages and Literature" and to appoint Dr. Jarvis to the new Professorship.66 There is reason to believe that the Professorship was created for the Professor and that, as Jarvis had given no indication of an early return to America, the appointment honored both the College and the appointee with no financial outlay to the College. And, except for the fact that Hebrew was not then a regular undergraduate discipline, the explanation may seem to be a reasonable one.

Actually, the appointment of a Professorship of Oriental Languages was the first step toward a Theological Faculty, and this was the understanding between Dr. Jarvis and Trustee Charles Sigourney at the time of Jarvis' appointment. Also, on August 10, 1830, the Reverend Francis L. Hawks was appointed Professor of Divinity and the Reverend Smith Pyne was appointed Professor of Moral Science in Washington College,67 the Trustees then going on record as believing it to be "of the greatest importance to the interests of the College," that the two Professorships be established at that time. Of what might be described as a Theological Faculty of three, Jarvis remained in Europe until 1835, and Pyne and Hawks were deputed to fund-raising activities for the College and, after a short while, and before either had met any classes, both resigned.

During the seven years before Jarvis' return from Europe, the College Catalogue proudly listed the name of Dr. Jarvis first in the list of Professors. No Hebrew was taught before 1835 and the college administration took particular care to point out that such religious instruction as was offered was geared to a "professedly classical course" and that Paley and Butler, the two theological writers studied in the curriculum, were included for academic and not professional reasons.68

By 1835, Dr. Jarvis had become involved in serious domestic troubles which were to culminate in divorce. Leaving his family in France, Jarvis came to Hartford and took a suite of rooms in Jarvis Hall. During the fall term of 1835, Jarvis met twenty Juniors and Seniors in a class in Hebrew three evenings a week. The course was given without credit (another example of the "optional" languages), but Dr. Jarvis had great plans to form classes in Chaldee and Syriac with lectures which would demonstrate "the derivation of Western and Eastern alphabets, and the influence of Oriental Literature upon modern languages." Jarvis also met the Senior Class in Kames' Elements of Criticism, heard the Juniors and Seniors in composition and declamation, taught two classes in French, and had hopes of introducing the study of Italian.69

Perhaps Dr. Jarvis was an ornament to the Faculty. Bishop Brownell, at least, thought so.50 But as had been true wherever Jarvis had been, trouble soon occurred. The instruction in Hebrew had met with no marked success, and it is doubtful whether Jarvis ever taught a second class in that language. The few duties involved in his Professorship doubtless gave the Doctor opportunity to work on his Ecclesiastical History, but Jarvis was not happy on College Hill, and soon he antagonized his colleagues on the matter of his beloved library. To be sure, the College had been lax in caring for the books and had neglected to insure their safety, but Jarvis had no appreciation of the problems involved in administering so large a collection. Matters came to a head in the summer of 1836 when the Professor of Oriental Languages sent the Trustees a strongly-worded complaint regarding his missing books. And perhaps the Trustees, by this time, were willing to have the matter settled once and for all. A committee was appointed from the Trus-
tees to "look into the matter" and "to make a final settlement with Dr. Jarvis of all matters connected with his library." 51

The matter of the Jarvis library brought Jarvis and President Wheaton into open conflict, and this undisguised animosity may have had its part in Wheaton's resignation of the Presidency in February of 1837 to accept a call to the rectorship of Christ Church in New Orleans. Perhaps Jarvis himself aspired to the Presidency of Washington College, but at a meeting of the Trustees held on February 28, 1837, the Trustees accepted Wheaton's letter of resignation and elected the Reverend Horatio Potter as his successor. At this same meeting, a committee of the Trustees was appointed to confer with Dr. Jarvis "upon the subject of his connexion with the College, with a view to ascertain his wishes in regard to official title - and the amount and nature of the duties he is willing to perform." When the three Trustees - Burgess, Scovill, and Huntington - called upon Jarvis they were met with a flat refusal to discuss any matters pertaining to the College until Jarvis had been able to confer with Bishop Brownell. 52

Potter declined the Presidency and on May 4, 1837, the Trustees again balloted on the choice of a President, this time choosing the Reverend Silas Totten, 53 Professor of Natural Philosophy at the College since 1833, who outranked Jarvis in time of actual service to the College, although not in time of appointment to the Faculty.

While the Trustees were considering a successor to President Wheaton, Dr. Jarvis was involved in ecclesiastical and academic intrigue - probably with a view to furthering his own ambitions to the College headship. As is so often true in matters so delicate as this, documents which would have revealed the exact nature of the activity have been lost. Be that as it may, at the meeting of the Trustees at which Silas Totten was elected President, the Trustees saw fit to absolve Jarvis of responsibility for instigating a student "memorial addressed to the Trustees on the subject of the election of a President." Did the students request that Jarvis be made President? Did they ask that Totten or Potter not be made President? Whichever the answer may be, Totten was selected by unanimous vote. 54

Jarvis had reached the point of no return as far as relations with his colleagues and the Trustees were concerned, and he wrote to his New York friend, James F. De Peyster: "I receive assurance from every quarter that there is but one voice in Hartford, of those out of our Church as well as in it, wishing me to remain here." 55 Even Dr. Jarvis knew that his usefulness on College Hill was at an end. Fortunately for Dr. Jarvis, Holy Trinity Church, Middletown, elected him rector and on August 2, 1837, he resigned his Professorship to accept this call. In 1838, he was appointed Historiographer of the Episcopal Church 56 and until his death in 1851 he remained popular among those who found Dr. Jarvis to be the sort of a man they liked.

For a while after his resignation, relations between Dr. Jarvis and the College remained somewhat strained, although several of the Washington graduates pursued their theological studies with the Doctor at Middletown. 57 Time helped heal some of the old wounds and, as new faces appeared on the Faculty and the Board of Trustees, Jarvis renewed his interest in the College. In 1841, he was elected to the Board of Trustees and in 1845 he was made a Fellow of the College. After 1841, he was also a member of the board which conducted the public examination of the students.

In his departure from the College, Jarvis was given an honorary Doctorate in Laws at the Commencement of 1837 but, along with his sheepskin, Dr. Jarvis also took his library which, with the accumulation of eleven years, was then valued at $50,000. 58 Again the College found itself with an embarrassingly small collection of books. From the proud number of 14,000 volumes in 1837, the Library was reduced at a single blow to the Wheaton Collection, the society Libraries, and whatever had come to the College by bequest or gift - certainly not more than 6,000 volumes in all. For many years the annual Catalogue omitted any mention of the size of the College Library, and it was not until 1847 that the number of volumes was given - in
that year a total of 9,000, of which 3,000 belonged to the literary societies. 59

The resignation of Dr. Jarvis ended, for the time, any attempt to offer instruction in Hebrew, even though that language was carried for many years in the annual Catalogue as a senior elective. Nor was there any attempt until the 1840's to revive (if that is the word) the Faculty of Theology. Later we shall see how a full-scale program of theological instruction was then developed, but by that time it came as a pure accident and was soon to be dissociated from the College.

But in view of the failure of this early attempt at theological instruction, the question must be asked whether the Trustees seriously intended to develop a professional School of Theology to prepare candidates for Holy Orders in the Episcopal Church. The answer is "yes." And what is perhaps more amazing is that almost from the beginning of the College the Trustees entertained the idea of expanding Washington College into a university with faculties of Arts, Theology, Law, and Medicine. Never was this intention publicly stated, and only occasional and passing implication suggested that the Trustees had ambitions beyond a conventional New England college. Action by the Board, however, revealed that it was the ultimate hope of the Trustees that Washington College would someday become Washington University. 60

The Charter of Washington College stipulated that the Trustees were empowered "to grant all such literary honors and degrees, as are usually granted by any University, College, or Seminary of learning in this State, or in the United States." 61 This meant, quite plainly, that Washington College could offer instruction and confer degrees in such disciplines and faculties as were given at Yale. If Washington were to be to the Episcopal Church what Yale was to the Congregational Churches, expansion of curricular offerings would have to follow developments in New Haven. By 1823, Yale was offering instruction by faculties of Theology and Medicine and, by 1826, the elder sister had also created a chair of Law.

In a sense, all American colleges of the period offered instruction in Law. Vattel's Law of Nations was a standard course and, at Washington College as elsewhere, it was offered not as a professional course but on the assumption that some knowledge of the Law was an essential part of a liberal education. 62 In 1827, however, the Trustees voted to establish a Professorship of Law and, at the same time, they appointed the Honorable William W. Ellsworth, A.M., as Professor of Law. Ellsworth was not appointed to hear Seniors recite Vattel; he was engaged to develop a full program of professional training in the Law. The Trustees instructed Trustees Brownell, Welles, and John S. Peters "to apply to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, and [to] request them to extend to the students in the law-school established in connexion with this college the privilege granted the students at the law school of Judge Gould in Litchfield, 63 that the time spent in their studies at this school [in Washington College] be allow'd & accepted as part of the time required to be spent in the study of the law, before admitted to practice, in the State of New York: And that the same Committee be authorized to apply to the Supreme Courts of the other States, to obtain the same privilege, if in their judgment it be expedient." 64

William Wolcott Ellsworth was, at the time of his appointment to Washington College, one of Hartford's most promising young lawyers, a graduate (A.B., 1810) of Yale College, and a son-in-law of Noah Webster, the lexicographer. From 1829 until 1834, he served in the United States House of Representatives and from 1838 until 1842 he was Governor of Connecticut. From 1847 until 1861, he was Judge of the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut, and during this period he twice declined election to the United States Senate. 65 Throughout his public career he was regarded as one of the principal leaders of the Whig Party of Connecticut, and of all Connecticut politicians of his day he was probably the one most universally respected.

Had the College seriously carried out the plan to develop a law school, William W. Ellsworth would most certainly have been the man
to serve as its head, but the time chosen to begin instruction was perhaps the most unfortunate in the College's history. In 1828, the institution was deeply in debt and there was serious question whether the College would even survive. Nevertheless, Ellsworth began his services to the College in the summer term of 1829 by lecturing to instruction was perhaps the most unfortunate in.

Ellsworth continued to teach law as a branch of the liberal studies until just seven years before his death in 1868. Upon Ellsworth's resignation, he was succeeded in turn as Professor of Law by Samuel Eliot (1861–1871), Judge William Davis Shipman (1871–1874), William Hamersley (1874–1900), and Sidney George Fisher, who lectured from 1900 until 1903.

Although both the faculties of Theology and Law died in infancy, the Trustees were to make still another try with a Faculty of Medicine. In 1832, the Trustees appointed a committee “to confer with the medical gentlemen of this town and vicinity upon the expediency of establishing medical lectures in connexion with the College.” Evidently the “medical gentlemen” were convinced of the desirability of such a program, for in August of 1835 the Trustees authorized the President and the Standing Committee “to make arrangements with suitable persons to deliver lectures on the subjects of Anatomy, Physiology, & Natural Sciences.” Accordingly, Samuel Berwick Beresford, M.D., was appointed lecturer on Anatomy and Physiology in 1838. But again no professional school developed. Beresford lectured to the Seniors on Anatomy and Physiology in much the same fashion as Ellsworth and his successors lectured on Law. In 1852 Dr. Beresford was joined by George Shattuck, M.D., who was appointed Professor of the Institutes of Medicine. At that time, the course offerings in Medical Studies were expanded to include Anatomy in both junior and senior years and lectures on the Institutes of Medicine and Physiology in the Senior year.

In her attempts to compete with Yale in the matter of professional instruction, Washington College was eminently unsuccessful. But ludicrous as these efforts may seem, they did have the effect of bringing to the College men of renown in their professions. Although the physicians merely lectured at the College between visits to patients, and the Honorable William Wolcott Ellsworth lectured on the Constitution during Congressional recess, the business of part-time teaching was somewhat in keeping with what purported to be the more regular instruction of the College, for few—if any—of the Faculty were actually “full time.” Between 1823 and 1845, the Catalogues of the College listed a Faculty of from six to eight persons, including the President and a Tutor in Languages, but in the 1830's even the students could see that the Faculty was a “sham” Faculty, and that the instruction was actually given by three persons: the Professor of Mathematics, the Classics Tutor, and the Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy. Dr. Jarvis was listed as Professor of Oriental Languages and Literature for seven years before he even appeared on the campus. The clerical members of the Faculty had parishes which made considerable demands on their time, and the good Dr. Sumner, Professor of Botany until 1855, taught only one course during the summer term, and that at his country home some way from the College. The Faculty who were actually in residence on College Hill paid scant attention to departmental barriers, and one undergraduate of this period recalled in later life that a single professor taught Greek, Latin, Mathematics, Chemistry, and Philosophy.

Paradoxically, the part-time Faculty retained their connections with the College longer than the “regulars.” Dr. Sumner taught his single course in Botany for thirty-one years, Judge Ellsworth lectured for thirty-five, and Dr. Beresford for nineteen. The Classical Tutors were almost always either young clergymen or candidates for Holy Orders, and their stay at the College was never more than a year or two unless they were advanced to a Professorship. Even those of professorial rank were seldom inclined to make a career of teaching at Washington College. Of the original faculty, George Washington Doane re-
signed in 1828 to become assistant rector of Christ Church in Boston.75 Frederick Hall resigned in 1828 to become Professor of Mineralogy in Columbian College in Washington, D.C.,76 and Hector Humphreys resigned in 1830 to accept the Presidency of St. John's College in Annapolis, Maryland.77 By 1831, the full-time Faculty had undergone a complete turnover and, by 1840, all of the replacements but one (Dr. Duncan L. Stewart) had again been replaced, several of them more than once.

This rapid turn-over of Faculty had the advantage of injecting what college administrators call "new blood," but it also had its bad effects. Faculty were unable to "dig roots" into College Hill and the Hartford community, and it was many years before the Faculty had a "grand old man." But with the coming and going of Professor after Professor, it may be surprising that so many of them remained at the College as long as they did, especially in view of the low salaries and the rather restrictive requirement that the Faculty live in the College buildings or in the immediate vicinity and that they be on twenty-four-hour call. The Trustees had done their best to raise the salaries from the mere pittances which were doled out at the beginning, but the goal of matching the salaries paid at Yale was never achieved. In 1828, Tutor Norman Pinney was raised to rank of Adjunct Professor of Ancient Languages at a salary of $60078 and the Reverend Horatio Potter was given an initial salary as Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy of $500, with $600 for the second year.79 In 1830, Samuel S. Lewis was appointed Tutor at a salary of $400,80 and the following year William M. Holland was appointed Professor of Ancient Languages at a salary of $600, with an additional $300 for serving as Bursar of the College.81 Occasionally there were raises, but usually only after the Professor involved had urgently pleaded his case to the Trustees. In 1836, Professor Totten and Professor Stewart asked for salary increases; Stewart had his salary raised from $600 to $750, but Totten's request was tabled until the next meeting of the Board.82 The request was never acted upon, for at the next meeting of the Trustees, Totten was elected President of the College. In 1837, the first salary of $1,000 was voted, that to the Reverend Caleb J. Good, Professor of Ancient Languages.83 In 1840, when Abner Jackson, A.B. 1837, was "translated" from Adjunct Professor of Ancient Languages to Professor of Intellectual Philosophy and Lecturer in Chemistry and Mineralogy at a salary of $750 for the first year and $1,000 per year thereafter, he accepted the multi-titled position only after he had wrangled another $50 from the Trustees.84 With the first appointments to the Seabury and Hobart Professorships in 1837, the Trustees came to regard a salary of $1,000 as standard, at least for these two chairs.85

The problem of attracting and retaining competent Professors was hardly exceeded by that of securing a student body adequately prepared to undertake the regular course of study. Quantitatively, the student body left little to be desired, and except for a sharp decline in the number of students in 1835 to a low of forty-eight,86 the number remained at what the Trustees must have regarded as "capacity." By 1837, the enrollment had again risen to sixty-five.87 By 1838, it had reached eighty-two,88 and for the next ten years annual enrollment averaged about eighty, fluctuating between seventy-two and eighty-three. Admissions officers of the present day would be delighted with the diversity of geographic origin of the students of the College before the Civil War — and this was achieved without benefit of quotas or athletic scouting.89 The wide geographic origin of the student body had, of course, the advantage of lending a cosmopolitan spirit to the College, but there was also a distinct disadvantage which was soon to be felt. In order that there be no sharp drop-off in the number of students, the College had been reluctant to adhere strictly to the stated requirements for admission. The normal "feeder" to the College was the Episcopal Academy at Cheshire, but during the late 1820's and the 1830's the Academy suffered serious reverses and at least thrice during this period the institution had been temporarily closed.90 Some of the better-prepared students had entered Washington College from
Bacon Academy in Colchester, Connecticut, which was then regarded as one of the best in New England, and during the 1830's there was usually a "delegation" from the Walnut Grove School in Troy, New York, a school of fair repute and patronized by Episcopalian families of the upper Hudson Valley. An occasional student from the West or South had attended a first-rate preparatory school, but it was these students from the more distant points who were least adequately prepared to undertake college study, and it was the poorer students who continued to set the pace which enabled the better students merely to "coast along." The college authorities insisted in 1837 that "the qualifications for admission are essentially the same as at Harvard University, and Yale and Union Colleges," but the subsequent performance of those admitted as Freshmen demonstrated that the qualifications were not infrequently ignored.

In 1829, the College entered into an arrangement with the Trustees of the Hartford Academy whereby students in the Academy were permitted to attend lectures at Washington College in Philosophy, Chemistry, Mineralogy, Botany, Political Economy, and Law. And the program was intended particularly for "those students who do not intend to acquire a Collegiate education." Hartford Academy had been chartered in 1819, and the Trustees were all members of Christ Church. That Hartford needed a good secondary school is beyond doubt, but the creation of Washington College had diverted interest and support, and the Academy was not to open until May of 1830. Certainly the Academy was to be a "feeder" to Washington College, but this purpose was hardly served by placing terminal secondary-school students in the advanced courses of a college already much concerned about its inability to appreciably raise academic standards. Fortunately for Washington College - if not for secondary education in Hartford - the Academy expired within a year after having enrolled a mere thirty students.

Perhaps the Trustees of Washington College had intended that the arrangement with Hartford Academy would be reciprocal and that college students with academic deficiencies would take preparatory subjects in the Academy. At any rate, the Academy was closed before any such arrangement could be tried. In 1835, the College instituted its own preparatory department by forming an "Introductory Class" to which students with academic deficiencies at the time of their admission were to be assigned until they were prepared "to recite with one of the regular classes." Such students were not regarded as regular "members of the College," which probably meant that they were not eligible for membership in the literary or secret societies or in the Archers.

The Introductory Class was never large. During the middle 1830's, the number listed in the *Catalogue* varied from three to six. After 1837, the *Catalogue* listed no Introductory Class, but such must have existed until 1844, when the College officially closed the Introductory Department and - in order "not to expose the students . . . at so early an age to the bad influences necessarily incident to a large town" - entered into an informal affiliation with the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut. At that time, the Episcopal Academy's course of study and instruction were described as "being under the supervision of the Faculty of the College." The "supervision" must have been purely nominal, for the affiliation was never again mentioned in either the college or academy publications. The College had simply divested itself of another embarrassing appendage.

During the decade of the 1830's, Washington College was able to at least hold her own so far as the number of students and the quality of the Faculty were concerned. The same, unfortunately, could not have been said regarding the institution's physical equipment, whether library, philosophical apparatus, or buildings. The College's boast of her splendid Library has already been told, and likewise, the loss of this Library. In the matter of philosophical apparatus, too, the College began with equipment worthy of the emphasis which was to be placed on the Natural Sciences, but here again, early eminence was cancelled out by later neglect.
In England, Nathaniel Wheaton had gathered not only books for the Library but scientific equipment as well,103 and in May, 1825, the Trustees voted that $2,000 be spent for additional philosophical apparatus.104 Also, a "Botanic Garden" had been laid out on the college grounds and a Cabinet Room was provided in Seabury Hall. Professor Frederick Hall, the first to occupy the chair of Chemistry and Mineralogy, brought to the College his valuable collection of minerals and this provided the nucleus of the Washington College Mineral Cabinet. Hall also circulated throughout the scientific world the College's desire to exchange mineral specimens with mineralogists in various parts of the world and, as a consequence of Professor Hall's plea, the College immediately received a valuable collection of minerals from Montreal, Canada, and vicinity, from a Mr. J. Viger of that city.105 Commodore Isaac Hull, father-in-law of Dr. Jarvis and then United States Minister to Chile, sent minerals from Peru and Chile, beautiful shells and corals from South America, implements of war, articles of dress and other curiosities from the islands of the Pacific, and "some very curious ancient vessels taken from the graves of the aboriginal Peruvians."106 The Honorable J. R. Poinsett sent minerals from the mountains of Guanexuato in Mexico,107 and an anonymous donor presented a collection of minerals "from the interior of Germany."108

The "Botanic Garden," too, received gifts from afar. Monsieur Bosc, Professor at the Jardin des Plantes in Paris, sent a box containing seeds of more than three hundred species of "useful and ornamental plants."109 By the summer of 1828, Dr. Sumner, Professor of Botany, was able to report that the "Botanic Garden" already had more than one thousand species represented.110 That fall, Thomas Nuttall, F. R. S., Director of the Botanic Garden at Cambridge, England, sent a choice collection of plants, including some exotics from South America, and the College immediately undertook to build a small greenhouse.111

Of this scientific paraphernalia Washington College was justly proud. The boast that the philosophical apparatus was the best in American112 was a great exaggeration, of course, but the more modest claim made by the Episcopal Watchman that the College possessed "every desirable facility" for the study of science was probably correct.113

The resignation of Professor Hall was a great loss to the College, for with him went his large mineral collection. Hall's successor, however, John Smyth Rogers, M.D., not only replenished the depleted mineral collection, but he also made valuable additions to the philosophical apparatus and, presumably at his own expense, set up an elegant chemical laboratory.114 After two years of service as Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy, Dr. Rogers submitted his resignation.115 Rogers was prevailed upon to reconsider, and his resignation was withdrawn. The Trustees, by way of encouragement to the Professor of the Natural Sciences, appropriated another $300 for the purchase of additional philosophical apparatus.116

Dr. Rogers fully lived up to early expectations, and his laboratory and cabinet were always well-kept during his tenure at the College. With Dr. Sumner and the "Botanic Garden," however, it was another matter. Dr. Sumner was a busy man and the management of the "Botanic Garden" was entrusted to the campus caretaker. Sumner taught his Botany class at home, and probably little use was ever made of the collection of plants of which he was at first so proud. By the mid-thirties the garden was almost completely grown with weeds and soon it disappeared entirely.117

Astronomical equipment, too, was soon to make its appearance on the campus. During several pleasant evenings preceding Commencement of 1836, the College had an unusual treat when Mr. A. Holcomb of Southwick, Massachusetts, exhibited a reflecting telescope. Under Holcomb's direction, the Faculty were shown such astronomical phenomena as "the division in Saturn's Ring, which it is believed no other telescope in the country has done, except one or two from the same author." The Trustees were prevailed upon to purchase a similar instrument for Washington College, and the Board obliged
by ordering from Mr. Holcomb "the best instrument he could produce." The telescope delivered to the College was one with "a mirror of 10 inches in diameter, and 14 feet focal distance." 118

In 1838, Dr. Rogers again submitted his resignation, and this time there was no reconsidering. Rogers took his mineral collection with him, and as one alumnus put it, the Mineral Cabinet was "left very destitute." As the Trustees did not feel able to purchase replenishments, they asked the Alumni to undertake the restoration of the College Cabinet. At the annual meeting of the Associate Alumni in 1839, a resolution was passed urging the Washington College graduates to send specimens of minerals and natural history to the College under care of Professor Abner Jackson, Rogers's successor as Professor of Chemistry and Mineralogy. The challenge met with immediate response, and the Reverend C. J. Ives of Matagorda, Texas, sent "a box containing several curious specimens of the Natural History of Texas." Others sent mineral collections, and the Trustees gratefully acknowledged the gifts. 119

This incident is of considerable interest as the first time in the College's history that the Trustees appealed directly to the Alumni to carry out a project for the improvement of instructional facilities. But the incident was also the occasion of announcing, rather incidentally, that the College was once more in serious financial trouble and of "sounding out" the Associate Alumni, the Ecclesiastical constituency, and the Hartford community regarding the prospects for financial assistance.

During the first fifteen years of the College's existence, Town and Gown relations, despite the occasional student disturbances, had been exceedingly pleasant, and the Faculty and students had participated in the activities of the Hartford community. The Washington Archers were usually on hand to parade on national holidays, and on several occasions members of the Faculty had delivered the town's Fourth of July oration. 120 When Hartford held her Centennial Celebration in 1835, the College took a prominent part. 121 When the Connecticut Historical Society was organized in 1825, the entire Faculty had been among the charter members, 122 and in 1835 Dr. Jarvis had organized the Connecticut Society of Natural History. At least one member of the Faculty, Professor Holland, became active in local politics, and in the election campaign of 1836 he was so vigorous in his support of the nascent Democratic Party that his academic activities suffered as a consequence. 123 The College cultivated a reciprocal interest by the community in the academic affairs of the College and encouraged the attendance of Hartfordites at the public exercises such as the Exhibitions and Commencements and even the more prosaic public examinations of the Senior Class, an academic exercise which was spread over four days. 124 But with all this friendly exchange, the College had not appealed to the Hartford citizenry for large-scale financial support since 1823.

With the Episcopal Church, the College had maintained an equally friendly relationship and the Church, in fact, regarded the College as her own. The Church press took delight in pointing out that the Founders had been Episcopalians, that the Trustees, Faculty, and student body were largely members of the Church, and that the College was "an Episcopal Institution, in the same sense that Columbia College is Episcopal, or Yale College is Presbyterian, or Harvard University, Unitarian." 125 When the Diocesan Convention met in Hartford the officers of the College were given honorary seats in the Convention. 126

In 1834, the Diocese recommended the College "to the patronage of this and other States," 127 and the following year the Diocese conducted a full-scale investigation of the internal affairs of the College, in the course of which the committee appointed for the purpose pried deeply into the religious and academic life of the institution, finding, fortunately, that both were of such standards as to warrant the continued support and patronage of the Church. 128 This Diocesan concern with the internal operation of the College was welcomed by the officers of the institution, and in 1837 the Trustees resolved that "the Right Reverend Bishop of the Diocese of Connecticut be requested to extend a particular religious superintendence over the students of the
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College – [and] that in connexion with the clerical members of the Faculty he designate the course of religious exercises & instruction to be provided in the Institution, and [that he] preside at all meetings of the faculty (at which he may be present) for carrying the same into effect.\textsuperscript{129}

In 1839, the Diocese of Connecticut directed that the records, papers, and documents of the Diocese be placed in the Library of the College under the care of the President, and thus the College Library became the depository of the Diocesan Archives.\textsuperscript{130} In that same year President Totten reported to the Diocese on the spiritual state of the College.\textsuperscript{131}

But these friendly relationships with Church and community had not resulted in any financial support for the College. The Church was a loving mother and the Hartford community was a pleasant neighbor. That was all. To be sure, Churchmen had completed the subscriptions for the Hobart and Seabury Professorships, but the Diocese of Connecticut had never appropriated a penny for the College, and throughout the 1830's Washington College was precariously dependent upon tuition fees to meet the necessary operating expenses. The Trustees still hoped that some large benefaction could be found.\textsuperscript{132}

In 1835, the Trustees had half-heartedly set out to increase the permanent funds of the College. The endowment funds and house and land rentals were then yielding an income of about $1,500 per year, and the College had resources of between $12,000 and $14,000 then described as "not yet productive."\textsuperscript{133} The Trustees realized that money would be given more readily to an institution which was financially solvent than to one which was deeply in debt; as the Catalogue of 1835 put it, "Men contribute more freely to build up, than to repair."\textsuperscript{134}

And the time would have been ideal to launch a full-scale drive for funds, for the country was then in what seemed to be a period of unusual prosperity. The nation had no public debt, and money was circulating as it had never done before. Huge speculative profits were being made in western lands, and business indexes reflected huge profits for investors. Washington College might well have come by some of the money which was going to charities, had the Trustees only carried through on their plans to increase the endowment. But instead of issuing a general appeal, the Trustees turned once more to Trinity Parish in the City of New York, asking for a gift of $50,000 or the pledge of an annual gift equal to the interest on such a sum.\textsuperscript{135}

But Trinity Parish in the City of New York declined to come forth with the gift of $50,000 or, for that matter, with any funds for the assistance of the College. Within a year, the country was in the Depression of 1837, and business in Hartford, as elsewhere, was prostrated.\textsuperscript{136} Washington College, like the others,\textsuperscript{137} suffered severely for, while there was no loss of students,\textsuperscript{138} income from investments fell off sharply. The Phoenix Bank, in whose stock much of the College's endowment funds had been invested, stopped paying its semi-annual dividend, and it seemed for a while that the bank would have to close.\textsuperscript{139} Although it was a case of locking the stable door after the horse had gone, the Trustees set themselves to the task of raising money for the permanent funds of the College, and this they attempted to do by appealing to parishes within the Diocese of Connecticut and well-to-do individuals beyond the limits of the Diocese. On August 1, 1838, Professor Jackson was released from his instructional duties and was sent out as Financial Agent of the College. Although the financial circumstances of the country virtually precluded any great success for Jackson's mission, the Professor faithfully visited each of the parishes of the Diocese and, while apparently obtaining no immediate cash gifts, he received at least the promise of scholarship endowments.\textsuperscript{140}

Promises would not tide the College over the immediate difficulties, however, and the Trustees, albeit in desperation, fell into that old pitfall of collegiate financing – the hope of increasing college income by enlarging the student body. Tuition fees were still only $33 per year but, with the number of students at roughly 80, income from that source – assuming the fees were always collected – amounted to $2,640. To double the enrollment meant to double the income from
tuition and thus bring the College a revenue from student fees of $5,280, and this sort of arithmetic accounted for almost the entire instructional budget. It could only have been reasoning such as this which prompted the Trustees on August 1, 1838, to authorize the Standing Committee to make application to the Legislature of the State of Connecticut for aid in the construction of another college building and to “take any other measures they may deem appropriate to raise funds for the same purpose.”

In May, 1839, a bill was presented to the Connecticut State Legislature asking for an appropriation for Washington College. The Washington College bill was virtually forgotten, for Wesleyan University had already requested the same session to appropriate $24,000, also for the erection of a new building. Debate on the Wesleyan bill consumed much of the Legislature’s time and, although the Wesleyan petition was finally continued to the next assembly, the Washington College bill died in committee.

Now it was at this point that the Trustees had presented the matter of the College’s financial embarrassment to the Associate Alumni and had asked the graduates to help replenish the depleted Mineral Cabinet. But why had the Trustees not been more direct in their appeal to the Associate Alumni? And why was there no plan advanced whereby the graduates of the College could be included in a general fund raising scheme? The Associate Alumni of Washington College had been one of the earliest of such organizations, and the whole program of alumni activities was then in its infancy. The “Class Gift,” the “Alumni Fund,” the “Class Secretary,” and the “Alumni Secretary” were still in the future, and it perhaps never even occurred to either the Trustees or the Associate Alumni that graduates would, if encouraged to do so, contribute. All that had been asked for were mineral and natural history “specimens,” and such were all that were received. But it might also be added that in 1839 the first graduating class was just twelve years out of college, and that of the 140 living alumni, 55 were either clergymen or students of theology, and with clerical salaries then little more than pittances, it was hardly an affluent Association! Nor did the Associate Alumni come forward with a plan or program of their own.

In the summer of 1839, the College’s situation was not unlike that of ten years before. The Connecticut Legislature had just declined to make an appropriation to relieve the institution’s financial distress, the Church had done nothing to remedy the situation, and the Hartford community had offered no assistance of any sort. The only different element in the situation was that despite the annual deficit with which the last few college years had closed, Washington College had considerably more by way of financial resources than she had in 1829, and the debt had not reached the earlier high. The Trustees had wisely invested some of the tuition money which had been gathered in the prosperity years of the early 1830's in real estate, and the College owned several parcels of land in Hartford and its environs as well as in scattered locations as far west as Ohio. And, the money raised for the endowment of the Hobart and Seabury Professorships had been invested in Phoenix Bank stocks. Doubtless these resources had appreciated in value, and they were available to be pledged as security on the loans which the Trustees were obliged to make to cover the deficit at the close of each year. And it was on a program of emergency borrowing that the Trustees began to shore up the College’s financial structure. Presumably acting on the assumption that there would be neither state appropriation nor gift from Trinity Parish, New York, and little hope of a large personal benefaction, and perhaps remembering their own unacted-upon words of a few years before, “Men contribute more freely to build up, than to repair,” the Trustees took the bold action of resolving to raise $20,000 as soon as possible for a new building, for new books for the Library, and toward the liquidation of the debt of the College. And to get the program under way, the Treasurer of the College was directed by the Trustees “to borrow for the use of the College the sum of five thousand dollars, and as collateral security for the same, to execute a mortgage
deed of the land and buildings lying on the east side of Bliss Street, [Hartford] and belonging to the College.\textsuperscript{147}

Money, at this time, was not hard to borrow, for by the summer of 1840 Hartford had already passed the economic crisis and business in the city showed much improvement.\textsuperscript{148} The Phoenix Bank, upon whose success the College's invested funds depended, had come through the depression without closing, and the endowment income of the College amounted to $2,000 per year. Tuition would have provided another $4,000, had not $1,200 been lost in the form of free tuition for candidates for Holy Orders. President Totten estimated at the time that $6,000 per year would have been sufficient to balance the budget, and at the Diocesan Convention of 1840 he had appealed to the Churchmen of Connecticut to help meet the deficit which he suggested had been incurred in the interest of the Church.\textsuperscript{149}

The Diocesan newspaper responded to Totten's appeal and urged the constituency of the College "to endow it; to foster it; [and] to support it... Let parents send their sons to Washington College; the wealthy give their money to Washington College; and let every Churchman pray for Washington College."\textsuperscript{150} But there was no "follow up" to this stirring editorial, for although the Practical Christian and Church Chronicle frequently reported during the next year on the doings at Kenyon and at Jubilee College, Bishop Chase's latest academic creation in Illinois, no mention was made of the affairs of the College in the Diocese of Connecticut.\textsuperscript{151} Not until the issue of May 27, 1842, did the Practical Christian deal with the College's financial needs, and then only to suggest that "a few more students would balance the budget."\textsuperscript{152} Thus, it was with rather ill grace that three months later the editor of the Practical Christian lamented that the College had not received the support it deserved.\textsuperscript{153}

By the fall of 1841, sufficient funds had been borrowed to insure the College's opening in mid-September when a new "take" in student fees would enrich the academic coffers. A year later, the Phoenix Bank resumed payment of semi-annual dividends, and the $3.50 per share\textsuperscript{154} on the College's invested funds was most welcome. In the spring of 1843, the College received several gifts: $1,000 by bequest of Mrs. Emily Phillips\textsuperscript{155} and $35.00 from an anonymous friend of the institution.\textsuperscript{156} By this time even the Church press had become enthusiastic regarding affairs on College Hill. In the issue of June 2, 1843, the Church Chronicle and Record editorialized in such fashion as to suggest that the Trustees had been lax in their public solicitation: "Will not some one acquainted with all the facts of the case, give us some articles on the claims of Washington College."

Although the editor of the Church Chronicle may have felt that the Trustees had been remiss in matters of public relations, certainly such was not the case in their concern for college finance. At each Board meeting, financial matters continued to dominate the agenda and, although the situation was far from flattering, the Trustees must have taken comfort in the fact that Washington College was able to mortgage her property rather than sell it outright as her sister-college, Kenyon, had been obliged to do.\textsuperscript{157} The Trustees had agreed that there were certain fixed expenditures which could not be reduced, and on the matter of buildings, grounds, and equipment there was to be no retreat. There was, however, (and unfortunately) an item in the budget upon which some adjustment could be made and that was, of course, faculty salaries. A committee had been appointed to work out an emergency salary schedule, and this committee reported to the Board at a special meeting held on June 15, 1843, recommending that there be a salary cut of ten per cent, and that the duties of Librarian be performed by a student for remission of fees. The Trustees voted to formally consider the committee's report at the next meeting and, after authorizing the Treasurer to make further emergency loans, the Board adjourned until August 2, 1843,\textsuperscript{158} at which time a salary cut, not to exceed ten per cent, was authorized.\textsuperscript{159}

Having thus reduced the operating budget, the Trustees turned to the raising of $15,000 for additional permanent endowment. The Board at
once accepted an offer of an annual grant of $200 to be provided by the Society for the Promotion of Religion and Learning in the State of New York for Washington College graduates who wished to pursue studies in the General Theological Seminary. There was but one difficulty; the College was to give a full scholarship to a pre-seminarian for each graduate attending the Seminary under the plan. 160

When the Trustees launched their $15,000 campaign there was evidenced a vigor not altogether unlike that of the College's launching some twenty years before. Advertisements (and they were probably paid advertisements) appeared in the Recorder, the Banner of the Cross, and the Church Chronicle and Record, in which contributions were earnestly solicited and in which the claims of the College upon the Church were boldly stated. 161 Fortunately, the Trustees did not sit by and await the arrival of contributions through the mails. Several agents, described in the College's releases to the press as "active and able clergymen," were sent out, not only to raise funds, but also "to enlist more interest in the institution itself, by making people acquainted with it, and interesting them in its behalf." 162 The agents visited the parishes of the Diocese of Connecticut and particularly carried the campaign into the enemy camp at New Haven. There they made public collections in the churches and called upon individuals who had been "spotted" as potential contributors. 163

The collections, and especially those in New Haven, met, as the Chronicle stated, "with some success," 164 and the canvassers next turned to the city of Hartford. In this phase of the fund-drive, there developed some confusion as to the purpose of the $15,000. The Trustees had originally hoped to add the amount to the permanent funds of the College, apparently without designation.
By the summer of 1844, however, the agents in Hartford were referring to the $15,000 as a "Charity Fund" and to the ultimate use of the money as the endowment of a Brownell Professorship. On August 1, 1844, the Trustees voted that such should be the use of the "Charity Fund." Subscriptions in Hartford were unexpectedly generous. The city was then enjoying great economic prosperity, a condition which the local Whig politicians attributed to the protective tariff, and by the spring of 1845 the $15,000 which the Trustees had set as their goal had been subscribed in Hartford alone. It was probably this local contribution which prompted the Trustees to revive the plan for the erection of a new building while, at the same time, raising money for the Brownell Professorship.

A third building on the Washington College campus had been assumed from the beginning, and a master-plan called for a mate to the "College" north of the "Chapel." Early woodcuts, one as early as 1827 which appeared on the title page of the bound volume of the Episcopal Watchman, showed an exact duplicate of the "College" in the northerly location, balancing the campus façade in conventional New England college-hill fashion.

Plans were drawn up by President Totten and work was commenced in May, 1845. A Mr. Goodwin and Trustee and Treasurer Thomas Belknap served as the Building Committee, the Messrs. Campbell were engaged to do the stonework, and a Mr. Rowell was engaged to do the woodwork. Construction progressed at such a rapid pace that the cornerstone was laid, with appropriate ceremonies (including an unscheduled and somewhat embarrassing "mock" corner-stone laying by the students) on August 1, 1845. At the same time, the building thus in progress was christened Brownell Hall, and the older buildings were given names honoring Brownell's Episcopal predecessors in the Diocese of Connecticut. The "Chapel" was named Seabury Hall and the "College" was named Jarvis Hall.

In just a little more than a year Brownell Hall was completed, and an imposing building it was. Within the structure were thirty-eight student rooms, a recitation hall, and an apartment to be occupied by a Professor and his family. Although similar in external appearance to Jarvis Hall, the new building's interior was notably different from Jarvis. An arrangement of rooms around "entries" rather than the long halls of Jarvis provided better light and also precluded the boisterous log-rolling contests which had caused so much trouble for the faculty committee on student discipline. The total frontage of the college buildings now extended to 450 feet.

Much of the money raised by the College between 1843 and 1846 was spent on Brownell Hall, but the other objects of the College were not entirely neglected. Although the Brownell Professorship fund was abandoned for the time, at least eighteen scholarships, equal in income to the tuition fees, were founded during these years and it was to this purpose that much of the money raised in the Diocese of Connecticut was directed.

In the matter of operating expenses, the "salary cut" of 1843 had done much to help balance the budget. Although the "cut" was doubtless unpopular among those whom it affected, "salary-cutting" was the common nineteenth-century method of meeting collegiate budgets, and the marvel is, of course, that the measure had not been resorted to in Hartford before. And even more marvelous, perhaps, was the fact that by 1845 all salaries had been restored to their previous scale.
The eighteen Diocesan scholarships helped reduce the number of those whose tuition was remitted, and it seemed that the policy of remitting tuition was quickly being abandoned, for in August of 1845, the Trustees resolved to take action regarding several students who had left the College without paying their fees. Several parcels of land (particularly those lying south of the campus on Washington Street, which was then being developed and which soon became Hartford’s “Quality Row”) were sold at a very advantageous price. And, although little of the money raised between 1843 and 1846 was added to the unrestricted permanent funds of the College, the income from the Hobart and Seabury Professorship Funds was augmented by the increased semi-annual Phoenix Bank dividend, which by the latter year had risen to four per cent. Thus, through a happy combination of the general economic prosperity of the times, the diligence of the Trustees, the sacrifices of the Faculty, and the generosity of the Diocese of Connecticut and the Hartford townspeople, the College was once more saved from extinction. So successful, indeed, had been the efforts of Churchmen and citizenry that by the time of the dedication of Brownell Hall the institution was able to report that it was once more free of debt.
Winds from the Isis and the Cam

For a quarter of a century, the institution on Hartford's College Hill had been just another New England college. Architecturally and otherwise there was little which set it apart from Amherst, Dartmouth, or the others. The curriculum was the classical-mathematical standard of the nineteenth century, and the “philosophy of education” was that of training the “faculties.” As the College’s Catalogue stated, “the primary object of intellectual education, as distinguished from moral and religious disciplines, . . . should consist of a series of exercises calculated to improve the intellectual faculties, and to confer readiness and aptness of expression.” This would have been the educational purpose of each American college of the time, and the fact that the College recognized an obligation to inculcate moral and religious principles in no way made it unique.

In spite of the fact that the College had been founded by Episcopalians and had a Faculty and student body largely Episcopalian, there may have been some question as to what extent the College was truly “Episcopalian.” Morning and Evening Prayers were said daily in the Chapel, but only the use of the Prayer Book made Trinity’s daily exercises calculated to improve the intellectual faculties, and to confer readiness and aptness of expression.” This would have been the educational purpose of each American college of the time, and the fact that the College recognized an obligation to inculcate moral and religious principles in no way made it unique.

In spite of the fact that the College had been founded by Episcopalians and had a Faculty and student body largely Episcopalian, there may have been some question as to what extent the College was truly “Episcopalian.” Morning and Evening Prayers were said daily in the Chapel, but only the use of the Prayer Book made Trinity’s daily exercises calculated to improve the intellectual faculties, and to confer readiness and aptness of expression.” This would have been the educational purpose of each American college of the time, and the fact that the College recognized an obligation to inculcate moral and religious principles in no way made it unique.

In spite of the fact that the College had been founded by Episcopalians and had a Faculty and student body largely Episcopalian, there may have been some question as to what extent the College was truly “Episcopalian.” Morning and Evening Prayers were said daily in the Chapel, but only the use of the Prayer Book made Trinity’s daily exercises calculated to improve the intellectual faculties, and to confer readiness and aptness of expression.” This would have been the educational purpose of each American college of the time, and the fact that the College recognized an obligation to inculcate moral and religious principles in no way made it unique.

With the tone of the College so mildly Episcopalian, it was hardly to be expected that there would have been any extensive proselytizing. Some non-Episcopal students had been attracted to the Church either in spite of, or because of, the rather insipid Chapel worship, but there were those who came to College Hill as Congregationalists or Presbyterians and left the campus four years later without changing ecclesiastical connections, and it may be assumed that most of those who were members of the Confirmation Class regularly held at the College were from Episcopalian families. The College was apparently content to have itself described as “firmly committed to the Episcopal Church” and the College shared with the University of Pennsylvania the honor of sending the largest number of graduates to the General Seminary.
and at the same time distressed that the Church was not more firmly committed to the College, especially when it came to the matter of financial support. To the non-Episcopalian community, the "commitment" was minimized; to the Diocese of Connecticut, the "commitment" was magnified.

With such a bland religious atmosphere, it must have been something of a surprise to those on the outside when in the mid-1840's the College became something of a minor battlefield between partisans of extreme "Churchmanship" within the Episcopal Church.

The founders of the College were largely what would have then been called "Connecticut Churchmen." Bishop Brownell and the laymen from Christ Church, Hartford, were certainly of this group which, while inclined to minimize ritual and ceremonial, held steadfastly to Anglican doctrine and staunchly defended the particular claims of the Episcopal Church. Although sometimes referred to as "Old Fashioned Churchmen" or even "High Churchmen," the Episcopalians of the "Connecticut" variety were soon, with the advent of the "Oxford" or "Tractarian" Movement of the 1830's, to be regarded as hopelessly "Low." Among the early Faculty were representatives of still another group: the "Hobartian High Churchmen," or the followers of Bishop Hobart of the Diocese of New York. The Hobartians represented what might be regarded as a next-higher level of "Churchmanship" from the "Connecticut Churchmen." The Hobartians were inclined toward a bit more ceremonial and, perhaps because they had never constituted a persecuted minority as had their brethren in Connecticut, were even more pointed in stating the claims of Episcopacy. Professor Doane, although later to be strongly influenced by the Oxford Movement, was, during his stay at the College, of this group. So, also, were Francis L. Hawks, (whose services to the College were both brief and peripheral), Horatio Potter (who later became Bishop of New York and who, incidentally, regarded all non-Episcopal ordinations as invalid), and John Murray Forbes, Tutor at the College in 1830 (and who in 1848 entered the Church of Rome). Samuel Farmar Jarvis was regarded as "High Church," although probably of neither the "Connecticut" nor "Hobartian" type. None of the early Faculty were representatives of the "Evangelical" or "Southern" Party, and this despite the fact that a number of the students came from "Evangelical" dioceses.

During the Presidency of Bishop Brownell, Connecticut and Hobartian Churchmen had gotten along quite well, for the differences between the two groups were of degree rather than of kind, and Bishop Brownell was not then one to accentuate differences of any sort. Under Nathaniel Wheaton it seemed for a time that all was still to be "sweetness and light," but this was not to be for long, for as the College's demands upon the Church increased, so did the Church's demands upon the College. And it was the coming of Oxford Tractarianism to the Diocese of Connecticut which was to make the College something of a pawn in the party conflict within the Diocese.
The Oxford Movement, viewed from the perspective of history, was a healthful one, and it served as a corrective to the Church in the nineteenth century as much as the Evangelical Movement had in the eighteenth. Essentially, the Oxford leaders attempted to re-state the Catholic nature of the Church of England and to revive elements of worship and devotion which had been abandoned at the time of the English Reformation. By the mid-1830's, a mild form of Tractarianism had reached America and was being received by several of those who had connections with the College in Hartford. George Washington Doane, by now Bishop of New Jersey but with many friends among the Alumni, was one of the movement's foremost proponents. Francis L. Hawks, then at St. Thomas's Church, New York, had also become a Tractarian enthusiast and he, too, had many friends among the Alumni. On the Board of Trustees itself were the Reverend Dr. Harry Croswell of Trinity Church, New Haven, perhaps the first parish priest in the Diocese of Connecticut to advocate Oxford principles, and the Reverend Jackson Kemper who was later, as Missionary Bishop of the West, to carry Tractarianism to the region where the movement took deepest root.

The Reverend Dr. Jarvis, at nearby Middletown, although not a Tractarian, represented a type of "Churchmanship" considerably above the general tenor of the Diocese, and it was indirectly through Dr. Jarvis that the first rumbles of "High Churchmanship" were felt on College Hill. Upon his leaving the College, Dr. Jarvis conducted what amounted to a one-man school of theology in the rectory at Middletown where several of the graduates of the College had gone for preparation for Holy Orders. Whether because of his dislike for President Wheaton and his successor Silas Totten (possibly prompted by Jarvis' own failure to achieve the Presidency), his penchant toward ecclesiastical intrigue and church politics, or a genuine distaste for what he regarded as the "Low Church" atmosphere of the College, Dr. Jarvis spared no pains in pointing out to his young theologues the inadequacies of the institution from whose Faculty he had recently been dismissed.

One of Dr. Jarvis' proteges was John Williams '35 who had studied Theology with the Doctor for two years following his graduation, while Dr. Jarvis was still an active member of the Faculty. When Dr. Jarvis left College Hill in 1837, Williams stayed on as Tutor in Ancient Languages, a position which he held until 1840. John Williams was a young man of parts and much respected by his senior colleagues, but however suave he may have been, the Tutor in Ancient Languages almost immediately found himself the eyes and ears of Dr. Jarvis on College Hill and, prompted to do so by his former mentor, Williams reported faithfully on the internal affairs of the College.

In what was perhaps his first report to Dr. Jarvis, Williams wrote on the day before Totten's installation as President, that a "Low Church Party" or "clique" headed by the Hartford Trustees including former President Wheaton and the Reverend George Burgess, Rector of Christ Church, was endeavoring to gain possession of the College, a possibility evidently not entirely pleasing to Bishop Brownell. Perhaps Williams' story of the "plot" was exaggerated, but Williams probably told Dr. Jarvis exactly what he wanted to hear, and the "Low Church" suspicions of George Burgess were not without foundation.

Whether, from his position as junior member of the Faculty, Williams understood its exact nature, there was something of a rift in both Faculty and Board of Trustees at this time. Although he had been unanimously elected to the Presidency, Silas Totten had actually been the Trustees' second choice, and his name had been put in nomination only after Horatio Potter had been elected and had declined to accept the office. Totten had been eminently successful as a teacher, but there were those who feared that Dr. Wheaton's departure from the College would "prove injurious to its prosperity," and Bishop Brownell felt called upon to assure the Diocesan Convention that Totten was "a gentleman in whose talents, learning, zeal, and piety, the Church may repose implicit confidence."
So far as the “Churchmanship” of the College was concerned, Totten identified himself, for the time at least, with the “Low Church” group, but there was no drifting of the College in the direction of Evangelicalism. Indeed, there was evidence that “High Church” principles were gaining favor among the Hartford Episcopalian community. In his Episcopal Address of 1841, Bishop Brownell conceded that Tractarianism was in the Diocese to stay, although he remarked that while he found much to praise in the Oxford Movement, there were many elements in Tractarianism “which we cannot approve.” Within the year, the Diocesan press was obliged to take cognizance of the “High Church” Movement, and the editor of the Practical Christian and Church Chronicle, A. B. Chapin, explained to his readers that the Church in Connecticut was neither “High” nor “Low” and that he deplored the use of these names. But the real beginning of “High-Churchmanship” in Hartford was the organizing of St. John’s Church in March, 1841.

Christ Church had been growing rapidly, and the beautiful Gothic building which had been dedicated in 1829 could no longer accommodate the worshipers. In 1840, Rector Burgess informed the Diocesan Convention that a division of the parish was imperative, and at a parish meeting on March 15, 1841, it was voted that a new parish would be created. The daughter parish was organized on March 18, 1841, and on April 20, 1842, a handsome Gothic structure on the present Atheneum block was dedicated as St. John’s Church. “Churchmanship” was not the principal factor in the founding of St. John’s Church, but the founders of the parish were of a somewhat more “Churchly” inclination than those who remained at Christ Church, and this tendency was strengthened with the calling as first rector, the Reverend Arthur Cleveland Coxe, a young man of twenty-four, a “High Church” graduate of the General Theological Seminary, and a recent convert from the Presbyterian Church in which his father was a distinguished minister.

John Williams’ fears of a “Low Church” plot must have been completely overcome with the founding of St. John’s Church, for among the charter members of the parish was the entire full-time Faculty: Professors John Brocklesby, Abner Jackson, Duncan L. Stewart, and, perhaps to the surprise of many, President Silas Totten and Treasurer Thomas Belknap. The Hartford Trustees of the College remained with Christ Church, and the line was thus drawn between Hartford Trustees at “Low Church” Christ Church and the Faculty at “High Church” St. John’s.

It was natural that St. John’s Church should have cultivated the friendship of the students at the College. The first friendly gesture was that of providing free use — and this in the day of the rented pew — by the students of the south gallery and, whether because of “Churchmanship” or of the fact that St. John’s was a good half mile closer to the College, several of the students became communicants. Almost immediately St. John’s Church assumed a relationship with the College which had been similar to that of Christ Church in the earlier years and which was, indeed, even more personal and direct. Christ
Church was to remain the scene of the College Commencements and the meetings of the Associate Alumni and its successor, and the Christ Church members of the Board of Trustees were still to dominate, but with Arthur Cleveland Coxe and his successors, Edward A. Washburn and William Croswell Doane, a tie was formed between parish and College which brought enrichment to both. The parish contributed liberally to the College, and in a single year (during the post-Civil War fund-raising campaign) contributed $18,000. Clerical members of the Faculty assisted in the many services of the parish (three services on Sunday, daily Morning Prayer and daily Evening Prayer through Lent, and the Holy Communion on all festivals), and students were active teachers in the educational program of the Church.26

"High Churchmanship" seemed to flourish in Hartford. St. John’s Church grew in number of parishioners beyond all expectations, and Hartford booksellers were offering for sale such titles as *Puseyism no Popery* and *Looking Glass for High Churchmen.*27 On the Hill, the College officially tried to steer a middle course, as was reflected in the appointments to the Board of Trustees and in the awarding of honorary degrees. The election to the Board in 1840 of the Reverend William Cooper Mead, one of the most outspoken Low Churchmen,28 was offset by the election in 1841 of Dr. Jarvis, in 1845 of Arthur Cleveland Coxe, and in 1888 of the Right Reverend Frederick Dan Huntington, a High Churchman of the pre-Tractarian stamp.29 Although in the matter of honorary degrees Low Churchmen such as Alfred Lee (1841), George Burgess (1845), and Samuel Chase (1848), seem to have predominated, such High Churchmen as Arthur Cleveland Coxe (1845) and the Reverend William Ingraham Kip (1846) also received the College’s honors. Apparently the students were reading books of a Tractarian sort, for in 1845 the Reverend George Burgess (who had received a $600 legacy from a late Mrs. Hart) gave $500 to the College with the understanding that the sum be expended for periodicals or for volumes which had not "been charged

with any tendency toward the errors of the Church of Rome."30 And the theological interests of both Faculty and Alumni were reflected in the organizing in 1846 of the "American Society" or the "Ecclesiological Society,"31 which was the first American group to formally study the science of Liturgics. Although it was intended by the society’s founders, Dr. Jarvis and Arthur Cleveland Coxe, that the membership should be largely from the college community, the New York Alumni assumed leadership under two New York clergymen with college connections, Thomas Scott Preston ’43 and John Murray Forbes, a former Tutor.32 With the domination of the New Yorkers, the Ecclesiological Society became identified with the General Theological Seminary,33 and the efforts of Coxe and Dr. Jarvis to re-organize a similar group on College Hill34 apparently met with no success.

Among the students, too, there was some evidence of High Churchmanship. In 1853, the student body held a "Missionary Service" in St. John’s Church for the purpose of securing inter-
est in and support for Racine College in Wisconsin, the High Church college of the Episcopal Church in the West.

While the College in Hartford was (depending on one’s point of view) gradually moving in the direction of High Churchmanship or holding its own against a drift toward Evangelicalism, the Alumni (and particularly the younger Alumni) were adding to the pressures. Leadership among the Associate Alumni had fallen to a group of moderate High Churchmen, particularly those who may be described as advanced Hobartians or those who were of the coterie of Dr. Jarvis. In 1837, Eben Edwards Beardsley ’32 became President of the Society, and in 1839 he was succeeded by John Williams. In 1841 Abner Jackson, then a Professor of the College and a communicant of St. John’s Church, became President and Jackson was, in turn, succeeded by the Reverend Joseph Scott ’27 in 1843. Under this leadership, the Associate Alumni pressed for both a closer relationship of the College with the Episcopal Church and a more “Churchly” (and, incidentally, a more “Academic”) atmosphere on College Hill, and in these endeavors they received, surprisingly, the full support of Bishop Brownell.

At first thought, it may seem that the Bishop’s decision to implement Section 2 of the College Charter was merely an internal affair of the Board of Trustees. When it is remembered, however, that the Charter permitted the Trustees to select the Fellows “from their own number or otherwise,” it must at once become apparent that Bishop Brownell had seized upon an opportunity to “pack” the governing body of the College and to “pack” it in a way which would be to the satisfaction of the Associate Alumni. At any rate, and perhaps because of suspicions of the motives of the Bishop and the Associate Alumni, it was decided at that time not to proceed with the selection of a Board of Fellows.

Although the Trustees would not then concede to the wishes of the Alumni in creating a new but subsidiary Board, they did make a concession (either in the line of “Churchmanship” or in imitation of English university practice) in recognizing the entire college community as a single academic body under the name of the Academic Senate. In 1842 the Trustees published, in addition to the regular Catalogue of that year, the Catalogus Senatus Academicici, et Eorum qui Munera et Officia Academica Gesserunt, Quique Aliquois Gradu Decorati Fuerunt, in Collegio Washingtonensi, in which were listed the past and present Presidents, Trustees, Treasurers, Secretaries, Professors, Tutors, Librarians, students, and graduates, and which described the Trustees and Professors of 1842 as the Senatus Academicus of the College.

The Catalogus Senatus Academicici was reprinted in the Church Chronicle and Record, the paper of the Diocese of Connecticut, and its wide circulation in other Episcopal periodicals seemed to assure Alumni and others interested in the College that more revolutionary changes would be forthcoming. In December, 1842, an alumnus of the College (either from New York or, if from Connecticut, one who had been denied space in the Connecticut religious press) wrote an article in the Churchman, a High Church journal edited in New York by Samuel Seabury, the grandson of Connecticut’s first Bishop. “Alumnus Coll: Wash.;,” as he signed
himself in the *Churchman*, noted the publication of the *Catalogus Senatus Academici* and chose for particular comment the fact that the publication had listed 229 graduates, a considerable number of whom had taken Holy Orders in the Episcopal Church, but of which only a small portion had remained within the Diocese of Connecticut. Apparent here was an unfortunate incongruity, for unlike the General Seminary, which was supported and controlled by the whole Church, the College in Hartford, which also served the whole Church, was controlled by a single Diocese, a situation which precluded any generous financial aid from the Church at large and any constructive changes in matters of “Churchmanship.” Why, asked “Alumnus,” has not the full Church system been carried out? Why are there not daily services? Why no regular observance of the Holy Year? Why “oblivion of all of the sacred rites?” This religious indifference, thought “Alumnus,” was the cause of the College’s financial and spiritual plight for, said he, “it is a piece of utter absurdity to point at what Church Colleges do in England, and insist on its being done here, until at least the one hundredth part of the means possessed by these Colleges is bestowed upon our own.”

Now, in the reference of “Alumnus” to the English “Church Colleges” is to be found a second clue (in addition to mere “Churchmanship”) to what the Associate Alumni wanted. In England, the Tractarian Movement had centered in several of the colleges at Oxford, in America High Churchmanship had been disseminated from the General Theological Seminary in New York, and useful to the purposes of High Churchmen (whether Hobbartian or Tractarian) would be a college from which High Church influence could emanate.

High Churchmen among the Alumni had long been dissatisfied with the institution’s designation as Washington College and, as early as 1842, a move was afoot to change the name to one more directly associated with the Episcopal Church. At that time the name of “Brownell College” had been urged, but the good Bishop had apparently opposed this move, and two years later the Associate Alumni recommended that the Trustees take steps to change the name to “Trinity College.” A committee was appointed to study the request, and although they were perhaps not moved by the theological implications in the petition of the Associate Alumni, the Trustees on May 8, 1845, concluded that as there were at least four colleges bearing the name of “Washington” (in Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Connecticut), there was a danger of some intended legacy being lost to the College in Hartford and, as “our higher Institutions of learning are intimately connected with the cause of religion,” the change of name should be made to Trinity College. A petition was immediately sent to the Connecticut Legislature which was then in session. Although the recommended change of appellation was undertaken with no apparent enthusiasm by the Trustees, that body did go on record as favoring some name which would recognize “the relationship [to the Church] and hold . . . it forth to its pupils and to the world,” but again, perhaps fearful of too close an association of College and Church in the public eye, the bill introduced in the legislature merely mentioned the confusion of the College with others of the same name, and no reference was made to the theological significance of the name “Trinity.” The bill passed both houses of the Connecticut State Legislature on May 23, 1845. Eben Edwards Beardsley’s later observation (much later, twenty years later) that the name Trinity was given to “attest forever the faith of its founders, and their zeal for the perpetual glory and honor of the one holy and undivided Trinity” was probably misplaced so far as the Trustees were concerned. With the Alumni, however, an end important to them had been achieved, and others were to be realized through the final creation of a board of Fellows and through a reorganization of the Academic Senate.

The High Church Alumni had finally resolved to do all within their power to remake the College into a little replica of the English university colleges in which the Oxford Movement had centered. At last, and unlike the College’s founders, the Associate Alumni had definite ideas.
regarding a distinctively "Anglican" type of education and, although they perhaps imperfectly understood their model, what they wanted was perfectly clear in their minds. It is a moot point as to whether the Trustees, in creating the Academic Senate, had made a concession in the form of adopting English university college terminology as an alternative to more painful concessions in matters of "Churchmanship," but it was to the existing Academic Senate that the attention of the Associate Alumni next turned.

At the meeting of the Associate Alumni on July 31, 1844, the Alumni drafted a petition to the Board of Trustees in which they requested Alumni inclusion in the Academic Senate. Obviously what they wanted was a modification of the characteristically American government of the College in the direction of that of the English universities, whose terminology, rich in such names as "Hebdomadal Council" and "House of Congregation," had a strong attraction for the alumni leaders and in whose government the clerical alumni had such a large share. The alumni plan was to re-organize the Associate Alumni as the House of Convocation which, with the Trustees and Faculty, would form a third "chamber" of the Academic Senate. At this same time the Alumni pressed for the creation of a Board of Fellows, and the two matters were presented to the Trustees.

As to alumni representation (or participation) in the Academic Senate, Trustees George Burgess and Arthur Cleveland Coxe were constituted a Trustees' committee to work with alumni representatives in devising a plan which would be acceptable to the Associate Alumni. The committee reported late in the same day (July 31, 1844) that a plan could be worked out without much difficulty. The following day (August 1, 1844) the Trustees voted that the Standing Committee of the Board of Trustees should work with Associate Alumni on a plan for the establishment of a Board of Fellows and for the further organization of the Senatus Academicus in the hope that the changes in the College's organization might go into effect by the next Commencement in August, 1845.

Whether or not the Trustees had intended to give the Standing Committee carte blanche in the matter of collegiate re-organization, Arthur Cleveland Coxe and Dr. Jarvis busied themselves in learning all that they could about the English colleges upon which the College in Hartford was to be re-modeled. Immediately they gathered copies of the calendars (catalogues) and statutes of Oxford, Cambridge, and King's College of the University of London, an Anglican college in what was essentially a Dissenters' university. As Coxe wrote to Dr. Jarvis: "We need anything that will throw light on the internal conditions of the Universities and of such institutions as King's College. I am determined that Trinity College[,] Hartford[,] shall be made a college worthy of the Church and an example to the country."

When the Trustees met on August 6, 1845, "the wind," as a Trinity professor wrote in 1903, "blew distinctly from the banks of the Isis and the Cam, and brought with it the music of such terms as Convocation, Senatus Academicus, Dean, Vice-Dean, Bursar, Fellow, [and] Chancellor." At that time the Trustees adopted a series of resolutions which put into effect the plan which had been devised by the Standing Committee and representatives of the Associate Alumni, and these changes were incorporated into a body of statutes adopted by the Trustees on that date and published as an appendix to the College Catalogue of 1846. A Board of Fellows consisting of six Fellows proper (elected by the Board of Trustees) and six Junior Fellows (elected by the Alumni) was given the power specified in the original Charter. The Board of Fellows was given additional responsibility as the "official examiners of the College" who should concur with the Faculty in the recommendation of all candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, to revise the College statutes when necessary, and to supervise the Library, Cabinet, and Chapel.

The Senatus Academicus was declared to consist of the President, Trustees, Fellows, Professors, and all graduates of the College with whatever degree. All members of the Senatus Academicus, not members of the Board of Trustees,
were constituted the House of Convocation, a body empowered to concur with the Corporation (Trustees) in the institution, naming and endowing of Professorships, fellowships, prizes, and the like, and in nominating the Junior Fellows and candidates for degrees \textit{ad eundem gradum}. Finally, the office of Chancellor was created. The Chancellor was to exercise a general supervision of the whole Academic Body with particular reference to moral and spiritual affairs and to hold periodic visitations of the College and to preside, when present, at meetings of the Board of Fellows. The Chancellor’s visitatorial powers were not, however, to conflict with the powers and privileges of either Faculty or Board of Fellows.

Bishop Brownell was, of course, elected the first Chancellor. The Trustees at once elected six Fellows: Samuel Farmar Jarvis, the Reverend Jonathan M. Wainwright (former rector of Christ Church, Hartford, and in 1845 on the clergy staff of Trinity Parish in New York), the Honorable William W. Boardman, the Reverend Thomas W. Coit (soon to become a member of the College Faculty), the Reverend William Croswell (son of Trustee Harry Croswell), and the Right Reverend Horatio Potter. The House of Convocation immediately organized and elected as Junior Fellows: the Reverend William H. Walter, the Honorable James W. Gordon, the Reverend Nathaniel E. Cornwall, the Reverend Eben Edwards Beardsley, the Reverend William Payne, and the Reverend John Williams.

A year later (in 1846), Convocation elected its first Dean (the Reverend Jacob Lyman Clark) and Vice-Dean (Professor Duncan L. Stewart), the offices which with the Registrar, Bursar, and \textit{Delectus}, added five new elements of English academic terminology to the campus in Hartford. In time the College became even more “English,” if not more “Anglican.” In 1847, the \textit{Catalogue} became the \textit{Calendar} and, in 1849, the three terms of the academic year were re-named the Advent, Lent, and Trinity Terms.

Almost sixty years later, a Trinity Professor described what had happened at the College in the mid-1840’s as an attempt to put “warmth and life . . . into the College by clothing it with all the paraphernalia of English nomenclature”\textsuperscript{60} and perhaps, to a large degree, it was. At the time, however, there was some feeling, even among those who must have regarded the developments with the greatest favor, that “externals” – whether ecclesiastical or academic – could not be ends in themselves. In an address to the House of Convocation delivered in August, 1846, John Williams spoke to this point: “There has been, as we trust, revived among us, something of the old and true principle of the University. . . . To have attempted . . . to revive those venerable academic forms and organizations, which in the ages when they spontaneously sprung up, were adequate expressions of real feeling, and adequate suppliers of real wants, would have been utterly meaningless. To have attempted . . . to copy . . . the present polity of foreign Universities . . . would have been even more absurd. . . . The former . . . would have [been] the merest piece of antiquarian trifling. . . . The latter . . . would have [produced] a body without a soul, a cumbrous machine without a motive power.”\textsuperscript{61} Here was indeed a challenge to the College to make meaningful the recently-made changes in organization.

If Trinity College’s “Revolution of 1845” made the College more “English” it also made the College more “Episcopalian.” As the clergy were the most articulate segment of the Alumni (if not the actual majority), the granting of alumni participation through the House of Convocation in the government of the College was welcome by the Episcopal clergy, and this new power was exercised gladly, particularly in recommending fellow clergy for honorary and \textit{ad eundem} degrees.\textsuperscript{62} And at a time when the relative number of clergy on the Board of Trustees was declining,\textsuperscript{63} the Board of Fellows for fifty years had a large clerical majority.\textsuperscript{64}

But the closest tie of the College to the Episcopal Church was in the office of Chancellor. Before the creation of this office, Bishop Brownell had occasionally presided over meetings of the Board of Trustees,\textsuperscript{65} and, as presidents of the College had come and gone, the Bishop of Con-
necticut had been regarded perhaps as something of a "Super President," to whom it usually fell to name Trustees' committees. On September 28, 1848, the Secretary of the Board of Trustees recorded a most interesting item in the Trustees Minutes. John Williams had just assumed the Presidency, but on that date "at the request of the President, Bishop Brownell took the chair," and from "the chair" the Bishop was not to be dislodged. And whether the procedure had been agreed upon beforehand, or whether the procedure was with John Williams' approval or even previous knowledge, the Board resolved to petition the Legislature of the State of Connecticut for an amendment to the Charter of the College making the Bishop of the Diocese of Connecticut ex officio Chancellor of the College and President of the Board of Trustees. The following May the legislature passed the bill which once more placed Bishop Brownell at the head of the institution and thus, by legislative enactment, an official relationship had been created between Trinity College and the Diocese of Connecticut. For weal or for woe, until 1888 no President of Trinity College was to be really and entirely President; the real President was to be the Right Reverend Chancellor.

From the second function of the Chancellor, that of Visitor to the College, there developed still another body or "Board" which participated in the internal administration of the College. Bishop Brownell served in capacity as Visitor until his death in 1865, but with the election of John Williams as Assistant Bishop of Connecticut in 1853 he, too, was given the title of Visitor and thus was formed the Board of Visitors. In 1859, the Right Reverends John Henry Hopkins (Bishop of Vermont), Carlton Chase (Bishop of New Hampshire), George Burgess (by then Bishop of Maine), Horatio Potter (Bishop of New York), and Thomas March Clark (Bishop of Rhode Island) were added to the Board as a symbol of cooperation with the neighboring dioceses in the management of the College.

Trinity College had become more English, possibly more "Academic," and certainly more Episcopalian, but had it become more Christian? To be sure, many of the students had been influenced by the High Church tendencies which were being evidenced on College Hill, and many of them were doubtless shining examples of the best of that particular brand of piety. Throughout the late 1830's and the decade of the 1840's, the proportion of graduates who had taken Holy Orders was even higher than it had been in the earlier years; indeed, it was thought (erroneously, of course) in some quarters that the College existed primarily as a minor seminary for the training of clergy. Episcopal visitations (and a new organ installed in the Chapel in 1850) must have done at least something toward enriching the worship of the College. Several students conducted a Sunday School at the College for faculty families and other children in the neighborhood. Two others, acting in a lay capacity and under the sponsorship of St. John's Church, Hartford, organized St. John's Mission in East Hartford. In 1846, Arthur Cleveland Coxe gathered a group of students for the study of Church Architecture, and throughout the period the Missionary Society, encouraged and assisted by the Episcopal clergy of Hartford, was one of the more prosperous and active student organizations. All in all, there was much to suggest that the re-organized College was moving in the direction of a Christian community of Trustees, Fellows, Alumni, and students. The apparently amicable concessions of the Trustees to the feelings of the Alumni seemed to reflect a Christian charity, and the wheels of the new machinery appeared to have been lubricated by the milk of human kindness. So, perhaps, it was— with the exception of the unfortunate case of President Totten.

From the beginning of his term as President, Silas Totten had been unpopular. Despite his abilities as a teacher and his reputation as a scholar, he somehow failed to inspire confidence as an academic administrator. Perhaps Totten was too eager to please. Perhaps, too, he was a joiner of causes. In the Hartford community Totten had tried to be a good citizen. Occasionally he lectured at the Young Men's Institute, a literary and debating society for the
young businessmen and apprentices of the city. And despite what must have been his scientific turn of mind, he was a devotee of the pseudo-science of Phrenology and could, on occasion, write glowing endorsements in the local press of lecturers on the subject. On Sundays he conducted services at St. Mary’s Church, a struggling mission in Manchester. During the first years of his Presidency, Totten had identified himself with the Low Church element which controlled the Board of Trustees, but possibly sensing that the winds were blowing from the direction of the Isis and the Cam, he joined the rest of the College Faculty in helping to organize St. John’s Church.

Try as he might, Silas Totten could not please, and by 1845 there was a definite move afoot to remove him from the Presidency. Ironically, the move was headed by those whom he had hoped to win by his transfer from Christ Church to St. John’s. Arthur Cleveland Coxe had little use for President Totten and did all in his power to make the unhappy college president even more uncomfortable. During the spring vacation of 1846, Totten went to the West, probably in search of a more congenial employment, and while still on vacation he suffered a physical breakdown. By mid-June he had partially recovered, and by the opening of the College in September he was back in Hartford defending himself and his administration against his critics.

Obviously, the leadership of President Totten left something to be desired. Not only was there a falling-off of the number of students as entering freshman classes became notably small, there was even noticed a serious demoralization of the Faculty. In March, 1848, Arthur Cleveland Coxe wrote to his colleague on the Board of Trustees, Samuel Farmar Jarvis, “The Examinations are a humbug; I think [that] no one is doing, or trying to do anything. Till Totten Goes!” Perhaps the students themselves showed their dissatisfaction with the administration when they burned the college outhouse. Trustee Coxe, of course, reported the incident to his friend Dr. Jarvis and used the occasion to again castigate President Totten. “Cloacine Hall,” he wrote, “was burned down, lately, by the Students; & is now rebuilding. Nothing else is in a state of edification on the premises; the fact is [that] there will soon be better accommodations for the bowels than for the brains in that famous seat of science.”

By the end of the academic year of 1847-48, President Totten had reached the end of human endurance and at the meeting of the Trustees on August 2, 1848, he submitted his resignation to take effect after Commencement the following day. The Trustees accepted the resignation which had so long been urged upon the unhappy President. Totten was asked by the Trustees to sit for a portrait by Mr. James Flagg—the portrait to be hung in the Library along with the portrait which had been made of former President Wheaton at the time of his leaving the Presidency.

The Board was not slow to choose a successor to Silas Totten. A committee consisting of Trustees Brownell, Croswell, and Coxe—all of whom had been hostile to Totten—was appointed to consider a new President, and the following day the name of John Williams, then Rector of St. George’s Church in Schenectady, New York, was proposed by the Committee; and Williams, perhaps the long-desired successor, was unanimously elected to the Presidency of Trinity College at a salary of $1,200 and house.

Totten was out, but he was not jobless. And, in a way, he went on from Trinity College to even greater things. From Hartford he went to the College of William and Mary as Professor of Belles Lettres, which position he resigned in 1859 to become Chancellor of the University of Iowa.

But Totten did not leave College Hill graciously, and he could hardly have been expected to. Among his few friends in Hartford, and they probably were few, Totten sought to appear as the victim of a High Church conspiracy headed by Professor Jackson, Arthur Cleveland Coxe, President-elect Williams, and particularly Dr. Jarvis. And in his hasty departure from Hartford, Totten had not been able to make a satisfactory financial settlement with the Trustees. Within a month he presented a claim for what the Trustees Minutes described as “additional
salary or compensation for past services." Evidently the claim was a legitimate one, for the Standing Committee was given "full power to compromise the same." No satisfactory agreement was made at the time, and in the spring of 1850 Totten brought suit against the College. In April, 1850, Treasurer Belknap and Trustee Huntington were delegated to deal with the late President in his "claim and suit," and, from the absence of further references to the case, it may be assumed that some sort of settlement was made.

The verdict of his contemporaries—and that of history—is that Totten failed as an administrator. But in view of the sweeping changes just described, and assuming that the changes were for the better, the Totten Administration must be regarded as one of the most dynamic decades in the College's history. And it would be hard to believe that all of this progress was made in spite of President Totten. Certainly some of it must have been because of him.
This Dear Little University

The return of John Williams to the College was the beginning of an idyllic period in the history of Trinity. Hartford was still (although a busy commercial, banking, and industrial center) a small city and had not yet experienced the rapid population growth of the 1850's and 1860's.1 But slowly the city was pushing out toward the College. In the direction of Asylum Street to the west and Asylum Hill beyond, and along Washington Street to the south, houses were being built in rather rapid succession. Since 1839, the tracks of the New Haven Railroad (leading to the terminal several blocks east of the present railroad station) had partially obstructed the hitherto unbroken vista to the west; but beyond the single line of tracks and several factories along the Little River, open farmland extended south-westward as far as the eye could see.2 And, although gradually becoming less so, the situation of the College was still essentially rural. Between the College and Main Street, vacant lots were being filled, and by 1852 the College itself had erected four four-story dwellings on the east side of Bliss Street opposite the campus.3

Since the completion of Brownell Hall in 1845, the external appearance of the campus had changed little, except that the grounds were probably better-kept than they had been previously. In 1854, the citizens of Hartford voted to develop the thirty acres to the north of the campus as a public park, and this project (carried out in the next few years) virtually added this beautiful expanse of lawn and shrubbery to the fourteen acres of the campus proper.4

Within the college walls there were notable improvements. In 1844, the Trustees voted to raise funds for the refurbishing of the “Library Room,”5 and in 1846 Nathaniel Wheaton was again traveling in Europe and, although not on official college business, he once more sent both books and scientific apparatus for the use of the College.6 By 1850, the College Library numbered 12,000 volumes, the largest number since the days of Dr. Jarvis; but this collection included the library of Professor Thomas Winthrop Coit and that of one of the Trustees.7 In 1852, the Alumni of the College undertook the enlargement of the book collection when the House of Convocation voted to add “one alcove of Books, to be known as the ‘Alcove of Convocation’; said addition to be made by subscription of three dollars or more by each member of Convocation, and by donations of books.”8 Some such contributions were soon received, but the first real permanent endowment of the College Library came in 1854 when John P. Elton of Waterbury, Connecticut, gave $5,000 as the “Elton Fund for the Library.”9

In 1852, an important change was made in the administration of the College Library when Samuel Fermor Jarvis, the son of the late Dr. Samuel Farmar Jarvis,10 was made Librarian. In the early days, the duties of Librarian had been performed by the Tutors. Professor Humphreys had served briefly in 1828 and Professor Totten had been in charge of the Library from 1833 until 1837. Abner Jackson became Librarian when he was appointed Tutor in 1837, and he retained the office when he was advanced to rank of Professor the following year. In 1852, however, James Rankine, Mathematics Tutor and Librarian since 1848, resigned as full-time member of the College and accepted an adjunct appointment as Lecturer in
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Mathematics whereupon the Trustees established the Librarianship as a separate position and gave the post to young Jarvis. Although Jarvis served for but two years, he did much to make the Library more than a storehouse for books; and the College Library as a useful part of the college equipment dates from Jarvis' time.

But Jarvis was succeeded in 1854 by one even more important in the development of the Trinity College Library—Charles J. Hoadley '51. Hoadley's term, too, was short, for in 1855 he resigned to head the Connecticut State Library. His departure from the campus did not mean the end of his interest in the College Library, for until his death in 1900 he was one of the Library's most generous benefactors, and he frequently presented the College with literary treasures. For many years he served on the College Library Committee. In 1865, he was elected to the Board of Trustees, and at various times he served as secretary of the Corporation, secretary of Phi Beta Kappa, and president of the same society.

When Hoadley resigned, the Librarianship was again taken over by one of the Tutors, the Reverend Rufus Emery, who served until 1857 when Thomas Ruggles Pynchon '41, Professor of Chemistry and Natural Sciences, succeeded him. Pynchon held the Librarianship until 1882 and, as he was elected President of the College in 1874, he was the only head of the College ever to serve as Librarian. Despite his heavy teaching schedule, Pynchon was much devoted to the Library. Frequently, he enriched the College's library holdings by the contribution of valuable works. In 1859, Professor Pynchon induced Professor Samuel Eliot to provide funds to rearrange the entire Library on the "alcove plan" and to engage Pynchon's brother, J. H. Pynchon, as Library Assistant. The Pynchons made a crude catalog in which the collection of books was arranged alphabetically by title. Pynchon cultivated alumni interest in the Library, and by 1859 the Alumni Program of $3.00 contributions had netted $1,500.

Professor Pynchon also did much to improve the facilities for the teaching of Chemistry. The old Chemistry "Lab"—Seabury Hall, "first floor, right-hand side"—which Pynchon had inherited from his predecessors, Professors Hall, Rogers, Jackson, and Rankine, had seen few improvements since the days of Dr. Rogers, who had resigned in 1839. During the academic year of 1855-1856, Pynchon took what may have been the first American sabbatical leave when he visited Europe to inspect the laboratories and cabinets of London and Paris and to study, as the local press reported, with "the most eminent teachers of Geology and Mineralogy in the world." While in Europe, he was impressed with the inadequacies of his own laboratory in Seabury Hall. Pynchon wrote to the College Trustees asking that he be sent $2,000 to purchase scientific equipment. The Trustees immediately raised $1,500 from "the local community" and then asked the Alumni to raise the remaining $500 in subscriptions of $5.00 each. The total sum of $2,000 was soon raised, and the Calendar for 1857 noted that the Chemistry Laboratory had been thoroughly remodeled, "and the apparatus greatly enlarged by extensive purchases in Europe."

In the dormitories there was, unfortunately, no similar refurbishing. Even the new dormitory, Brownell Hall, had none of the "conveniences" later to be taken for granted by college students. There were still neither bathrooms nor running water. Each student had his own tin tub to which one of the janitors carried a bucket of water each morning. And each morning during the winter months the janitors lighted a fire in each student room. Camphene lamps provided illumination, and occasionally a lamp exploded and burned holes in the carpets.

Although the dormitories could have accommodated 150 students, there was no increase in the student body. In fact, the decline which had set in during the latter period of the Totten administration continued, and the average student body during the decade of the 1850's numbered about 60, rather than the 80 of the previous decade. But it could hardly have been the expense of attending Trinity which kept the student body small, for the tuition remained at the original $33 per year until 1854, when it was in-
creased to $39 per year. Not until 1857 was the tuition fee set at $50 per year. With the total yearly expense still not exceeding $150, the cost of a Trinity education was still low when compared with the $195 at Yale, the $226 at Princeton, the $245 at Harvard, or the $332 at the University of Virginia. And for those who could not pay—either in full or in part—there were many scholarships.

The College had still made no provision for dining, and the boarding houses were still patronized by most of the students. From the mid-1830's, however, there had been a sort of "student cooperative," the Franklin Club, in which a dozen or so students rented a house opposite the College for dining and hired a steward to superintend the cooking. Board here was from one-half to two-thirds the rate charged by the boarding houses, but the Franklin Club seems to have expired about 1845 and was never revived.

The failure of the college administration to provide a commons notwithstanding, during the late 1840's and during the 1850's the students enjoyed a social life, both on campus and in town, not altogether unlike that which is now associated with collegians. The College Statutes as revised in 1852 revealed something of a relaxing of the severity of the college rules, and a 10:30 P.M. curfew permitted the students to go "on the town" without incurring the wrath of the authorities on College Hill. Equally pleasant to the students was the new schedule of classes adopted in 1857 whereby the first class in the morning met at eight rather than six. And, although each class had a recitation as late as four in the afternoon, there were still more than five hours in which the undergraduates could enter into the activities—cultural and otherwise—of the Hartford community.

Hartford in the decade of the 1850's was a gay place. There were numerous dances to which the students, as well as the "leading families," were welcome. Among these the most "fashionable" were the "Cotillion Parties"—described locally as "harmonical soirees"—held in Gilman's Saloon; the annual or semi-annual balls held by Blackford's Brass Band, the Hartford Quadrille Band, and the Hartford Brass Band; and the Dancing Academy held through the winter months at Gilman's Saloon. Music lovers enjoyed the annual
visits of the Germania Society (a forty-piece symphonic orchestra) and M. Paul Jullien’s ensemble (the principal competitor to the Germania Society). There were also concerts by Ole Bull, Adelina Patti (who appeared in Hartford in 1853 as an eight-year-old prodigy), Jenny Lind (whose one recital in Hartford was broken up by the booing victims of a ticket scalper), Madame Sontag, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, and the Pyne and Harrison English Opera Troupe. Those whose tastes were along more “homey” lines enjoyed the appearances of the Baker Family, the “Ballad Concerts” of Mr. and Mrs. L. V. H. Crosby, the Welch Family, the Campbell Minstrels, and Davis’ Ethiopian Serenaders. The Young Men’s Institute (soon to become the Hartford Public Library) and the Hartford Arts Union sponsored lectures by such notables as Ralph
Waldo Emerson, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Wendell Phillips. In the public halls of the city appeared Fanny Kemble who gave Shakespearian readings and Miss Lola Montez, erstwhile mistress of King Ludwig I of Bavaria, who lectured on the subject of “European Women.” In the summer months, there were almost nightly concerts by the city’s many bands. In the fall there were the Hartford County Fair and the horse races at the “Trotting Park” in the South Meadows. Sometimes there were traveling panoramas: “The Burning of Moscow,” “The City of Paris,” and the ever-popular “Holy Land” and “Solomon’s Temple.” The older, and braver, of the students could visit Hartford’s more than twenty “grog shops” (that is, until the Connecticut Prohibition Law of 1854), and universal satisfaction greeted the opening in September, 1854, of Southmaid’s Saloon (or ice cream parlour) in which were dispensed ice cream, fancy cakes, meats, oysters, game, and other comestibles, and which was open all hours of the day to the fastidious of both sexes.31

As Hartford grew in population and as the intellectual horizons of the townsfolk broadened, the chasm which had always existed between the College community and the local citizenry widened. The numerical growth of the student body and faculty had not kept pace with Hartford’s rapid population expansion and, indeed, the student body had suffered an actual decline in numbers. To be sure, the College added a “respectable” element to the city, but by the 1850’s it was but one of many institutions which added distinction. In a sense, the collegians had become spectators at, rather than participants in, the life of the city, for attendance at balls and concerts was something altogether different from the earlier days when the “College Archers” appeared on every public occasion and headed every parade.

The decline and ultimate disappearance of the “Archers” in the late 1830’s coincided with the rise of the uniformed fire companies of Hartford, and these splendidly-clad defenders of life and property succeeded to their place in public adulation. On occasion, the students were invited to participate in public exercises (as in 1847 when President Polk visited the city32 or the Fourth of July parade in 185633), but then it was in the company of the Faculty and dressed in civilian clothes. And as an illustration of the declining interest of the town in the College on the Hill, when Hartford celebrated the completion of the Atlantic Cable in August of 1858, the Committee on Arrangements decided not to illuminate the College, even though the plan was to illuminate all public buildings.34

The College authorities, of course, deplored the lack of rapport with the Hartford community and, it would seem, no effort was spared to share the resources of the College with the town. From time to time the Faculty offered public lectures — the first series was described as being “primarily intended for the instruction and entertainment of the Faculty and Students” — to which the townsfolk were invited. Professor Eliot lectured on “Dante and his Times”;35 Professor Brocklesby lectured on Electricity and Magnetism;36 Adjunct Lecturer Edward A. Washburn, rector of St. John’s Church, gave a series of lectures on English Literature;37 and Dr. Goodwin held forth on “Goethe’s Faust.” Although the lectures were well-advertised in the local papers and although admission was usually free, the attendance of the public lectures of the College was poor.38 The Hartford people had little interest in what the College was best able to give!

But there were factors which could have had no other effect than to accentuate the estrangement of town and College. In 1853, the College Faculty petitioned the Connecticut State Legislature for an exemption from taxation for the officers of the College.39 The request was denied when the House Judiciary Committee reported unfavorably on the bill,40 but the damage was already done, and a vain and unwise petition had laid the College Faculty open to the charge of seeking special privilege.

The generous support of the College by Hartford Episcopalians, and the flaunting of this generosity by the College, plus the fact that the College had briefly offered regular theological instruction for candidates for Holy Orders,41 had
revived suspicions that the College was an institution of and for the Episcopal Church. In December, 1856, a supporter of the College (probably the President) wrote five articles for the Hartford Daily Courant in which he attempted to correct what he insisted were erroneous opinions locally entertained regarding Trinity College. The series was entitled "Has the City of Hartford an Interest in Her Own College?" and the essays were signed "Justitia." The author acknowledged that the popular opinion was that Trinity was a "sectarian institution" and he freely admitted that the Board of Trustees was then "wholly Episcopalian." He pointed out, however, that this had not always been so and that although the student body was then predominantly Episcopalian, the College did not proselytize, that the College no longer had a Theological Department, and that it was now "a College; a proper College; and a place for Classical and Mathematical training." Here, argued "Justitia," the College had become the victim of a vicious cycle. Hartford had not supported the College 1) because it was thought to be "sectarian" and 2) because it was small. Lack of support had kept the College small and Hartford families, because the College had remained small, sent their sons elsewhere. And because the College had remained small, many believed that it was inferior to others in New England. Now, wrote "Justitia," Hartfordites refer to your College, whereas they should say our College. "A prosperous College," he concluded, "is an important element in the reputation of a city," and Trinity College contributes (through the spending of the seventy persons connected with the institution) $30,000 annually to the economic prosperity of Hartford.

Then, as now, the collegians doubtless availed themselves of many of the social and cultural opportunities of Hartford, but an examination of the campus life of the 1850's would more than suggest that life on College Hill went on almost oblivious of that of the bustling little city across the park. And in view of the readiness of the press to publicize student disorders, the absence of reports of student misdemeanor and the absence of students in the local police courts suggest that either the students visited town less than formerly or that they were notably circumspect.

Regarding life on the campus the same observations could hardly apply. On their home grounds the students were still given to much rowdiness and crude undergraduate horseplay. Despite the college policy and the laws of the state of Connecticut, there was considerable drinking. Parents of the students were much concerned about what was regarded as a lax enforcement of the College Statute against the use of alcohol, and at least one undergraduate was obliged to transfer to Kenyon where, it was thought by his parents, he would be less exposed to temptation. Once the students stole a load of hay and at night placed it in the Chapel. On another occasion the pranksters played havoc with the official weather report. Since 1846, the College had operated a weather station from which Professor Brocklesby reported weekly to the local press on such matters as daily rainfall, hours of sunshine, temperature, etc. During one heavy rainstorm, the students poured water into the rainfall-measuring instruments and before Professor Brocklesby realized what had happened the instruments had recorded the greatest rainfall in history. Annually, the students "burned Euclid" and although the festivities of Euclid's cremation were boisterous indeed, the Faculty made no attempt to terminate the custom as their counterparts at Yale had done in 1848. Tobacco chewing, particularly by the southern students, enjoyed some vogue, and the spitting on the floor of both classrooms and Chapel brought forth Professor Brocklesby's warning: "Those who expectorate on this floor need not expect-to-rate high in this class." Occasionally, however, the Faculty felt obliged to curb the collegians' antics. Parodies were the order of the day, and nothing was spared from Phi Beta Kappa's annual meeting to the Junior Exhibition. In 1859, however, the lowly Freshmen stepped beyond the Faculty's rather broad definition of the limits of propriety. Just before Commencement the Freshmen "got up a very
well arranged 'Pow-wow,'” as the local press described their parody on the ceremonies of the graduating class. Programs for the occasion had been printed and distributed, and some of them fell into the hands of Alumni who were in town for Commencement week. A number of the “old grads,” as well as their wives, entering into the spirit of the occasion in happy reminiscence of their own earlier participation in similar affairs, attended the performance and seemed to enjoy the lampoon. Two of the younger Professors, however, thought differently and took it upon themselves to order the Freshmen to their rooms. The performers ignored the order and were encouraged to continue by the Alumni present, who declared the parody to be “harmless and innocent.” Professor Eliot appeared on the scene and, taking the side of his faculty colleagues, successfully appealed to the “better natures and feelings” of the Freshmen and thus, in spite of alumni disgruntlement, brought a pleasant Trinity “public occasion” to an end.52

Freshman hazing, perhaps as old as the College or as old as collegiate education, became somewhat formalized at Trinity in the campus institution known as the “Grand Tribunal.” The origins of the Grand Tribunal are lost in the mists of early college tradition, but by the beginning of the 1850’s it had come to be recognized as a mock court composed of Seniors and Juniors for the purpose of keeping the Sophomores in tow. The Grand Tribunal was headed by the “Grand High Chancellor” who presided at the court’s sessions. There were also judges, advocates, and a sheriff. Sophomores accused of misconduct would be brought before the court for trial, but the seriousness with which the court was regarded might be attested to by the fact that cases were few, and that sometimes an entire year passed without a sitting of the Grand Tribunal. In the prosecution and the defense, the students often rose to great heights of eloquence and the Tribunal was, thus, a practice court for potential lawyers. Perhaps, too, the Tribunal was a rudimentary form of “student government,” for the Faculty offered full cooperation in acting as “police” while the court was in session to prevent the Sophomores from creating disturbances outside the courtroom.53

Although originally intended to discipline the Sophomores, those traditional persecutors of Freshmen, the Freshmen themselves, in the course of time, came under the jurisdiction of the Grand Tribunal, and the hazing of Freshmen — officially at least — became one of the functions of the Junior and Senior “court.” In the fall of 1860, the Tribunal “sat” in Odd Fellows Hall in Hartford and the new students were summoned, one after the other, to appear, and each was “put through a course of sprouts after a mock trial.” Three of the Freshmen, however, refused to submit, and the officers of the Tribunal proceeded to punish the recalcitrants. One was taken at night to Zion Hill Cemetery and lashed to a tombstone. Happily, he was released by a classmate at an early-morning hour. Another was forced into a carriage and taken several miles from Hartford where he was tied up and left suspended in an old well.54 The third, Preston D. Sill of South Carolina, was more elusive. On the evening of Thursday, October 11, however, as the students were leaving the Chapel after Evening Prayer, “agents” of the Grand Tribunal attempted to seize Mr. Sill and carry him to a carriage waiting at the side of the building. Sill had anticipated such an incident and, as the rush was made, he produced a revolver and fired at his nearest assailant. Fortunately, the shot was high and the bullet lodged in a pillar of the chapel portico. The students, thinking that the bullet had hit its mark, shouted “Man shot!” Immediately the Faculty appeared on the scene, took charge of Mr. Sill, and dispersed the students.55

Sill became literally an over-night hero in Hartford and the local press praised his bravery,56 but on College Hill it was another matter. There his action was regarded as having been most cowardly, and there was some reason to believe that he might suffer bodily harm at the hands of irate undergraduates. Immediately after the incident, Sill was taken by Professor Edward Graham Daves, Professor of Greek, to the rooms of Professor Austin Stickney, Daves’ colleague in Latin. There Sill was examined by the Faculty,
and according to Sill’s own version of the story—much to be doubted—the Faculty absolved him of all blame for the affair and assured him that he would not be punished. At any rate, although the Faculty never issued an official statement regarding the proceedings, Sill left Hartford on the first train and never returned to the College. 57

The students could be unruly, disrespectful of lawful authority, uncouth, and even—some of them—actually vicious; but they could also be considerate perhaps beyond normal expectation. When Professor Jackson left the College to accept the Presidency of Hobart College, the students “serenaded” their former Professor at his home on the eve of his departure. The following day they accompanied him to the railroad station and sang “Auld Lang Syne” as the train left Hartford. 58 Shortly thereafter they gave a similar “serenade” for the departing Instructor in Modern Languages, M. Leopold Simonson. 59 And on the occasion of Bishop Brownell’s eightieth birthday, the Trinity students adopted resolutions “indicative of their esteem of the founder, first President, constant patron and faithful supporter of the institution.” 60

In a way, some of the undergraduate deviltry was a form of “letting off steam” in the days before organized sports absorbed so much of the collegians’ energies. But only in a way, for the decade of the 1850’s was the period in which collegiate (although not inter-collegiate) athletics began at Trinity.

Critics of the mores of the Trinity undergraduates had long deplored the sedentary life of the residents of College Hill, and visiting preachers had continued to reiterate the unfavorable comments long since made by Nathaniel Wheaton in the 1820’s. In 1847 the Reverend Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright, a Fellow of the College and then of St. John’s Chapel of Trinity Parish, New York, delivered the annual address before the House of Convocation in which he, as Wheaton had previously done, compared the activities of English and American collegians. Pointing out that in the English colleges the student spent two hours each day in riding, walking, rowing, fencing, or gymnastics, Wainwright urged that Trinity adopt compulsory measures to insure adequate physical exercise. 61 By remarkable coincidence, three days after Wainwright had presented his views on the strenuous life, there appeared an item in the Hartford Daily Courant, which, although not specifically mentioning the Trinity students, more than suggests that the collegians were more committed to outdoor recreation than the convocation speaker realized. Many complaints, the Courant noted, had been heard of the large number of persons who swam in the Little River, “directly back of Inlay’s Mill, and in sight from the railroad . . . occasionally as many as 75 persons . . .” from March until as late as November, and “from morning until late in the afternoon . . . It is one continual scene of diving, swimming, shouting and running naked over the back of the College, and around the lots opposite; and in the midst of all this, respectable females are compelled to pass the Railroad in going to and from church.” 62

The Courant’s editor’s suggestion that cleanliness—when achieved through bathing in the Little River—was hardly akin to godliness could not prevail against Wainwright’s preaching of a sound mind in a sound body, for the students, with or without Faculty sponsorship or approval, had come to find sports, of one sort or another, very much to their liking. Swimming in summer and skating in winter took the undergraduates frequently to the “Hog.” Several undergraduates took up boxing, and the more affluent among the student body hired saddle horses and rode as far away as to Avon Mountain. 63 Visiting preachers continued to lament that “educated men are sadly deficient in . . . manly robustness,” 64 but it was not long before organized team-sports made their appearance.

In 1856, the first Trinity team, the “Minnehaha Club,” came into being. The Minnehaha Club was a college rowing team, 65 and the founding of this club marks the beginning of Trinity’s long history of competitive sports. In the formation of the Minnehaha Club, the collegians had merely succumbed to a fad which absorbed the young men of Hartford at the time. The first of the many Hartford boat clubs (there were at least five by
1858), other than that of the College, was the Undine Club and it was with this group that the Minnehaha entered into first competition. The Undine boat was 35 feet, four-oared, and painted salmon color with a blue stripe. The Minnehaha Club's boat was 30 feet, four-oared, and painted black with a gold stripe. The contest was held either in the summer of 1856 or 1857, and consisted of two races. The first was won by the Trinity team; but in the second race, Trinity broke an oarlock and consequently lost.

By the summer of 1858, Trinity was ready for intercollegiate competition. The rowing clubs of several eastern colleges had scheduled a regatta to be held at Springfield, Massachusetts, on July 23, a date just one week before Commencement. Harvard, Yale, Brown, Dartmouth, and Trinity were scheduled to participate and, as the Hartford Daily Courant put it, the regatta "daily became more an object of interest." Three days before the regatta, however, George E. Dunham of Hartford, a member of the Yale team which had gone to Springfield a week early for practice, fell from his boat and was drowned. Yale immediately withdrew from the competition and the Hartford Daily Courant included a notice, "The regatta 'daily became more an object of interest.'" Three days before the regatta, however, George E. Dunham of Hartford, a member of the Yale team which had gone to Springfield a week early for practice, fell from his boat and was drowned. Yale immediately withdrew from the competition and the Hartford Daily Courant included a notice, "The regatta 'daily became more an object of interest.'"

The death of George Dunham had its effect upon rowing among the Hartford clubs. A regatta scheduled for Hartford on July 26, 1858, was postponed out of respect to the deceased townsman. There were several "reviews" of the "Hartford Navy," as the aggregate of the local clubs was called, but Trinity did not participate. Commencement was on July 31, and the crew was dispersed at that time.

By the summer of 1859, the fad of boating had largely passed in Hartford. There were still a few races and an occasional review, but there was little real enthusiasm. The Minnehaha Club, however, remained active, and although they did not engage in competition, they still rowed on the nearby river and even replaced their first boat. The old Minnehaha was replaced by another boat of the same name, the second Minnehaha being 36 feet. The second boat, the Trinity, was 32 feet, and like the Minnehaha, was painted black with gold stripes. And at about this same time the crew began sporting the first Trinity athletic uniform: white shirts with blue cuffs, collar, and bosoms bordered with white, with "TRINITY" in white across the shirt, white duck pants, and straw hats. A year later (1860), the straw hats gave way to blue skull caps. On July 25, 1860, a regatta was held at Worcester. The participants were Harvard, Yale, and Brown. But Trinity's absence may have enhanced her reputation, as the participants made themselves unwelcome in Worcester by their noisy disturbance.

Even though not entering into competition with collegiate or other clubs, the Minnehaha Club continued to function. In 1862, the club
added a third boat to the Trinity fleet, the Niad, 26 feet long, six-oared, and painted white with blue stripes. In the later years of its formal existence, the Minnehaha Club became less active, and although officially listed among the clubs comprising the Hartford Navy until 1865, it may be said that Trinity’s first rowing club was a casualty of the Civil War.

Other competitive sports made their appearance in Hartford, but the students showed little enthusiasm for anything but rowing. By the summer of 1858, wicket, an American version of cricket, already popular among the Yale students and Hartford schoolboys, became popular in inter-town sports. Hartford, Wethersfield, Newington, Waterbury, and Plainville had wicket teams, but the College never seems to have put a team into the field. Baseball, by 1860 popular at Hartford High School where it was then played by eight-man teams, also seems to have been ignored by college students even though the high school team played in nearby City Park.

Football alone, of the pre-Civil War games, seems to have held much interest for the Trinity men. On Saturday afternoon, September 26, 1857, the first recorded game of football was played between the Freshmen and the Sophomores. The Freshmen won the game, which was of enough local interest to have been noted in the local newspapers.

On October 19, 1858, the Trinity athletes received their first football challenge through the pages of the Hartford Daily Courant, when “twenty young men of Hartford, being desirous of having a friendly and sociable game of football,” challenged an equal number of Trinity students to meet them at a place to be agreed upon on Saturday, October 27, at 2:30 P.M. The students were requested to send a delegation of three to the United States Hotel “Wednesday evening at 8 o’clock P.M.” The “twenty young men of Hartford” had not read their calendar correctly, for October 27 fell on Wednesday rather than on Saturday. Trinity, nevertheless, accepted the challenge immediately and the game was set for Saturday, October 30, at 2:30 P.M. on the “Military Grounds” in South Meadows. But weather twice forced a postponement, but the contest finally came off on November 9, not on the South Meadows, but on the South Green, and with the opening time moved up to 1:00 P.M.

The Hartford team arrived half an hour late, and another half-hour was consumed in drawing up the rules for the game. The rules agreed upon made clear that the game which was played was what would now be called (in the United States) soccer rather than football. There was to be “no carrying of the ball”; there were to be three contests, the first of 50 minutes, the second of 40 minutes and the third of 20. The 200 to 300 spectators enjoyed “numerous exciting episodes,” and “good spirit and courteous tone was preserved, with some unpleasant exceptions.” Each of the three contests, much to Trinity’s chagrin, was taken by the “Twenty Young Men of Hartford.”

Trinity did not take the triple defeat graciously. The college team, feeling that the victory of the Hartford team was because of popular feeling against the College, challenged the victors to a re-match on neutral ground at New Britain. The Courant, however, chided the Trinity men for their lack of sportsmanship and attributed the Hartford victory to the Young Men of Hartford having “too much muscle on their side.” The Trinity Faculty was less than enthusiastic regarding the college team, and the re-match scheduled for Saturday, November 13, was called off because of faculty objection.

During the 1850’s, the more conventional student activity still centered in the literary societies, but some of the student interest was even then being channeled toward the fraternities. Although ensconced in attractive society rooms in the college buildings, the literary societies had lost some of their former glamour. Students continued to affiliate with one society or the other as a matter of course, and meetings were held regularly, although frequently adjourned for want of a quorum. The literary societies were still semi-social in nature, and this element of the organization was perhaps emphasized in an effort to maintain interest.
The literary societies' loss was the fraternities' gain and, indeed, as in most of the American colleges of the day, the decline in interest in the literary societies was in direct proportion to the increased interest in the fraternities. It was not that the fraternities had robbed the literary societies of their purpose, but that the fraternities were able to instill a larger spirit of loyalty than the literary societies had been able to do. And, as on other campuses throughout America, the fraternities filled "an emotional and social rather than a curricular vacuum."99 Whereas the literary societies were traditionally a supplement to the curriculum, through the debates and exhibitions, the fraternities were totally extracurricular and, as a recent historian of American higher education has described the fraternity movement, "the fraternities offered an escape from the monotony, dreariness, and unpleasantness of the collegiate regimen, . . . and gave a new meaning to a cigar, a drink, a girl, [and] a song."100

At Trinity, the fraternities escaped the administrative castigations which they suffered at neighbor colleges. Both Amherst and Williams attempted to abolish fraternities, and the presidents of both of these institutions regarded the fraternity system as an undemocratic evil.101 The fraternities had been at Trinity for a long time—in one form or another—almost from the beginning. And at Trinity the fraternities could hardly have deserved the charge of having been undemocratic! Of the Class of 1851, for example, all but two of the twenty-two graduates belonged to one of the four fraternities then in existence and, of the two, one had entered the College at the beginning of his senior year.102

Although the "fraternity house" was still quite in the future, each fraternity had permanent headquarters (what might now be called "chapter rooms") in the College103 or in the upper stories of business buildings in downtown Hartford, in which the weekly meetings—still both literary and social—were held.104

The "literary" element in the fraternities was slow to die, and as late as 1866 (June 26) Beta Beta held a meeting in Touro Hall with "outside speakers," to which the public was invited.105 And the fraternities made much of the academic attainments—both in college and after graduation—of their members. Beta Beta was proud of the fact that of the eighty-four members admitted to that society between 1846 and 1860, thirty-seven had become clergymen, thirty-four had been elected to Phi Beta Kappa, six had been valedictorians, and eight salutatorians.106

If Beta Beta could claim a larger portion of academic honors, in the matter of class officers there was a more general spread and, indeed, it is entirely possible that even at this early date there was some attempt to divide the senior class offices among the four fraternities. At any rate, elections for senior office were run on definitely fraternity-candidate lines. In 1851, for example, the Juniors elected for the following year a marshal from I.K.A., a president from Beta Beta, a secretary from Delta Psi, and an assistant secretary from Phi Kappa.107

I.K.A. made much of her slight time-wise advantage in her claim of being the oldest fraternity in the College. In 1857, I.K.A. marked her twenty-fifth anniversary with an elaborate program.108 Phi Kappa was still technically a "Senior Society," and the annual Phi Kappa Commencement Supper was a solemn occasion for the members about to depart the campus.109 But the "technicality" of Phi Kappa's being a "Senior Society" was an interesting one. Underclassmen, and sometimes Freshmen, were elected, but membership was kept a secret until the senior year when members were permitted to wear the fraternity pin.110 Delta Psi, the newest fraternity in the College, was established in 1859 as Trinity's first chapter of a national fraternity. From the beginning, the
chapter was known as St. Anthony's Hall (or simply "the Hall") from the name of the mother chapter at Columbia College in New York.\textsuperscript{111}

Like everything else at Trinity, the fraternities became the objects of lampoon, and as an example of this might be mentioned the mock ceremony, announced in formal programs and in the Hartford newspapers, of the Anniversary of Theta Xi Psi Omega Alpha Rho to "be held at the halls of the order" on Monday evening, February 22, 1858.\textsuperscript{112}

Along with the secret societies, Phi Beta Kappa continued to prosper under the vigilant and kindly direction of the chapter's founder, Professor John Brocklesby. With the highest third of the rising Senior Class elected to the society,\textsuperscript{113} the number of initiates averaged five a year for the decade of the 1850's.\textsuperscript{114}

Of the older "interest groups" the Missionary Society was the most flourishing during the 1850's and, indeed, it seems to have been the only one to have survived. The Archers and the Temperance Society had long since disappeared, but the Missionary Society continued to meet twice each month during the college year. Membership in the society remained small (between 1850 and 1860 from three to fourteen new members were admitted annually),\textsuperscript{115} but the meetings were generally well attended. Meetings consisted of an abbreviated form of Evening Prayer, "practical" and "missionary" essays prepared by the students, and "missionary intelligence."\textsuperscript{116} The Reverend Arthur Cleveland Coxe of St. John's Church acted as chaplain and adviser to the society, and under Coxe's direction the society raised funds (contributions of from $1.00 to $15.00) for the Nashotah Mission, for the Episcopal Home Missionary Society, and for foreign missionary work in Africa and the Sandwich Islands.\textsuperscript{117}

Trinity has always been a "singing college," and songs have always been a part of the Trinity tradition. The crude lyrics sung at the Burning of Conic Sections were ephemeral enough, and
as "occasional pieces" they had their brief day. But the students also sang the more traditional college songs, and at the Commencement Dinner it was customary to sing "Gaudeamus Igitur," "Lauriger," and "Auld Lang Syne" between the speeches. The College Choir, too, became quite proficient. The Choir, the College's oldest musical organization, sang regularly in the Chapel and in 1860 they made their first "public appearance" when they sang *Gloria in Excelsis* at the cornerstone laying of Trinity Church on Sigourney Street.

From the 1850's, date some of the College's most interesting traditions. Washington's Birthday was added to the college calendar sometime in the mid-'50's, and after 1859 it became an official college holiday. In the evening there was always a "grand illumination" of the college buildings and a program in the Cabinet consisting of music, a poem, and an oration.

Class Day began at about this same time, probably in 1858. The institution of Class Day was obviously modeled on that of Harvard and was probably introduced to Trinity by Professor Eliot. The program consisted of the conventional orations, class chronicles and prophecies, and planting the ivy along the college walls. The ceremony was held on the campus in front of the Chapel at 3:00 P.M. and was followed by a dance in the evening. All of this was more or less common to all Class Days, whether at Cambridge, New Haven, or Hartford, but in the local Trinity variation were to be found unique features.

"Professor Jim," by the time of Trinity's first Class Day, was an ancient retainer who had performed his services faithfully and, by his own standards, well. The Seniors took the Class Day occasion to present the aged janitor with a purse and, until the time of his death in 1878, the gift to "Professor Jim" was a high spot of the program. The "Professor's" response placed him at the top of the list of Trinity orators, and his farewell to the graduating class was flowery indeed!

"Gentlemen," he would say, "you have been kind to me, an' our communion has been sweet together. . . . But we've got to take our depar-
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the highest," with the understanding that the recipient class should pass it on to the class of its own choosing.

The choice of the Class of 1857 was that of 1859, and the lemon squeezer was presented to the rising Juniors with appropriate ceremony at the Class Day of 1857. The Class of ’59 inscribed their class motto and class ribbon, and each successive recipient was to do the same. In the course of time, there were also added three dried lemons. To insure the safety of the trophy, the Class of ’59 hid the lemon squeezer in a secret place until it was presented by that Class to the Class of 1861.

As the Class of ’61 passed the squeezer on to the class of 1863, there was some feeling among the undergraduates that the odd-numbered classes were favored. The Class of 1864 felt that it was the equal (in scholarship, character, and popularity) of that of ’63 and ’65 and, when the selection of the Class of ’65 was announced, the Class of ’64 resolved to take matters in their own hands. The measures taken by the Class of 1864 marked the beginning of one of the College’s most lively traditions – as we shall see in our next chapter.

But Class Day and the Lemon Squeezer presentation were but two manifestations of a rising consciousness of membership in a particular college class. Regular class meetings probably date from the early 1840’s, but it was the Class of 1851 which placed class organization on a regular footing at Trinity. The Class of 1842 had voted, at graduation time, to hold a tenth reunion on the day before Commencement, 1852. On the same day as the meeting of the College Corporation and Phi Beta Kappa, the Class of ’42 gathered as scheduled. W. H. Corning read a paper, prayers were said, and letters were read from those unable to attend. Before adjournment, the Class of ’42 voted to meet again in 1857, and the Reverend Charles R. Fisher was elected to receive any communication which might be made to the Class in the interim. The members were requested to communicate with Fisher on “all matters of interest connected with the class.”

The good intentions of the Class of ’42 were probably not carried out, and it is doubtful whether the fifteenth reunion was held in 1857. The Class of 1851, however, had the good fortune of graduating several of the College’s most active and loyal Alumni, and it was these men who were able to instill class loyalties as undergraduates and to maintain a half-century of alumni class organization. Even as Freshmen the Class of 1851 held regular meetings, first in student rooms and later in classrooms. The usual hour of meeting, 10:30 P.M., may suggest that the sessions were clandestine, and as such they were spied upon. On one occasion, the Class, gathered in Room 37 of Brownell Hall, “knocked out the ventilator and gave the outsiders the redolent contents of a slop bucket.” But within the room the Class of 1851 debated momentous questions, deciding in the negative against wearing the “Oxford cap” (an attempt to revive the short-lived custom of twenty years before), elected officers, adopted a “class watchword,” appropriated money for the purchase of a class football, and, as Sophomores, voted to haze the Freshmen.

At the final meeting of the Class on July 2, 1851, the members voted to hold their first reunion on Commencement Day, 1854, at which time it was expected that most of them would be present to receive their Master’s degrees, and to hold
reunions in 1861 and every tenth year thereafter. John Brainard was elected Class Secretary, probably the first Trinity Alumnus to hold such a title.\textsuperscript{132}

Large numbers of the Class attended the Commencements of 1852 and 1853, and at the formal reunion in 1854 eighteen of the twenty graduates of 1851 returned to the College for their M.A. degrees\textsuperscript{133} and to attend the first reunion. The meeting was held in the College Chapel. As class officers, '51 elected John Brainard, president; John D. Ferguson, vice-president; and Charles J. Hoadley, secretary.

It was Charles J. Hoadley who held the class organization together. Hoadley spent his entire life in Hartford, and for almost fifty years he divided his interests between the Connecticut State Library and the College.\textsuperscript{134} It was he who arranged the Class Dinner in 1861, and it was he who continued the class records by listing in the Class Book the number present at the annual Commencement (sometimes three, occasionally six, usually three or four) and the deaths of the class members as they occurred. The Records of the Class of 1851 were completed by George C. Hoadley with the following entry: "My brother Charles J. Hoadley who kept this record from July 23, 1854, attended his last Commencement June 30, 1898, and died October 19, 1900."\textsuperscript{135}

The Class of 1851 thus set a precedent of class organization which was followed, more or less, by the subsequent classes, and the Classes of 1852 and 1854, at least, held three-year and ten-year reunions.\textsuperscript{136} Some of these classes from the 1850's voted to present a silver cup to the first legitimate boy whose father was a member of the class.\textsuperscript{137}

The larger alumni organization, the House of Convocation, continued to meet regularly during Commencement season to hear the Convocation Address and Poem. In 1857, at the Alumni Dinner, the graduates presented the College with a portrait of Professor Stewart,\textsuperscript{138} who had retired from teaching the previous year.

With the many societies, fraternities, classes, and alumni groups meeting at Commencement time, the campus was a busy place. By several stages, the Commencement date had been moved from the first Thursday in August to the last Thursday in June, a change which doubtless provided more comfortable weather. And, fortunately for the patience and comfort of those who attended, the graduation ceremony was accomplished in a single morning session, rather than the earlier morning and afternoon sessions.

Some of the events more recently associated with Commencement week itself were spread over a considerable portion of the Trinity Term. Junior Exhibition was held in April or May in one of the halls in the city—Touro Hall, American Hall, or the Melodeon—and the Faculty attended in academic regalia.\textsuperscript{139} Sophomore Declaration was held the end of May,\textsuperscript{140} a Baccalaureate Sermon was preached on Trinity Sunday,\textsuperscript{141} and Class Day was held on the second Thursday of June.

Two days before Commencement was the meeting of the Board of Fellows. The day preceding Commencement began with Morning Prayer in the Chapel at 9:00. At 9:30 A.M. the House of Convocation met in the College Cabinet, and at 3:00 P.M. the House heard the annual Convocation Oration and Poem in Christ Church. Early in the evening Phi Beta Kappa met in the Library, and at 8:00 P.M. the Commencement Concert (usually by Colt's Band) was held in Touro Hall. While these activities were in progress, the Trustees were holding their Annual Meeting.\textsuperscript{142}

Commencement Day began at 8:30 A.M., with brief meetings of the literary societies in their halls. Toward mid-morning the academic procession began to form in front of the Chapel. The procession was led by a band—the Hartford Brass Band, the New Haven Brass Band, Colt's Band, or the Hartford Cornet Band—and sometimes the cadets from Mr. Everett's School in Hamden were present in uniform. At 9:30 A.M., the procession left the campus, crossed City Park, and proceeded up Asylum Street, pausing at Bishop Brownell's house to sing "Auld Lang Syne," and then north on Main Street to Christ Church.\textsuperscript{143}

Christ Church was always crowded and, as
the Hartford schools were given a holiday for Commencement Thursday, many school children crowded into the gallery. On one occasion two youngsters, about six years of age and barefooted, fell into the procession, "walked sedately into the Church" with the dignitaries, and took places on the platform. After about half an hour, the two boys got up, walked down the center aisle, and left the Church. On another occasion, "the venerable Dr. Robbins [Director of the Connecticut Historical Society] fell from the offset on the platform. After about half an hour, the two boys got up, walked down the center aisle, and left the Church." Dr. Robbins was stunned, but not seriously hurt.

The program at Christ Church consisted of the usual Latin salutatory and valedictory orations, prayers by the President, English orations, and music. In 1858, the choir of Christ Church sang, "supported by a full orchestra." As the graduating classes were still small, the degrees were conferred individually. The President took the hand of each candidate in his own as he conferred the degree, and he also passed to the student the Book of the College Statutes which he held in his left hand during the performance of a part of the ceremony.

After the benediction by the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor, the procession moved to the Allyn House for the sumptuous Alumni Dinner, an affair which with speeches, songs, and almost innumerable courses, lasted until long into the afternoon. The day ended with final meetings of the Atheneum and Parthenon Societies and the fraternity suppers.

Now, lest the reader think that Trinity College of the 1850's had changed little since the Washington College of the 1830's, we hasten to say that such was most certainly not the case. The student body, for one thing, although it was smaller than it had been in the 30's, was more homogeneous and was perhaps better prepared for college work. There were no more of those strange creatures, the religiosi, the over-age-for-grade candidates for Holy Orders who had previously added nothing to either the social or intellectual life of the College. Most of the entering students were of almost the same age which, if the Class of 1851 may be regarded as typical, was fifteen. The wide diversity of geographic origin of the students continued, and most of the states and some of the territories were usually represented in the student body. Although a few of the entering students were still prepared by private tutors, a majority of them had been graduated from preparatory schools or had entered from other colleges.

Dismissal from the College for academic failure was unknown, but there were conscious efforts on the part of the Faculty to raise the level of instruction. And although there was little success in the efforts by the Faculty to reduce "cribbing" and outright plagiarism, the extant specimens of College writing suggest a remarkable degree of originality and an acquaintance with the literature of the college curriculum.

Perhaps not the least stimulant to academic excellence was the large number of prizes offered in the various disciplines. Seniors competed for the Tuttle Prize of $30.00 in writing an essay on an assigned general topic. Seniors, Juniors, and Sophomores were eligible to compete in an examination on selected (and announced) Latin authors for the Latin Prize of $20.00. The Greek Prize was one of $20.00 given to the Freshman who passed the best examination in Greek at the end of the Trinity Term. Professor Eliot gave the Prescott Historical Prize of $20.00 to the Senior writing the best essay on an assigned topic in American History, and a copy of one of Eliot's historical works was given to the Freshman writing the best essay on an assigned topic in Ancient History. The Sophomore Prize of $20.00 was awarded to the member of the class who should pronounce the best declamation at the Public Exhibition (Sophomore Declamation).

During the 1850's, Trinity settled down (for the time, at least) as a college of the Episcopal Church. The High Churchmen who had been so effective in instituting the reorganization (and reorienting) of the College in 1845 were now able to assert, in certain quarters, that the College was truly an Episcopal Institution. And by claiming in one circle (the Episcopal Church) to be a Church College and by denying it in another (to the Hartford community), the Anglican
well-wishers of Trinity College were able to have their cake and eat it too.

John Williams came to the Presidency thoroughly committed to the idea of strengthening the bonds between the College and the Church. In 1848, Williams was a young man of but thirty-one years, and it was believed that he was then the youngest president of an American college. At St. George's Church in Schenectady (which he served from 1842 until 1848), Williams had pursued a policy not unlike his own mentor, Dr. Jarvis. Williams was especially popular among the students at Union College, and he soon found himself operating a private theological school similar to that which he had himself attended. When Williams came to Trinity in 1848, several of these students of Theology followed their teacher to Hartford.

At first, John Williams' theological instruction was of the informal sort which had been conducted by Dr. Jarvis, and it was Williams' private operation; but within a year, the President tried to integrate the instruction in Theology with the college program. By the opening of the College in the fall of 1849, the theological work had been recognized as a part of the college offerings, even though John Williams' theological instruction had not received much notice outside Hartford.

In the fall of 1851, a full course of theological studies was organized and adopted by the Trustees as an integral department of the College, and a circular was issued announcing the work. In June of 1852, the Convention of the Diocese of Connecticut expressed its approval of the undertaking which was tantamount to official recognition as a Diocesan School of Theology.

This official recognition by both Church and College brought theological students to College Hill in considerable numbers, and the college authorities were obliged to make arrangements for their housing and instruction. The former problem was easily solved by assigning the theological students to the unused rooms in the two college dormitories, but the second problem could be solved only by the addition of professors competent to teach the theological disciplines. President Williams was designated as Professor of the Biblical and Theological branches, but a Professor of Church History had to be engaged. For this post, the Trustees selected the Reverend Dr. Thomas Winthrop Coit, one of the most distinguished scholars in the Church of his time. Coit was a graduate of Yale College (A.B., 1821) and had studied Theology at Andover Theological Seminary and at Princeton. From 1829 until 1835, he had been rector at Cambridge and Salem, Massachusetts, during which period he had also served as Professor in the short-lived Theological Seminary conducted in Boston by the Diocese of Massachusetts. From 1835 until 1837, he had been President of Transylvania University in Lexington, Kentucky, and from 1839 until his appointment at Trinity, he had served as rector of Trinity Church in New Rochelle, New York.

Coit was a man of encyclopedic learning, and by the time of his appointment to Trinity, he had already published four books on biblical and historical subjects. And, as might have been expected, Coit had an unusually large and valuable personal library. Upon his arrival in Hartford, Coit deposited this library in the College, and Coit's collection of books was regarded as a part of the College's library holdings.

To assist President Williams and Dr. Coit in their work, the Trustees appointed Nathaniel Wheaton as Professor of the Institutes and Evidences of Christianity. Professor Jackson was also assigned to teach several of the theological courses. Bishop Brownell was given the title of Professor of Homiletics and Doctrinal Theology, the Reverend T. M. Clark was appointed Professor of Christian Evidences, and Arthur Cleveland Coxe was appointed Professor of Pastoral Theology. As Coit was the only full-time member of the Theological Faculty, he was given the title of Dean of Theology.

The curriculum of the Trinity College Department of Theology paralleled that of the General Seminary in New York. By 1852, there were 16 students enrolled—11 from Connecticut, and one each from Antigua, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Rhode Island. Six of the students held A.B. degrees, one was a Master of Arts, and
the others had completed partial college courses.165 No theological degrees were awarded in course,166 although ad eundem degrees of Bachelor in Divinity were given to two persons in 1849 and 1850. Graduates of the Theological Department usually took the M.A. at the completion of the three-year course.167

Instruction in Theology seems to have been somewhat slipshod. Williams and Jackson performed their duties to the Theological Department in addition to their regular undergraduate assignments. Clark and Coxe were rectors of large parishes, and Coxe spent much of the time of the Department’s existence in Europe.168 And Bishop Brownell’s appointment was probably an honorary one, entailing only a short series of lectures to the Senior Class. Professor Coit found himself carrying the main burden of teaching, and as he had given the College the use of his library and probably served without salary, to say nothing of having lent his name as a distinguished scholar to the institution, Coit soon came to feel that his services to Trinity were neither recognized nor appreciated. Toward the end of the Trinity Term of 1852, Coit expressed his dissatisfaction with his situation, and the Trustees regarded the complaint of sufficient importance to devote a considerable portion of one of their meetings to a discussion of how to give some sort of special recognition of Professor Coit’s valuable services to the College. A letter was sent to him by the Trustees, and this communication enumerated his many useful qualities.169 At this same time Coit was invited to give an inaugural address, which he delivered on November 14, 1852, on the subject of The Standard of Appeal on Doubtful Points Where the Bible fails to Produce Unity, and which was published “at the request of the theological students.”170 The following year the Trustees voted Coit the degree of Doctor of Laws and directed that he be paid $500 from any funds which should be raised expressly for the Theological Department.171

But by the time the Trustees offered these visible expressions of confidence in Dr. Coit, the Theological Department had been practically eliminated from the College. In 1851, John Wil- liams was elected Assistant Bishop of Connecticut and on October 29, 1851, he was consecrated in St. John’s Church.172 Once more the College found itself headed by a Bishop of the Episcopal Church, and immediately pressures were exerted by the Diocese to have Williams resign the Presidency of the College in order to devote full time to his Episcopal duties. Indeed, there had been some opposition to Williams’ election to the Episcopacy on grounds that he would be unable to perform both duties. In 1853, Williams yielded to these pressures and submitted his resignation as President of Trinity College.173

Neither Bishop Brownell nor Bishop Williams was eager to keep the theological instruction of the Diocese of Connecticut at Trinity, and shortly after his consecration Bishop Williams expressed the hope that the Theological Department might be chartered as a separate corporation and located in another city. And in his Episcopal Address to the Diocesan Convention of 1852, Bishop Brownell urged that the Theological Department be dissociated from Trinity, urging that the Diocese adopt “the universal practice of the primitive Church” where the Bishops had candidates for Holy Orders under their direct supervision and regulation. The Convention adopted a resolution embodying the Bishop’s ideas, and thus the first step was taken to set up a Diocesan Theological Seminary independent of the College.174 Although the Diocesan Convention strongly favored the resolution, there were misgivings about building a seminary which would center about the personality of the Bishop or the Assistant Bishop, and when Middletown was being considered as a possible location, Eben Edwards Beardsley ’32, Fellow of the College and one of the institution’s most loyal sons, urged that the Theological Department be moved to New Haven,175 presumably to avoid too much immediate direction from the Bishops.

In 1854, the Connecticut General Assembly chartered the Berkeley Divinity School which was immediately opened in Middletown, by interesting coincidence, in the former residence of the late Dr. Jarvis. But although a new legal corporation, Berkeley Divinity School was merely
the former Theological Department of Trinity College. Bishop Williams moved into the lower floor of the Jarvis mansion, and Dr. Coit took up residence in Middletown, taking his library with him.176 Legally, there remained one tie between the College and the Divinity School; the Divinity School charter specified that the President of the College was to be ex officio member of the Berkeley Board of Trustees, and this connection lasted until 1895.177 After the removal of the theological institution to Middletown, Coit technically remained on the Trinity Faculty as well, and his name was included on the College Faculty roster as late as 1863, when he was still listed as Professor of Ecclesiastical History, a subject which was then offered as a one-term course for Sophomores.178

The brief existence of the Theological Department caused one later writer to say that the two Faculties gave Trinity “somewhat of the character of a University,”179 and there is no doubt that the addition of a Theological Department had once more raised the hopes of many that Trinity might rival Yale. Hardly had the Theological Department been organized, when Arthur Cleveland Coxe referred to Trinity as “this dear little university.”180

There were other evidences, too, that the “university idea” was being revived. In some quarters the hope was being expressed that instruction in Law would be introduced.181 In 1852, a second Professor had been added to teach the medical disciplines, which had been taught more-or-less regularly since 1838. It is, of course, impossible to say with certainty that the development of the “Medical Faculty” was intended as an attempt to revive the plans for a full program of medical instruction, but such may have, indeed, been the case. On the other hand, the appointment of a second medical Professor may merely reflect a new interest in scientific education at the College. At least that may be deduced from the public announcement of the appointment of Dr. George C. Shattuck, Jr., that the new Professor’s lectures were intended to “enlighten the student in a noble science, and to teach him how to use aright his own physical system.”182

The decade of the 1850’s saw a new approach to scientific education in the American colleges. Trinity and Union had pioneered in giving a more prominent place to the Sciences in the Liberal Arts curriculum,183 but the purely scientific course had been developments of institutions such as the United States Military Academy at West Point and the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute at Troy, New York. The rapidity with which the nation was becoming industrialized caused the colleges to make provision for technological instruction which would parallel that of the Liberal Arts. Harvard and Brown introduced scientific courses as adjuncts to the traditional program. At Harvard, the Bachelor of Science was first conferred in 1851, and in that same year Brown began offering a Bachelor of Philosophy degree to those who should complete the scientific course.184 Yale followed in 1852 with the offering of the Ph.B. At both Yale and Harvard, the scientific course was one of easy entrance, and the requirements for admission were somewhat less exacting than for the traditional A.B., and at Yale the Ph.B. course was of three years rather than the traditional four. At both Yale and Harvard the scientific students were looked upon as second-class citizens and were not permitted to sit with the other students in chapel.185

During the 1850’s, scientific study spread across the country. Scientific departments were instituted at such diverse places as Dartmouth, the University of Rochester, Denison, New York University, Illinois College, and the state universities in Michigan, North Carolina, Iowa, and Missouri,186 and it was not long before a scientific course was being offered at Trinity. In 1854, William Henry Scovill and James M. L. Scovill of Waterbury, Connecticut, gave the College $20,000 to endow the Scovill Professorship of Chemistry, and in October of that year the Reverend Thomas Ruggles Pynchon was appointed Scovill Professor of Chemistry and Natural Sciences.187

The Scovill brothers were manufacturers of buttons and high-grade material used in daguerreotyping, and the firm that they headed later became the Scovill Manufacturing Com-
pany. The Scovills were men of considerable wealth, and had they lived (William died in 1854 and James in 1857), they might have supported scientific foundations similar to those subsequently established at Harvard and Yale. And, indeed, had the Trinity Corporation of the 1850's sufficient foresight, Yale's most significant scientific benefaction might have gone to Trinity instead.

Joseph Earle Sheffield was a native of Connecticut who, with only a common school education and but fifteen years of age, settled in New Berne, North Carolina, in 1808. In North Carolina, Sheffield met with unusual business success and made a sizeable fortune as a cotton merchant. In 1835, he settled in New Haven and increased his wealth by successful investment in the New Haven Railroad and the Chicago and Rock Island Railroad. Sheffield had an intense interest in higher education and, as one involved in the development of the nation's transportation system, he was particularly interested in engineering.

In 1856, Trinity College announced the introduction of a course in Civil and Mechanical Engineering and appointed Theodore G. Ellis to teach the course. Ellis was a professional engineer who had achieved fame as the chief engineer of the Sackett's Harbor and Saratoga Railroad. Before he could begin instruction at Trinity College, however, he went to Mexico to take charge of a silver mine, and thus another Department at Trinity died before it was born.

It was the announcement of instruction in Engineering that brought Trinity College to the attention of Joseph Earle Sheffield, and the New Haven railroad magnate expressed his interest in the College with a gift of $5,000 in shares of the New Haven and Northampton Railroad, the income from which was to be used for improvement of the College Library. In 1858, Sheffield was elected to the Trinity Board of Trustees, but although he served on the Board until 1875, he is not known to have made any further large financial contribution. As will soon be shown, Trinity, too, soon offered the B.S. degree, but Sheffield, feeling that the Scientific Institution in New Haven had a greater future as a center for scientific and technological studies, gave his financial support to the New Haven school instead. In 1860, Sheffield gave $100,000 to the scientific adjunct to Yale College which was soon to bear his name.

Perhaps the Trustees had dawdled in the development of scientific instruction and, like most of the changes in curriculum at the older Trinity, the Scientific Course, as it finally developed, was the result of a comparatively evolutionary process. Harvard and Yale, both of course with greater financial resources, could undertake large projects of revolutionary consequences; Trinity was obliged to start with what she had, and what
she had was the old and almost dormant "Partial Course," whose pursuers had in 1845 been designated as "University Students." And, in a way, the "Partial Course" was a natural foundation upon which to build a scientific course comparable to that in existence in Cambridge and New Haven. The Partial Students had been admitted with little or no formality, and in this respect the University Students who attended Trinity were probably no less prepared than the scientific students at Yale or Harvard. The studies engaged in by the University Students at Trinity were the upperclass mathematical and scientific courses, and the scientific curricula at Harvard and Yale were devoted almost wholly to these branches. And in view of the fact that neither Harvard nor Yale required the full four years for their scientific degrees, there was no logical reason why the B.S. might not be given to those who had completed the "Partial Course." Consequently the Calendar for 1857-8 announced that "University Students may receive the degree of Bachelor of Science, provided they have resided at least two years and a half at the College, and have regularly passed their examinations in all the prescribed studies of the Academic course, except the Latin and Greek; together with a further and more particular examination in . . . Differential and Integral Calculus; Practical Anatomy; Analytical and Agricultural Chemistry; Geology and Mineralogy; Natural History; or Civil Engineering." Permission was also granted the A. B. candidates to receive the B. S. by passing the required examinations. This decision by the Trustees at once resolved the problem of what to do about the "Partial Course" and at the same time kept Trinity apace with her older sisters in at least offering a scientific course.

In 1858, John A. Boughton, George Scovill Mallory, Jacob Ewing Mears, and John H. S. Quick were granted both A.B. and B.S. degrees. These four men, however, were not "University Students," but were, rather, Academic Students who had simply passed the prescribed scientific examinations. In 1880, William G. Davies repeated this feat, but it was not until 1871, that a student (James Stoddard) was granted the B.S. for the completion of the Scientific Course alone.

In the field of graduate study, Trinity had made no advances which in any way anticipated the modern standard for the Master of Arts degree. Traditionally, the American college, as the saying went, granted the M.A. "to all college men who three years after graduation were not in jail." Actually, it was not quite as simple as that, for the candidate for the M.A. had to petition the Trustees for the degree, pay the President a fee of $5.00 or $10.00, and appear in person at the Commencement. The old custom of awarding the M.A. "in course" had its origin in the fact that most of the early college graduates studied Theology, Medicine, or Law immediately upon graduation, and the M.A. was a recognition of accomplishments in these areas of study. But by the middle of the nineteenth century, the M.A. had lost all of its earlier significance, and an M.A. "in course" was, to all intents and purposes, purely "honorary." In the 1850's, the University of Michigan announced courses of study leading to the earned M.A. and M.S. degrees, and a similar program was offered at Columbia at the same time. At neither place was there any great response, and with these institutions, which made pretense of moving to "university status," unable to introduce a practical or popular program of graduate studies, it was hardly to have been expected that Trinity should advance along such lines. College faculties still conceived their function as that of transmitting accumulated knowledge, and not as contributing to that body of knowledge. The "university spirit" which prompted Arthur Cleveland Coxe to refer to Trinity as "our dear little university" was something far removed from the modern concept of the university as the prime agent in the extension of the frontiers of knowledge.

These facts, unpleasant as they may seem, by twentieth-century standards which have come to be accepted by colleges as well as universities, in no way reflect discredit upon the Faculty who taught on Hartford's College Hill. The Professors were devoted teachers and cultivated gentlemen, and this was as much as could
have been asked of a mid-century college faculty.

But although neither professing nor evidencing any of the attitudes of modern academic scholarship, the Trinity Faculty was not without scholarship, the Trinity Faculty was not without ing any of the attitudes of modern academic President Williams was a regular contributor to *The American Church Quarterly Review* and was the author of *Ancient Hymns of the Holy Church* (1845) and *Thoughts on the Gospel Miracles* (1848). Professor Eliot published *Passages From the History of Liberty* (1847), *The Liberty of Rome* (1849), and *The Early Christians* (1853). Professor Brocklesby was the author of several textbooks used in secondary schools: *Elements of Meteorology* (1848), *Views of the Microscopic World* (1850), *Elements of Astronomy* (1855), and *Elements of Physical Geography* (1868). And Professor Calvin Colton published several volumes dealing with the life of Henry Clay.

The Trinity College Faculty, to say nothing of the Governing Boards, was conservative in both political and philosophical outlook, and perhaps the best summary of this conservative spirit was the Convocation Address, *Conservatism: Its True Signification and Appropriate Office* (Hartford, 1852), delivered by William F. Morgan in Christ Church, July 28, 1852, in which the speaker praised the stable attitude of the College at the time. And as Morgan tried to make clear, the Trinity conservatism was a positive one for although, taken as a whole, the academic community would have welcomed no radical curricular innovation, the College, during the decade of the 1850's, did much to modernize and “enrich” the Liberal Arts curriculum.

John Williams had come to the College Presidency in 1848 with some definite ideas of curricular revision, and his inaugural address delivered on Commencement Day of 1849 spelled out what he had in mind. History, as an academic discipline, was not then quite “respectable,” and at most colleges History was given mere passing attention. History, however, seems to have been the central theme of Williams' address, for in his approach to a three-branch curriculum he treated the conventional disciplines in what might be regarded as “historical” terms. Not only did he refer to Ancient and Modern Languages and Literature as “authentic records which convey to us an account of the feelings, the sentiments and the actions, of men prominent in the famous empires of the ancient and modern world,” but he also insisted upon “the study of ourselves as social and intellectual beings,” and placed under the heading of disciplines permitting such study: Ethics, Metaphysics, Political Philosophy, History, “and some other kindred subjects of great complexity. . . .” And History, as Williams conceived of it, was not “a mass of disconnected facts, and purposeless events;” rather, History furnished man with “mighty lessons of the past.” But, Williams clearly stated, “History if it be taught to any real purpose . . . must be taught philosophically; and if it be taught philosophically, it must be taught with a constant reference to the Holy Scriptures.”

The Trustees responded to John Williams’ urgings, and the Faculty were asked to devise a new course of study. The Faculty complied and the Trustees unanimously approved. In the “New Curriculum” of 1849, History was given a place in the Advent and Lent Terms of the senior year to be taught with “lectures and references.” Presumably, this senior course was in Ancient and European History, for they were so designated in the Calendars beginning with 1854, after which year Professor Eliot also gave instruction in American History in the Trinity Term. And the new importance which was assigned to History at Trinity was emphasized by the designation of Professor Eliot’s new chair as one of History and Literature.

The Trustees, too, would have included Elocution in the “New Curriculum,” for in 1850 they voted to appoint a “teacher of Elocution” at a salary of not more than $500 and engaged Francis T. Russell as Instructor of Elocution. Nevertheless, Elocution did not advance beyond the “weekly declamations” and “forensic debates” in the coaching of which Mr. Russell used his own textbook, Russell's Vocal Culture. In 1856, Russell's contract was not renewed, and
it was not until his reappointment in 1863 as Professor of Oratory that Elocution was reinstated.215

The Social Sciences made their first appearance in the Trinity curriculum in 1853, when the Reverend Calvin Colton was appointed Professor of Public Economy. It will be remembered that the earliest curriculum of the College had provided for instruction in Political Economy and that one of the first faculty appointments had been a Professor of Agriculture and Political Economy, and it will also be remembered that the Professor of these disciplines left the College after a short, and perhaps unhappy tenure. The course in Law, which had been offered from the beginning of the College, had come to be expanded into one in Law and Political Science; but, as has been shown in an earlier chapter, actual instruction in those subjects was sporadic. President Williams held the Chair of History and Political Science while President of the College, and the appointment of Professor Colton was doubtless a serious response to John Williams' insistence upon some curricular consideration of man as a social being and to provide instruction in what subsequently came to be recognized as Political Science, Economics, and Sociology.

Calvin Colton was a man of extensive learning and wide reputation. Although in Holy Orders, he had early in life abandoned a clerical career because of a failure of his voice and had turned, instead, to literary and journalistic pursuits. By the time of his appointment to the Trinity Faculty, he had published more than a dozen books on American Political History, Abolitionism and Slavery, Travel, Labor, and Theology.216

Colton, like so many of the other Professors listed in the College Catalogues, was a "shadow professor" and, although the Trustees had every hope of endowing the chair of Public Economy,217 Colton's teaching seems to have been limited to a single course offered for Seniors during the Trinity Term. Colton resigned in 1857, presumably for reasons of failing health, and moved to Savannah, Georgia, where he died almost immediately after his removal.218 At that time, Professor Eliot was relieved of the responsibility for instruction in English Literature and was designated Professor of History and Political Science. Eliot took over Colton's course, which was then renamed Political Economy,219 and also offered a course in Principles of Political Science to the Seniors in the Christmas Term.220

In 1857, the Trustees made a most unusual appointment — that of Charles Callahan Perkins as Lecturer in Art.221 Perkins was a graduate of Harvard (A.B., 1843) who had studied painting and music in Paris and Rome and, although he attained a national reputation only in his later years,222 he was already regarded at the time of his appointment to Trinity as an authority on aesthetics.223 The editor of the Hartford Daily Courant hailed the appointment as one which might open the way for the creation of a Professorship of Music and Art.224 The Courant's editor also expressed the hope that Perkins' instruction might result in "a more refined tone among the students who come under his influence."225 The Calendar for 1857 announced "Lectures in Art" for the Seniors during the Advent Term,226 and in June of 1857 Perkins began his instruction at the College with a series of evening lectures open to the public on the "Rise and Progress of Art from the earliest times to the beginning of the sixteenth century."227

The instruction in art may have had no great success at Trinity, for Perkins' appointment was terminated in 1862,228 but the existence of a Lectureship in Art represents a legitimate Trinity "first" and probably reflected a genuine interest in formal instruction in the Fine Arts. Such interest was evidenced by the fact that on February 10, 1858, Professor Eliot gave a public lecture in the College Chapel on the life and works of his friend, Thomas Crawford, the American sculptor who had recently died in Rome.229 At the Commencement of 1858, the College awarded an honorary degree of Bachelor of Music to Nathan B. Warren in recognition of his contribution to the liturgical music of the Episcopal Church in adapting the choral service of the English Church to the American Book of Common Prayer.230 Inspired by the lectures of Charles C. Perkins, one of the students, Mait-
land Armstrong '58, took up painting. Armstrong purchased a colored lithograph of Botticelli's "Venus Rising from the Sea" and began copying it in oil. While busy at his easel one pleasant June morning, Armstrong looked up to see Dr. Goodwin,231 "gazing in horror" at the lithograph, and as Armstrong described the incident many years later, Goodwin's "face bore the expression of one who looks down from the sanctuary of Abraham's Bosom on a soul in perdition." Dr. Goodwin gave an on-the-spot lecture on morality, and in an afternoon lecture he rehearsed the reprimand in the presence of the Senior Class.232 Needless to say, this was the end for many years of "applied art" at Trinity.

In the 1850's, two developments further "modernized" the curriculum and the administration. In 1857, the College adopted the two-term academic year, and the older Advent, Lent, and Trinity Terms gave way to the present Christmas and Trinity Terms. And in 1857, the courses of study were arranged into eight "departments": Religious Instruction; Greek; Latin; Modern Languages; History and Literature; Mathematics and Natural Science; and Moral and Intellectual Philosophy.233

In the 1850's, a new system of faculty ranking was adopted. The earlier Faculties of the College had consisted of Professors and Tutors, the conventional American titles which had been in use since the founding of Harvard in 1636. And whether one taught full-time or merely lectured on Botany to the Seniors, all except the teachers of the freshman Languages and elementary Mathematics were of Professorial rank. In the '50's, Judge Ellsworth and Dr. Sumner were still in the Calendar, although seldom in the classroom, as Professors of Law and Botany respectively, and the physicians who lectured on Medicine were also listed as Professors of their disciplines. Several of the local clergy had been designated Adjunct Professors, and occasionally appointments had been made to Lectureships or Instructorships. In 1847, the title of Assistant Professor was introduced with the appointment of William Payne as Assistant Professor of Chemistry. In 1852, the "table of organization" of the Arts Faculty revealed, in addition to the President, seven Professors, two Assistant Professors, two Instructors, and two Lecturers, one of whom (James Rankine) also served as Librarian.234 In 1857, Professor Stewart, who had been in ill health for many years and had often been unable to meet his classes,235 was relieved from active teaching and made Professor Emeritus of Greek and Latin Languages and Literature. In 1858, the Faculty consisted of, in addition to the President, one Professor Emeritus, eight Professors (including three who taught only one course), one Instructor, one Lecturer, and one Adjunct Lecturer.236

The ranking of the Faculty was a matter of providing degrees of academic dignity, but it was also a means of designating niches in the salary schedule. In 1847, William Payne had been engaged as Assistant Professor at a salary of $500 per year,237 at a time when $1,000 had been accepted as the standard for a full Professorship.238 But the practicability of this salary schedule was well demonstrated when Payne resigned at the end of his first year.

Actually, the salaries paid the Trinity Faculty at this time were neither the nation's highest nor lowest. Harvard was then paying her professors about $3,000 per year, and Emory, one of the leading Southern colleges, was paying only $775. In 1855, Hanover College in Indiana cut the salaries from $800 to a mere $335.239 Trinity maintained the $1,000 figure until 1854, when the Trustees raised the salaries of Professors Jackson and Brocklesby to $1,200 and that of Professor Stewart to $1,600, including compensation for Stewart's serving as College Bursar.240 In 1857, the Trustees fixed the salaries of Professors at $1,500 and that of Tutors (and perhaps Instructors) at $600.

Several of the "nominal" Professors served without compensation,241 and President Williams gave back a good deal of his salary, in one way or another, to the College.242 But there were in 1853, four full-time Professors, an Assistant Professor, two Instructors, and a Tutor whose salary had
to be paid, and when Daniel Raynes Goodwin was called to the College as John Williams’ successor, there was some serious question as to whether the new President’s salary of $1,200 could be raised without too much strain on the instructional budget.243

The older endowed Professorships (Seabury and Hobart) had been useful, and one of these had always been held by the President. In 1844, an attempt had been made to endow a professorship in honor of Bishop Brownell, but the funds raised at that time had been diverted to the scholarship fund and to the construction of Brownell Hall, and it was not until ten years later that the Scovill brothers provided for a third Professorial endowment.

The creation of the Scovill Professorship inspired the Trustees to raise $25,000 for a Chair of Belles Lettres. The Trustees pledged themselves to contribute $10.00 each, annually and, in order to interest others in the project, voted to send “agents” throughout the Diocese of Connecticut to solicit subscriptions. Bishops Brownell and Williams and President Goodwin issued a general letter endorsing the project and soliciting subscriptions of $10.00 to $25.00 per annum.244

In 1856, a legacy of $15,000 from Mrs. Sarah Gregor of Norwalk, Connecticut, completed the endowment of the Brownell Professorship.245

But the Trustees, in 1854, had been thinking in larger terms than a mere fourth Professorship, for as was reported in the educational press, it was the intent of the College to endow “at least one professorship every year, until its apparatus for instruction is, in all respects, of the most complete and perfect character.”246

Unfortunately, the high hopes of the Trustees were not to be realized. The Diocese of Connecticut could not be aroused to contribute to the College, and the Trustees were soon embarrassed as to how to meet existing commitments. In August of 1856, the Trustees met in a special session called to deal with another of the almost cyclic financial crises which confronted the College.

The immediate problem of raising enough money to begin another College year was solved by selling a sizeable parcel of land lying to the east of the College,247 but the Trustees realized the folly of “dipping into the principal” to meet emergency situations. The campaign to raise money in the Diocese of Connecticut was re-opened with a new vigor, and an appeal for $75,000 to be added to the permanent endowment was announced the following May.248 Apparently the new financial drive met with some initial success, for on July 16, the Trustees raised the President’s salary to $2,000 and house, and established salaries of $1,500 and $600 for Professors and Tutors respectively.249

But once more, hardly had the major Trinity fund-raising campaign been started, when depression hit the country. Perhaps the Panic of 1857 hit Connecticut no harder than any other section of the country, but by September, the Hartford Daily Courant began to report consistently on the bad financial condition across the nation and in the Hartford community.

The College managed somehow to get through the academic year of 1857-58, but by Commencement time the Treasury was so depleted that on June 30, 1858, the Trustees authorized the Treasurer, Thomas Belknap, to borrow up to $10,000 for the academic year which was to begin the following September.250 Belknap, upon whom the responsibility of saving the College had fallen, expressed his lack of confidence in either his own abilities or the decision of the Board of Trustees by submitting his resignation as Treasurer and Trustee the following day.251 Fortunately, the Board refused to accept the resignation, and Belknap served ably as Treasurer until 1867, and as Trustee until 1880.252 Others, too, expressed doubts as to the College’s future. When Abner Jackson resigned to accept the Presidency of Hobart and when Duncan L. Stewart was made Professor Emeritus, there was difficulty in securing replacements. In fact, the two persons first elected by the Trustees to these positions declined the appointment. When Austin Stickney finally was induced to accept the Professorship of Latin Language and Literature, it
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was at a salary of $1,000 (only two-thirds of the figure set for a Professorship just a year before). Leopold Simonson was also induced to accept an Instructorship in Modern Languages at a mere $500.253

Thomas Belknap succeeded in borrowing the money to save the College, and he also succeeded in persuading the Trustees to mortgage several of the College properties to raise money to erect a block of five three-story dwellings in what was locally described as "the Norman order of architecture," on Elm Street. The College was able to take advantage of the low prices which had resulted from the depression, and as the buildings neared completion, the editor of the Hartford Daily Courant observed that "Park Row will eventually become the Fifth Avenue quarter of the town, . . . and [the buildings] when finished, will be a fine back-ground to view from the Park."254

Hartford may have been proud of "Park Row," but her citizenry, despite Thomas Belknap's efforts to raise money locally for the endowment fund, made no subscriptions.255 The Trustees once more turned to the Episcopalian community outside the Diocese of Connecticut and this time they sent Professor Eliot to Boston to solicit subscriptions for a Massachusetts Professorship,256 and to make Eliot's "agency" more palatable, the Trustees acted on the strength of the charter amendment of May, 1857, permitting the election of out-of-state Trustees,257 and elected to the Board two of Eliot's Boston friends, the Reverend George M. Randall and Henry M. Parker, Esq.258

Eliot succeeded in raising $2,074 for the Massachusetts Professorship, but neither Randall (who served as Trustee until 1868) nor Parker (who served until 1863) contributed to the Professorship.259 The Massachusetts Professorship never materialized,260 and the funds raised for the purpose were, in all probability, directed to meeting operational expenses during this time of financial distress, for other than an annuity of Miss Harriet Kirby of $500 on which she was to receive interest during her lifetime,261 this was the only money raised in the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the Civil War.

Now, apart from the usual problems of collegiate finance and the unfortunate Panic of 1857, to what may this particular season of financial distress be attributed? Perhaps it may be said that Daniel Raynes Goodwin lacked the qualities of leadership so essential to the College President, or that Goodwin was in the unenviable position of following John Williams as one of the College's most popular presidents, and that Goodwin failed to maintain Williams' high standards of "public relations."

Much of John Williams success was personal, i.e., people supported the College because John Williams was its head. And much of this support was Church support which was quite naturally transferred to the Berkeley Divinity School when the Theological Department of the College was set up as a separate institution. Williams, too, had had a long connection with the Diocese of Connecticut, whereas Goodwin was a native of Maine, and his academic career (as student and professor) had been at Bowdoin. At the time of his inauguration at Trinity, he had been in Priests Orders but five years, and he had none of the useful social connections which come in the course of a parish ministry.

But although Goodwin was an outsider to the Diocese of Connecticut and the Trinity College community, Bishop Williams had great confidence in the new President and seemed to feel at the time of Goodwin's election that all that his
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successor lacked was an honorary degree, a matter which was soon taken care of by Bishop Burgess who, on Williams' request, induced Bowdoin to give a D.D. to Goodwin. Goodwin came to Trinity with the highest recommendation from Bowdoin, where he had been highly regarded as a logician and linguist.

Goodwin held, in addition to the Presidency, the Hobart Professorship, first of Modern Languages and Literature, and later (after the creation of Samuel Eliot's chair of History and Literature) of Ethics and Evidences of Christianity. Until Eliot's appointment, Goodwin and Bishop Williams shared the instruction in History, and Goodwin here demonstrated his intention of following John Williams' philosophy of education and his philosophy of history, by delivering a series of lectures on "History and the Philosophy of History" in which he reiterated the "Biblical" philosophy of Williams' inaugural - "History as the story of Man's redemption."

Goodwin tried to be the "good citizen" in the Hartford community, officiating frequently in the churches of the City and delivering an occasional public address. In 1857, he joined his colleagues, Professors Pynchon and Eliot, and five other clergymen in organizing the Society for the Increase of the Ministry, an institution devoted to raising money to provide scholarships for candidates for Holy Orders. Like his predecessor once removed, Silas Totten, Daniel Raynes Goodwin tried to please. But again like Totten, Goodwin never quite succeeded in impressing either students, colleagues, or constituency as a leader. One of the students of the time described him as "a scholar[,] but a cold, unsympathetic man." And with Bishop Williams, relations were always somewhat strained. Williams had been elected, upon his resigning the Presidency, to the office of Vice-Chancellor, and with a Chancellor (Bishop Brownell) and a Vice-Chancellor (Williams) in ex-officio positions of life tenure, Goodwin was virtually but third in command. On the Faculty, too, there were forceful personalities: the young and popular Abner Jackson until 1858; the aggressive Samuel Eliot after 1856; and throughout his administration, Dr. Thomas Ruggles Pynchon and John Brocklesby.

Goodwin was not unaware of his own inadequacies and of his failure to exert effective leadership. On February 5, 1857, he submitted to the Trustees his resignation from the Presidency, but the Trustees, having committed themselves to a major fund-raising drive, and wishing, perhaps, to present a favorable picture of the College's internal condition, asked Goodwin to withdraw his resignation. Goodwin, fortunately for the College, placed the welfare of the institution above his own comfort, and for another three years he remained what must have been the purely "nominal" President of Trinity, while the College weathered the Panic of 1857 and the slow economic recovery just before the outbreak of the Civil War. And there can be no doubt that the Presidency of Daniel Raynes Goodwin was "nominal" between 1857 and 1860, for it was during this period that Professors Pynchon and Eliot re-vamped the College Library and during which Treasurer Belknap and Professor Eliot - not the President - raised enough money to keep the College solvent. And it was during this period that Professor Eliot emerged as the dominant - albeit a newer - Professor.

On May 18, 1860, Goodwin again submitted his resignation, and the wording of the letter was that of a frustrated man. "My reason," he wrote, "for this step need not be detailed, and perhaps, would be of little interest to any besides myself." But the Trustees, refusing to let the unhappy President depart in peace, appointed a Committee (Dr. Robert Hallam and Dr. Gordon Russell) "to wait upon the President, and request an explanation of some parts of his letter, and to confer with him on the whole subject." The committee met with Dr. Goodwin, but he could not be drawn into a discussion of the reasons for his resignation, and the Trustees, consequently, appointed a committee to nominate a successor, if Goodwin should insist on having the resignation accepted. After at least one more conference with the President, the Trustees were obliged to accept Goodwin's resignation as final, but only
after Goodwin had taken leave of the students at the Baccalaureate Service of June 3, 1860.273

Goodwin's departure from the College was with as little ceremony as he desired. At Class Day, June 8, the students presented him with a watch,274 and at the meeting of the House of Convocation (June 19) the Alumni adopted resolutions expressing regret at Goodwin's retirement and praising his seven years of usefulness to the College.275 But significantly, Goodwin never made a farewell speech beyond the passing reference to his resignation at the Baccalaureate Service, and he did not speak at either the Commencement exercises or the Alumni dinner.

From Trinity, Goodwin went to the University of Pennsylvania as Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy. In 1862, he was appointed to the first faculty of the Philadelphia Divinity School, and in 1865, he resigned his Professorship at the University to become Dean of the Divinity School, with which institution he remained until his death in 1890.276

Goodwin's resignation should have been a surprise to nobody, for the Trustees, and perhaps the Faculty—to say nothing of the students, who are remarkably perceptive in such matters—were obviously aware that no one could have been happy (or even successful) in such a "figurehead" position. But, perhaps because he had been induced to rescind his resignation in 1857, the irrevocable resignation of 1860 caught the Trustees totally unprepared. No successor had been "groomed," and probably only one member of the Faculty seriously regarded himself as "heir to the throne." That person was Professor Eliot.

Samuel Eliot was, to say the least, a remarkable man. Following his graduation from Harvard in 1839, he had been engaged in various charitable endeavors in his native city of Boston, having taught gratuitously in charity school for vagrant children and young workingmen, and until his coming to Trinity, he had divided his time between charitable instruction and historical scholarship. At Trinity, Eliot had twice placed himself in the College's debt. He had raised a sizeable sum of money for the College in Boston, and he would doubtless have secured more had not his friends and family suffered heavy financial losses in the Panic of 1857.277 In 1857, Eliot had also declined an appointment as Professor of Literature at Columbia College in the City of New York. Bishops Brownell and Williams had urged Eliot to stay at the College, and they appealed to the Professor's better nature not to leave a weak and struggling college because of an attractive offer from a stronger one.278 Eliot was a man of independent wealth (his wife had inherited a sizeable fortune)279 and the financial consideration at Columbia was secondary. There was, too, the prospect of a Presidency at Trinity, and Eliot, the Hartford Daily Courant reported, "declined the inducement offered by Columbia College," a sacrifice in both salary and "personal convenience," to remain at Trinity.280

Eliot could hardly have been surprised at President Goodwin's resignation, but the action taken by the Trustees was certainly not what he might have hoped. Goodwin's resignation was dated May 18, 1860. The resignation had not been considered by the Trustees until May 31, and the Governing Board did not regard Goodwin's action as irrevocable until June 24, at which time the Trustees selected a Committee to nominate a successor.281 Four days later (June 28) it became quite obvious that the Trustees had no particular candidate in mind, for at that time they simply designated the senior Professor, John Brocklesby, as Acting President to serve until a permanent appointment should be made.282 Eliot, however "available," was probably not even being considered because of an objection by some trustees to the election of a layman as President of the College.

On August 15, 1860, the Trustees met to hear the nomination of the committee which had been appointed to select a candidate for the College Presidency. Arthur Cleveland Coxe, then Rector of Grace Church in Baltimore, was nominated and unanimously elected.283 But Coxe, despite his love for the College, declined the appointment, and Brocklesby was continued as Acting-
A second committee was constituted, and on this one were some of Professor Eliot's closest friends: Bishop Williams, Henry M. Parker, and the Reverend Alexander Hamilton Vinton, then Rector of Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia, and formerly of St. Paul's Church, Boston. The other members of the Committee were William Whiting Boardman and Eben Edwards Beardsley, and of the entire committee, only Beardsley seems to have had any feelings against Eliot's being elected.

On December 18, 1860, at a special meeting of the Board of Trustees, Samuel Eliot's name was presented by the committee as candidate for Trinity's Presidency. There was serious debate, centering largely, it would seem, about the wisdom of breaking with the well-established tradition of having a President who was in Holy Orders. Henry Joel Scudder, Eliot's old friend who had probably been instrumental in having Eliot elected to a Professorship at Columbia in 1857, proposed a resolution that "in the opinion of this Board it is not essential to the interests of the College that the President should be of the order of the Clergy." The motion was passed, and the way was cleared to elect Samuel Eliot. The twelve Trustees present then elected Eliot as President of Trinity College at a salary of $1,500 per annum with use of the President's House and furnishings.

Eliot was aware, of course, that there had been opposition to his election. He knew, too, that he had been elected at a meeting at which a little more than half of the twenty-three Trustees had been present, and that the vote had not been unanimous. There was also the embarrassing fact that he had been, at best, second choice. And the Hartford Daily Courant cryptically noted that Eliot at this time had "other objects in view."

By this time the proverbial "edge had been taken off" the idea of a College Presidency, and Eliot declined the appointment. Now the situation was reversed; Eliot, once a seeker for office, now became the sought after. The Vice-Chancellor, several of the Trustees, members of the Faculty, friends of the College, and alumni pleaded with Eliot to reconsider, and by Commencement time in June these importunities had had their effect. Eliot wrote to the Trustees accepting the position, but at the same time expressing a reluctance to do so. Modestly, perhaps too modestly, insisting on his own poor capacities, Eliot wrote that he would "undertake the Presidency as an experiment, and if it proves an unsuccessful one, I shall ask permission to withdraw from it in season to prevent any permanent injury to an institution which represents an important cause, and to which many faithful and generous services have been rendered in the past."
Pro Patria: North and South

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

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

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

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

Before coming to Trinity, Eliot had attempted to put Arnold’s philosophy into effect through his educational work with the Boston immigrant working class. And at the time of his appointment to the Chair of History and Literature at Trinity, Eliot had demonstrated his preference for Anglican education in declining a similar po-
sition at Harvard," perhaps also suggesting by this choice that newer and smaller Trinity would be more receptive to his own educational philosophy than ancient and tradition-bound Harvard. Among the Trinity students, Eliot had been immensely popular. 11 One of them, Maitland Armstrong, wrote of Eliot years later: "I loved this man—the finest gentleman, the best scholar, and the best Christian that I have ever known." 11 Another, Samuel Hart, who later became a member of the Trinity Faculty, wrote: "Dr. Eliot brought to the College and set before the student an ideal of wise learning, [and] of true character." 12 Eliot had had his part in curricular revision, 13 but at that time Eliot's sole concern seems to have been to extend the offerings in his favorite discipline and his own "department"—History. Indeed, in his later public utterances in Hartford, there was much to suggest that there was little that was really revolutionary in his educational thinking 14 and that Eliot was perhaps simply re-phrasing the traditional concepts.

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

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

In the first place, there had been considerable fluctuation in the student body for some time before the outbreak of hostilities. In the academic year 1856–57, the student body numbered 60, of whom only three were from states which were to secede from the Union. 15 In 1857–58, there were 57 students, three from the South. 16 In 1858–59, there were 56 students, two southern. 17 The next year (1859–60) there were 62 students in attendance, 58 regular students and four "University Students," five from the South. 18 In 1860–61, the year of Eliot's installation as President, there were 65 students pursuing the regular course (including two Juniors and a Senior listed as "not in full standing"), two "Scientific Students," and three "University Students"—a total of 70 undergraduates, of whom eight were from the South. 19 By 1861–62, however, registration in the College had fallen to 43.20 Notable among the students then enrolled were David Lamb Peck of Tuscaloosa, Alabama, who remained until the end of the Trinity Term to receive his A.B. 21 and to give a Commencement Address on "Labor's Destiny," 22 and Robert Agnew Benton of Little Rockfish, North Carolina, who remained in Hartford to graduate as valedictorian in 1864. 23 For 1862–63, the Catalogue listed 47 students, but the actual attendance was somewhat smaller, for of this total eight were listed as absent "on leave in the National Service" and three others were listed simply "on leave." Thus, for 1862–63, the number of students in attendance was 36. 24 In 1863–64, the total student listing in the Catalogue was 49, but again there were students on leave—six "in the National Service" and three others "on leave"—or a total of 40 young men in actual residence. 25 In 1864–65, there were 49 students in actual residence. 26 With the end of hostilities, however, there was no post-war upswing in enrollment, for in 1865–66 there were again only 44 students enrolled, and two of these were still listed in the Catalogue as "absent on leave." 27 Not until 1866–67 did enrollment reach a more-or-less normal 59, with an all-time large Freshman Class of 28. 28 To say that the student body was "depleted" either as to enrollment or actual attendance, would be grossly overstating the situation, for the one-third reduction in attendance from the
average of 60 students in the 1850's to the low point of 40 students in 1863-64 was but little greater than the decline from an average enrollment of 80 in the mid- and late-1820's to the average of 60 for the following three decades. And the fallacy of the belief that an exodus of southern students contributed to the decline in enrollment is demonstrated in the fact that in the three academic years before the outbreak of the Civil War, the southern students never numbered more than eight, and in that year (1860-61) they constituted little more than ten per cent of the total.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The literary societies seem to have been largely inactive and, of the student groups, the Missionary Society alone appears to have continued normal operations. Meetings of this organization were held regularly every second week, and occasionally joint meetings were held with the Missionary Society of Christ Church. Professor Pynchon served as chaplain to the society, and he and President Eliot frequently read papers (usually on historical subjects) to the members. The Missionary Society collected a small library; and a reading room, replete with missionary books and periodicals, was opened in one of the dormitories.65

Washington’s Birthday, as was natural in a time of patriotic emphasis, was one of the high spots of the college calendar. The celebrations held at the College were well-attended, and in 1864 the speaker, Joseph F. Ely of the Senior Class, so stirred his hearers with his address on “Patriotism” that he was “frequently encored,” and repeated “the same speech fifteen or twenty times in succession to the same audience.” On this same occasion there was read a poem by Robert A. Benton ’64, “Alma Mater, the School of Loyalty.” The German Quartette Club of Hartford also sang patriotic airs.66

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

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

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

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

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

When the College opened in September, the Professors took up their new responsibilities, and even President Eliot spent one evening each week in the College. But this supervision had no appreciable effect upon the unruly students. After three terms under the system, President Eliot reported to the Trustees that, despite the efforts of the Faculty to maintain good order, the students had been exceptionally disorderly during the Christmas Term of 1863-64. In January, 1864, the Trustees, recognizing the unworkableness of a system of dormitory supervision which depended upon married men who were inclined to leave the dormitories early in the evening, voted to engage the Reverend Pelham Williams to reside in the College as "Proctor."74 Williams did not accept the appointment, but the fact that the position of "Proctor" was created was more than indicative that Samuel Eliot's ideal of "Christian manliness" had been far from realized.75

At the Class Day in 1863, an event occurred which must have shaken President Eliot's faith in human nature. The custom of the Seniors of passing on the lemon squeezer to their favorite rising class had begun in 1857 when the Seniors awarded the trophy to the Class of 1859. Traditionally, it seemed, the squeezer had gone to odd-numbered classes, for '59 had passed it on to '61, and '61 had made the award to '63. As Class Day 1863 approached, the rumor was going 'round the campus that the odd-number tradition was to be continued and that the Class of '65 would be the recipients. The Class of '64 was determined to break the odd-number tradition and had secured an alliance with the Class of '66, perhaps holding out the proposal of an even-numbered tradition. The rumors were definitely based on fact, for '63 had indeed voted to present the squeezer to '65 and, at the proper point in the Class Day ceremonial, Richard French Goodman '63 rose to make the presentation speech. While Goodman was speaking, a rainstorm suddenly broke, and just as he was presenting the squeezer to Charles Wentworth Munro '65, rain began to fall in torrents. The
confusion which ensued enabled a Freshman to leap from the chapel portico, followed by the Juniors and Freshmen yelling like demons, and wrest the heirloom from Munro's hands. The audience fled in panic, leaving the graduate circle the scene of a battle between the two alliances. Faculty and city police joined in the mêlée while spectators, who had taken cover in the college buildings, watched from doorways and windows. With the help of the Faculty and police, the squeezer was recovered by '63 and '65 and carried by a policeman to the College Cabinet where the ceremony was completed.75

Experiences such as this were more than President Eliot felt that he could endure, but there were other elements in his situation that made his position somewhat less than a happy one. With the students, the Trustees, the Faculty, the Hartford community, the Episcopal Church, with the wider academic circles, and, indeed, with everybody, Eliot had been more than eager to cooperate. His dealings with the students had been on an informal and certainly friendly basis, but this friendly spirit seems to have been rewarded with a total breakdown of student discipline. In the affairs of the Society for the Increase of the Ministry, an organization which Eliot had helped found, his well-intentioned enthusiasm had created the impression that the society was something of an adjunct of Trinity College—an impression which benefited neither Trinity nor the Society for the Increase of the Ministry.76 In the “College Association,” an organization consisting of the presidents and a faculty member from each of the endowed New England colleges, Eliot had been active and, in October of 1862, Trinity College was host to the “Association.”77 And, like his predecessors, Eliot had participated in the civic, literary, and religious activities of Hartford; but for Eliot these activities were, perhaps, burdens rather than pleasures. Scarcely a year had passed after Eliot's inauguration, when the President of Trinity College confided in his former colleague, Abner Jackson, then president of Hobart College, that the President's responsibilities were not altogether what he had expected them to be.78

Eliot's status as a layman was something of a handicap. Each of his predecessors had been in Holy Orders, and by College Statute the President had been College Chaplain.79 Although the Trustees had declared, just before elevating Eliot to the Presidency, that the President of the College need not be in Holy Orders, and although the actions of the Trustees were confirmed by the revised Statutes of 1862 deleting any mention of the President's responsibility for conducting public worship,80 a lay president was something of an embarrassment to the College. There were, of course, pressures put upon Eliot to seek ordination,81 but Eliot would have none of it.

In June, 1861, the Trustees appointed Professor Pynchon as Acting-Chaplain to serve for the academic year of 1861-1862. Pynchon received no compensation for his extra services,82 but he remained in that capacity throughout Eliot's tenure at the College.

Pynchon conducted the daily Morning and Evening Prayer and the morning service on Sunday. But just as the wartime situation at the College had not led to an improved student decorum, neither had it led to greater religiosity. In fact, the students wanted less religion, or at least fewer religious observances. It is true that during the decade of the 1850's, Evening Chapel had practically disappeared from the daily schedule of the American colleges,83 and this fact was doubtless known to the Trinity students. The only deletion from the schedule of religious exercises was the Sunday evening service at the time of President Goodwin's leaving the College in 1861, but the students were determined that there should be more deletions. In July, 1862, the students petitioned the Trustees to make attendance at daily Evening Prayer voluntary. The governing board, however, had other plans and denied the request.84

The plans of the Trustees centered around the erection of a new Chapel. From the beginning of the College, the Chapel had been a small room in Seabury Hall, 50 feet by 35, whose only real asset seems to have been the exceptionally fine organ which had been installed in 1850.85 On March 18, 1862, Nathaniel Wheaton, Trin-
ity's second President, died.\textsuperscript{86} Wheaton had made the College the principal beneficiary in his will. In addition to a residual legacy of $10,000 for the general use of the College, Wheaton had bequeathed $10,000 toward the erection of a new Chapel.\textsuperscript{87} And thus, with the probability of a new Chapel, the Trustees were in no mood to take kindly to a petition for a reduced number of chapel services. But the fact remains that Eliot had not brought the students to share his feeling that the Chapel services were an indispensable pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night!

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

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

It was doubtless a combination of these factors — poor discipline in the College, an irreverent attitude toward the religious exercises on the part of the students, and the deterioration of the College's financial condition — which caused Eliot to feel that he had failed as a college administrator. On February 16, 1863, he submitted his resignation, reminding the Board of Trustees of the conditions under which he had accepted the Presidency, which had been on an experimental basis, and with the understanding that if the experiment should fail, he would be permitted to resign.\textsuperscript{84}

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

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

Although Eliot probably agreed to continue in the Presidency with reluctance, it was a family tragedy which brought Eliot's administration to an end. At about this time, Eliot's youngest child, George, died, and Mrs. Eliot, as a consequence, suffered a breakdown. Her physicians prescribed a sea voyage and Eliot, at the same time he with-
drew his resignation, asked for a six-month leave of absence in order to take Mrs. Eliot abroad. The leave was granted, and President and Mrs. Eliot and their eldest son, William, sailed from New York for Cadiz, Spain, on the barque Evelyn in January, 1864.88

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

John Barrett Kerfoot found Trinity College an altogether different place from the College of St. James. In his former position in Maryland, discipline had been strict, and the relationship between the rector and students (as well as the Faculty) had been personal and paternal. The life at the College of St. James may well have been described as that of a “family” or perhaps something of a religious community. But if Kerfoot intended to reproduce his former administrative policy at Trinity, he was in for a great surprise.

When Kerfoot arrived on College Hill, student discipline had degenerated to the point where even some of his more lenient predecessors would have become alarmed. The new President was appalled to learn that after the students had completed their daily recitations, the Faculty knew little (and Kerfoot was certain, cared little) about how they spent their time—whether they were in their rooms, or whether they were “on the town.” And the students, doubtless aware of Kerfoot’s feelings on student decorum, decided to put the new President to the test. Keyholes were plugged, doors were tied shut with ropes, and personal orders by the President were rudely disobeyed. Before the first month of the Christmas Term of 1864–65 had ended, Kerfoot was so disheartened that he was already giving thought to resigning his post “if discipline could not be made effective.”

But despite this unfortunate start, conditions at the College improved somewhat. At the beginning of the term four of the worst-behaved students were suspended, and if this was more than the campus rowdies had bargained for, Kerfoot was, fortunately, able to persuade as well as punish. The new President’s powers as a teacher were soon felt in his senior courses in Ethics and Metaphysics, and some of this influence filtered downward to the underclassmen. Chapel services were made “more hearty and lifelike,” and the special concerns of the twelve or fifteen pre-theological students were given special attention by the President. To his duties at the College, Kerfoot soon added the Chaplaincy of the Hartford Hospital, a position in which his faithful services did much for the relations between Trinity and the Hartford community. By the end of his first academic year at Trinity, Kerfoot seemed to be taking everything more or less in stride.

On Wednesday, June 28, 1865, Kerfoot was formally installed as President of the College with appropriate ceremonies in Christ Church. His inaugural address, *The Christian College,* however, suggested that he had not altogether abandoned the philosophy which had guided him in the administration of the College of St. James. The Christian College, as Kerfoot described it, was “a single community; a society of Professors and Students; organized under rules and devoting its daily tasks to mental discipline and acquirement; a school of learning in a home of its own.” And in his elaborate tracing of the history of the medieval colleges and universities, he noted that “the college was not originally the place of instruction, but of shelter and care,” and that “its officers were not teachers, but guardians of the young inmates.” If the tone of the address may seem a bit “paternal,” it might also be
pointed out that Kerfoot, perhaps more than any of his predecessors, conceived of the American college as a community of scholars.

In September, 1865, the Christmas Term began quite auspiciously. Professor Mallory's fund-raising campaign had been a tremendous success, and $100,000 had been added to the College's endowment funds. And as evidence of the loyalty of the local community to the College, the Trustees were proud to note that of the total sum, $96,000 had been given in the state of Connecticut, $55,000 by the citizens of Hartford, and $38,000 by the Trustees. In addition to this (for the time) astronomical sum, the Wheaton bequest of $20,000 had become available to the College, a member of the class of 1853 had given $2,500 toward the cost of an astronomical observatory, and the Alumni Library Fund had by that time aggregated $20,000. Never before had the financial condition of the College been better. The Faculty, too, were made happy by salary raises which brought those of the full-time Professors to a new high of $1,900.

Enrollment figures for the College were also encouraging. There had been no great upswing in enrollment such as had been noted at some of the other colleges, but the academic year of 1864–65 had forty-nine students in residence, and that of 1865–66 had forty-four. President Kerfoot was responsible for the number being as large as it was, for with the closing of the College of St. James, eight or ten students from that institution came to Trinity with President Kerfoot, certainly no small token of the esteem in which he had been held in his former position. Bishop Williams assured Kerfoot that the success of the new President was the source of much comfort to him, and the Alumni, according to Kerfoot's estimate at least, had turned out at the last Commencement "in four times the number seen for years."

The Diocese of Connecticut expressed its confidence in Trinity's new President by sending him, in October, 1865, as delegate to the General Convention held in Philadelphia. The Connecticut delegation was, indeed, a Trinity delegation, for along with President Kerfoot, were three Trustees: the Reverend Doctors Mead, Hallam, and Clark.

The Convention of 1865 was one of the most momentous in the history of the Episcopal Church, for it was to that Convention that the Bishops from the dioceses of the seceded states returned and were given their seats, thus ending the schism which had resulted from the creation of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States of America. Kerfoot had attracted attention by his leadership in a successful move to vote down a motion which was intended to deprecate the Churchmen of the former Confederacy. And, he also made a great impression by his report as chairman of the Committee on Christian Education. That same Convention had created the Diocese of Pittsburgh by detaching the western part of the Diocese of Pennsylvania; and on November 16, 1865, at the first Convention of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, John B. Kerfoot was elected Bishop on the first ballot.

The College, of course, was honored by the election of its head as a Bishop of the Episcopal Church, the second time in its history; and Kerfoot, but forty-nine years of age, was well aware of both the dignity and awful responsibility of the Episcopal office. The Trustees of Trinity College had not been unaware of the possibility of Kerfoot's election to the newly-created see and Bishop Williams, prompted to do so by the current rumors, had written a private letter to Kerfoot, urging him to consider whether his true vocation might not be in educational work rather than in the Episcopate.

When he himself received the news of his election, even though he must have had some reason to anticipate it, Kerfoot pondered Bishop Williams' question. But his old friends, Muhlenberg, Bishop Whittingham, and his former associates at the College of St. James, all urged acceptance.

Only in Connecticut did there seem to be objections to Kerfoot's going to Pittsburgh. Immediately upon hearing of Kerfoot's election, Bishop Williams called on Kerfoot to reiterate his earlier feelings on the subject. On November 23, the Trustees met in special session "to
devise means, if possible, to retain him in the Presidency of the College.” At that time, the Trustees adopted a resolution assuring Kerfoot of the full confidence of the Board, and urged him to consider whether he might not exert a greater influence for good as a college president than as a bishop. The Diocese of Connecticut, too, felt that it could ill spare the President’s service to the higher education of the Diocese, and one hundred and twenty Connecticut clergy, headed by Bishop Williams, presented a petition urging him to decline the Pittsburgh Episcopate.

The entreaties, however, were in vain, for on November 30, Kerfoot wrote his “acceptance of the solemn call to the Bishopric of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.” At the same time he wrote his letter of resignation as President of Trinity College. Trinity was once more without a President and this time after an administration of but one year and four months.

Kerfoot’s biographer has made much of his success at Trinity, and Bishop Niles of the Diocese of New Hampshire, who had been Professor of Latin at Trinity from 1864 until 1870, wrote in 1885 that Kerfoot’s administration “was the turning of the tide,” so far as the fortunes of Trinity College were concerned. An un-named Professor in the College made the not altogether unreasonable statement that Kerfoot “was almost alone among the presidents of Trinity College in leaving it freely of his own accord, in response to duty, [and] not because of trouble arising in the College.”

Bishop Niles’ observation was admittedly prejudiced, and the anonymous professor’s comment may have been damning with faint praise. The College’s financial successes of 1864 and 1865 were due to the efforts of Professor Mallory and not of President Kerfoot. And the disciplinary problems which had so vexed the President in the early weeks of his administration may have been solved largely by the President’s choosing to ignore them. Kerfoot could never quite realize that he was at Trinity and not at the College of St. James, nor could he think of his Maryland boys as being completely “Trinity” men. Each Sunday evening the students who had transferred from St. James to Trinity met at the President’s home to sing the old St. James’ music to Mrs. Kerfoot’s accompaniment on the melodeon.

Kerfoot was perhaps never really happy at Trinity, and he never quite gave up the hope of the ultimate revival of the College of St. James. Perhaps unbiased opinion might have been less complimentary toward Kerfoot’s efforts at Trinity, for Professor John Taylor Huntington, who like William Woodruff Niles had come to Trinity with Kerfoot in 1864, and was certainly no purveyor of academic scuttlebut, confided to Abner Jackson in 1867 that “Kerfoot’s administration could not but have been a failure if he had staid [sic] – that he wanted to resign, and that he was elected Bishop just in time to save his reputation.”

But whether or not Kerfoot’s leaving the College had been anticipated before the General Convention of October, 1865, the Trustees were prepared, when Kerfoot’s resignation was accepted, to elect a successor immediately. Their choice was the Reverend Henry Augustus Coit, D.D., rector of St. Paul’s School at Concord, New Hampshire.

Henry Augustus Coit was one of John Kerfoot’s closest friends. He had attended St. Paul’s College at College Point, Long Island, from which he had transferred to the University of Pennsylvania. Coit had been on the faculty at the College of St. James, and he had gone to St. Paul’s School when that institution had been opened in 1856. Incidentally, St. Paul’s School had been founded by Trinity’s nominal Professor of Medicine, Dr. George Shattuck.

The salary offered Coit, $2,000 per year and house, had no attraction for the Headmaster of St. Paul’s, and the offer of the Presidency of Trinity College was promptly declined. Professor Brocklesby continued as Acting-President and on June 27, 1866, the Trustees again ballotted for a permanent head of the College, this time unanimously selecting Bishop Williams’ classmate of 1835, the Reverend Edwin Martin Van Deusen, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, Utica.
New York, with the promise of a salary of $3,000 per year and house. The "upping of the ante" on the President's salary in no way reflected a greater confidence in Van Deusen than in Coit. It merely meant that the Trustees had just raised the salaries of the Professors from $1,900 to $2,000, and that was what just half a year before had been offered as the President's salary! But even this bold inducement could not attract a president, and Van Deusen, too, declined.

Twice embarrassed by having offers of the College Presidency turned down, the Trustees next turned to a former Professor in the College, the Reverend Dr. Abner Jackson, then in his ninth year as President of Hobart College. Jackson's career at Hobart had been eminently successful, and in the Diocese of Western New York he had enjoyed the full confidence of Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe (erstwhile Trinity Lecturer and Trustee) and the rank and file of the Diocesan clergy. Jackson had also been exceedingly well thought of during his professorial days at Trinity and had been popular both with the students and Hartford townspeople. His first wife (she died in 1853) was the daughter of Judge William Wolcott Ellsworth, Professor of Law at the College. And during his residence in Hartford, Jackson had made many ecclesiastical connections, having served as priest-in-charge of missions in New Britain, Glastonbury, Windsor Locks, and West Hartford. Certainly Jackson was an able man and perhaps, with a bit of encouragement, he might be returned to Hartford. The Trustees and Faculty at once set to work.

On February 13, 1867, Jackson received a letter from the Reverend John Taylor Huntington, Professor of Greek at Trinity, inquiring whether, if elected, Jackson would accept the Presidency of Trinity College. Jackson "took the bait," and without giving any serious thought to the matter, wrote to Huntington that he would at least "consider the question if brought before me in any tangible form," and perhaps he honestly thought that would be the end of the matter. And the more he thought about it, the more he entertained a "secret hope" that there would be no follow-up on the letter he had so hastily sent to Professor Huntington. But three weeks later a letter arrived from Bishop Williams, a most flattering letter in which the Bishop disclosed his feelings that nothing would have given him (Bishop Williams) greater pleasure than to have had Jackson succeed him (in 1848) or President Goodwin (in 1860). And in this communication, Bishop Williams virtually promised the Presidency to Jackson, if he would only agree to accept if elected. Again, Jackson replied that he was interested, and to Bishop Williams he even went into some of the details of a possible arrangement: Would the College share the moving expenses? Could he expect a leave of two or three months for a trip to Europe?

Jackson realized that he was becoming deeply involved in a situation which could have but one outcome. Immediately, he went to see Bishop Coxe in Rochester and told him the whole story. Bishop Coxe was shocked to learn that his "dear little university," as he had once called Trinity, was about to steal the head of the college in his own Diocese, and the Bishop declared that he "would rather lose his right hand" than allow Jackson to go to Trinity! Mrs. Jackson (he had remarried in 1856) also expressed strong objection to leaving Geneva, and Jackson's daughter, Emily, then in school at New Haven, appealed to her father in urging him to stay at Hobart by reminding him of how much his health had improved since he had moved from Hartford. A second visit to Bishop Coxe a week later revealed that the Bishop had not changed his mind, for the Bishop, in a moralizing lecture which lasted for an hour and a half, used every possible argument, including the "social," by dwelling "very much on the character of Hartford society as being so intensely disagreeable." Everybody seemed to be against Jackson's leaving Hobart, and Jackson philosophically recorded in his journal: "It will all be the same 100 years hence." But in spite of the obstacles being thrown in his way of a rational consideration of the prospect of the Trinity Presidency, Jackson found occasion to go to Connecticut— not directly to Hartford, but not, either, without making his
plans known to his friends at Trinity. On April 30, Jackson went to New London to see the Reverend Dr. Robert Hallam, Trinity Trustee and rector of St. James Church, on some matters of church business—it would seem that the visit had something to do with church publications—and on his return to Geneva he just happened to stop in Hartford. There he talked with Acting-President Brocklesby, Professor Mallory, Professor Pynchon, Treasurer Belknap, Trustee Isaac Toucey, and Bishop Williams. All seemed to feel that Jackson should accept the Presidency, and Jackson was so encouraged that he gave Bishop Williams verbal assurance that he could see no reason why he should not accept the Presidency of Trinity College if elected.84

Acting on Jackson’s comments to Bishop Williams, the Trustees scheduled a special meeting for May 22. As there was no quorum at the special meeting, the vote on the Presidency was postponed to another special meeting called for New Haven on June 11, 1867, to coincide with the Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of Connecticut scheduled for that date. Bishop Williams wrote a letter to Jackson assuring him that the vote at that meeting would be unanimous.85

By that time, of course, the probability of Jackson’s being called to the Presidency of Trinity College had become common knowledge, and an announcement of appointment appeared in the columns of the Gospel Messenger, the publication of the Diocese of Western New York. Jackson, who had hoped to keep the matter quiet, was much incensed, but when he called the editor of the Messenger sharply to task, the editor merely replied that the matter had been so generally talked about that he had assumed it to be true.86 At any rate, Jackson had been maneuvered into a position where he felt obliged to resign his position as President of Hobart College even though he had not, as yet, been formally elected as President of Trinity. On June 9, 1867, he submitted his resignation to the Hobart Trustees.87

The governing board of Trinity College met on June 11 and elected Abner Jackson President of Trinity College at a salary of $2,500 and house,88 and Jackson had no choice but to accept. Three days later Jackson wrote to Bishop Williams accepting the appointment.89

The next week (June 20) Jackson went to Hartford where a grand reception had been arranged. Professors Brocklesby and Huntington met him at the railroad station and took him to the campus in a carriage. When they arrived on College Hill, the students were waiting with Bishop Williams on the Chapel steps. Williams presented the new President to the students in a flattering speech, after which the students responded with three cheers. Jackson made a short speech, and then Bishop Williams introduced the students individually. Jackson called at the homes of the members of the Faculty, visited such Hartford notables as Mrs. Colt, and after two days of wining and dining, he returned to Geneva to prepare for his move to Hartford.90

Only one unfortunate incident marred Jackson’s brief visit to Trinity. With one exception, the Professors had been most gracious. Professor Pynchon, however, was quite open in displaying
his displeasure at Jackson's coming to the College. Pynchon had come to Trinity as Tutor in 1843, two years after his graduation from the College, and had served in that capacity until 1847. After an interval of seven years in pastoral work, he had returned to the College as Scovill Professor of Chemistry and Natural Science in 1854, and except for Acting-President Brocklesby (who began service in 1842), Pynchon was the senior member of the Faculty. As such, he perhaps felt resentment at the appointment of his former colleague to a position to which he felt entitled. Nevertheless, Bishop Williams apologized for Pynchon's rudeness and assured Jackson that Pynchon had the alternative of either supporting the new administration or going elsewhere, in which case, Williams said, the College would lose little. It was with this pleasant assurance that Jackson returned to Geneva to hold his last Commencement at Hobart College.

But after winding up his affairs in Geneva, Jackson did not go immediately to Hartford. A two-month's leave for a trip to Europe had probably been a condition upon which he had accepted the Trinity Presidency, and the Trustees had granted a leave for such a trip. Jackson spent the summer months in Europe, and he even extended his stay somewhat beyond the intended two months, for it was not until October, after the College had opened in September under Dr. Brocklesby, that Jackson finally arrived on campus.

After an absence of nine years, Jackson found College Hill much the same place as in his earlier professorial years. The three brown-stone buildings had mellowed somewhat. Virginia creeper had by then practically enveloped them, and Brownell Hall's original shingle roof had been replaced by one of slate. The grass on the lawns still grew long until the Trustees' annual mowing of the hay crop - that is, what had not been eaten by the cows which the College's neighbors surreptitiously pastured on the campus at night. And behind the buildings there were patches of flowers which came up where a garden had once been, and one perhaps planted a decade before by Abner Jackson himself. The park which ad-

joined the campus had been beautified with lawns, drives, and a fountain. Perhaps the most noticeable change of all was the installation of gas lamps along the streets which bordered the College.

Beyond these few and simple changes, the Trustees had great plans. According to a "master plan," probably executed in the summer of 1867 by John A. Butler, Esq., of Hartford, a "long walk" of buildings, including the proposed chapel, a tower, a library, and a President's house, was to extend east and west along the north side of the campus, south of Elm Street, and north of Brownell Hall. A similar group of buildings, including a dormitory and a porter's lodge, was to extend along the southern boundary of the campus along Rifle (Capitol) Avenue.

During the nine years of Jackson's absence from Trinity, there had been an almost complete turnover in full-time Faculty, and of those of the earlier years, only Brocklesby and Pynchon remained. The most conspicuously noticeable absence from the college community was that of Bishop Brownell, who had died in June, 1865, and whose passing had been universally mourned.

By the time of Jackson's arrival at the College in October, 1867, the makeup of the student body was not altogether unlike that which he had last known at Trinity. The broadly "southern" contingent had been swelled by the coming, with Dr. Kerfoot, of a large number of Marylanders, and in the fall of 1866 the first student from a seceded state had appeared on campus. This was Joseph Blount Cheshire, later to become Bishop of North Carolina. Cheshire was a lad of fifteen and his father, a North Carolina Episcopal clergyman, had some fears as to the reception his son would receive at Trinity. President Kerfoot kindly offered to place young Cheshire under the personal care of Professor Niles, and with this assurance of safety, the young Carolinian was sent to Trinity.

Cheshire, contrary to what might have been expected, had little trouble at the College. Although his closest friends were the Maryland
group, he was well treated by all, and he never complained of any hostility on the part of the northern students. In fact, he seems to have fared quite well, having been initiated into Phi Kappa, made president of the Senior Class, and elected a marshal for the Commencement of 1868.51

Other southern students followed, and their acceptance was much the same as that of Joseph Blount Cheshire. There were, of course, arguments between Yankees and Rebels, and many of them were quite heated. Some of the southerners had served in the Confederate Army and Lincoln's name, to them, was a dirty word.53 When Jackson arrived in Hartford, four young men from the former Confederacy were in residence,54 and a year later (1868) there were seventeen,55 a number larger than it had been at the pre-war peak.56

Abner Jackson assumed the Presidency of Trinity College at what was, to say the least, a challenging time. There had been, since 1860, two brief Presidential administrations—one largely ineffectual and the other almost too paternal—and after President Kerfoot resigned, as George Otis Holbrooke '89 put it, "the College took a recess under Prof. Brocklesby,"57 who then served as Acting-President for the third time, and until the arrival of Abner Jackson.

During this "interregnum" the matter of student conduct continued to trouble the Faculty. The rape of the Lemon Squeezer, which had been the cause of so much embarrassment to President Eliot, was about to be repeated. The Class of 1865, it will be remembered, had acquired the trophy under the most colorful of circumstances in 1863, and by the time of 1865's Class Day a new crisis was impending. The Class of 1867, assuming that '66 had, by its previous conduct, forfeited any claim to the squeezer, believed itself to be the rightful heir. When '65 announced that '68 had been selected to receive the squeezer, '67 was incensed. A member of the disappointed class succeeded in stealing the lemon squeezer from the clothes closet in which it had been kept for safekeeping, and this deed brought forth a polite request from '65 that it be returned, and a sharp demand to the same effect from the Faculty. The squeezer was promptly restored, but the Faculty forbade the public transfer at Class Day, and the presentation to '68 was made privately.58 A year later the Faculty attempted to modify the Class Day program, and although the transfer of the lemon squeezer would not take place until two years later, the Professors took measures to have the Class Day exercises conducted decently and in order. The Seniors ('66) were instructed by the Faculty to eliminate the "class chronicle" and Professor Jim's speech. But the Seniors decided that rather than eliminate two of the oldest and most colorful portions of the exercises, they would have no class day at all! This was bold action, but the senior festivities were not completely lost; for on the traditional Class Day date, the Class of 1866 held a promenade in the City Guard Armory.59 The Seniors made their point, but in so doing, they both deprived themselves of a Class Day and set a precedent which was to give Class Day a distinctively "Trinity" twist.

The following year (1867) Class Day was again omitted, probably because of Faculty feeling against the "less dignified" portions of the tradition. The date of June 20 was carried on the official College Calendar as Class Day, but that year there was probably not even a promenade. In 1867, the Seniors lost out completely, but not Professor Jim. Although he did not receive his customary purse from the Seniors (at least not at the traditional time), Professor Jim received a high honor: the nomination as candidate for the Vice-Presidency of the United States!

In the spring of 1867, Daniel Pratt, a vagrant widely known as "The Great American Traveler," appeared in Hartford. Pratt was a man of about sixty years of age, a former carpenter, and a regular visitor to the New England campuses and college towns. He was immensely popular among the New England college students, and his "philosophical addresses" to student groups—presumably without official college endorsement—were "remarkable for their long words, bombastic phrases, and curious figures of speech."60

At the conclusion of Pratt's Trinity College ad-
dress, delivered "before a delighted audience," the students unanimously nominated Pratt for the Presidency of the United States in 1868 and named Professor Jim as Pratt's running mate. Pratt modestly accepted the honor and proceeded to "define" his political position and to establish his platform. Needless to say, neither Pratt nor Professor Jim attained office.

The coming of Abner Jackson to the campus had no effect upon the faculty attitude toward Class Day. The College Calendar designated June 18, 1868, as Class Day, and no classes were scheduled for that date. But when the Faculty once more ordered that the (to them) objectionable features be dispensed with, the Seniors once more refused to celebrate according to a shortened form. Again, however, the day was not entirely lost, for several of the members of the Class of '68 had "spreads" in their rooms, and one Senior, Frank Louis Norton of Norwich, Connecticut, entertained the Class at a supper at the Allyn House. In the evening, there was a class oration by Samuel Washington Clifford of Boston and a dance with music by Adkins' Orchestra which played a galop composed by Frank H. Potts '68 and dedicated to the Senior Class. This may not have been the traditional Class Day, but it must have been a reasonably pleasant substitute!

By the spring of 1869, an entire college generation would have passed without a College Class Day. For some unexplained reason, the Faculty finally relented, and on June 17, 1869, at two-thirty in the afternoon, the Senior Class held Class Day with music by Colt's Band, orations, class prophecy, class chronicle, planting of the class ivy, a presentation of the lemon squeezer to the Class of '71, and the presentation of a purse to Professor Jim. Only on one point did the Seniors have to accept compromise: there was no speech by Professor Jim.

The Class of '69 had re-established the tradition of Class Day which was not thereafter to be broken, but '69 also continued some of the ele-
ments which had been added to the classes between '65 and '69. The "spreads" had become a regular part of the Class Day festivities, but they had soon come to be given by the fraternities rather than by the individual members of the Senior Class. Quite naturally, the fraternities competed in the quality and quantity of the food and drink. The underclassmen were, of course, invited, and some of them, in their sampling of the claret punch offered by the several societies, became "ingloriously drunk."64

Thus, although nominally a senior "occasion," Class Day also had interest for others as well. In years when the Seniors held the lemon squeezer, Class Day was happily awaited by those who had become heirs to the coveted trophy, and such classes were those of '71, '73, '74, and '76.65 For even the lowly Freshmen, Class Day was one of rejoicing, for at that time they were released from the restrictions which had been placed upon them as a badge of lowly station. On the morning of Class Day, the Freshmen would "swing out" with canes and beaver hats, which they carried proudly through the remainder of the term.66

But the cane and the beaver hat were symbols of status only to the Freshmen themselves. For to the rest of the world, the cane and "beaver" still marked their possessors as Freshmen—albeit *emancipated* Freshmen. The real garb of distinction was the academic gown and mortarboard, by the 1870's one proper to undergraduate use and not the misappropriated doctor's gowns sometimes worn on ceremonial occasions in the earlier 1830's. Academic gowns and mortarboards were worn by the Seniors at Class Day,67 the Baccalaureate Service, and Commencement,68 by the poet and orator at the Washington's Birthday celebration,69 by the speakers at the Prize Declamations,70 and perhaps by others on occasions of varying degrees of academic solemnity.71 Indeed, so commonly were cap and gown worn that one visitor to Hartford thought that they were the everyday wear of the undergraduates, noting that "the students wear costumes like those at the English Universities—silk gowns and mortarboard caps."72

If the mortarboard and academic gown came to Trinity College with Abner Jackson, as they probably did, they may be symbolic of the change which that able President was to effect in the attitudes and conduct of the students. Undergraduates, of whatever college, have always been noted for their ingenuity—a form of ingenuity often less obvious in the classroom than elsewhere, but nevertheless a remarkable ingenuity.

Prior to Jackson's coming to Trinity, the undergraduates who were then in residence were noted for their mighty hoaxes, harmless in themselves but indicative of cunning and even genius and certainly indicative of the spirit of the College at that time. Acting-President Brocklesby had once asked the Junior Class to remain in the Chapel after Morning Prayer. The matter was a routine one, involving a mere change in the schedule of daily recitation, but when the Juniors emerged from the Chapel, they were met with all sorts of questions from the Seniors and Sophomores as to why they had been detained. The Juniors did not reveal the purpose of the meeting, and by afternoon they met to determine how the occasion could be used to best advantage. Word was sent 'round the campus that the entire Junior Class had been suspended, and the latter part of the afternoon was spent in packing the bags of the Class of '67. In the evening, the Juniors went to the depot to meet the 9:00 steamboat train, accompanied by members of the other classes. On the station platform there were "mingled utterances of affection and sorrow." The Juniors boarded the cars, got off at the first station, and returned to Hartford on the midnight train.73

President Jackson had no intention of tampering with undergraduate genius; that was probably the last thing he would have done. Instead, he attempted, with remarkable success, to direct student energies to useful purposes, and to combine Samuel Eliot's ideas of good fellowship with John B. Kerfoot's conception of the College as a community of scholars. Jackson's approach to this problem was without the "familiarity" of the former, or the rigid paternalism of the latter.

Jackson was never subjected to the indignities which had been inflicted upon Kerfoot, but dur-
ing his first years as President there were episodes which threatened to undo his efforts to instill in the students a seriousness of purpose and to have at least local recognition of his own administration as a positive one. In his early addresses to the students, Jackson may have been notably persuasive, for the winter of 1867-68 passed with unprecedented calm. Warm weather, however, once more sent the students outdoors, and in late May the old prankish spirit returned. The park commissioners had been missing a number of park benches (settees, as they were then called) and it was soon ascertained that they had been placed on the roof of one of the college buildings. City employees were sent to the roof to recover the misplaced property, but when they were ready to descend, they found that the trap door had been fastened from below. The men succeeded, however, in having someone unfasten the door, and they then removed several of the benches and returned them to the park. When they once more got to the roof for the remaining benches, they again found the trap door fastened. A second time they were let down with outside assistance, but when the second group of benches was taken to the park, the ones which had previously been replaced were missing. The local press said little about the incident other than that “some of the elegant young gentlemen who so ... studiously wear 'mortarboards' on the street, and flirt with silly school girls, doubtless know their whereabouts.” Apparently the whereabouts of the benches was soon disclosed, for no further mention was made of the incident.

Jackson’s first year as President ended on a rather discordant note, especially as the new President had reason to feel that he was at last getting his house in order. At the Commencement Dinner, held at the United States Hotel on July 9, 1868, ex-President Daniel R. Goodwin was the principal speaker. In the course of his address, he made passing reference to Abraham Lincoln—something to the effect that Lincoln was a self-made man. The response was a mixed one, for there were both hisses and applause. Goodwin was embarrassed by the hisses and said that perhaps he had better sit down. Those at the speaker’s table urged him to continue, which Goodwin promptly did, explaining that he “did not intend to justify or eulogize Mr. Lincoln’s political views or course,” whereupon he was roundly applauded by those who had previously hissed.

The incident was used by the Hartford Daily Courant to revive the old charge of “Copperheadism” at Trinity, for the reporter from the Courant noted that of the two-hundred people present, a few applauded, but “the applause was drowned in a perfect storm of hisses by the majority.” The editor of the Courant further commented that “there is a singular difference in colleges. At Yale five-sixths of the students are Republicans; at Trinity five-sixths are Democrats, to a considerable extent of the species called copper[head].”

As the Courant was Hartford’s leading Republican paper, an opposite view could usually be taken by the Hartford Daily Times, the leading Democratic paper, on almost any situation. The hissing of Dr. Goodwin’s speech was no exception. The Times called the Courant to task for inaccurate reporting, declaring the report on the Commencement Dinner “a gross exaggeration of the truth.” Said the Times: only about six persons hissed, and these were students sitting at the far corner of the hall, and the hissing was silenced “by a general round of hearty applause for the speaker.” Also, said the Times, the Courant used the incident to revive the charge of copperheadism against the College.

Jackson, despite the editorial support of the Times, could not let the Courant’s charges go unanswered. Immediately he wrote to the editor of the Courant deploring the incorrect reporting of the affair at the Commencement Dinner. Jackson said that the number who hissed “was not over six all told,” and that they were “a knot of young men at one of the tables at the lower end of the room.” Jackson strongly resented the charge that five-sixths of the students were “Copperhead” Democrats, and stated that, upon inquiry, he had found that during the recent war a majority of the students were Republican, and that at the present time (1868) the student preference was
about evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. Several other persons present at the dinner also wrote to the Courant in the same vein. One of the writers, who signed himself "Alumnus," said that he had "canvassed the College[,] and of those students who have any political connection, thirty-two are Republicans and thirty-six Democrats," and that of the students who were eligible to vote, a majority were Republicans.79

Although the Times had probably been the more accurate reporter of the Commencement Dinner incident, it was the Times which carried on a debate which should have been quickly forgotten. It was soon apparent that the Times' championing of accurate reporting could be turned to journalistic advantage, too, and that ardently Democratic paper carried articles pointing up Trinity as a "Democratic" college, even through the summer recess and into the opening of the College in the fall. These articles were regarded as challenges by the Courant which had, by that time, assumed responsibility for clearing the College of pro-Democratic tendencies, if not of "Copperheadism!" On October 21, 1868, the Courant solemnly reported that of the ninety-one students, fifty were Democrats (including twenty from the southern states) and thirty-five of the students were members of the Republican Club which had been founded the previous spring.80

Even this was not exactly disinterested reporting, for the obvious intent was to prove that by simple arithmetic (50 less 20 = 30), the Republicans outnumbered the northern Democrats by thirty-five to thirty!

The mathematics of the Courant's political poll may have been largely wishful thinking, but the Republican Club of which the Republican press boasted, was a real, live, student political organization! On October 28, 1868, the Hartford Republicans held a large political demonstration and, for that occasion, the Republican Club illuminated the college buildings, flew flags from every window, and set off red lights as the parade passed the campus.81

But even this proved little, for students have always had a way of finding momentary enthusiasms. Two years later (1870), the Senior Class took its own poll of political party preference and at that time the results, not to be taken too seriously, revealed that there were two Republicans, four Democrats, three Woman's Rightists, two Monarchists, five Mormons, and five Fenians.82

Those who hissed Dr. Goodwin's speech were, without doubt, southerners, and the incident was one which was magnified out of all proportion. Fortunately, this was the only major student disturbance during Jackson's administration and, as Jackson made his influence increasingly felt, the conduct of the students became that of model young gentlemen. There were, to be sure, occasional lapses into the ways of the free and easy days of Eliot and Brocklesby—the "kidnapping" of a Freshman in the fall of 1868 and some heckling by the students at an encampment of Knights Templar on the park in 1869—but even then the local press took a surprisingly defensive position regarding the students, the Courant commenting that when "a Freshman makes a monkey of himself it may be very funny to his comrades but not to outsiders," and that in the case of the offending Freshman, "the college hadn't had him long enough to make of him a gentleman."84

The students themselves had become exceedingly sensitive to their own probity and to the opinion of the Hartford community regarding them. Town and gown relations had improved immensely, and the students were accepted, perhaps more than ever before, into the social life of the city.85 The Trinity Tablet, the student newspaper which had been started in April, 1868, was careful to point out that the majority of the students were well-intentioned young men, and that the objectionable conduct was largely that of a group "which can with propriety be styled Society Men."86

Some of the older college traditions had been "toned down." The Burning of Anna Lytics was "cleaned up" and made a "public occasion" of the College, rather than the rowdy late-at-night ceremony it had traditionally been. In 1869, the time was moved up from midnight to 9:00 P.M.
so as to encourage public attendance, and seats were provided for visitors. The good intentions of the students were nobly rewarded, for the ceremony, held this time in the rear of the college buildings, was attended by more than 1,000 persons! When the Christmas Term opened in September, 1869, the editor of the Tablet encouragingly noted that "the spirit of reform appears to have settled upon us generally," and so much had the spirit of reform settled upon the students that the Tablet carried articles deploring the defacing of college property, the clipping of items from the newspapers in the college reading room, and the stealing of signs from railway stations. And, marvel of marvels, even hazing went so far out of fashion that in 1870 student leaders predicted that the practice would "die a natural death" in another two or three years.

To these gestures of good will, the Faculty responded in kind. On February 22, 1870, the students held their annual Washington's Birthday celebration with a dance which lasted until midnight. The Faculty excused the first class on the day following. But perhaps the greatest concession on the part of the Faculty (remembering that faculty concessions are seldom really great) was their permitting Professor Jim to make his speech at the Class Day of 1870. Truly, Abner Jackson had succeeded where others had failed. Faculty and students &last enjoyed mutual respect. In 1871, the Times, which had never gone out of its way to praise the College, grudgingly admitted that the good name of the students in town had never been better than at the present time.

In the academic tone of the College, too, Jackson was able to institute modest reform. Examinations, which had traditionally been conducted by outside examiners who were usually Episcopalian clergymen, became real examinations, instead of perfunctory social hours for the Alumni. The examination period was extended from three days to six, and the new rigor with which the examinations were conducted seems, oddly enough, to have met with the approval of the students. There was also a "tightening up" in the admissions policy. In 1870, according to one report, one third of the applicants for admission to the Freshman Class were rejected, something which would have been unheard of in pre-Civil War days!

With his long experience in both clerical and academic circles, Jackson was able to cope, with remarkable success, with that twin bugbear of the church-related college administrator — compulsory chapel, and church-college relations. Before Jackson's coming to Trinity, the chapel activity had had its ups and downs. During the early and mid-1860's, several services had been omitted or made optional. For a while, the Sunday morning service had not been held, and in 1865 attendance at the Saturday evening service had been made voluntary. Kerfoot had done much to "enrich" the chapel services, and Jackson, a moderate High Churchman, continued the ritualistic influence — to such a degree, in fact, that the College attained the rather widespread reputation of being a High Church College, from which Evangelical rectors tried to divert the young men of their parishes to Low Church Kenyon.

President Jackson was intensely fond of music, and it was quite natural that he should have carried on the "choral" services introduced by his predecessor, Dr. Kerfoot. There was, in fact, even an improvement in the quality of the music and, for a while at least, the singing was regarded as among the best to be heard in Hartford. The choir of eight undergraduates and the student organist attracted frequent visitors from Hartford to the Sunday Choral Evensong.

At the Sunday services there was usually a sermon preached by one of the clerical members of the Faculty. Joseph Blount Cheshire '69 once evaluated the preaching abilities of the Faculty. Professor Niles was described as "an excellent preacher, plain, forcible, devout, and uncompromising in his statement of truth and duty." Professor Mallory was "intellectually light, cultivated, and accurate, but cold and icy — with little warmth or enthusiasm." Pynchon was "dry, formal, and restrained, with little idiosyncrasies of voice and manner; not at all an animated or arresting preacher. But there was a truth and
modesty and simplicity about him that made him pleasing and attractive.” Professor John T. Huntington was described by Cheshire as “the only one of them who had any of the gifts of the popular speaker. He was bright, intelligible, and . . . with strong imagination, . . . but there was somehow an element of levity in his language and in his manner which prevented him from making any very serious impression upon the students.”

The students, at least some of them, had become quite devoted to the Chapel. When voluntary services were added to the schedule during Lent of 1870, the attendance was unexpectedly large.

At the time of his taking the Presidency, Jackson noted that of the seventy-three students enrolled, only thirteen were communicants of the Episcopal Church. And it was this embarrassing statistical point which probably led him to arrange for a large-scale “preaching mission” at the College. On January 28, 1869, there were present in the evening service at the Chapel, Bishops Williams, Coxe, Kerfoot, Neely, and Bishop-elect Doane, each of whom had once been connected with the College in some capacity or other. At the close of the service, Bishop Kerfoot spoke to the students urging them “to estimate rightly the advantages which they enjoy and to make full use of them.” The following day, Bishop Coxe addressed the students in a similar vein, reminding them of “the great value of the daily services in chapel,” and urging them “to seek God’s grace as the only source of strength, and to rightly use the chapel services as one of the precious means provided for obtaining it.”

Spirituality is one of those elements which is not easily measured, and even “religiosity” is hard to define. Jackson’s bold approach to the problem of undergraduate religious life can, however, be evaluated somewhat in respect to “tangibles,” and it is not found wanting. In 1870, Jackson reported to the Convention of the Diocese of Connecticut that of the ninety-three students, all but twenty were communicants of the Episcopal Church, and that forty were studying for Holy Orders. In the day-to-day routine of chapel exercises, there was a remarkable loyalty to be noted. The one student petition submitted during Jackson’s administration for the making of Wednesday evening chapel attendance voluntary was presented, so said the students, not out of disrespect for religious observance, but because baseball games and practice “conflicted with the service and caused a mad rush of sweaty, dirty bodies to chapel at 5:30 P.M. Wednesday afternoon.”

Ever since the Wheaton Chapel Bequest in 1862, the Trustees had had some vague plans for a new chapel building. Unfortunately, however, the Trustees’ plans were based on the assumption that there would be a great increase in the size of the student body, which would necessitate a larger building. As there was no appreciable increase in the number of students, the governing board had made no immediate plans for a new Chapel. The students were unwilling to make the new Chapel dependent on an enlarged student body, and they pressed for the erection of a new Chapel at once. The editor of the Tablet proposed on October 10, 1870, that the Senior Class make pledges and contributions toward a fund of $75,000 for the Chapel. Perhaps the editor was overly optimistic, for he stated that the College already had $20,000 from Dr. Wheaton’s bequest and an additional $10,000 from interest on the principal. Actually, only $10,000 of the Wheaton bequest was given for a new Chapel, and even double that amount would have yielded much less than $10,000 in eight years. But such was the student enthusiasm for the new Chapel. Unfortunately, the happy thought was never implemented, and the student chapel fund never materialized. But the idea of a new and better Chapel did not die. In his Treasurer’s Statement of July 12, 1871, George S. Mallory, Professor of Rhetoric and Treasurer of the College, devoted two paragraphs to urging the need for a new Chapel and pointing out the anachronism of a Church College without a Chapel. Mallory simply refused to regard the “small room . . . in which the air is always oppressive” as a true Chapel. And shortly, too, the students were to despair of ever having a new place of worship.
The Tablet of November 29, 1871, reported that the students then felt that the new Chapel—"that gorgeous phantom"—would be completed by their grandchildren. In 1873, the Chapel was mildly refurbished with a new carpet and cushions on the kneeling-benches; but by that time, the whole prospect of the College had changed. Plans were already afoot to abandon the campus and move to another site.

In the matter of college-church relationships, Jackson guided the College through a rather critical period. From the beginning, the College had maintained rather close connections with one of the Hartford parishes. At first it had been Christ Church, and later it had been St. John's. But when St. John's became "Low Church" under the rectorship of the Reverend Edward A. Washburn, the ties between Trinity College and St. John's Church were weakened. Jackson had little respect for either Washburn's churchmanship or his intellectual capacities. Washburn resigned the rectorship of St. John's in 1862, and was succeeded by the Reverend William Croswell Doane, the son of Bishop George Washington Doane, the College's first Professor of Belles Lettres. The new rector of St. John's was a close personal friend of President Jackson, but by the time Jackson assumed the Presidency of Trinity College in 1867, a new movement within the College itself had gained so much momentum that Jackson was obliged to follow a course which was to further estrange Trinity College and St. John's Parish.

In 1866, Professor John T. Huntington organized a Sunday School for the faculty children and others in the neighborhood. The Sunday School first met in the Cabinet of the College, but so successful was Huntington's little mission that steps were taken almost immediately to establish a new parish to serve the immediate neighborhood of the College and the newer section of the city along Washington Street, then one of the finest residential areas. A parish was formed in 1867 with Huntington as rector and Abner Jackson as one of the vestrymen. On November 18, 1868, the Church of the Incarnation, a beautiful, stone, Gothic structure, built with funds donated by Professor Huntington, was dedicated at the southeast corner of Park and Washington Streets, with the College choir singing at the service of dedication.

As the Church of the Incarnation was but two blocks from the College, the new Church was attended by the students. The growth of the parish was rapid, and within a year, transepts and a chancel were added to the building, thus doubling the seating capacity. Professor Huntington was an unabashed High Churchman, and the tone of the parish's churchmanship was set by the first rector. When the press of academic duties forced Professor Huntington's resignation in 1870, he was succeeded by the Reverend Cyrus F. Knight. Knight, too, was a High Churchman, and his introduction of a surpliced choir, then a novelty in the Diocese of Connecticut, brought Knight into head-on collision with Bishop Williams. Knight submitted his resignation rather than defy the Bishop's orders, but Bishop Williams compromised his own anti-ritualistic feelings and conceded on his original protest. Knight remained at the Church of the Incarnation until 1878 when, according to parish tradition, the parish treasurer absconded with the church funds, leaving the parish without the means of continuing the rector's salary. Knight left town, or as one writer said, "vanished into thin air." At that point, Bishop Williams prevailed upon Huntington to resign his Professorship at the College to become rector of the In-
carnation. Huntington remained at this church, later named St. James, until 1913.

During the Jackson administration, most of the Faculty were in Holy Orders. Only Professors Brocklesby, Stickney, and Holbrooke were laymen. Leopold Simonson, who had served since 1864 as Instructor in French and German (at a top salary of $900) and who had served since then as lay reader among the German-speaking residents of Hartford, was ordained deacon in the College Chapel on November 28, 1868. This was the first ordination to be performed in the College Chapel. In 1870, Professor William Woodruff Niles was elected Bishop of the Diocese of New Hampshire.

The clerical members of the Faculty were active in missionary work in the Hartford area. Professor Niles had been rector of St. John’s Church, Warehouse Point, during his entire stay at Trinity and the others followed the part-time-supply tradition which dated from the founding of the College. All of this was, of course, good “public relations” in the local community, and especially among Hartford Episcopalians, in enhancing the College’s reputation as a center of solid Christian learning. In the larger Anglican community, the election of the New England Bishops to the Board of Visitors extended the same reputation into a broader Episcopal “constituency.” In 1871, ex-President Kerfoot, Bishop of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, was elected to the Board of Visitors.

But what might have been good public relations in one quarter could be bad public relations in another. For fifty years it had been the function of the President to emphasize the Episcopal character of the College when dealing with Episcopalians, and to minimize the College’s relations to the Episcopal Church when dealing with non-Episcopalians. From the College’s founding, a delicate balance had been set up, and it was upon the successful preserving of this balance that the College’s fortunes, to a great extent, depended. In 1870, that balance was almost tipped, and perhaps, considering the subsequent long-range developments, was upset by what were probably the best of intentions.

At the Commencement Dinner of 1870, the principal speaker was the Reverend Edward Miner Gallaudet ’56, President of the Columbian College for Deaf Mutes in Washington, D.C., and one of the College’s most distinguished Alumni. The speaker expressed regret that the Hartford citizenry had not “more munificently endowed Trinity College and more heartily supported it as their own.” The reason, argued Dr. Gallaudet, was that too many people felt that Trinity was an exclusively Episcopal college. But Trinity, he continued, belonged no more exclusively to the Episcopal Church than Yale to the Congregationalists.

With the emphasis on Gallaudet’s word “exclusively,” the statement was one of mere fact, to be borne out by both the College Charter and tradition. But the emphasis on “no more exclusively” was a fatal reversal of the logic which had traditionally been applied in explaining Trinity’s church relationship. Always it had been that Trinity was Episcopal — as Yale was Congregationalist, as Harvard was Unitarian, or as Princeton was Presbyterian. Certainly by 1870, Harvard was less obviously Unitarian, Yale less Congregationalist, and Princeton less Presbyterian, but did it follow that Trinity was less Episcopal? Jackson fell into a trap probably not intended by Dr. Gallaudet, for in his comments following the Doctor’s speech, Jackson added gratuitously that Trinity College taught only “the essential doctrines of Christianity upon which all Christians agree.”
The Gilded Age

Abner Jackson was, if anything, an organizer. When he began his tenure as President of Trinity College in 1867, there were few societies or other formal groups. There were then the Missionary Society, Phi Beta Kappa, four fraternities, two moribund literary societies, a choir, and the Grand Tribunal. Three years later there were these ten organizations plus the Guild of the Holy Trinity, a revived Boat Club, a Baseball Club, the Euterpean Society, Iota Phi, something called “Po Pai Paig,” The Tablet, Ye Mystic Crew of Comus, K.S.C., Phi Theta Chi, Ye Pipes of Peace, Oxyposes, the Chess Club, and the Whist Club. Some of these groups were quite ancient; others were new. Several were little more than drinking clubs; some have been totally forgotten— even as to nature and purpose. And in the next few years, the societies on the Trinity campus were to proliferate by an almost geometric progression.

Of the older groups, the Missionary Society had survived the Civil War as the most active organization on campus. Meetings were held twice each month. Small donations were made from the regular “collections” to various missionary and educational purposes. And although the membership remained relatively small—perhaps from twelve to fifteen—the Society’s function remained purely that designated in its title.

In 1870, several members of the Missionary Society organized the Guild of the Holy Trinity. The Guild was a “branch” of the Brotherhood of the Holy Cross which had recently been organized in New York City as a federation of the Episcopal Missionary Societies of various colleges and theological seminaries, with such diverse representation as Brown University, the General Theological Seminary, Columbia, Hobart, Princeton, St. Stephen’s College, the Philadelphia Divinity School, and Trinity. As it turned out, however, the Brotherhood of the Holy Cross was thought to have excessive “ritualistic proclivities,” and Trinity soon withdrew from the brotherhood.

The literary societies had barely survived the War. The Parthenon Society’s hall had served as a drill room for the Graham Guard, and the lack of regular quarters had apparently caused the society to languish. And thus deprived of a rival, the Atheneum suffered a similar fate. It was not until September of 1867 that the Atheneum was re-activated and not until that following year that the Parthenon resumed a normal schedule of activities. When the Christmas Term of 1868–1869 opened, there seemed to be a genuine interest in the two societies. The Atheneum Hall had been completely redecorated during the summer, and President Jackson addressed the Parthenon at its initial meeting. Both societies reported the largest attendance in many years.

But the new enthusiasm for the literary societies was not sustained, and the officers were soon hard-pressed to keep the spark of interest alive. By the spring of 1870, the Tablet reported that “the interest of novelty has worn off and the societies are now struggling for existence” and that it was “hard to find twenty-five students to join.” Both societies disbanded in the spring of 1870, and the “assets” of the Atheneum and the Parthenon were distributed about the College. The horse-hair sofas which lined the walls of the Society Rooms found their way to the Chapel.
Vestry, and the carpet from the Atheneum Room was stowed away for use on the stage at Commencement. Several works of art were placed in halls and classrooms, and the Society Libraries were given to the College to be incorporated into the permanent holdings of the College Library.

The gift to the College of the Society Libraries was of great benefit to all. From a rather stagnant collection of 10,000 volumes in 1870, the book collection was swelled to 15,000 volumes, and many of the societies' additions were more recent and interesting titles. Also, the societies induced the College to fit up two reading rooms which were opened daily from 8:00 A.M. to 10:00 P.M., and which were supplied with books for recreational reading, the Hartford and New York newspapers, college papers, and English periodicals. This was the first time that the College made a wide variety of periodical literature available to the Trinity community.

Thus, the two oldest campus organizations had disappeared. Perhaps they had outlived their usefulness. Locally it was believed that the literary societies had lost out in a competition with the fraternities, but that was only part of the story. Debate and declamation, the original pur-
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HORACE: LIB. I. CARMEN IX.

Several poetical translations from Horace have appeared in late numbers of the College Courant, none of which, we venture to say, exceed the following in closely adhering to the original, and in merit as English verse.

Scott thus rends Scylla's brow
Whitemaid a'ye with pearl-dived snow;
While the first tear's glistening bough
Sarchs in snowy half despairs low!
And the mountains current inside Crystallize in joy bound.

Conquer Winter! Let the beach,
Piled with firewood, brightly burn.
Thalassic, once, with north,
Marching down the Sabine urn,
Fill an overflowing measure,
Now's the time for wine and pleasure.

To the gods resign the rest,
For, when they have killed the warm
Raging force of ocean's breast,
Not the anchor's giant form,
Nor the holm-oak, reared fast,
Grows before the northern blast.

Be the narrow what it may,
Still, with greatest heart, enjoy
What kind fortune grants you stay.
Nor should then disdain, O boy,
Cupid's wish and hollow chain,
And the furnace winding train.

Since to hateful threat of white
Mars thy wealth of curling brown,
Seek the refreshment, when Night
Spends her mandate over the town;
Learning through the silent hours
To the fountain's peaceful showers.

Happy to be recently clad,
When the laughing skies betray
Where some merry girl lies hid,
Smash the frozen promise away
From her hands or dainty wares,
While she playfully raises
O. '90.

ULTRA TENDENCIES OF THE AGE.

For the last few centuries everything has been progressing so rapidly that we can scarcely appreciate the merit which is sometimes found holding back. All our conceptions of improvement are connected with rapid and reckless advance. In the retrospect we see some things which are pleasant and romantic, but are apt to think that for real good they must be changed. If the minds of men have of late become as much expanded and developed, if those theories and systems which prevailed a few generations back, are now exploded, and in science and art such perfection has been attained, surely there must be need of more intellectual religious, more theoretically-perfect forms of government, and more utopian systems for the regulation of education and manners. This seems to be the tendency of the age. Far be it from us to decry or depreciate reform and radical change when it is for the better; but there is danger that we may be carried too far. The current of speculation and experiment has for so long a time been receiving increasing weightiness that there is danger of its overflowing its banks and devasta-
ing the country instead of watering and refresh-
ing it. It can scarcely be restrained within the accustomed bounds, and we may fear miscellaneous results. The "governer" forms too insignificant part of the machinery of the popular mind. Its regulating influence is feebly felt in this hurry-scurry restless age.

In religious men are fast losing sight of the old landmarks. Pulled up by self-conceit, they would subject the Eternal and Perfect to their own finite and perverted judgment. They mistake for the discoveries of a masterly intellect, a skeptical and incredulous spirit, altogether base and contemptible. A, too readily belief may mark a shallow and feeble mind, but not more than does this conceit - "Free thinking."

In literature we also see indications of evil. Within the last few years works have been issued which, cast in the shade even our old dramatists; not, perhaps in the coarseness and open offensive-
ess of expression, but certainly in the spirit which pervades them. Reckling with the fumes of emotional passion and, in many instances, full of the loftest blasphemy, they not only commed a ready sale, but those who express the abhorrence of them are accused of narrow mindedness and intolerance to genius. The evil effects produced are undeniable, and it is only commended that the bulk is produced from a man's own evil mind and not from the book. "To the pure all things are pure." True! but where shall we find the pure? Not in these days can we expect to find them anywhere. Men are human, and it is human to err. If we handle pitch, how shall we escape flames?

But in the College world that we have more particularly to do, though these other things must be interesting to us all. We are happy to say that one good feature of the day, is the great encouragement given to institutions of learning. In almost all our colleges the endowments are being increased, additions made to the buildings, and not but what there is in many places an agreeable rise in the number of students. But even here there are some things which seem to us a little wrong. Evidence of novel and unproved theories for the regulation of studies and students, are sometimes to be observed. It is scarcely necessary to say that we are in general opposed to innovations in the old beaten track of college studies, not to changes in the standard but in the time honored course.

In the first place there seems to be a tendency to undervalue the classics, and more abstract math-
ematics. Some years ago the question was gravely discussed whether it were not desirable to abolish the classics altogether. Some enlight-
ened son of America argued that they were totally opposed to the spirit of Christianity and American institutions. Then we had an excellent article from Pres. Follett, in which he showed more conclusively that the charges against classical studies were groundless. Nothing of great importance was effected by this established curriculum, but ever since then there have been evidences that the current is setting more and more in the new direction. Straws they are but they serve as indices. The majority of peo-
ple don't seem able to appreciate anything which does not put money into a man's pocket, or at least information into his head. By "information" probably most folks mean a smattering of natural science, history, &c. We don't profess to know exactly what it does mean. The mental discipline, severe drilling necessary to bring the mind to its greatest perfection are not once thought of.

The American ideal of a college seems to be a place where a young man goes to "finish his edu-
cation," to do up his studying. When he comes out he is expected to have nothing more to do in natural science, history, &c. We don't profess to know exactly what it does mean. The mental discipline, severe drilling necessary to bring the mind to its greatest perfection are not once thought of.

The American ideal of a college seems to be a place where a young man goes to "finish his education," to do up his studying. When he comes out he is expected to have nothing more to do in natural science, history, &c. We don't profess to know exactly what it does mean. The mental discipline, severe drilling necessary to bring the mind to its greatest perfection are not once thought of.

The American ideal of a college seems to be a place where a young man goes to "finish his education," to do up his studying. When he comes out he is expected to have nothing more to do in natural science, history, &c. We don't profess to know exactly what it does mean. The mental discipline, severe drilling necessary to bring the mind to its greatest perfection are not once thought of.
poses of the societies, had become less popular among the students, and this was perhaps best evidenced by the fact that the last Junior Exhibition was held in 1868. The college curricula, too, were changing in such a fashion as to reorient student interest. The older curriculum, with its emphasis on oral class recitation, was giving way to one which stressed written composition, and at Trinity the emphasis on "theme writing" seems to have been even greater than at any other New England college, something to be attributed to the Reverend Edwin E. Johnson, who was Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory from 1867 to 1872 and of English Language and Literature from 1872 until 1883.

Originally, the activities of the societies provided a "second curriculum" to parallel the Classical and Mathematical studies of the regular college courses. In the society meetings, debates were held on subjects of general literary and cultural interest, as the classroom could then find little time for such consideration. But as the curriculum was enriched—and by 1870, History and Modern Literature had won a permanent place in the college offerings—these needs were satisfied without the students' having to resort to a "second curriculum." Finally, an outlet for literary production—in this case written, rather than oral—was found in the college publications, whose rise paralleled the decline and fall of the literary societies. In April, 1868, the first number of The Trinity Tablet appeared. The Tablet was a monthly newspaper until 1878 when it became a bi-weekly, and the sixteen pages of each issue provided ample space for all undergraduates who had literary aspirations. And in 1873 appeared the first Trinity Ivy, the college annual which must have been something of a model for this type of publication.

Even though the literary societies formally had been dissolved, there were some never-say-die members of both the Athenaeum and the Parthenon who insisted that the societies were merely being "held in abeyance." In the spring of 1871, these young men formed a society known as the Phoenix which they regarded as a successor to the two defunct societies, and which they hoped would carry on until the Athenaeum and the Parthenon could be revived.

The faith of those who had hoped to resuscitate the societies was partly justified, for in the fall of 1871, the former members of the Parthenon reorganized and reopened the Parthenon Hall. Perhaps it was a case of the students missing the water when the well went dry, for with the dissolution of the societies, the undergraduates suddenly manifested a new interest in debate. Meetings of the new Parthenon Society were held every Monday during the winter months, and the attendance was usually quite large. But again, it was easier to reactivate a dormant society than to sustain it. By the spring of 1873, the Parthenon had again expired and at Commencement time of that year a final meeting was held.

In the fall of 1873, a new society, simply calling itself "The Literary Society," was founded to replace the defunct Parthenon. Although the group always carried the name "Parthenon" under the heading of "The Literary Society" in the Commencement issue of the Tablet and the Ivy, it was not the old Parthenon. The Literary Society had no permanent quarters, and meetings were held in the Greek recitation room; membership was made up exclusively of Juniors and Seniors; and the programs consisted of readings from literary masterpieces, rather than debate.

As the two lower classes were excluded from The Literary Society, the Sophomores soon organized a society of their own—the Sophomore Debating Club. The original membership was fifteen, all Sophomores. The Sophomore group was soon a going concern, and as the Sophomore Debating Society prospered, so did The Literary Society decline, and soon the Sophomore Debating Club absorbed The Literary Society, admitting members of the other three classes and changing its name to the Sophomore Literary Society. In 1876, the Sophomore Literary Society had thirty-nine members of which only fifteen were Sophomores. For two years the Sophomore Literary Society enjoyed a brief period of glory, and then it, too, disappeared.

The last flurry of literary society activity—
anticlimactic, of course—came in February, 1874, when the literary society movement was breathing its last. At that time the Intercollegiate Literary Convention was held at the Allyn House in Hartford and, although Trinity College was not an official sponsor, the College was represented at the sessions by three members of the upper classes.\textsuperscript{33}

Delegates were present from Bowdoin, Amherst, Williams, Princeton, Columbia, Wesleyan, Lafayette, Hamilton, Brown, the University of the City of New York, Rutgers, Cornell, Trinity, and Syracuse. The convention was the brainchild of Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson, a popular literary figure of the time, and then a resident of Newport, Rhode Island. There were addresses by Colonel Higginson, Charles Dudley Warner, and Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain).

All present found the meeting both stimulating and entertaining, and at the business session it was decided to hold an intercollegiate literary debate and oratorical contest in New York City the following January.\textsuperscript{34} At that time, however, only six colleges participated, and Trinity was not among them.\textsuperscript{35}

With the final collapse of the literary societies, it was Phi Beta Kappa alone which kept the spark of literary interest aglow, albeit with little more than the annual meeting. In the late 1860's, Phi Beta Kappa abandoned the time-honored practice of admitting the highest third of the Senior Class. In the Class of 1869, for example, those elected were ranked first, third, sixth, eighth, and tenth of a graduating class of fourteen.\textsuperscript{36} The "rival" Kappa Beta Phi Society, however, suddenly emerged as an active group. There were regular meetings of Kappa Beta Phi, not in one of the college halls, but in one of the back rooms at the Heublein Hotel where, it was said, orations and poems were delivered. Although the society consisted of the lowest third of the class, its members honored themselves by electing "honorary members" to grace the pages of the annual edition of the "Ivy. And whether or not the "elections" were with the consent or notification of those so "honored," the list was imposing indeed. In 1874, the honorarii included such public and literary figures as Bayard Taylor and William Cullen Bryant, the Right Reverend James Roosevelt Bayley ’35, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Baltimore, and the Honorable William E. Curtis ’43, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the state of New York. And the list was soon extended to include such worthies as the Right Honorable William E. Gladstone, Bishop Williams, Lieutenant General Philip Sheridan, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Treasury Secretary B. H. Bristow,\textsuperscript{37} President Rutherford B. Hayes, Popes Pius IX\textsuperscript{38} and Leo XIII, Alfred Tennyson, Czar Alexander II, The Sultan of Turkey, David Pratt,\textsuperscript{39} and Sitting Bull.\textsuperscript{40}

On the American college scene, the post-war period was the heyday of the fraternity movement, for in their recovery from the lean years of depleted student bodies, the competitive fraternity rushing was carried on with an unprecedented vigor. Trinity was no exception. Phi Kappa was re-activated in 1865 with eight of the students who had come to Trinity with Dr. Kerfoot from the College of St. James;\textsuperscript{41} and this gave Phi Kappa a bit of advantage in members over the other societies. Beta Beta was revived more slowly, for in 1868 the Betas initiated only three men and in 1869 only two. In 1870, however, nine men were admitted and from that point on the number of initiations per year averaged nine.\textsuperscript{42} And in this connection it might be pointed out that Beta Beta was the only Trinity fraternity which did not admit Freshmen. The alumni members of the fraternities were deeply concerned that the fraternities would get the "right" men, and that the young men whom they were directing to Trinity should get into the "right" fraternity. It became the practice for Alumni to urge candidates for fall admission to the Freshman Class to attend the Commencement exercises in July. At that time, the fraternity members would "look after," as well as "look at," the sub-Freshmen and decide which ones should be "rushed" when College opened in September.\textsuperscript{43}

The fraternities at this time began to assume permanent quarters "off campus." I.K.A. moved from the room previously occupied in Jarvis
Hall to quarters in the State Bank Building. Delta Psi was a near neighbor in the building of the Hartford Times. In 1872, several graduate members of Beta Beta organized the Colt Trust Association in memory of the Reverend William U. Colt '44, one of the founders of the society who had died in 1848. The purpose of the Colt Trust was to hold the trust funds of Beta Beta and such property as should come to the Society's possession—obviously in the hope that a "chapter house" might be obtained. In 1873, the Epsilon Chapter of Delta Psi was chartered by Act of the Connecticut State Legislature.

The "downtown" rooms of the fraternities were not residence quarters. Fraternity members still lived in the dormitories, but here there was to be noted a pattern of room-selection somewhat resembling the later "crowding in entries." Phi Kappa and Delta Psi men almost invariably lived in Jarvis Hall, and I.K.A. and Beta Beta lived in Brownell. And on patriotic holidays, the fraternities assumed responsibility to hang appropriate flags and bunting on that portion of the dormitory in which the members resided.

In 1869, a fifth society was founded at Trinity College as Delta Upsilon. The group which "swung out" with eleven members on Washington's Birthday, 1870, described itself as an "Anti-secret Fraternity." But if "anti-secret," it was still as "exclusive" as the others; membership was always less than half that of the "secret" societies, and several of the campus leaders belonged to Delta Upsilon. Nevertheless, Delta Upsilon was never recognized as a real fraternity, and in 1876 the Anti-secret Society of Delta Upsilon disbanded.

The Grand Tribunal— that august body, keeper of the campus peace, and prototype of student government—had fallen upon evil days. Membership was still small and select, and the Tribunal, like the fraternities, rented quarters downtown. The initiation ceremonies which were conducted at night with elaborate and mysterious incantations, replete with coffin, human skeleton, sacred seals, and liquid flame, attracted much attention from the Hartford townsfolk. In fact, the Faculty thought that the Tribunal had attracted too much attention and urged its end. By this time, the Grand Tribunal had long since failed to serve any useful purpose and had become merely another secret society, regarded by the students (the non-members, that is) as an "antiquated fossil." Alumni still boasted, it is true, of their former connections with the Tribunal, but even the active members were obliged to concede that the chief benefit from the Grand Tribunal was the annual "bum" given for the membership by the initiates. Although the Grand Tribunal would not disband, it did attempt an internal reform, and in 1874 membership was limited to Seniors.

The Grand Tribunal was a nuisance, a perennial nuisance. But the Grand Tribunal was not the only nuisance on campus for, late in the 1860's, there appeared a rival organization—Po Pai Paig, a society whose origins, purpose, and activity were so shrouded in mystery that some students (obviously non-members) even doubted its very existence. Po Pai Paig revealed the name of members only after the individuals had left college and, assuming that all of those listed as "retired demons" actually were one-time members, the society comprised an interesting cross-cut of the student body, including both social and academic leaders. Active members were listed with either cryptic or nonsensical names. Still a third "ghoulish" group was Mu Mu Mu which was, if possible, even more secret than...
the Grand Tribunal or Po Pai Paig, and which existed during the middle 1870’s. By 1874, there were a dozen small groups devoted to card games: the Cribbage Club; the Cribbage Club of ’75; the Euchre Club; the Ukur Club (was this really a club?); The Seventy-Four Whist Club; the S.P.F.D.; the S.P.F.D. Whist Club; the ’77 Whist Club; Brownell Hall Whist Club; the Champion Whist Club; the Solitaire Club (with the motto: “go it alone”); and Ye Pipes of Peace, a group which listed the address of its “wigwam” as 41 Jarvis Hall. There were also several “eating clubs”: the City Hotel; M.M.C.; and the Mutual Benefit Eating Society.

Musical organizations were late in making their appearance at Trinity and, for a long while, the Chapel Choir was the only formal singing group on the campus. Not that the students did not sing, they most certainly did, and on such occasions as Class Day and the Commencement Dinner several college songs were always heard. “Auld Lang Syne” was the Trinity Alma Mater, and to the original first stanza by Robert Burns, two Trinity stanzas were added. The third stanza was:

All hail to Trinity we sing,
Old Mother, staunch and true;
May added years fresh honor bring
And still her age renew.

Another favorite was “Lauriger Horatius,” with words by John J. McCook ’63:

Vale, Mater Trinitatis,
Valet, Professores,
Valeatis, Socii,
Etiam sorores.

Still another was “Annie Lisle” with words by James Walters Clark ’63, the chorus of which was:

Then come, invoke their voices, from each waving tree,
Let them chant Eolian blessings, for old Trinity.

At Class Day the song “College Days” was always sung to the tune of “Figaro.”

Hartford concerts by the glee clubs of Wesleyan and Yale inspired the organization of the Euterpean Society, the first glee club at Trinity.
ity. The Euterpeans gave their first concert in the College Cabinet on February 9, 1869. The program was one of popular male-chorus songs of the day, and the only adverse criticism that was made was that the program did not include enough of the familiar college songs. At the Euterpeans' second concert, given on June 11, there was a great variety of offerings: chorus numbers, “quartettes,” piano duets, vocal solos, and two selections composed especially for the occasion—“Spirit of Liberty” by Brady Electus Backus '70, and “Farewell Song, Trinity College” by John Henry Brocklesby '65. The attendance was large, and the concert was very much a success.

With a bit of prodding from the Tablet and competition from the Yale Glee Club, which sang to a large audience at the Hartford Opera House, the next fall the Euterpean Society was revived, enlarged, and improved. On February 10, 1870, the Euterpeans gave a concert in Philo Dramatic Hall in the Sisson Block in Hartford. The first part of the program was made up of glee, college songs, and comic skits. The second part was an original operetta, “The Sweets of Matrimony,” which was given with the assistance of an amateur orchestra and in which the female parts were sung by the student members of the society.

The Euterpean Society soon took the alternate name of the Trinity College Glee Club and thus enjoyed its status as an official college organization, but the absence of a long tradition of Trinity College as a “singing college” was soon reflected in the propensity to fragment the larger singing group into quartets. The early history of the Trinity Glee Club was, thus, largely a process of division, consolidation, division, and continuous repetition of this process. In 1874, for example, there were, in addition to the College Glee Club and Chapel Choir, the Thunderers, the Beta Beta Quartette, the I.K.A. Quartette, and Ye Sweet Singers of Israel.

The beginnings of instrumental music at Trinity were much more primitive. At the old-time ceremonies such as the Burning of Conic Sections or the Burning of Anna Lytics, there were usually present performers on such “instruments” as the fish horn, the cowbell, the dishpan, and the “musical comb.” And from time to time, ensembles of similar instrumentation gathered to nocturnally “serenade” faculty and fellow students. By the early 1870’s, one such group actually strove for recognition as an official campus organization under the title of the Calithumpian Band on the grounds that it had a legitimate function to perform at certain informal college occasions. The Tablet took a dim view of the “Tin Horn Association” or “Cape Cod Band,” as the group was derisively called, but the “Calithumps” would not be silenced, for, perhaps convinced that even such a band was better than none, they even insisted on listing their names and membership in the official undergraduate publications. Of course, the presence of such an outfit as the Calithumpians pointed up the paucity of musical talent on the Trinity College campus. In describing the musical situation at the College under the title of “What I Know About Trinity,” one undergraduate declared in the Tablet that the only musical instruments to be found on the campus were “a few dozen banjos, a few more fish horns, sundry tin pans, and the chapel organ.”

In the fall of 1873, a Freshman, unidentified but acknowledged to be an accomplished banjo
player, began to give instruction on that instrument. During the winter of 1873–1874, the halls rang with the brittle music of the many banjos. In fact, the banjo fad even brought an end to the Calithumpians.

The first serious college instrumental ensemble, the Cherubini Philharmonic Club (two violins, a flute, and the chapel organ) flourished during the winter of 1875–76. Two years later, the Trinity Hall Orchestra, with the mongrel instrumentation of flute, violin, piano, horn, triangle, and bones, was listed in the Ivy. In the fall of 1878, four undergraduate banjo players formed the Royal Italian Band (Jo). The Royal Italian Band (jo) was soon augmented by two more banjos, and the organization took the name of the Royal Egyptian String Sextette, an organization which was to enjoy an unusually long life for a musical club of this sort.

In 1881, a very “proper” College Orchestra was organized with two violins, cello, two flutes, and piano. When the College Orchestra expired after a single season, the Royal Egyptian String Sextette adopted the motto: “Freshmen may come and Seniors may go, but the Royal Egyptian String Sextette goes on forever.” And so, it seemed, it would. For two years, the Royal Egyptians were alone in the field, so far as instrumental music at Trinity was concerned. In 1884-85, however, they shared the honor with another College Orchestra, this one comprising two violins, a flute, a clarinet, a piccolo, piano, and three of the banjos from the Royal Egyptians. Obviously, those whom the Royal Egyptians could not lick, they joined.

The story of college dramatics at Trinity is somewhat more dignified. In the earlier days, Junior Exhibition usually was concluded with a dramatic piece enacted by the class, albeit without costume, scenery, or props. With the disappearance of Junior Exhibition, it was quite natural that a dramatic club should have appeared on campus, and so in the Christmas Term of 1871–72 the Trinity Student Dramatic Club performed The Poor Gentleman in the Philo Dramatic Hall on December 14, 1871. The performance was for invited guests only and that was just as well, for the local critics described the acting as “that of beginners.”

On May 13, 1872, the Dramatic Club presented Sheridan’s The Rivals in Philo Dramatic Hall, this time to the public at an admission of fifty cents with the proceeds being donated to the Boating Club of the College. The performance was much better than the last, but the reporter from the Hartford Times (perhaps making a comparison with the professional company which had presented The Rivals in Hartford three years before) still thought it “inferior to the performance of similar groups.” Charitably, however, he added that a little training would bring much improvement. But just at the time that the “little training” would have been so useful to the Dramatic Club, the College’s Professor of Elocution, the Reverend Francis T. Russell, became Principal of St. Margaret’s School for Girls in Waterbury, Connecticut, and from that time on Russell’s connection with the College was little more than nominal. The Dramatic Club next scheduled a more modest undertaking, a dramatization of Twice Told Tales, to be given in the College Cabinet, rather than downtown. But despite chiding and prodding from the Tablet, the performance never came off. This was the end of Trinity’s first Dramatic Club and the end, too, of the Dramatic Club’s sister society, the Shakespearean Club, which had existed briefly under the guidance of Professor Johnson.

In this busy atmosphere of club activity of the 1870’s, it was quite natural that there should have been a succession of organizations devoted to athletics. The rise of team sports at Trinity was all the more phenomenal in that, with the disappearance of the College’s rowing team during the Civil War, the post-war athletic interest represented a starting from scratch. Indeed, it must be said that at the time of Abner Jackson’s taking over the Presidency of the College in 1867, not a single sport was being played at Trinity, and even football (or soccer, if you prefer) had come to a sudden end during the closing months of John Brocklesby’s Acting-Presidency.
young men from Hartford, interest in football had centered about the traditional game between the Freshmen and Sophomores which was usually held on a vacant lot opposite the Orphan Asylum on Washington Street. This game had lapsed during the war, but in 1865 the two classes played for the best three games out of five, and so this strenuous form of interclass "rush" continued until 1867, when a member of the Class of '69 broke his leg in the course of the game. The following year, the Faculty forbade the Freshman-Sophomore game, but to make up for the loss, the college authorities declared the first day of November to be "Compensation Day," an occasion which soon took its place as a high spot on the Trinity calendar. In 1869, the class of '73 inaugurated the custom of "burying the football," a nocturnal ceremonial carried out in lavish imitation of the Burning of Anna Lytics or the Burning of Conic Sections, complete with funeral procession (led by the Calithumpian Band), orations, and poems. The football was solemnly laid to rest in a grave dug in a remote corner of the campus, and then ensued a scramble for the beer which had been carried to the place of interment.

Compensation Day remained on the College Calendar (although officially as All Saints' Day), but the ceremony of burying the football soon disappeared. Although the bier was gone, the beer was not, and Compensation Day (or All Saints' Day) became the occasion of a "bum" given by the Freshmen for the entire College. And during the early 1870's there began the soon-to-become traditional push rushes between the Freshmen and Sophomores. If the Faculty had eliminated the Freshman-Sophomore football game in the interest of preserving life and limb, what developed in its stead was even more deadly for, in the rushes, the members of the contending classes met on an open field (usually at the vacant lot at the corner of Washington and Baker Streets), locked shoulders in a solid phalanx, and met head-on, with the team which gave way being declared the loser. And for a while, the loser was expected to pay for the "bum." The Sophomores usually had the advantage of size and weight, and the expense of the "bum" usually fell on the Freshmen, who got off by providing a barrel of poor beer and some crackers, usually on the field just after the rush.
The faculty prohibition of the Freshman–Sophomore football game did not necessarily reflect faculty hostility toward athletics as such. President Jackson, it will be remembered, had been something of an athlete in his earlier years, and at one time he had been quite adept at wicket, and there were, as we shall see, others on the Faculty who shared his interest in sports.

Following the Civil War, baseball was, far and away, the most popular collegiate sport. During the war, baseball had been played in both Union and Confederate Armies, and as the young veterans returned to the college campuses, they took the sport with them and soon baseball had become a mania among American collegians. On June 27, 1863, Harvard and Brown played the first game of intercollegiate baseball, and from that time on, the game was to take hold on almost every campus.

For a while, the Trinity students remained aloof from what the Hartford papers were even then referring to as the "National Game," feeling that a college with so small a student body could not find "material" for a baseball team. Occasionally a "scrub game" would be played on the back campus, but no one gave serious thought to the possibility of intercollegiate baseball. Early in the spring of 1866, Wesleyan announced that a varsity baseball team had been formed and that a schedule of games (including one with Harvard) had been arranged. In Hartford, too, there appeared a number of baseball teams. In addition to the old Charter Oak Nine, there were now fire company teams, insurance company teams, factory teams, and all sorts of independent groups.

By the spring of 1868, Trinity, too, had a varsity baseball team, and on June 10, the Trinity team ambitiously played the Charter Oaks, to be defeated by those capable semi-professionals by a score of 41 to 26 in a seven-inning game. Just the experience of having played the Charter Oaks was enough to create a baseball craze on the Trinity campus. Soon each class had its team, and a lively inter-class rivalry ensued. Inter-class games were played on all favorable Wednesday and Saturday afternoons during the spring and fall months. Trinity's intercollegiate baseball competition began in 1870, and on June 1, the Trinity team of '71 lost to Yale 26–19. Three days later, the Trinity varsity defeated Wesleyan 42–31 and the Trinity second team defeated the Hartford Public High School, 36–13.

The beginnings of the Trinity–Wesleyan rivalry were most auspicious, for the Trinity students were lavish in their "thanks to the Wesleyan students for their kindness and hospitality." In the return match, Wesleyan defeated Trinity, 55–43.

Following this reasonably successful first season, the Trinity Baseball Team went into a period of inactivity. The team, along with the class teams, maintained its existence, but no games of any consequence were played. There was no intercollegiate competition, and what the Tablet called "laziness" (apathy, if you prefer) caused Trinity to even pass up a game with Wesleyan. And even though the Hartford city officials had generously permitted the College to play ball on the north end of the park, the students were content to offer as their excuse the suggestion that they had no good grounds on which to play.

By the spring of 1874, however, there was some agitation for a new varsity baseball team, and in a short while, baseball was again a going concern at Trinity. New flannel uniforms in the college colors of green and white were ordered from
Marster of Brooklyn, and on May 30, the Trinity team wore the splendid new costume in a defeat, 18-26, to Brown University at Hartford. On June 9, Trinity defeated Brown, 14-9 at Providence, and on June 28, Trinity won over Amherst, 15-11 at Hartford.

Upon their return from the long summer vacation in 1874, the Trinity Baseball Team tried to get back in the swing of their spring season. A victory over the team from the Deaf and Dumb Asylum was followed by a trip to Amherst, where the ardor of the Trinity players was somewhat cooled by what they described as shabby treatment from the Amherst men. The game was set for Saturday, October 10, and upon the arrival of the Trinity players at Amherst, there seemed to have been some sort of misunderstanding as to the exact date scheduled for the game. The Trinity men finally convinced the Amherst team that they had arrived on the proper date, and Amherst finally agreed to play. But rain held off the game until late afternoon and then, when the score at the end of the third inning stood at 5-0 in favor of Amherst, a Trinity man was injured, and the game was stopped. The Trinity men complained of the rudeness of the Amherst players, and on that unhappy note the season came to an end.

In the spring of 1875, there was again much interest in baseball. The College promised to lay out a new ball field, and some progress was made on the project during the spring months. Unfortunately, however, once laid out, nothing was done to keep the field in good playing condition. No game was played that spring, but in the fall of 1875 Trinity lost to the Charter Oaks 9-20 and defeated Wesleyan 16-11.

The following spring (1876), baseball enthusiasm was high. The students, first of all, wanted new uniforms to replace those which had been purchased in 1874, which by now seemed "rather countrified-looking." The Faculty contributed $100, and new uniforms were purchased. The College authorities, too, resumed work on the new baseball field, and for several months the full-time service of two workmen was devoted to this project.

But by the time the first game was to be played, alas, the baseball spirit seemed to have vanished. Only seven Trinity men appeared to play the Hartford Baseball Club, and the Hartford club had to supply two men to fill out the Trinity team. One might wonder whether the Hartford club lent Trinity its best players, for the scores for the "double header" were 16-2 and 18-0, both in favor of the Hartford team. And at the next meeting with the Hartford Baseball Club, Trinity lost, 0-11. Of two games with the Charter Oak Nine, Trinity lost the first 1-2 and won the second 7-5. Later Trinity lost to Yale, 4-3.

In June, 1876, Trinity journeyed to Providence to be defeated by Brown University 6-7. Here the Trinity team complained of treatment similar to that received at Amherst: bad food (tough beefsteak and raw potatoes) and ungentlemanly behavior. Trinity further insisted that Brown's victory was won by chance, rather than by skill. Next came a defeat by Yale, 2-12, and finally, two games with Harvard were lost by scores of 5-13 and 4-7.

Such a disastrous season was enough to dampen even the most optimistic spirits, and during the season Trinity spirits had been somewhat less than that. Baseball was not resumed in the fall, and the team disbanded, over $140 in debt and without even the remotest possibility of raising funds to satisfy the clamoring creditors.

In many ways, the history of the Trinity College Rowing Team during this period was just as pathetic—and even more tragic. The early success of the Baseball Team in 1870, probably more than anything else, led to the movement to revive rowing at Trinity. Rowing was an expensive sport—much more so than baseball—but Mrs. Colt generously gave the land for a boathouse, friends of the College and students subscribed money for the erection of the building, and soon the Trinity College Boat Club was fully organized as the successor of the old Minnehaha Club.

Membership in the Boat Club was open to all undergraduates, whether one hoped to make the crew or not, and almost all of the students be-
longed. The club raised enough money to purchase a fine boat from A. Chappelle and Company of Detroit. Unfortunately, however, the shell was seriously damaged in shipment and had to be returned to the manufacturer. This ended Trinity's hopes for an active boating season in 1872. 129

On July 17, 1873, the Trinity crew for the first time entered intercollegiate rowing competition at the Springfield Regatta. Yale won an easy victory over the other ten competitors, and Trinity finished seventh, ahead of "Mass Aggies," Cornell, Columbia, and Williams. 130

Although the outcome of the 1873 Regatta was not what the Trinity Boat Club might have hoped, interests in boating at Trinity had never been greater, for the mere participation in a major regatta was, indeed, something of an achievement for a college of only eighty students. In January, 1874, Trinity was host to the Regatta Convention held in Hartford at the Allyn House.

At that meeting, J. H. Brocklesby '65, the son of Professor Brocklesby, was appointed one of the judges for the Regatta to be held at Saratoga Lake on July 15, 1874. 131

During the spring months, the Trinity crew engaged in extensive practice. Arrangements were made to board the team at 65 College Street where they could enjoy a special diet. The six members of the crew were the "athletic type" - average age 22, average height 6 feet, average weight 174 pounds. Everything seemed to foretell a successful appearance at Saratoga. 132

The Trinity crew went to Saratoga Lake two weeks in advance and took up training quarters at James Riley's Resort at the upper end of the lake. The crew seemed much improved over that of the previous summer - that is, with the exception of one man who seemed to have become less proficient as each day passed. Four days before the race, that man was dropped from the crew and a substitute (totally untrained) was put in his place. 133

As the Regatta day approached, it was apparent that the plans for the race had not been too carefully laid. Only nine teams appeared, 134 and there was an air of informality (or disorder) which hung over the whole proceedings. The water was very rough, and before the boats could take their places at the starting line the waves nearly swamped the boats. Trinity's boat suffered some damage. Much confusion was caused by the premature firing of the starter's gun and, with the situation having become so chaotic, the race was postponed until the following day. 135

The next day the boats again lined up, but one team did not report at the starting line until dark, and the race was again put off until the next day. When the race was finally run (July 18) Trinity got off to a good start and remained in the lead until the end of the first mile. Bad steering caused the Trinity boat to fall behind, and as the competing crews overtook the Trinity boat one-by-one, the Trinity rowers were completely unnerved by the strange actions of the man in the position of "bow oar" who suffered some sort of "breakup," stopped rowing, and loudly yelled "Ba, Ba, Ba." Trinity crossed the finish line in
seventh place ahead of Yale and Princeton. Trinity's seventh place became something of a "moral victory," and Trinity consoled herself with the fact that she had come out ahead of Yale, which had a freshman class almost twice the size of Trinity's entire student body.\textsuperscript{136}

On January 13, 1875, the College was again host to the committee to arrange the Regatta for the following summer when the Rowing Association of America met in Hartford at the Allyn House.\textsuperscript{137} And in the spring, Trinity sent two delegates to Springfield, Massachusetts, to the convention which organized the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, the first over-all intercollegiate athletic association ever to be established.\textsuperscript{138}

Again it looked as though Trinity would have a brilliant rowing season. The date for the Saratoga Regatta was set for Wednesday, July 14, 1875.\textsuperscript{139} The crew was again ensconced in training quarters at 154 Washington Street to enjoy the special muscle-building diet. In March, however, the crew lost two of the most valuable members: James B. Erwin, who accepted an appointment to the United States Military Academy, and Edwin M. Scudder, who was advised by his physician not to row.\textsuperscript{140} Calamity overtook the Trinity Boat Club on Friday, May 28. That evening, Henry Grover Cameron, a Junior, was drowned in the Connecticut River when the waves of a passing tug-boat caused the Trinity shell to capsize. Cameron was unable to swim and was swept beneath the water immediately. Sydney Douglas Hooker, the crew captain, ran from the Morgan Street Bridge to the campus to bring the bad news. Grappling and diving (including work by a New York man in "submarine armor") were unsuccessful, and the body was not recovered until the following Wednesday when it was discovered on the eastern bank of the river.\textsuperscript{141}

Cameron's death caused the boat crew to disband. Several Trinity men, however, attended the Regatta where they were much affected by the condolences of the representatives of the other colleges and by the draping in mourning of the Trinity course.\textsuperscript{142}

There were repeated efforts to revive rowing, but the Cameron tragedy was too much to overcome. In the summer of 1875, Trinity won a two-mile race against the Hartford Rowing Team, and in the fall the college rowers were already training for the next Saratoga Regatta.\textsuperscript{143}

In the spring of 1876, still another misfortune befell the Trinity Boating Club. In the last week in March, heavy snows caused the roof of the
boathouse to collapse, and all of the Trinity boats except one were damaged.\textsuperscript{144} Shortly afterward, the boathouse was caught up in the spring floods, floated downstream, and sank. Although the boathouse was later located and recovered, these unfortunate losses precluded any intercollegiate rowing competition for 1876. That summer, Trinity's only race was with a Windsor crew. Trinity won by ten lengths, even after having rowed upstream six miles to the starting line.\textsuperscript{145}

During the fall months of 1876, there was no athletic enthusiasm of any sort at Trinity. The Baseball Team had disbanded, and now the Rowing Team had also become inactive. Several games of “pick-up” football were played with little enthusiasm, but the playing was poor, and there were no prospects for a varsity team in that sport.\textsuperscript{146}

But despite the demoralizing situation, there were still those at Trinity who felt that interest in rowing could be revived. On November 22, 1876, representatives of Trinity, Brown, and Dartmouth met in Boston to found the Rowing Association of New England Colleges, which was to sponsor four-oared (rather than six-oared) competition among colleges with enrollments of fewer than one hundred students. S. O. Hooker of Trinity was elected the first secretary of the Association. The Trinity College Boat Club continued a nominal existence until 1890, but the “baseball fever” which swept the College in the 1880’s and 1890’s brought on the Boat Club’s ultimate demise.\textsuperscript{147} In 1891, the boathouse was sold to the Hartford YMCA, and the two remaining boats were hung in the college gymnasium.\textsuperscript{148}

But if the gymnasium was the scene of little physical exercise, it quickly became the place for the many dances which were held throughout the academic year. Traditionally, there had been only the Class Day dances, and an occasional dance organized by the undergraduate body and held in a hall in downtown Hartford. Class Day dances were usually held in the College Cabinet,
small and cluttered with museum cases, but the opening of the gymnasium offered unlimited opportunities for collegiate social activities. Soon almost any college occasion became the excuse for a dance. There was the Natal Day Dance, held on or near May 16 (the date of the granting of the College's charter) and supported by student subscriptions of $1.00, $2.00, and $3.00.\textsuperscript{160} The Boat Club sponsored a Regatta Dance, and the Burning of Anna Lytics was soon replaced by a dance given by the Sophomores.\textsuperscript{161} The Washington's Birthday Celebration ended with a dance—except when February 22 fell in Lent, when college custom demanded its omission.\textsuperscript{162} The Tablet, while regarding dancing as an appropriate collegiate pastime, deplored the substitution of dancing for some of the older college customs, and even suggested that the money spent for some of the dances might have better been given to support the expense of the crew.\textsuperscript{163} And an alumnus, writing to the Tablet, questioned the wisdom of using every college occasion as the excuse for a dance. The Tablet's contributor also predicted that Trinity would soon be known as the "Dancing College of America."\textsuperscript{164}

Trinity College in the Gilded Age was indeed a gay place, and it is seriously to be doubted that a more convivial academic atmosphere could have been found in America. And yet, there was no large number of young men attracted to the campus. The predicted post-war influx of students had not materialized, and by the academic year of 1869-1870 the enrollment stood at only ninety-two. By 1872-1873, enrollment had declined to eighty-nine, a figure which even included nine special students. In 1875-1876, the number of students had further declined to eighty-three. Although admission standards had become more rigid, it was hardly the supposed "stiffness" of the entrance examinations which kept Trinity's enrollment static. American colleges generally were raising admission requirements, and Trinity's standards were probably no higher than elsewhere. The charge of "sectarianism" had perhaps had the effect of diverting young men from the Hartford non-Episcopalian community, but the Anglican connections—obviously more apparent than real—would have had the effect of attracting young men from Episcopalian families throughout the country. This was particularly demonstrated in the wide geographic distribution of the student body, and Trinity in the 1870's still could boast of her "cosmopolitan" undergraduate body.\textsuperscript{165} The fact is, of course, that Trinity had not, as the Tablet's editor pointed out, become well-known throughout the country either as an athletic stronghold or as a center of the higher learning. Trinity was small, pleasant, and provincial—at least provincial in its catering to young men from well-placed Episcopalian families.

But this, for weal or for woe, was almost inherent in the church-related college of the 1870's. And thus, it was hardly by design that the College, numerically and academically, had remained static. The college authorities were not committed to the idea of the "small college," even small as colleges went in those days. To the contrary, a sort of naive optimism seemed to prevail, and students were constantly being reminded "that Trinity was growing fast, . . . in wealth, in scholarship, in everything that can add to the true worth and dignity of a college."\textsuperscript{166}

The Pillow, while regarding dancing as an appropriate collegiate pastime, deplored the substitution of dancing for some of the older college customs, and even suggested that the money spent for some of the dances might have better been given to support the expense of the crew.\textsuperscript{163} And an alumnus, writing to the Pillow, questioned the wisdom of using every college occasion as the excuse for a dance. The Pillow's contributor also predicted that Trinity would soon be known as the "Dancing College of America."\textsuperscript{164}

Trinity College in the Gilded Age was indeed a gay place, and it is seriously to be doubted that a more convivial academic atmosphere could have been found in America. And yet, there was no large number of young men attracted to the campus. The predicted post-war influx of students had not materialized, and by the academic year of 1869-1870 the enrollment stood at only ninety-two. By 1872-1873, enrollment had declined to eighty-nine, a figure which even included nine special students. In 1875-1876, the number of students had further declined to eighty-three. Although admission standards had become more rigid, it was hardly the supposed "stiffness" of the entrance examinations which kept Trinity's enrollment static. American colleges generally were raising admission requirements, and Trinity's standards were probably no higher than elsewhere. The charge of "sectarianism" had perhaps had the effect of diverting young men from the Hartford non-Episcopalian community, but the Anglican connections—obviously more apparent than real—would have had the effect of attracting young men from Episcopalian families throughout the country. This was particularly demonstrated in the wide geographic distribution of the student body, and Trinity in the 1870's still could boast of her "cosmopolitan" undergraduate body.\textsuperscript{165} The fact is, of course, that Trinity had not, as the Tablet's editor pointed out, become well-known throughout the country either as an athletic stronghold or as a center of the higher learning. Trinity was small, pleasant, and provincial—at least provincial in its catering to young men from well-placed Episcopalian families.

But this, for weal or for woe, was almost inherent in the church-related college of the 1870's. And thus, it was hardly by design that the College, numerically and academically, had remained static. The college authorities were not committed to the idea of the "small college," even small as colleges went in those days. To the contrary, a sort of naive optimism seemed to prevail, and students were constantly being reminded "that Trinity was growing fast, . . . in wealth, in scholarship, in everything that can add to the true worth and dignity of a college."\textsuperscript{166}

The Tablet, while regarding dancing as an appropriate collegiate pastime, deplored the substitution of dancing for some of the older college customs, and even suggested that the money spent for some of the dances might have better been given to support the expense of the crew.\textsuperscript{163} And an alumnus, writing to the Tablet, questioned the wisdom of using every college occasion as the excuse for a dance. The Tablet's contributor also predicted that Trinity would soon be known as the "Dancing College of America."\textsuperscript{164}

Trinity College in the Gilded Age was indeed a gay place, and it is seriously to be doubted that a more convivial academic atmosphere could have been found in America. And yet, there was no large number of young men attracted to the campus. The predicted post-war influx of students had not materialized, and by the academic year of 1869-1870 the enrollment stood at only ninety-two. By 1872-1873, enrollment had declined to eighty-nine, a figure which even included nine special students. In 1875-1876, the number of students had further declined to eighty-three. Although admission standards had become more rigid, it was hardly the supposed "stiffness" of the entrance examinations which kept Trinity's enrollment static. American colleges generally were raising admission requirements, and Trinity's standards were probably no higher than elsewhere. The charge of "sectarianism" had perhaps had the effect of diverting young men from the Hartford non-Episcopalian community, but the Anglican connections—obviously more apparent than real—would have had the effect of attracting young men from Episcopalian families throughout the country. This was particularly demonstrated in the wide geographic distribution of the student body, and Trinity in the 1870's still could boast of her "cosmopolitan" undergraduate body.\textsuperscript{165} The fact is, of course, that Trinity had not, as the Tablet's editor pointed out, become well-known throughout the country either as an athletic stronghold or as a center of the higher learning. Trinity was small, pleasant, and provincial—at least provincial in its catering to young men from well-placed Episcopalian families.

But this, for weal or for woe, was almost inherent in the church-related college of the 1870's. And thus, it was hardly by design that the College, numerically and academically, had remained static. The college authorities were not committed to the idea of the "small college," even small as colleges went in those days. To the contrary, a sort of naive optimism seemed to prevail, and students were constantly being reminded "that Trinity was growing fast, . . . in wealth, in scholarship, in everything that can add to the true worth and dignity of a college."\textsuperscript{166}

The students knew better. Other than the telescope, the chemical equipment brought from France by Professor Pynchon in 1856, and a new and fascinating "electrical machine" purchased in 1868,\textsuperscript{167} the scientific equipment of the College had not been appreciably improved for almost half a century. And the Library, although boasting of 12,000 volumes, was still a hodge-podge collection of gifts and random accessions which as late as 1869 did not include either the Encyclopaedia Britannica or what the Tablet then described as "the most familiar works on what we can style modern literature."\textsuperscript{168}

If the students were aware of the College's inadequacies, so also were the Trustees and the Alumni. But the Trustees were hampered in their dealing with the situation by a lack of funds, and the Alumni were equally powerless for want of effective organization.

By the 1870's, the House of Convocation was a
moribund body which met but once a year at Commencement time. True, the House of Convocation elected the Junior Fellows of the College, but the Board of Fellows, too, had virtually ceased to function, especially since the Faculty themselves gave the Senior examinations rather than the Fellows, as had been the case during the 1850's and 1860's. Class organization, too, was rudimentary, for while several of the classes from the 1840's and 1850's were kept in touch through class secretaries, the actual meetings were the informal fifth- and tenth-year reunions again held during the busy and distracting Commencement week. 169

Alumni activity set out on a new track in the spring of 1870, when the Tablet urged that as a large number of the Class of '70 intended to pursue studies in New York City the next year, it might be well for them to meet at regular intervals. The Seniors approved of the idea and even broadened the plan to include all Alumni living in New York City in a New York Trinity Alumni Association. 170

President Jackson, who dearly loved "organizations," took the initiative, and without waiting for the class of 1870 to take up residence in New York, he called a meeting of New York Alumni for April 26 to be held in the Sunday School Rooms of St. Anne's Church on Elizabeth Street, New York. At that time, there was organized the New York Association of the Alumni of Trinity College, 171 and a second meeting was scheduled for June 15 at the Astor House. The Honorable William E. Curtis '43 was elected president of the association. 172 All who attended felt that the new organization would have a beneficial effect on the College. 173

The meeting held in June, described as the "First Annual Reunion," was attended by some fifty to sixty persons. Dinner was followed by many toasts and an address by President Jackson. The President used the occasion to praise "the high standard of scholarship in the college" and to plead for a closer relationship between the College and her graduates. In this connection he also pointed out the needs of the College - a new "library, chapel, and above all things a gymnasium." 174

The second "annual" meeting of the New York Alumni was held on April 13, 1871, at Delmonico's. Almost sixty Alumni were present, and after the dinner there were speeches and toasts. President Jackson again addressed the group, and in his remarks he spoke in defense (or perhaps rationalization) of the small college, declaring that the small college is in many ways to be preferred to larger and more pretentious ones, and citing as examples of the small-college product, Longfellow, Bryant, and Whittier. That this sentiment hardly reflected the feelings of the New York Alumni was more than apparent in the response to a toast to "the Professors" given by Trustee Henry Joel Scudder. Scudder called for Trinity to become larger, and urged that the "younger alumni should lead the way in this job." 175

The two philosophies brought forth in this meeting were both defensible, and each sincerely expressed. Jackson's preference for a smaller college was confirmed in 1872 when he visited Oxford and Cambridge. At that time he concluded that 150 was a practical maximum for the Trinity student body, and that when that number had been reached, a second coordinate college should be created. 176 At that time Trinity had a long way toward reaching Jackson's suggested maximum.

Jackson's stated preference for the small college was not necessarily an equation of smallness with excellence. The small college was all that Jackson had ever known, and to him the small college, with intimate faculty social relationships, was the best of all possible worlds. The New York Alumni would have been perhaps even less willing to equate size with worth, but they, too, were driven by their own experience to encourage the expansion of the Trinity student body.

As professional and business men in the largest city in the United States, their day-to-day life was lived among people to whom Trinity College meant nothing - indeed, among people to whom "Trinity" was not even a name. Call it advertising, call it public relations, call it what
you will—the New York Alumni wanted Trinity to become better known. The New York papers had seldom bothered to report Trinity news, but this was soon to be remedied, for in the early 1870's, Arthur Dyer '70 joined the staff of the New York Daily Graphic, and until his death by suicide on June 9, 1875, that young journalist did everything in his power to put the name of "Trinity" before the New York reading public. No occurrence at Trinity was too trivial for reporting in the Graphic, and the accounts of the Regatta of 1874 read as if Trinity were the most important college represented at Saratoga. The Graphic was read by the Trinity Alumni of New York, and this paper was sometimes used to express ideas regarding the policy of the institution itself.

The Graphic was read on campus, too, and it must have thrilled the young collegians to see their college so well-covered by a metropolitan daily, even though the Graphic was not a "major" New York paper. The Graphic was one of the papers subscribed to by the Library for the reading room, and there were also students who received what must have been their favorite newspaper through the mails.

And the students shared the hopes of the New York Alumni for a larger student body. They did not, however, want to see the enrollment enlarged by the admission of women; they preferred to leave the education of females to Vassar. What they wanted, really, was more men who could improve Trinity's odds in athletic competition. The students had been constantly told that Trinity was growing, and they most certainly wanted it to be so. When the Class of '80 entered the College in the fall of 1876, the large number of Freshmen was regarded as an encouraging sign by the students, and as evidence of "how much more widely the college is known today than it was five or ten years ago." The Class of '80, with its thirty-five men, was the largest class yet admitted, and the Tablet expressed the hope (and belief) that the Class of '80 would be "the first of a succession of large classes." This hope, as we shall see in our next chapter, was not to be sustained.
To the New Campus

The Gilded Age was not a Golden Age for Trinity College. Life in this mid-Victorian atmosphere was leisurely, pleasant, and perhaps even urbane. Abner Jackson, Trinity's eminent Victorian, set the tone, dictated the policies, and served as the pivot about which the College's rather parochial interests and activities revolved. Jackson had restored the good name of the College and had brought the institution to a firm footing of respectability after three lesser presidents had almost allowed it to expire. His social personality, his love of students, and his interest in their everyday affairs had been most important during the transition from the older, traditional, New England college to the modern, activity-oriented institution which was to change but little during the next half-century. In only one sphere of college administration did Abner Jackson fail to achieve remarkable success. That sphere was college finance.

But Abner Jackson could hardly be blamed for a situation over which he had little direct control. The Trustees, apparently with the advice and consent of the College Treasurer, approved all but the most trivial expenditures and it was they who were responsible, although not always effectively, for providing for the payment of the College's financial operations. The Trustees, too, had their problems, and not all of them were of their own making. Trinity College was the victim of circumstances, and the financial affairs of the institution reflected a chain of cause and effect, or perhaps, rather, a series of chains of cause and effect. Periods of financial distress were repeatedly followed by briefer periods of relative prosperity. During these better years, the Trustees had been able to discharge the most pressing obligations of the College and even to make reasonable advances in the direction of the progress which was being made by the more prosperous sister colleges. But hardly had Trinity's financial house been set in order when new, and not always expected, obligations were incurred which demanded immediate attention.

The last of these crises had been met in the mid-1860's by Professor Mallory's heroic and successful efforts in raising $100,000 for the College, but much of this new wealth had been dissipated, again in ways which did not necessarily reflect bad financial management. The buildings had been kept in reasonably good repair, and the salaries of the Faculty had been raised to a competitive level—at least with the smaller colleges, if not with the larger and more affluent ones. In 1867, for example, Harvard had just raised the salary of full professors from $3,000 to $4,000 and New York University had doubled academic salaries from $1,500 to $3,000. Although Trinity's $2,000 must have seemed paltry by comparison, it was considerably above the $1,500 then being paid by the University of Michigan. 1 Trinity, too, was providing what later came to be known as "fringe benefits." Many of the professors lived in the college buildings in what amounted to "subsidized housing"; and in 1865, the College had set the precedent for free tuition for faculty sons by granting Professor Brocklesby remission for all fees for his son's attending Trinity. 2

Professor Mallory had been so successful as a fund-raiser that in July, 1867, Treasurer Thomas Belknap resigned in his favor. 3 Mallory was a most devoted alumnus, and his independent
means enabled him to engage an Assistant Professor of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, the Reverend Edwin E. Johnson, to teach most of his classes and, for several years, at no expense to the College. And even Mallory’s services as Treasurer were performed almost gratis. The original arrangement was that he should receive a house rent-free; later, he was paid a mere $500.4 Not until 1873 did he receive a regular salary, when the Trustees voted him $2,000 per annum.5

There were others on the Faculty who used their private fortunes to pay the salaries of their colleagues. In 1868, Professor Huntington asked that he be relieved of some of his teaching duties and that Samuel Hart ’66 be appointed Tutor in Classical Languages with the Tutor’s salary to be paid by Professor Huntington.6 The arrangement was continued for several years. Although the Trustees in 1868 voted to pay Hart $145 in addition to what he received from Professor Huntington,7 it was not until 1870 that Hart received a regular salary of $1,200 from the College with the understanding that he act as Bursar in addition to his teaching duties.8 Here it might be well to point out that for a full-time Faculty of eight, including the President, the instructional salaries amounted to a mere $11,000 for the academic year 1868–69. The total expenditure for that year came to $27,354.06.9

At the time the college income was sufficient to meet the expenses, and the year 1868–69 had ended with a cash balance of $47,76. The college holdings in real estate were providing an income of $9,645.95, bank stock yielded $5,244.45, donations for 1868–69 amounted to $2,635, and the students had paid $3,702.92 in tuition, much of which had been derived from the many scholarship funds then held by the College. The real estate values were increasing, and even the stocks and bonds were appreciating in value.10

In 1869, the Trustees accepted the gift of what was to be a favorite Trinity landmark – the statue of Bishop Brownell. The colossal statue was the work of Chauncey B. Ives of Rome, Italy, cast at the foundry of Ferdinand von Müller of Munich at a cost, according to one report, of $3,500,11 or $10,000 in gold, according to another,12 and paid for by Bishop Brownell’s son-in-law, Gordon W. Burnham of New York. Although it was originally planned to place the statue at Bishop Brownell’s grave in Cedar Hill Cemetery,13 Burnham later decided that it would be more appropriate to locate it on the Trinity campus. The Trustees were receptive to the idea and accepted the gift, only to learn that Burnham would not provide “a suitable pedestal for the statue.” The pedestal cost the College $5,000,14 but a very grand pedestal it was – of Quincy granite, and sixteen feet high.15 And on Thursday, November 11, 1869, at two o’clock in the afternoon, the statue was unveiled with appropriate ceremonial and addresses by Bishop Williams, Bishop Potter, the President of the College, and the Honorable C. F. Cleveland, former Governor of the state of Connecticut.16

The pedestal for the Bishop’s statue was, at the time, an expensive luxury. Professor Huntington had been delegated by the Trustees to solicit

Statue of Bishop Brownell on Old Campus
contributions, but most of the cost was borne by the College. At this time, too, the Trustees were expecting an increase in the number of students and were giving serious consideration to enlarging the instructional and residential facilities of the College. At the Diocesan Convention of September, 1869, President Jackson announced that the College would have to raise $250,000 to erect income-producing homes on some of the valuable building lots belonging to the College, a new chapel, and a fire-proof library. And in late December Jackson was in Providence, Rhode Island, not begging, as he reported to his daughter, but trying to interest people in the work of the College.

There were no subscriptions pledged to underwrite the building program. There had been several bequests between 1869 and 1871—notably $20,000 from Trustee Isaac Toucey for scholarships and $65,000 from Chester Adams of Hartford for the general endowment, the largest gift from an individual up to the time, but nothing which could be applied to a large-scale academic building program. With careful management of the College’s investment portfolio, largely through the judicious buying and selling of real estate, the College had been able to take in enough money from rentals, student fees, and interest on investments to balance the budget at the end of each year. By the summer of 1872, however, Treasurer George S. Mallory predicted that the academic year 1872-1873 would end with a deficit of $3,582. Again it seemed that the College was to be faced with another of its almost cyclic crises, and so it might have been, had not the College become involved in a deal with the city of Hartford which was to result in the sale of the Trinity campus for what was regarded at the time as a fantastic sum of money and the re-location of the College on a new site some two miles to the south.

There was never any question that Trinity College was located on the most desirable site in the city of Hartford. The campus was large, and the adjacent park provided enough perspective to properly set off the buildings when viewed from the city. During the Civil War there had been some sentiment for a new state house to be erected near the College and for a new city hall to be built in the park nearby. In 1870, Hartford became involved in a contest with New Haven as to which of the two cities should become the sole capital of Connecticut. The Charter of 1818 had retained the colonial arrangement whereby alternate sessions of the state legislature were held in the two “capitals” – New Haven and Hartford – but in the late 1860’s there was considerable agitation for a single capital. The two state houses in Hartford and New Haven were both very much in need of repair, and in 1870 Hartford seized the initiative and offered the state of Connecticut $500,000 toward the erection of a new capitol building. The Hartford officials proceeded at once to take steps to acquire the most desirable site in the city – the Trinity campus.

When the matter was presented to the College Trustees, the college officials made clear that they could not even consider abandoning the property which they had held for almost half-a-century. Time had hallowed the ground and, though Trinity was not an old college so far as colleges go, plans were already being made for the institution’s semi-centennial observance. Both students and Alumni were distressed to learn that their campus was being sought for public purposes. The students were well-pleased with the College’s location, and the Alumni had sentimental attachments to the old grounds and buildings. The Tablet perhaps spoke for many when it declared that it would have been better had New Haven been selected as the Capital City. The Faculty, too, preferred not to be moved and in February, 1872, they petitioned the Trustees not to sell the campus.

The original offer, based on an impartial appraisal, was for $374,375, but the Trustees decided that not even $500,000 would be adequate compensation for the loss of grounds, buildings, and the advantages of the site. And even when the offer was increased to $550,000, the Trustees still refused to part with their property. But the city fathers persisted and on March 11, 1872, a public meeting was held in Hartford to sound
out public opinion as to how high a price might be offered. Although there was some opposition—largely based on Hartford's already staggering municipal debt of $3,000,000—the sense of the meeting seemed to be in favor of purchase even if the figure to be offered should reach $600,000. The Board of Aldermen, consequently, voted to purchase the Trinity campus for $600,000. The action was approved at a citizens' meeting held in Central Hall on March 16, and on March 19 the matter was put to referendum, when the Hartford voters declared three-to-one in favor of the purchase.

On March 21, 1872, the Trustees voted twelve-to-four in favor of accepting the city's offer. Those opposed to the sale were Bishop Williams, E. E. Beardsley, James E. English, and James Goodwin. For a while President Jackson, too, had been opposed to disposing of the college property, but finally he was won over to the side of those who could vote for the sale. Indeed, Jackson's reversal of position came so late that he felt obliged to justify his new attitude on grounds of the College's having need for expansion and for new buildings worthy of the institution's growing reputation.

On April 15, 1872, the deed was signed and the city of Hartford gave the Trustees of Trinity College $100,000 in cash and a bond for the remaining $500,000. Although the College was in need of funds for immediate operating expenses, the Trustees unanimously voted that all proceeds from the sale of the Old Campus be kept "for the securing of other grounds and buildings and, if practicable, for a future endowment" and that none of the new wealth be used for the current expenses of the College.

Hardly anyone connected with the College was pleased with the decision to move. The students had already had their say, and they were to have it again. The Tablet added a sarcastic note in the suggestion that the buildings to be erected on a new site be named for the grounds and janitorial staff—Franklin, Adams, Hollingsworth, and Professor Jim. And even before the sale had been completed, there was something of a movement to take the College from Hartford. President Jackson boldly asserted that a rumor that the College would move to New Haven had been "started by some evil-disposed person," but there were those among the College's well-wishers who sincerely thought that it would be to the advantage of both the College and the Episcopal Church to move to New Haven and affiliate with Yale as "Trinity College of Yale University." Nothing, of course, came of this effort, as neither the Yale Corporation nor the Trinity Trustees even considered the proposal. But this was not the end of the efforts to move the College from Hartford, for hardly had the New Haven rumor subsided than some of the New York Alumni urged that the College be removed to "a site on the banks of the Hudson."

In spite of these pressures, the Trustees proceeded to look for a new site within the city limits of Hartford. Five locations were immediately offered for sale, and each was carefully considered by the Trustees at their meeting of July 11, 1872. The "Penfield Place" on the north side of Park Street was the location closest to the Old Campus. A site had also been offered on Summit Street, just south of Vernon Street, and close to the Zion Hill Cemetery. Another possibility was on Farmington Avenue, "north of the Avenue and west of the bridge." Judge Barbour had offered a tract of land "on the Windsor Road." And a fifth site was on Blue Hills Road, "one mile north of the Trotting Park." Each had its virtues, and the Trustees were much divided as to which might be chosen. To help resolve the problem, the Trustees sought the expert advice of Frederick Law Olmstead, the landscape architect who had achieved fame as the designer of Central Park in New York City. Olmstead decided in favor of the Blue Hills site, but the Trustees were unwilling to accept Olmstead's suggestion and postponed the selection until October.

Although uncertain as to where the new buildings would be located, the Trustees sent President Jackson to England to engage an architect for a complete, new campus and authorized him to commission a preliminary plan from any architect whom he might select. On July 13, 1872, Jackson left New York on the steamship Atlantic.
accompanied by Mrs. Jackson, his brother-in-law, Charles K. Cobb, and his nephew, Charles K. Cobb, Jr. 44

Immediately upon his arrival in England, Jackson set out on a tour of the educational and ecclesiastical centers of that country. Within a matter of days he had visited Eton College, Oxford, Stratford-on-Avon, the monastery of the Cowley Fathers, the Parliament House at Westminster, and the British Museum. At Oxford he met John Henry Parker, the celebrated architectural historian, 45 to whom he had a letter of introduction from their mutual friend, Bishop Coxe. 46

When Jackson explained his mission, Parker recommended two architects, Scott and Burges. Sir George Gilbert Scott was a celebrated ecclesiastical architect who had been employed widely in restoring numerous English cathedrals and who was regarded as one of the most competent figures in the English Gothic revival. 47 William Burges was a younger man and, although he had not yet made his mark as a first-rate architect, he had attracted considerable attention as the designer of St. Mary’s Episcopal Cathedral in Edinburgh, Scotland. Of the two, Parker felt that Burges might better be able to accommodate President Jackson. 48

So, on Parker’s advice, Jackson presented himself at Burges’ office in London. Burges and Jackson “hit it off” from the beginning, and the architect agreed to provide a plan for a new Trinity College campus. Jackson was vague as to exactly what he had in mind, but the fact that he had first consulted Parker and Parker had recommended Burges, suggests that Jackson had been thinking in terms of some sort of Gothic. At any rate, Burges suggested that the two visit Oxford “to examine the Colleges,” and the President and his newly-engaged architect set out for Oxford together. 49

For a week Jackson wandered about Oxford taking notes on all that he saw. He was particularly interested in Brasenose (Jackson spelled it “Braez Noze”), Pembroke, All Souls, and Keble Colleges, the Bodleian Library, and the Sheldonian Theatre. When he returned to London, he gave Burges (who had not remained in Oxford with Jackson) his impressions, and Burges immediately began to block out a general plan for a college to include residence quarters, dining hall, chapel, library, and theatre. 50

While Burges was thus busily employed, Jackson set out for a visit to Scotland. After a brief stay in Glasgow, where he found the University a most depressing sight, he touched briefly at the tourist points of Oban, Iona, Glencoe, and Inverness. On his way back to London, he stopped at Trinity College, Glenalmond, a Scottish Episcopal secondary school for boys some twelve or fifteen miles from Perth. Jackson was much impressed by the architecture of the school which was arranged in a closed quadrangle with the principal façade comprising a “long walk” of two three-storied Victorian Gothic buildings connected by a large central tower. 51 Jackson wrote of Trinity College, Glenalmond, in his notebook: “I make my notes in my notebook on what I saw here. It is a most noble pile of buildings.” 52 It was from these notes that the general outline of the new Trinity College, Hartford, campus doubtless took form.

When Jackson got back to London, he and Burges set to work on the Trinity plan in earnest.
For some time, they spent five hours together each day. And when Burges needed time to work out details, or when Jackson could not decide how a particular element should be executed, Burges would send Jackson out on another visit. Once he suggested that Jackson go to see St. Augustine's Missionary College at Canterbury. And when Jackson was unable to make any concrete suggestions as to how the dormitory entries should be arranged, Burges suggested that he visit Jesus College, Cambridge.

By the end of September, 1872, Burges and Jackson had agreed upon the general plan of the new campus, and Jackson returned to Hartford. On October 16, 1872, the Trustees met in special session to select the site for the New Campus.

The Penfield Farm on Park Street was selected, and a committee consisting of President Jackson, Thomas Belknap, and George Beach was authorized to make the purchase at a price not to exceed $2,000. This was a ridiculously low figure, especially considering that the Old Campus had been sold for $600,000, but the Trustees were perhaps paying heed to the suggestion of the New York Alumni (in formal expression by Bishop Potter) that the new wealth of the College not be dissipated on grounds and buildings.

As they might have expected, the Trustees' offer for the Penfield Place was rejected. But if on October 12, 1872, the Trustees were "penny-wise," on February 16, 1873, they proved to be
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“pound-foolish,” for on that date they decided in favor of the Vernon Street site, and agreed to pay $225,000 for it—almost half of what they had received for the Old Campus. The site selected by the Trustees had little to commend itself but the view. On the north was the Zion Hill Cemetery, a spot which had frequently been visited by the Grand Tribunal, Mu Mu Mu, and Po Pai Paig. To the west was the gravel pit or trap-rock quarry. To the east, although at a considerable distance, was the Hartford Retreat, later known as the Institute of Living. And to the south, along New Britain Avenue, was a row of cheap boarding houses. The students were particularly unhappy that a location so far from the center of town had been decided upon. The Tablet was again outspoken. "The Trustees," said the Tablet, "have seen fit, in their wisdom (?) to purchase property adjoining the stone pits... in the immediate proximity of two cemeteries and the Insane Asylum." The neighborhood was a bad one—a second "Pigville"—and the city would not move southward, but would spread out toward the north and west, leaving the College in an isolated position, perhaps without even horse-car transportation to the center of town. Had they thought of it, the Tablet staff might have added that the location which the Trustees had selected was known as "Gallows Hill," from the fact that during the eighteenth century it had been the place for public executions.

The Trustees were doubtless aware of these arguments, but it was a strange sort of reasoning which had dictated the final choice. Despite the disreputable character of the neighborhood, the Trustees felt that the very presence of the College on Zion Hill would raise real estate values, and that in time it would become a most desirable section of town. Several persons had offered to buy building lots from the Summit Street side of the College tract, and the Trustees were certain that at least ten lots could be sold for $10,000 each.

Whether wisely or foolishly, the Trustees had not acted a day too soon. The agreement with the city of Hartford called for the College's leaving the Old Campus within a five-year period, and in February, 1873, work was begun on the excavation for the new state capitol. By March, the west-end of the Old Campus was one large hole and by May the north section of Brownell Hall had been vacated in anticipation of its destruction. The students who had occupied rooms in the building either moved into Jarvis Hall or took rooms in town.

After Commencement of 1873, President Jackson went to England to complete the plans with Burges and when he returned to the College the following September he brought with him the most elaborate plan which had ever been designed for an American college campus.

The original Burges plan called for four spacious quadrangles, with a chapel, 140' x 45' ; a library, museum, dining hall, and art building, each 130' x 45' ; a theatre, 130' x 80' ; a tower 45' x 45' with a spire 240' high; two smaller towers, 45' x 45' each; an astronomical observatory, 35' x 35' and 95' high; a block of professors' apartments on the south line, 265' x 30' ; two blocks of student quarters, each 260' x 30' ; and two additional rows of student rooms, each 200' x 30'. The plan was for the largest and most elaborate group of academic buildings yet to be erected in America and had the plan been completed it would have been, as one newspaper boasted, "next to the Capitol at Washington, the most imposing edifice in the United States."

In both spirit and detail, the Burges plan was executed in what would now be called "Victorian Gothic." To be sure, the final result was rather eclectic—a central quadrangle façade in the style of Trinity College, Glenalmond, a tower to resemble the Victoria Tower of the new House of Parliament in London, dormitories patterned after the living quarters at Jesus College, Cambridge, and a theatre on the model of the Sheldonian at Oxford. When the plans were first shown in Hartford, the architectural style was described as "Early English." Later it was called "early French Gothic," and at the end of the century the college Catalogue and other college literature employed the term "English Secular Gothic."

The Trustees were most enthusiastic about the
new campus plan, and they voted to begin construction in April, 1874. Wisely, they did not see fit to begin the whole campus at once. To be completed in the first stage of development were to be a portion of the Chapel sufficient to accommodate the current student body, the Library, the Dining Hall, one block of lecture rooms, and two sections of dormitories. And even this small section of the total plan was estimated by the Trustees to cost $334,000, not including the installation of plumbing and heating.73

To superintend the actual building, the Trustees engaged the eminent Hartford architect, F. H. Kimball, who had recently been in charge of the construction of the Connecticut Mutual and the Charter Oak Life Insurance Company buildings.74 In December, 1873, Kimball was sent to London to prepare the working drawings required for the execution of the Burges plan. And although Kimball was expected to return to Hartford by May, 1874,75 events and decisions in Hartford kept the plans in such a state of flux that he was obliged to remain in London until October.76

The Trustees had, in their enthusiasm, underestimated the probable cost of actual construction, and the first “cut-back” from the original plan was to decide on a “three-quadrangle” campus rather than one of four quadrangles which Burges had first suggested,77 and this radical change called for a complete re-working of the master plan.

But the event which brought near-tragedy to Trinity College was the death of President Jack-
son on Sunday, April 19, 1874, just as plans were being made for the groundbreaking ceremonies for the New Campus. Actually, Jackson had planned to go to England that spring, presumably to work with Burges and Kimball in bringing the working drawings for the new buildings to completion.

Jackson's death was an unexpected blow. Although he had never been in robust health, his passing after a brief illness with pneumonia, was unexpected.

Once more, the Trustees designated John Brocklesby as Acting-President of the College, this for the fourth and last time. And under an "Acting" President it was hardly to be expected that the plans for the move to the New Campus could be advanced very rapidly. Indeed, the Trustees postponed the groundbreaking ceremony, and once more the whole Burges plan was to be subjected to a reconsideration. And perhaps a reconsideration was in order.

Thirty years later, a Trinity Professor (Winfred R. Martin) remarked that at the time of the sale of the Old Campus, President Jackson and the Trustees were bewildered by their new wealth and that "they forgot that a million is only a thousand thousand." But then, almost everybody thought that the College was "rich." The students thought so, and the New York Alumni thought so, too. The New York Daily Graphic, unofficial spokesman for the New York Alumni, said, incorrectly of course, that the College had resources of $2,000,000 which should be spent on buildings which would "compare with the best buildings at Oxford University" and which would place Trinity as the rival of Yale and Harvard, thus providing the Episcopal Church with a "University that will be at least as great as those of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches." And it was thinking such as this which caused Professor Martin to write that President Jackson "died the victim of too high a hope and disappointed trust."

The students, or at least many of them, were, by this time, becoming impatient regarding the construction of the new buildings. Although they had at first strongly opposed the move, it was the plan for a huge dining hall which was to be one of the first buildings to be erected that conjured up "visions of frothing tankards of ale, 'home-brewed,' like those at which Tom Brown quaffed while at Oxford." And in this spirit, the undergraduates accepted the move. From time to time, the Tablet offered suggestions. Hope was expressed that the class ivies could be transplanted and that the class stones would be built into the walls of the new buildings as a sentimental connection between the Old Campus and the New.

The students were unhappy, too, that the Trustees were so long in selecting a new President, especially since little was to be expected by way of furthering the new campus plans until a President was elected. But despite undergraduate impatience, the Trustees were attempting to secure a successor to Abner Jackson. The difficulty, however, was that a suitable candidate could not be agreed upon. On July 1, 1874, the Trustees had taken two informal ballots but could come to no conclusion. Although the names of the candidates were not made public, the students assumed that only clergymen had been considered. The Tablet urged that the new President not be a clergyman on grounds that the tradition of a clergyman President had caused the College to be too often thought of as "a mere divinity school." And as a strange alternative to a layman as President, the Tablet suggested that it might be "better for the reputation of the College, if it were allowable by the charter, to choose a clergyman from some of the sects rather than a Church one."

Although there was no announced candidate for the Presidency, the name of one Professor, Thomas Ruggles Pynchon, was increasingly appearing in the public press. During the summer of 1874, he had been elected to the Board of Trustees of St. Mark's School in Southborough, Massachusetts, delivered the commencement address at Cheshire Academy, and had attended the meeting of the Society of American Chemists at Northumberland, Pennsylvania. And no little stir had been created when he presented to the College "the old gun-barrel" with which Joseph
Priestly had performed his first experiments. 92

On November 7, 1874, the Trustees elected Thomas Ruggles Pynchon the ninth President of Trinity College 93 and on Friday, November 13, Pynchon announced at the evening chapel service that he had been elected to the position. Perhaps realizing that there might be no great enthusiasm from the student body, Pynchon carefully pointed out that he had not sought the appointment and that he would have preferred to follow his literary and scientific pursuits. And his remark that he regarded the appointment as a personal honor and an expression of confidence in the Faculty more than suggested that the Trustees had complied with a faculty request that one of their own number be chosen to head the College. In this regard, the Tablet quoted one professor as saying that the Faculty “didn’t want any stranger coming here to wake them up.” But if the Faculty were pleased, the students were not; and although they dutifully gave “three cheers” for Professor Pynchon as he left the Chapel, the students were generally disappointed with the choice. 94

But perhaps the choice was a wiser one than any one then realized. Pynchon was, of course, pedestrian and unimaginative to the extreme, but of those directing the interests of Trinity College, he was the one most in touch with reality. Pynchon alone sensed the folly of beginning even the minimum number of buildings which had been decided upon just a year before. Pynchon urged that only two buildings (the present Seabury and Jarvis Halls) be started as the west side of the Great Quadrangle and that the other buildings be erected as the generosity of a later time might provide. This was the retreat from Burges’ original plan which nobody had even thought possible. But the Trustees, in their acceptance of Pynchon’s recommendation, probably saved the College from bankruptcy and possible extinction. 95

Upon this decision by the Trustees, groundbreaking was scheduled for July 1, 1875, and Commencement Day of 1877 was set as the date for completion of the two buildings. Frederick Law Olmstead was commissioned to landscape the grounds, and Mr. Kimball was ensconced in an office at Number 15, Connecticut Mutual Building, fourth floor, where the revised model of the buildings was to be on public display. 96

As the modified plans called for the elimination of the dining hall, the students were disappointed to see their visions of tankards of ale vanishing into thin air. Gloomily, they resigned themselves to the miserable fare of such Hartford “eateries” as Mother Bacon’s, the Clinton Lunch, and Merrill’s—places which had long been accepted as part of the Trinity way of life. 97

Throughout the winter, Kimball worked away at the plans. By December, he had moved his office into one of the rooms of Old Seabury Hall, 98 and soon he was to be assisted in the work by “a corps of able draughtsmen.” 99 Early in February, President Pynchon took a quick trip to Philadelphia to inspect the buildings which had recently been erected at the University of Pennsylvania. 100 On April 2, the Trustees voted to place $300,000 at the disposal of the Building Committee to insure immediate bidding
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for the actual construction.¹⁰¹

On Commencement Day, July 1, 1875, after the annual Alumni Dinner at the United States Hotel, those present formed into a procession, and headed by Colt's Band, marched to the site of the New Campus. At the spot where Jarvis Hall now stands, Bishop Williams read the Lord's Prayer and a collect and then the President, the Chancellor, and Professor Jim turned the first sod. After the singing of the 138th Hymn and a Benediction by Bishop Williams, the college flag was unfurled on a new flagpole. After the students had saluted the flag, the students raised the Bishop, the President, and Professor Jim on their shoulders and carried them about the grounds. The entire company returned to the Old Campus where President Pynchon held a reception. The day was concluded with dancing in the Cabinet.¹⁰²

Excavation began immediately after Commencement.¹⁰³ The work progressed rapidly during the summer, and by October the foundations for the two buildings were nearly completed. And as the buildings began to take shape, the College became the object of local interest and, indeed, of considerable interest throughout the country. Brown and Gross, a local stationer, sold letterheads with a cut of the new college buildings—not of just the two buildings under construction, but the whole Burges plan.¹⁰⁴ And before the stonework had reached the second floor, William Clairborne Brocklesby '69 had published an illustrated article on Trinity College in Scribner's Monthly in which many of the Burges details were emphasized. The College purchased the woodcuts (some of the elements in the buildings were never actually executed) and issued the article in pamphlet form.¹⁰⁵

There were several unfortunate delays during the course of construction, but these were to be expected in the carrying out of a project as large as this.¹⁰⁶ The Class of 1876 planted the class ivy as usual on the south end of Jarvis Hall, even though the building was soon to be taken down.¹⁰⁷ And during the spring of 1877, Brownell Hall was completely vacated. The students who had still kept their rooms in the south-end of the hall were moved across Trinity Street to several homes which the College had rented for temporary dormitories. The Faculty, too, were moved out of Brownell Hall. Professor Brocklesby moved his study to his home on Washington Street and Professor Hart, a bachelor, moved in with the students across from the College.¹⁰⁸
Brownell Hall was demolished during the summer. During the winter of 1877–1878, the final touches were put on the new buildings. The northern building, which the Trustees named Jarvis Hall, turned out to be a dormitory of even greater comfort and splendor than anyone had ever imagined. Seabury Hall, the southern building, contained classrooms, laboratory, cabinet, faculty offices, commons, and chapel. And these quarters were splendidly executed.

The Library occupied the basement and ground floor of the southern end of Seabury. The book rooms on the two floors were arranged in alcoves and the librarian’s office, with an interesting circular bay window, was formed by the exterior of the entry. The “Chemical Apartments,” consisting of office, laboratory, and lecture room, were located on the ground floor of Middle Seabury. The Chapel, although intended to be for temporary use until the one called for by the Burges plan could be erected, was splendid with a handsome altar and reredos. Located on the second floor of Seabury, its exposed beams and trefoil windows with colored glass added a “churchly” touch that had been lacking in the old Chapel. And the chapel pews, arranged in choir (or collegiate) form were as Anglican as anything that Abner Jackson had seen at Oxford or Cambridge. The Commons, which the Trustees had reluctantly provided, was located in the basement of the north-end of Seabury. The Commons was also designated as the “Picture Gallery” where were hung the portraits of the college presidents, and as the Picture Gallery the room was usually known. J. H. Bolton, Jr., was engaged as the College’s first steward, and colored waiters were employed to wait on table.

Somewhat in contrast to the splendor of New Jarvis and New Seabury were several unsightly wooden structures. The large building which had been used as a carpenter shop was retained as a laundry. Between Jarvis and Seabury, where the tower gateway was to be placed, was a wooden structure to contain the kitchen and rooms for the steward and servants. There was also a small gas plant to provide lighting for the college buildings and, last but not least, the old gymnasium had been removed from the Old Campus and located north of New Jarvis Hall near Vernon Street.

If one could close his eyes to the temporary structures, the two permanent buildings would have presented an imposing appearance. Hattie Howard, the Hartford poetess upon whom the mantle of Lydia Huntley Sigourney had fallen as the “Sweet Singer of Hartford,” found them so and shortly after their completion she wrote:

O Trinity! thy turrets gleam
In proximate suburban space
Like vast cathedral towers, and seem
Suggestive of some holy place;
Some quiet, quaint, monastic spot,
Within whose deep reclusive shade
Benignant priors might have taught,
And strangely solemn friars prayed.

Grand metamorphosis of rocks!
A blemish once on nature’s face,
By sudden expedited shocks
Of man’s designing, rent apace;
The work of master-architect
Amorphous mass who shaped anew,
That magic-like, without defect,
Into thy storied structure grew.

O symbol of a golden age
That typifies, in solid stone,
A progress neither seer nor sage
Of ancient time had ever known!
For in symmetric, stately walls
Is dignified an honored name
That Athens’ classic haunts recalls,
And rivals Alexandria’s claim.

Here Xenophon’s delightful maze
Allures the philologic mind,
Or Plato’s facile, honeyed phrase
Ambitious youth their model find;
While Homer’s bold hexameters,
And Virgil’s matchless epic lines,
To Poesy’s wild worshipers
Are sacred as their altar-shrines.

Thy bounds encircle forum-ground
Where embryonic Presidents
The key to statesmanship have found,
Or latent gift of eloquence;
While, promised guerdon of his dreams,
More radiant than kingly crown,
To many a bright aspirant, seems
The ermined robe, or surplice-gown.

Proud alma mater thou hast been
Of scores of earth’s successful sons
Who, in life’s broad arena, win
The plaudits of less favored ones;
Who toy with fame, and are beset
By honor and prosperity –
But never, never quite forget
Their love and reverence for thee.

Within thy portals year by year,
From every clime beneath the sun,
May those assemble who revere
The majesty of “Three in One”;
Thus, o’er the daisied fields around
Where student-feet shall press the sod,
With nature’s worship shall resound
The voice of praise to nature’s God.

In the spring of 1878, the move of the college equipment to the New Campus was begun. The books from the Library – all 18,000 of them – were brought safely to the new Library in April. The moving of the scientific equipment was not carried off so successfully. The “electrical machine,” the College’s most prized piece of scientific apparatus, was dropped by the movers and shattered beyond repair.

On Friday, May 17, 1878, the first instruction was given on the New Campus by Dr. H. Carrington Bolton, the newly engaged Professor of Chemistry and Natural Science, who gave a lecture on Chemistry to the Seniors in the new Chemistry Room, and by Bishop Williams, who lectured on History to the Juniors. In June, the class ivies were transplanted in positions along the new structures, and on the twenty-seventh of that month, the last Commencement which centered about the Old Campus ended with the President’s Reception being held in the Portrait Gallery in New Seabury Hall.

Commencement of 1878 was a sad day for many of those who were unhappy to see the College moved from its old location. Robert H. Coleman ‘77 promised a new organ to be installed in the new Chapel by the opening of the next Christmas term. Thinking that the old chapel organ would be of no further use to the College, one Alumnus, “in his eager desire to carry home a relic of the old sanctuary,” removed a small gilt cross from the top of the organ. The undergraduates, following the example of this worthy Alumnus, too, began to remove “souvenirs” from the organ, taking the ivory keys, the gilded pipes in front, and finally, after overturning the organ, the pipes from within. Only after the instrument had been completely wrecked did they learn that the organ had been sold.

During the summer of 1878, the old buildings were quickly demolished. No stones from the old buildings were sentimentally incorporated into the new Seabury and Jarvis, but one of the large Portland stone bases of the chapel columns was rescued by the Alumni to be made into a tombstone for Professor Jim, who had died in May, 1878. As the buildings were being destroyed, “relic hunters” gathered bits of wood, stone, and metal, and canes made from the spindles of the bannisters of Jarvis Hall were especially prized. After the buildings had been removed the ground was ploughed over, and the grading of the Old Campus as part of the State Capitol grounds was begun, leaving no trace of the institution which had occupied the site for over half a century.
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.10

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.11 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 “go”) 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.12

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.15 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.16

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.17 In May of 1878, he gave the first lecture on the new campus.18 Bolton was immensely popular with Faculty and students,19 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. 20 The appointment in 1883 of L. M. Cheesman, Ph.D. (Berlin), as Professor of Physics and of William Lippenard 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. 21

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. 22 The Freshmen “bums” became little more than brawls, and the “rushes” which preceded them were specimens of manly but unsportsmanlike conduct. 23

President Pynchon (called “Old Pynch” by the students) 24 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.” 25 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. 26 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. 27 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. 28 And the campus social life—the musical clubs, the
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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, for on occasion the Faculty even broke up groups of students engaged in conversation on the chapel steps. Washington's Birthday, one of the favorite Trinity holidays, passed without celebration. 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. So the vicious cycle continued. As the Faculty became more severe, the students became more disrespectful. And since so much of the faculty-undergraduate controversy centered about the College Chapel, the students demanded the abolition of compulsory attendance. 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." 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, 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.

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.

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 DIVERS 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.44

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.”45 Perhaps the students were taking comfort in the rumor which was going the rounds that Pynchon would soon be out as President.46

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 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."69

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.71

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." The offices of the House of Convocation at this particular point were men who were hardly likely to accept rebuff graciously. The Dean of Convocation was the Reverend Dr. George Morgan Hills '47 of Point Pleasant, New Jersey, a parish priest who had distinguished himself as an ecclesiastical historian by the publication of no fewer than nine books and who had lectured on Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in Burlington College in New Jersey. The Vice-Dean was the Honorable William Hamersley '58, then a Hartford attorney who had, incidentally, a rather low opinion of President Pynchon. The Secretary was William E. Curtis '75, son of Judge Curtis '43, who had served as College Trustee from 1857 until 1880 and, as principal founder of the New York Alumni Association, had been one of the College's staunchest friends. Treasurer was Sydney George Fisher '79, the leader in the "singing episode" of 1879. The two additional members of the Executive Board ("Delecti," as they were called in Convocation terminology) were Professor Hart and the Reverend John J. McCook, Rector of St. John's Church, East Hartford.

Although the make-up of the Executive Board of the House of Convocation was to change with the election of Hamersley to the Board of Trustees, the others, including Hamersley's successor, Erastus Winslow Williams '53, continued to press Convocation's case for alumni representation. The joint committee of Trustees and Alumni studied the question of alumni representation at other colleges and wrote letters of inquiry to the Trinity graduates asking to know the wishes of the individual members of Convocation. On March 14, 1882, the committee presented a report to the Trustees who had then met in special session. The report stated that in six colleges (Bates, Brown, Dartmouth, Oberlin, Williams, and Pennsylvania), the Alumni nominated a portion of the membership of the governing board and that at ten colleges (Yale, Cornell, Amherst, Union, Hamilton, Wesleyan, Iowa, Hobart, Ohio Wesleyan, and Harvard) the Alumni directly elected a portion of the Board. The Committee favored the method of direct election, and a proposal was made to amend the Trinity Charter so as to provide for the election of three Trustees to serve for terms of three years.

When the Trustees received the Report of the Committee on Alumni Representation, they went on record as favoring the plan, and a Trustee Committee was appointed to effect the change in the College Charter. At the Legislative Session of 1883, the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut passed an act amending the College Charter in exactly the form recommended by the Convocation-Trustee Committee.

At the same time that the plans were being
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 noncommittal 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...
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.\textsuperscript{126} The Trustees accepted Smith's conditions and voted at once to provide a President's mansion on the campus.\textsuperscript{127}

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.\textsuperscript{128} Thus ended the short, unhappy reign of Thomas Ruggles Pynchon.
A New Regime

If the students at Trinity College were wondering what sort of man had been selected to succeed "Old Pynch," they were soon supplied with a most attractive description by the Trinity Tablet. George Williamson Smith was portrayed as a man of great executive ability; "an excellent disciplinarian, though only so far as discipline is duty"; one possessed of "good, practical common sense, combined with a large experience," "no quibbler over particulars," but "one thorough in his work"; possessed of "a wonderful knowledge of men and things," able to "analyze them very quickly" and one who "can read a man at first sight"; of a "warm, hospitable disposition," always taking "the bright side of everything," laughing at trouble, and "always bringing matters to a favorable result." The physical description was equally impressive: "of fine physique, over six feet in height, broad shouldered, and straight as an arrow." Here was, indeed, a man who could re-make Trinity College, and one who, "through his many years already spent among young men," had "acquired a thorough knowledge of them," and who would doubtless want to revive the spirit which had prevailed at Trinity in the good old days of Abner Jackson.

Others, too, expected great things from President-elect Smith. In announcing the appointment to the Alumni, the Trustees' committee which had been appointed to communicate the invitation to the new President used the occasion to "urge upon every Alumnus and every friend of the College the great desirableness of immediate and earnest efforts to secure an increase in students and endowments." Smith's election really was the occasion and not the reason for this announcement, for ever since the resignation of President Pynchon those connected with the affairs of the College had begun to think in very expansive terms, and the committee's communication to the Alumni was just another manifestation of this spirit.

In November, 1882, the College was honored by the presence of several of Germany's most distinguished scientists. Dr. Gustave Mueller of the Astro-Physical Observatory at Potsdam, Dr. Fritz Deischmueller of the Observatory at Bonn, and two assistants set up permanent headquarters on the Trinity campus where they were to observe the Transit of Venus on December 6. For over a month, the four astronomers were quartered in two large suites of rooms (Seabury 18 and 19). On the site of the present Student Center they set up several pre-fabricated wooden structures which were to accommodate their thirty-three cases of instruments, the total weight of which was, incidentally, seven tons.

The German scientists were surprised to learn that Trinity College had neither an astronomical observatory nor instruction in Astronomy other than a brief introduction for Juniors taught during the Trinity Term as part of the course in Natural Philosophy. In view of the unusual publicity given to the German astronomers in the public press, it was somewhat embarrassing to admit that the campus selected by the most important observing group in the scientific world was not the great scientific center the general public might reasonably assume it to be. The Board of Fellows, long largely inactive, rose to the occasion and issued a circular letter "To the Alumni and Friends of Trinity College" in which...
George Williamson Smith
they urged setting up of "a complete Apparatus and Endowment for the study of Astronomy and for Astronomical observations," including the finest instruments that could be procured.

And while they were making their appeal to Alumni and friends, the Board of Fellows also urged the erection of a residence for the President-elect, a new gymnasium, a library, a museum, a chapel building, an endowment to maintain the proposed structures, and additional professorships and scholarships so as to enlarge both Faculty and student body. In other words, now that President Pynchon, the one who had been so instrumental in modifying the original Burges plan for the campus quadrangle, was leaving, the Board of Fellows was urging that the larger plans for the Trinity campus be carried out and that they be carried out at once. Northam Towers was then nearing completion, and the funds had been provided by a single benefactor and at no expense to the College. Might not others similarly contribute toward the completion of the Trinity campus?

The appeal of the Board of Fellows was well received. Dr. Samuel B. St. John of Hartford presented several telescopes to the College with the understanding that an observatory be erected. The Trustees voted to use the $2,500 bequest of E. Winslow Wilson, which had come to the College in 1864, and within a year the small but, for the time, adequate, St. John Observatory was completed on the south part of the campus. At this time, too, the Trustees had voted to erect a President's mansion, and this building (completed in 1885) was under construction when George Williamson Smith took office as President of the College.

From the last two years of the Pynchon administration, one thing had been apparent at the College: the Trustees and Alumni were responding to all sorts of challenges which represented attempts to improve the College. The House of Convocation had pressed for alumni representation on the Board of Trustees; a local alumni group had set into motion the chain of events which resulted in the resignation of President Pynchon; the Board of Fellows had inspired the creation of the Astronomical Observatory; and a demand from the President-elect had resulted in the provision of a home for the College's head. Now it was the turn of the students to make their demand.

The old gymnasium, which had been removed to the new campus from its former location, had never been really satisfactory. It was small, unsightly, unheated, and poorly equipped. In a circular letter to the Alumni dated January 26, 1883, the Trinity College Athletic Association presented the case for more adequate facilities for athletics at the College. No pains were spared in pointing out the old gymnasium's deficiencies, and a not-too-well-concealed hint was offered that a new gymnasium would be a most useful addition to the college facilities. Again, the challenge was taken up, and with contributions by Junius S. Morgan, Esq., Robert H. Coleman '77, and others, the gymnasium, elaborately furnished with up-to-date athletic facilities, was dedicated as Alumni Hall in 1887.

A year later (1888), the Jarvis Physical Laboratory was completed and this building, too, was erected largely upon the insistence of an interested party—in this case, Professor Henry Carrington Bolton, Professor of Chemistry and Natural Science since 1877. Bolton was perhaps the brightest star on the Faculty at that time, and his services were much valued. It was he who had re-directed Trinity's instruction in science along the more modern lines and who, by his personal popularity among the students, had made scientific study at Trinity not only "re-
spectable," but popular as well. Although Bolton had personally supervised the fitting of the scientific facilities in Seabury Hall, by the mid-1880's they had become totally inadequate—especially with the appointment of a Professor of Physics (L. M. Cheesman, Ph.D.) and the prospect of a Professorship in Biology. It was thus largely by the efforts of Professor Bolton that George A. Jarvis of Brooklyn, New York, was induced to erect the Jarvis Physical Laboratory, a brick building with full facilities for the teaching of Physics and Chemistry.

Apparent to everybody was the interest and activity of the Alumni of Trinity College—whether acting as a general association, as local alumni groups, or as individuals. The Trinity Tablet of December 18, 1883, observed that the "great and enthusiastic interest of the alumni in the affairs of the College...is unprecedented among Trinity men." For many years, the old alumni organization—the House of Convocation—had been practically dormant and had, indeed, been the object of mild ridicule by the undergraduates. The editors of the Tablet had once referred to the House of Convocation as "a befrilled and mysterious title for the plain and moderate men known as the graduates of the College," and the Tablet had further suggested that the annual meetings of the Convocation be dropped because they interfered with the alumni meetings of the secret societies, which the Tablet went on to describe as "the bones and sinew of the College." But it was Convocation, it will be remembered, that led the movement to secure alumni representation on the Board of Trustees. And it was with the election in 1883 of the first Alumni Trustees—E. Winslow Williams, Luke A. Lockwood, and Thomas Gallaudet, all men who had been active in collegiate reform—that the general Alumni Association took on a new life.

In June of 1883, the House of Convocation,
perhaps wishing to regularize their terminology with that of the organized alumni of sister colleges, petitioned the Trustees to change the name of Convocation to the Association of the Alumni of Trinity College and to permit the use of the conventional English titles of the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer, instead of the old Latin ones. The Trustees made the desired change. 19

From time to time, Alumni wrote to the Tablet and to the public press urging generous giving to Alma Mater, and in the fall of 1883 a Committee was appointed by the officers of the Alumni Association to raise funds for specific objects—the President’s house, scientific equipment, and new Professorships. Sub-committees were formed to canvas various sections of the country, particularly the large cities—Chicago, Savannah, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Hartford—where local Alumni Associations were in existence.20

It was, in large degree, through the local groups that the general Alumni Association was to work. The New York Association was, of course, the first to have been founded, but the New England Alumni Association dated from perhaps as early as 1877.21 In 1880, an Alumni Association was organized in Pittsburgh,22 and in 1881 the Philadelphia Alumni formed a similar group, but interestingly only after the Trinity graduates there had joined with the alumni of the University of Pennsylvania, Yale, Harvard, and Princeton in organizing the University Club of Philadelphia.23 In 1883, a Trinity Alumni Association was even organized in far-away Georgia, and before many years had passed there were Trinity Alumni Associations in California and Maryland.24

One of President Smith’s first acts was to prepare a full statement of the College’s finances and to circulate it among the Alumni. Nothing else that he could have done would have won more confidence for George Williamson Smith, for the Alumni at last felt that they were being taken into the inner circle of the institution. The response by the local associations was to invite the new President to their meetings. In New York, the Alumni met at the Fifth Avenue Hotel on October 31, 1883, and George Williamson Smith was the honored guest. As the Association’s President reported, the meeting was called “for the special purpose of having a talk with our new president and learning from him what the college needed and what it is doing.” The New York Alumni were not to be disappointed, for President Smith stated the needs of the College in elaborate detail—scholarships, scientific apparatus, and a house for the President. Nor was Smith disappointed; several members made subscriptions to the individual purposes “on the spot.”25 In January, 1884, Smith was the guest of the New England Alumni at a meeting in Hartford, and there he inspired similar confidence by his frank and informal manner.26

The Alumni Fund drive was a tremendous success.27 During the College’s fiscal year of 1884–1885, the Alumni made donations of $2,260.28 The following year Alumni contributions totalled $2,510.29 1886–1887 saw a contribution of $10,960 for the gymnasium, a considerable portion of it from the Alumni,30 and in 1887–1888 there were large alumni donations for various college purposes.31 In 1889, the College Treasurer was able to report an Alumni Fund of $4,880 as one of the College’s financial assets.32 And, by 1888, the President could boast that within the last year the College had increased the endowment by over $110,000!33 So far as the Alumni and the finances of the College were concerned, the administration of George Williamson Smith had, to say the least, gotten off to a good start.
With the undergraduates, too, Smith was an immediate success. Although the Tablet was to admit that the first flattering description of the new President had been based on the reports of the Trustees, they soon found George Williamson Smith to be a man very much to their liking. Hardly had the new President made his appearance on the campus, when the editor of the Tablet became rhapsodic regarding the new administration. "There has been," he wrote, "a new infusion of life into the hearts of all the undergraduates and particularly the upperclassmen, who have seen the great effects of the change, and who more than any others appreciate the new state of things." And, in another column, the Tablet reported that the "old conservatism" which had long characterized the College had been broken and that the administration had shown the new spirit by allowing the students to paint the walls of their rooms in bright colors—"brick-dust to light blue"—and that the entire student body had evidenced a new enthusiasm for studies and for athletics.

And this was more than mere undergraduate journalistic nonsense. Changes had been made. In the fall of 1883, it seemed that there had been an entirely new Faculty, for with Professors Pynchon and Bolton on leave, only two of the old Faculty—Professors Hart and Beckwith—were actually meeting classes. Likewise, there seemed to be a new student body. Whereas the number of undergraduates had dropped to a low of sixty-six during the last year of President Pynchon's unhappy reign, the number of students increased rapidly, so that by 1884-1885 there were eighty-two undergraduates, and by 1887-1888 the student body had reached a new high of one hundred and twelve.

President Smith returned the compliment and noted in his first report to the Board of Trustees that "the conduct of the students has been uniformly excellent." The Faculty, too, rewarded the students' expression of confidence in the new regime. Within a year, most of the old rules which had so long restricted the students' conduct were abolished and as the Tablet reported, the students "no longer...[had] fines imposed for drinking beer, or playing cards." So seriously had the students come to regard their own correct deportment that in March, 1884, they proposed that Trinity follow the example of several other colleges in creating a "Senate, composed of Faculty and representative students from the four classes." Then, said the Tablet, "disorders on the part of the students would be unknown."

In November of 1885, George Williamson Smith was elected Bishop of Easton, the Episcopal diocese of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The students were shocked to learn of the probability of losing their new but already beloved President. A student meeting was held, and a resolution was drawn up which strongly urged Smith to decline the Bishopric. The resolution declared that the loss of President Smith would be "a blow to the college which it could ill afford to sustain." Trustees and others joined in the appeal to keep George Williamson Smith at Trinity. Smith declined the consecration, and the student body was elated. The new President doubtless felt that he was so much at home in his new situation that it would be impossible for him to leave. Just before Christmas vacation President Smith, as the Tablet reported, "gave a large reception to Hartford society, and to the faculty and students of the college. This occasion was much appreciated by the students."

George Williamson Smith seemed truly to have infused a new life into the affairs of the College, for with the undergraduates and particularly the upperclassmen, who more than any others appreciate the new spirit by allowing the students to paint the walls of their rooms in bright colors—"brick-dust to light blue"—and that the entire student body had evidenced a new enthusiasm for studies and for athletics.

And this was more than mere undergraduate journalistic nonsense. Changes had been made. In the fall of 1883, it seemed that there had been an entirely new Faculty, for with Professors Pynchon and Bolton on leave, only two of the old Faculty—Professors Hart and Beckwith—were actually meeting classes. Likewise, there seemed to be a new student body. Whereas the number of undergraduates had dropped to a low of sixty-six during the last year of President Pynchon's unhappy reign, the number of students increased rapidly, so that by 1884-1885 there were eighty-two undergraduates, and by 1887-1888 the student body had reached a new high of one hundred and twelve.

President Smith returned the compliment and noted in his first report to the Board of Trustees that "the conduct of the students has been uniformly excellent." The Faculty, too, rewarded the students' expression of confidence in the new regime. Within a year, most of the old rules which had so long restricted the students' conduct were abolished and as the Tablet reported, the students "no longer...[had] fines imposed for drinking beer, or playing cards." So seriously had the students come to regard their own correct deportment that in March, 1884, they proposed that Trinity follow the example of several other colleges in creating a "Senate, composed of Faculty and representative students from the four classes." Then, said the Tablet, "disorders on the part of the students would be unknown."

In November of 1885, George Williamson Smith was elected Bishop of Easton, the Episcopal diocese of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The students were shocked to learn of the probability of losing their new but already beloved President. A student meeting was held, and a resolution was drawn up which strongly urged Smith to decline the Bishopric. The resolution declared that the loss of President Smith would be "a blow to the college which it could ill afford to sustain." Trustees and others joined in the appeal to keep George Williamson Smith at Trinity. Smith declined the consecration, and the student body was elated. The new President doubtless felt that he was so much at home in his new situation that it would be impossible for him to leave. Just before Christmas vacation President Smith, as the Tablet reported, "gave a large reception to Hartford society, and to the faculty and students of the college. This occasion was much appreciated by the students."

George Williamson Smith seemed truly to have infused a new life into the affairs of the College and it seemed, indeed, that there was to be a return to the halcyon days of Abner Jackson.

Quite obvious was the revived interest in athletic sports which, unfortunately, had all but disappeared from the Trinity scene during the Pynchon days. In 1876, the Tablet noted that the students then showed very little enthusiasm for sports, and that such physical exercise as the undergraduates had was around the billiard table. In October of that year, however, the students had met off-campus and, without faculty approval, formed the Trinity College Football Association. During the autumn months several "pick-up" games were played by the Trinity students.

Intercollegiate football competition came in
the fall of 1877 when a Trinity team, wearing canvas shirts which had been thoroughly greased with lard, lost to Yale, 13 to 0. The canvas shirt was, incidentally, a Trinity "first," for it was soon adopted (without the grease) by other colleges and for a number of years remained a part of the collegiate football uniform. Two more losses to Yale the following year (1878) brought an end to Trinity varsity football during the Pynchon administration. The only other game played before the arrival of President Smith was in 1881 when a Trinity freshman team played their Wesleyan counterparts at Middletown. That game was declared a draw after President Beach of Wesleyan marched onto the field, seized the ball, and ordered his charges into the classroom, under penalty of suspension.44

But the coming of George Williamson Smith, plus the arrival on campus in the fall of 1883 of several freshmen football enthusiasts, marked the beginning of an intercollegiate football competition that was to be unbroken until the days of World War II.45 In 1884, Trinity played Williams and Harvard, but failed to score against either. In 1885, Trinity's one-game season was a 6-60 loss to Wesleyan. 1886 saw two losses to Amherst and one to Lafayette, but in 1887 Trinity defeated the Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, and Stevens Institute; lost to Wesleyan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Dartmouth; and tied Boston University. A most successful season was 1888, for that year Trinity lost to only Worcester Polytechnic Institute, tied Amherst (0-0), and defeated Massachusetts Agricultural College, Worcester Polytechnic Institute (in its first game), Fordham, Stevens Institute, and Amherst (in the first of two games). In 1889, Trinity entered the "big time" in defeating Columbia, 24-4. In that year Trinity was also victorious over Vermont and the University of Rochester, split two-game meets with Wesleyan and Stevens Institute, tied (0-0) the Boston Athletic Association, and lost to Yale by a score of 64-0.

These early contests were spirited, indeed, and were usually marked by a great deal of roughness and violation of rules on both sides. Crowds who witnessed the home games were often quite large, and the Wesleyan game of 1891 drew some 500 spectators. Home games were played on a fenced-in lot on Ward Street until 1890, when the Trustees authorized the grading and draining of a proper athletic field on Broad Street. Professor McCook succeeded in raising $2,000 for the erection of a grandstand, complete with dressing rooms underneath.

John J. McCook was the football team's greatest financial benefactor, but in moral support none could have exceeded Professors Flavel S. Luther and Charles F. "Boo-hoo" Johnson, who had succeeded Edwin S. Johnson as Professor of English Literature. Luther, it is said, always stood on the sidelines and when a player would fumble, he would turn to a nearby undergraduate and say, "Please swear for me." Regarding Johnson, too, there were tales. His nickname, an affectionate one, came from his habit of occasionally beginning sentences with an "explosive" which sounded something like "Boo-hoo." Once in his absent-minded enthusiasm for the team, Professor Johnson wandered from the sideline and onto the playing field and directly into the path of on-coming captain William W. Barber '88. When the undergraduates rushed to the field to assist the prone Professor, Johnson murmured apologetically, "Boo-hoo! Boo-hoo! Guess I must have gotten in Mr. Barber's way."

Baseball, which had first been played at Trinity in the late 1860's, had an early history of "ups-and-downs." In 1876, after a rather dismal season
in which Trinity did not win a single game in college competition, the team was disbanded. There were several attempts to revive the baseball club, but in each instance student interests and energies were either directed toward other sports or completely stifled under the depressing atmosphere of the Pynchon administration. In the late 1870's, for example, there was evidenced some genuine interest in baseball, but at that time cricket, too, made its appearance on the campus. Ever since its founding, St. Paul's School in Concord, New Hampshire, had sent a sizeable delegation to each new Freshman Class at Trinity. Indeed, so large was the St. Paul's group that a formal St. Paul's alumni group was active on campus. Cricket was the leading sport at St. Paul's School, and it was the St. Paul's men who in 1880 introduced the sport. The short-lived Cricket Club lost to Harvard in November of 1880 by a score of 40 to 50. With the baseball team virtually defunct, there was much enthusiasm for cricket, and there was even thought of Trinity's joining the Intercollegiate Cricket Association. It was the cricket team which, incidentally, engaged the first professional coach for a Trinity team—Charles Russell, a professional cricketer who had played on cricket teams in the New York and Philadelphia areas.

But cricket was merely a passing fad and by the spring of 1881 baseball was once more the Trinity (as well as the “American”) game. Each class had its team, and there was a “varsity” which was listed in College publications as “The College Nine” and which, from time to time, played in intercollegiate competition. In 1886, the Trinity Nine played Amherst, Dartmouth, Wesleyan, Lafayette, Lehigh, and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute—winning three and losing three. By 1890, Trinity’s baseball schedule included Wesleyan, Columbia, Rensselaer, Lafayette, Lehigh, the University of Pennsylvania, Brown, and the Massachusetts Agricultural College. The baseball team, too, briefly enjoyed the services of a professional coach. For several weeks during the academic year of 1887–1888, C. J. Ferguson “of the Philadelphia League Team” was on campus, and, as the Icy reported, “the men . . . trained very faithfully.”

Other sports enjoyed brief vogue at Trinity. The old “Coaching Club”—if this truly represented athletic endeavor—was revived from time to time. Annually there were “field meetings” at which the usual track-meet sports were played. Gymnastic enthusiasts organized as the Athletic Association (sometimes called the Gymnastic Association) and this group, which occasionally put on “Gymnastic Exhibitions,” was briefly coached by a Mr. Chase, who had been engaged in the fall of 1881 as “gymnastic instructor.” A Tug-o-War team competed on occasion with the Tug-o-War team from the Hartford Y.M.C.A. “Hare and Hounds” had a considerable following, and intramural competition over a distance of about nine miles accounted for many a Saturday afternoon. One of the strangest sports of all was “Roller Polo,” a cross between ice hockey and field hockey, played on a wooden floor on roller skates with sticks similar to those used in field hockey.

But the sport which most occupied student attention during the 1880’s was Lawn Tennis, a game which was introduced to the United States from England via Bermuda in 1874, and which made its first appearance on the Trinity campus in the fall of 1878 when an undergraduate Lawn Tennis Club was organized with twelve members. On the south-end of the new campus, the Tennis Club laid out a turf court, and a rope was put up to keep out the cows.
An early tennis team

which were pastured on the college grounds. The game "took hold" immediately and, by 1880, "half the student body were swinging rackets." More courts were laid out. Delta Psi claimed her own court on the site of the chancel of the present Chapel, and Psi Upsilon's court was near Seabury Hall. By the spring of 1881, there were three tennis clubs, and a year later there were five. By 1883, six clubs were in existence at Trinity, and all were federated into the Trinity College Lawn Tennis Association, from which were selected the members of the Trinity varsity tennis team. The Trinity College Tennis Association began intercollegiate competition in October, 1882, the year of the Association's organization, by splitting a two-game series with Amherst.

On April 17, 1883, Trinity again made athletic history when, on Trinity's invitation, representatives from Amherst, Brown, and Yale met in Hartford to found the Intercollegiate Lawn Tennis Association. Frank W. Richardson '84 was elected the association's first president. Harvard joined the association a few weeks later.

The first intercollegiate meet of the association was held in Hartford on June 7, 8, and 9, 1883, on the grounds of what is now the Institute of Living on Washington Street. At the second meeting of the Intercollegiate Tennis Association held on October 9, 1883, membership was extended to include Columbia, Princeton, Williams, and the University of Pennsylvania. At the October meet, the Trinity Tennis team, incidentally, wore for the first time the newly-adopted college colors of dark blue and old gold, a combination of colors which the Harvard Lampoon was to describe in 1884 as "Blue and Mustard."

From the very beginning, Trinity was a "power" in intercollegiate tennis. The selection of three Trinity men out of the first five association presidents gave this sport, which alone had survived the darkest days of the Pynchon regime, a special "status" at the College. In April of 1887, the Tablet reported that almost everybody in the College was playing tennis, and in May of the same year the Tablet, "plugging" for five new tennis courts, declared that "probably, on the average, more tennis is played here at Trinity than at any other college in the country."

The enthusiasm for the sport bore fruit in the intercollegiate competition, for in the first eight tournaments, played either at Hartford or at the New Haven Lawn Club, Trinity ranked fourth out of ten in comparative standing of the Association Colleges, being placed below only Columbia, Harvard, and Yale. By the end of the first decade of intercollegiate competition, only two colleges exceeded Trinity in the number of tournament prizes won. Trinity's interest and success in lawn tennis continued until 1896. Largely because Trinity's student body had failed to keep up to the size of the student bodies of competing colleges, such institutions as Harvard, Princeton, Cornell, Pennsylvania, and Yale seemed too formidable, and Trinity withdrew from Intercollegiate Lawn Tennis Association competition.

Trinity's prominent (indeed, dominant) part in the founding of the Intercollegiate Lawn Tennis Association inspired other college teams to seek membership in similar intercollegiate groups. In 1887, Trinity united with Amherst, Dartmouth, Brown, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Stevens Institute to form the Eastern Inter-Collegiate Foot Ball Association. Trinity was quite active in this Association, and a Trinity man, Willard Scudder '89, was once elected secretary. Interestingly, it was in 1887 that Trinity declined membership in a baseball
league which was to include Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, the University of Pennsylvania, Stevens Institute, St. John's College, and Wesleyan, the reason for declining being the great distance of several of the member colleges. Trinity at that time preferred to affiliate with the regional Intercollegiate Baseball League, comprised of colleges ranging (geographically) from Princeton to Dartmouth. At a meeting of the New England-centered group held in Springfield in March, 1887, Yale, Princeton, and Harvard resigned, and this left places for new member colleges. Trinity and Williams both applied to fill the vacancies. Williams was admitted provisionally with the understanding that it prove that two of its players were not professionals. Trinity was refused, having been blackballed by Amherst and Dartmouth. In view of the old unpleasantness between Trinity and Amherst, which went back to Trinity's first baseball season, it is not difficult to understand this hostility, but what was truly amazing was the fact that Trinity's chief supporter for admission to the league was Brown, a club which had once been just as unfriendly as Amherst, but which by 1887 had come to be Trinity's most friendly rival.

A year later, Trinity's bid for membership in the American Intercollegiate Baseball League was successful. In 1889, Trinity also joined the Inter-Collegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, an organization which had been founded in 1875 and whose membership included such distant institutions as the University of Vermont and the University of Michigan.

Although Trinity's student body had remained comparatively small, the College had been able to compete more-or-less successfully with institutions several times her size. Athletic facilities, while not comparable to those of several of the larger colleges, were adequate for a student body of a little over one hundred. The class teams and the fraternity teams, which engaged in constant intramural competition, were steady feeders to the varsity teams. The Faculty were ardent in their support of the athletic program and genuinely concerned for the well-being of the college athletes. Alumni, too, rallied behind the teams and gave moral support and more tangible support as well. In 1891, a Graduate Athletic Committee was formed, as the Tablet put it, to give the undergraduates "the additional advantage of the carefully formed and conservative judgment of older men." Actually, the Graduate Athletic Committee was to see that the athletic clubs did not squander the money in the club treasuries and to raise money among the Alumni for support of the teams. And, in a way, the Graduate Athletic Committee was to act as an impartial judge in determining team membership. Traditionally, the teams had been elected by the students on the basis of popularity. Under the new system, the Graduate Committee would approve all elections and dismiss from the rosters all members who were unable to demonstrate competence on the several teams. All of these factors were conducive to success in Trinity's athletic competition. But still another, and certainly not of the least importance, must be mentioned—Trinity's close relation to the Episcopal Church. The College Calendar had always been carefully synchronized with the Church year. Saints' days may have come and gone without particular notice, but Lent was one season which called for special observance. Between Ash Wednesday and Easter Monday no social events were ever scheduled, and this meant that the spring athletic training could begin. Although the students occasionally chafed under this restriction upon their social life, there can be no doubt that this early beginning of "spring-training" was a definite advantage.
One of Trinity's biggest athletic (as well as social) events occurred in the summer of 1889 when Robert H. Coleman '77, who had just been elected to the Board of Trustees, invited the Senatus Academicus (Corporation, Faculty, and Alumni) and the undergraduates to Mount Gretna, Pennsylvania, for an "outing" which lasted from June 28 to July 6. Originally, Coleman had intended to have the Trinity baseball team use his private railway car for a tour of Pennsylvania. Upon second thought, however, Coleman decided to invite the entire College, both past and present, and to have the ball games all played at Mount Gretna. And to provide for their accommodation, one hundred and eighty tents—complete with floorboards, cots, and washstands—were set up as "Camp Trinity" on the shore of Lake Conewago. Additional tents served as post office, telegraph office, reading room, barber shop, and newsstand. A dining pavilion and bandstand were erected, and a baseball field with grandstand, football field, and tennis courts were specially laid out for the occasion.

One hundred and fifty-nine undergraduates and graduates of the College, with representatives of classes as far back as 1846 and 1850, arrived at the camp on June 28. For nine days they were treated to such a round of athletic and musical entertainment as defies imagination. Seven baseball games were played: Trinity Varsity, 27-Cornell, 4; Trinity Alumni, 45-Cornell, 19; Trinity, 3-University of Pennsylvania, 1 (game called after two innings because of rain); Trinity 10-University of Pennsylvania, 0; Trinity, 1-Lafayette, 1 (game called); Trinity, 5-Lafayette, 6; Trinity, 27-Cornell, 2. There were tub races and boat races, tennis matches, climbs of 1,200-foot Mount Governor Dick, and field events of all sorts. Between the athletic events there were visits to the nearby source of Mr. Coleman's wealth, the Coleman ore banks, the Pennsylvania Steel Works, and the Coleman Iron Furnaces at Lebanon. On July 4, there were fireworks, ring dances, marches, etc., and each evening there were concerts by the Perseverance Band of Lebanon and the Trinity Glee Club.

The students were understandably amazed at Mr. Coleman's hospitality, and the Tablet was lavish in its praise of Trinity's generous Alumnus who had contributed an endowment for Alumni Hall, who had been the donor of the chapel organ, and who had provided the funds for the erection of the first fraternity chapter house on the Trinity campus.

Coleman sent souvenir photographs to the
guests of Camp Trinity, gave the baseball team $50.00 for each game won, and sponsored the baseball team's Easter-vacation trip in 1890. Trinity reciprocated the interest. The Tablet made a point of noting Coleman's coming and goings, his winter visits to Florida, and his solicitude for the well-being of the hundreds of workmen in his extensive iron and steel operations. At Alumni Day of 1890, over two-hundred Trinity graduates awarded a handsome silver loving cup to their idol, and in 1892 Robert Habersham Coleman was elected to his third term as Alumni Trustee of Trinity College.

But there was an unhappy sequel to this story. Not content to limit his business operations to those which he had inherited from his father, Coleman invested heavily in the railroads of the American Southland—particularly in rapidly-developing Florida. In the Panic of 1893, the railroads in which Coleman had invested so heavily were bankrupted, and Trinity's genial benefactor lost his entire fortune. Tradition has it that he placed all his worldly goods in a few suitcases, which he put into a carriage, and drove from his Cornwall mansion never to return. Nor did he ever return to Trinity. From 1893 until his death in 1930, he lived in seclusion at Saranac Lake, New York.97

In the rejuvenation of Trinity College under George Williamson Smith, social organizations, as well as athletic teams, showed a marked vitality. During this period, the fraternities developed along patterns which were to continue well on into the twentieth century. And in a way, it was Robert H. Coleman who changed the Greek-letter societies at Trinity from the older "secret societies" to the modern fraternities. While the buildings on the new campus were under construction, Coleman, who was a prominent and active member of Delta Psi, offered to erect a chapter house near the College, provided the alumni members of Epsilon Chapter would purchase a tract of land. A building lot at 340 Summit Street was purchased in 1877 and a chapter house, designed by J. Cleveland Cady98 of New York and built by John E. Sidman of New York, was completed in April, 1878, at a cost of $28,000.

St. Anthony Hall, as the Delta Psi house has always been known, was intended to harmonize with the "Gothic" buildings designed for the College by William Burges. And indeed, the suggestion has often been made that Burges rather than Cady was the actual designer of the Hall. In 1875, Burges designed a London residence for himself in what he called thirteenth-century style, and even the most casual comparison of Burges' residence and St. Anthony's Hall as to both exterior and floor plan will suggest that there is here a more than accidental similarity.100

The lavish building excited much comment in Hartford, and the rumor that the fraternity had gone heavily into debt prompted the trustees of the chapter to publish notices in the local newspapers stating that the new property was entirely free and clear of any financial obligation.99

At any rate, architecturally, the Delta Psi House was a radical departure from the customary "tomb-like" structures of the secret societies on other campuses.101 And socially, Delta Psi had moved to an advantageous position on campus, while the rival fraternities still maintained their chapter rooms in downtown Hartford.

When Delta Psi first announced plans to build
a chapter house, the other societies began to think along the same lines. In May, 1877, the College's oldest secret society announced that "plans for a lodge to be built by the I.K.A. Fraternity of Trinity, have already been drawn." Unfortunately, however, I.K.A. had no wealthy alumnus to provide the funds, and it was not until 1882 that a chapter house, St. Elmo's Hall, was erected. Beta Beta, too, had hopes of erecting a chapter house. The Colt Trust, which had been set up in 1872 by the graduate members of the society, had been intended for that purpose, but by 1879 the fund amounted to only $7,000. Generous contributions by alumni members, however, enabled the society in 1884 to build a handsome building at Washington and Park Streets, which, although somewhat distant from the campus, was then described as one of the most handsome structures in the city. In 1902, the fourteen-room house at 81 Vernon Street was purchased, and Beta Beta, too, moved to the Campus.

In 1879, the fraternity picture at Trinity College had been much changed when on December 20 of that year Phi Kappa became a chapter of Alpha Delta Phi, one of the oldest of the country's national fraternities with chapters at most of the leading colleges and one which had, by tradition, made a point of pledging men with literary tastes. Before 1877, all of the Trinity Fraternities had been locals except Delta Psi, and the affiliation of Phi Kappa with Alpha Delta Phi set up a balance of two "locals" and two "nationals," which was soon upset when in 1879 Delta Kappa Epsilon established a chapter at Trinity. Delta Kappa Epsilon was one of the larger "nationals," having forty-four chapters extending from Maine to California.

But even before Delta Kappa Epsilon was instituted on May 5, Beta Beta had taken action to curb what it regarded as a conspiracy on the part of the "nationals" to capture the college offices. On March 26, 1879, the officers of Beta Beta sent a circular letter to its membership. The letter, signed by David B. Willson, Orlando Holway, and Orr Buffington, noted that Delta Psi and Alpha Delta Phi had captured the offices in the Baseball Club, the Athletic Association, and the Boat Club. I.K.A., Beta Beta's natural ally as a "local," helped to "pressure" the "nationals" into entering into an agreement regarding the college offices. A "treaty" was soon signed, and the fraternities generously included the "neutrals" "as though they constituted a body." The four fraternities agreed that the five officers of the Senior Class (President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Chronicler), the Poet on Washington's Birthday, and the Commencement Marshals were to be rotated among the five groups. Exception was to be made only in the case of Class Day appointments, which were to be made on merit and without regard to connection. Although it was planned that the "treaty" was to be in effect for five years, it was probably never put into operation, for within a few months the coming of Delta Kappa Epsilon upset the schedule of rotation which had been agreed upon. When the idea of dividing offices according to fraternities was revived in 1887, the "neutrals" declared the election for class officers to have been invalid, and a new election was called.

The defensive position taken by Beta Beta in 1879 pointed up the weak position of the "local" fraternity and soon Beta Beta, the defender of
the rights of the "locals," too, became a chapter of a "national." In 1880, Beta Beta became the Beta Beta Chapter of Psi Upsilon.113

The coming of George Williamson Smith to Trinity in 1883 had little immediate effect on the fraternity system. At Hobart College, Smith had belonged to Theta Delta Chi, but his loyalties to his fraternity and to the fraternity system do not seem to have been particularly strong. Thus it may be said that his policies at Trinity College neither contributed to, nor detracted from, the system. Indirectly, however, the Smith administration had its effect on the fraternity system. There was an increase of the student body, and during the first five years of President Smith's administration there was a doubling of the number of the students. And, although there were two new fraternities, each society continued to admit but a few men from each class. Consequently, a smaller proportion of undergraduates was admitted to the fraternities, and this led to what the Tablet once described as "cliqueism" on the campus.114 But the Tablet could also deplore the criticism of those "writers upon educational topics and moralists" who questioned the value of the fraternity system. In defense of fraternities, the Tablet argued that in any college community, cliques would be formed, whether called fraternities or not, and that abuses, such as putting incompetent men into college office, would not invalidate the system itself. Rather, argued the Tablet, the fraternities were a positive good, as they exercised a restraining influence upon the members.115

There was, of course, much to be said for the Tablet's argument. And perhaps, too, the fraternity situation at Trinity did not deserve the castigations of the critics of the fraternity system in general. Although the fraternities were, by their very nature, socially exclusive, the Trinity fraternities generally recognized the rights of the "neutrals."116 And even in Trinity campus slang, the non-fraternity men were never called such derogatory names - "fruits," "drips," "black men," or "meat balls" - as on some other campuses.117 The Trinity word for the "neutral" - and it was a perfectly reputable one in the political jargon from which it was borrowed - was "Mugwump."118 Nor does there seem to have developed among the several fraternities a hierarchy of esteem which depended upon the age of the local chapter or on the overall standing of the national fraternity.119 Each of the Trinity fraternities had its share of campus leaders, and each could boast of the large number of its graduate members who had succeeded in business or in the professions. None of the societies could have been characterized as being "grubby."120

The Tablet was, of course, eminently correct when it described the fraternity system as a restraining force on the campus. Many of the most pleasant social functions were sponsored by the fraternities. The annual reunion dinners held during Commencement Week were eagerly looked forward to,121 and fraternity dances were high days in the College's social calendar.122 And during the rushing season the Freshman ate and drank "at the expense of his new and strangely enthusiastic friends, until he grew fat and sleek as a lizard."123

But those not selected to membership in the enchanted circle could easily become bitter, and in some instances one not elected to a fraternity could remember the slight for the rest of his life.124 Many Freshmen must have been amazed at the workings of a system whereby, as the Tablet once described it, "a man's whole future may depend upon the cut of his coat."125

Even though fraternity houses had appeared on the Trinity campus, it was some considerable time before fraternity life settled into the pattern of fraternity-house living. The first chapter houses were meeting places comparable to the older chapter rooms which the secret societies had maintained in the college buildings or in the business section of Hartford. The chapter houses were places in which to hold fraternity meetings, to gather of an afternoon, or to entertain Alumni and guests during Commencement Week. None of them had facilities for either dining or sleeping, although something of an exception may be made in the case of Delta Kappa Epsilon which, when the Commons was closed in 1882, rented
“eating quarters” at 73 Allen Place while still maintaining the Chapter Room at Number 20, Hartford Times Building.

There were, however, sections of the college dormitories occupied exclusively by members of the several fraternities. I.K.A. occupied Section 5 of Jarvis Hall, Delta Psi occupied Jarvis 6 through 12, and Psi Upsilon lived in Center Seabury.

In the spring of 1890, Alpha Delta Phi announced that the fraternity intended to build a chapter house on Vernon Street. And especially pleasing to President Smith was the plan to provide dining facilities and rooms for six or eight students, an agreement which, he felt, would relieve the pressure of over-crowded dormitories.

When the Alpha Delta Phi House was completed during the summer of 1890, six members of the fraternity took rooms in the new house. Thus was set the precedent which was later to be followed by the other fraternities.

Just as Alpha Delta Phi was about to move to the fraternity’s new quarters, the old squabble about college offices began all over again—this time over Class Day speakers. Although the elections involved only the Seniors, the fraternities themselves became quite bitter toward each other, and it became apparent that the “nationals” had lined up against the single remaining “local,” I.K.A. At the senior election, the Class Day appointments went to two men from Alpha Delta Phi, two from Psi Upsilon, two from Delta Psi, one from Delta Kappa Epsilon, and one non-fraternity man. When the Delta Kappa Epsilon man resigned as Class Poet, an Alpha Delta Phi man was elected in his place. As no I.K.A. man had been elected, the three Seniors from I.K.A. wrote to Alpha Delta Phi demanding that an Alpha Delta Phi man resign and that an I.K.A. man be allowed to take his place. Alpha Delta Phi, quite understandably, insisted that all the men had been properly elected and without regard to fraternity membership. Having been thus rebuffed, the three I.K.A. men resigned from the Senior Class and announced plans to hold a Class Day of their own. This was choice local news for the Hartford papers. The Hartford Post conducted an elaborate investigation into the matter and determined, to the paper’s own satisfaction at least, that the election had been deter-
fortunate, for that fraternity prospered, soon acquired a chapter house, and enjoyed more than three decades of usefulness at Trinity.

Alpha Chi Rho was the only national fraternity to have been founded on the Trinity campus, and the story of Alpha Chi Rho's origins begin with the rejection of a fraternity "legacy." In 1894, the Reverend Paul Ziegler '72, a member of old Beta Beta, proposed his son, Carl G. Ziegler, and a close friend, Herbert F. Sheriff, as pledges to Psi Upsilon. When the two were rejected by Psi Upsilon, the elder Ziegler, a prominent Detroit clergyman, resolved to found a new fraternity, and during the Christmas holidays of 1894, the two Zieglers and Sheriff laid the plans and drew up an "Exoteric Manual of Alpha Chi Rho."

Upon their return to Trinity, the two undergraduates invited William A. Eardeley '96 and William H. Rouse '96 to join them in getting the new fraternity under way. On June 4, 1895, the four undergraduate organizers held their first session in ritual, and on September 20, 1895, the fraternity was incorporated under the laws of the state of Connecticut.

As the founder was an Episcopalian clergyman, it was not unnatural that Alpha Chi Rho should have been directed toward moral and religious objectives as well as the purely social. So much emphasis was placed upon this facet of the fraternity's activity that it was regarded as quite distinct from the other societies at the College.

The Christian foundation of the fraternity was clearly stated in the Society's Exoteric Manual: "Alpha Chi Rho believes in a God whose moral law is the guide and law of the universe, and in Jesus of Nazareth as the one whose life, above all others, exemplifies such law." But there was also a considerable liberality expressed: "Membership in Alpha Chi Rho is not denied by reason of race, color or religion, but the Fraternity requires that its members look up to Jesus of Nazareth as their moral exemplar."

Considering the circumstances of the fraternity's founding, it was quite to have been expected that many or most of the early members should have been Episcopalians. The moral emphasis of Christian teaching, however, enabled Alpha Chi Rho to admit other than Episcopalians, and even other than Christians. By the end of the century, Alpha Chi Rho could boast of being the largest Trinity fraternity, having a membership in 1898 of twenty-five.

The fraternities at Trinity were a most important element in the college life. One of the true measures of the worth of any institution is its imitation, and in this regard there was considerable emulation and something of an effort to provide fraternity advantages to those who had not been elected to fraternities. In 1878, the Sophomore Class organized "The Clio," which was described as a "Literary Society," but whose membership was to be open to all underclassmen who were not members of a fraternity. A year later "The Clio" became the Alpha Chi Chapter of Delta Kappa Epsilon. A society such as "The Clio" seemed to fill a need, for with the absorption of "The Clio" by Delta Kappa Epsilon, a new but short-lived sophomore secret society was organized, and shortly thereafter a Freshman secret society came into being.

The sophomore society died in infancy, but the freshman society, Sigma Pi Upsilon, prospered and threatened to become a major organization on the campus. The regular fraternities offered vigorous opposition, and by 1888 the rumor was circulated that the Grand Tribunal would take action to suppress it.

The Grand Tribunal? What had happened to the Grand Tribunal during the early years of George Williamson Smith? Or, for that matter, what had happened to Po Pai Paig, Mu Mu Mu, and the other ghoulish groups which had flourished at the College during the 1870's? The Pynchon administration had been particularly hostile to such organizations. Mu Mu Mu had disbanded and Po Pai Paig had "gone underground." In 1881, the active membership of the Grand Tribunal was listed in the Ivy as five, and a year later, the last of the Pynchon regime, no active members were reported. For several years thereafter, i.e., the early years of President Smith, one member was officially reported for the Grand Tribunal. In 1886, Po Pai Paig "came out into the open" and held its annual
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initiation on the front campus. The members appeared in “regalia,” and “the emblem of the order” (a chamber pot filled with beer) was brought forth and its contents passed around until a late hour of the night. Although this was the “swan song” of Po Pai Paig, it was at this same time that the Grand Tribunal was revitalized. Throughout the late 1880’s, the Tribunal’s membership usually was seven, and in 1889 and 1890 it was five. And at that point, the Grand Tribunal dropped from the Trinity scene forever.

In June of 1892, eighteen Juniors organized a society which was, as the Tablet reported, as yet unnamed, but “whose pin was a Medusa’s head.” It was understood that the society was “to be continued as a senior society and handed down from class to class.” The organization was subsequently called “The Medusa’s Head,” the “Senior Honor Society,” and finally “Medusa.” Although the purpose was probably primarily social and modeled on the senior societies at Yale, Medusa ultimately assumed an important place in the student government at the College as the agency “responsible for the maintenance of College tradition.” Although it may be questioned whether Medusa is the direct successor to (or the continuation of) the Grand Tribunal, it may also be remembered that the Tribunal had been brought into existence in the 1840’s for the same purpose.

The fraternal, if not the fraternity, spirit at Trinity was also reflected in the campus alumni groups which had begun in Reconstruction days with the graduates of the College of St. James who were then at Trinity. During the 1870’s, a St. Paul’s alumni group was both large and active and by the 1880’s there were, from time to time, groups from Shattuck School (Faribault, Minnesota), the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut, Holderness School, St. Albans School, Hartford Public High School, and others.

These alumni societies, of course, varied in size depending on the number of students from the school in any particular year. Because of the wide geographical representation in the student body, and as there was no longer any single school recognized as a Trinity “feeder,” most of the student alumni groups were small. Perhaps their chief function was to provide the occasion for a meal eaten downtown in the dining room of one of the hotels, a pleasant respite from the much-complained-about food served in the College Commons.

This is, of course, speculation, but one campus organization actually was created for the purpose just ascribed to the undergraduate alumni groups. The College Commons had been reopened by President Smith upon his arrival at Trinity, but even the best intentions of the President could not make the College’s eating facilities attractive to the undergraduates. Even allowing for the traditional comparisons made between college food and that which the students had known at home, it would appear that the Commons’ food left much to be desired. The charge for meals in Commons was ridiculously low, and the management changed frequently, as one “proprietor,” as he was called, after another gave up trying to make a living at provid-

**College Commons**

JAMES H. MCDERMOTT, Proprietor.

LEMONADE, for five, 55 Cents.
CHOCOLATE, five, 50 "
" four, 40 "
" three, 30 "
" two, 20 "

Cigars, Cigarettes and Tobaccos.

Meno served at rooms

20 Cents extra.
ing the Trinity collegians with three meals a day.\textsuperscript{163} Several of the less affluent undergraduates solved the “Commons problem” by cooking in their own rooms, using two-burner gas plates to prepare meat and vegetables brought from home and stored in the janitor’s cellar.\textsuperscript{164} Most students, however, worked out the more practical (but more costly) solution of “eating out,” whether alone or in informal groups, or at some formal function of an undergraduate organization. Class banquets began in the 1880’s, and at least once a year each student was able to eat with his class away from campus. Each year the Freshmen gave a banquet for the Juniors and the Sophomores gave one for the Seniors. These class banquets replaced the earlier class “bums.”\textsuperscript{165} On February 15, 1897, several members of the Class of 1899 founded the Sophomore Dining Club with the sole purpose of eating in town several times each year. The meals eaten at Heublein’s, Merrill’s, or Koch’s\textsuperscript{166} would have been sufficient reason for the Dining Club’s existence, but in the course of time the club assumed campus responsibilities which made them most useful members of the college community.\textsuperscript{167}

Phi Beta Kappa continued to honor outstanding scholarship in the Arts and Sciences and went its unobtrusive way. One high spot occurred on June 26, 1895, when Beta of Connecticut celebrated its Fiftieth Anniversary with a public convocation held in Alumni Hall.\textsuperscript{168} Kappa Beta Phi, too, carried on – probably, however, more obtrusively. Each year when, shortly before Commencement, Professor Hart posted the notice of the annual meeting of Phi Beta Kappa, a similar announcement for Kappa Beta Phi almost immediately was pinned to the same bulletin board. On the same evening as the Phi Beta Kappa meeting, the lower third of the class gathered at Heublein’s to enjoy their beer, songs, and extemporaneous “addresses.”\textsuperscript{169} During these years, the proliferation of student organizations even exceeded that of the Jackson era. Trinity was not unique in this regard, for this was the pattern at other colleges, too. But what was remarkable was that a college, which as late as 1900 had only 122 students, could support the many groups which had been formed. In addition to the fraternities, the religious organizations, and the school alumni associations, there were clubs which catered to almost every conceivable student interest. Card clubs were always popular. In 1887, there were five fraternity whist clubs, the I.K.A. Poker Club, and three chess clubs.\textsuperscript{170} In 1890-1891, there were the Sophomore Bowling Club, the Nimrod Club, the Trinity Gun Club, a Jockey Club, the Trinity College Naughtical Club (with four “yachts”), a Toboggan Club, a Camera Club,\textsuperscript{171} and the Trinity Bicycle Club, of which Professor Luther was president.\textsuperscript{172} Those who had journalistic interests worked on the staff of the \textit{Ivy} or the \textit{Tablet} or joined the Trinity College Press Club, the object of which was to prepare news releases on college happenings for the local or national press. The Press Club was organized about 1890\textsuperscript{173} and received the hearty support of the Alumni Association which, in 1892, gave the young journalists a grant of $75.00 to carry on their work.\textsuperscript{174} Despite this generous encouragement, however, the Press Club proved to be something of a disappointment. Charges were made that the club excluded the ablest men from the organization and that in order to have their releases accepted, incidents (particularly of hazing) had been exaggerated.\textsuperscript{175} Unfortunately, the Press Club was unable to live up to early expectations. By 1897 it had become inactive\textsuperscript{176} and shortly thereafter it dissolved.

Those students who enjoyed dancing joined the German Club – that is, if they were invited, for this was one of the most select groups on campus. The Germans were attended by the “proper” Hartford young ladies, and the six social evenings each year were important dates on the Hartford social calendar. But there were dances other than the College Germans. Almost every student organization gave at least one dance each year.\textsuperscript{177} Most of the faculty receptions given the students and their lady guests ended with dancing.\textsuperscript{178} and the “College Teas” which were held in the late 1890’s were actually tea dances held in Alumni Hall from 4 to 6
A NEW REGIME

Junior Promenade program

P.M.\textsuperscript{179} There was always the Junior Ball held just before Lent,\textsuperscript{180} and in 1897 the custom of Trinity Week was begun. Trinity Week was intended as “a week of gaiety at the college before Lent.” Actually, it was a “three-day week” with a German on Tuesday, the College Tea on Wednesday, and a dramatic presentation on Thursday.\textsuperscript{181}

Trinity was certainly living up to her old reputation as “the Dancing College of America,” for in a single year, the Tablet once estimated, the students attended twenty dances in Alumni Hall alone, and perhaps another twenty in town.\textsuperscript{182}

Every four years (presidential election years), the students formed political clubs to line up behind their favorite candidates. Although the Republican Club had the advantage of numbers, the Democratic Club was equally enthusiastic. In 1888, the political clubs were particularly active. Sixty-seven men formed the Harrison and Morton Club, and thirty-seven men formed a Cleveland and Thurman Club. Both participated in the political parades and rallies held in Hartford.\textsuperscript{183}

And there were even attempts to revive the old interest in literary societies and debate. A debating club known as “The Whatley” had maintained a precarious existence during the latter Pynchon years, and this society was given a new lease on life with the coming of George Williamson Smith.\textsuperscript{184} But again, there was insufficient interest in debate to make “The Whatley” a useful institution. The Tablet campaigned vigorously to keep “The Whatley” going,\textsuperscript{185} but to no avail.

By the Christmas Term of 1889, “The Whatley” had expired and the undergraduates formed a group with somewhat broader purpose. A group which met every Friday evening took the old name of the Athenaeum Literary Society and devoted its attention to debate, oratory, declamation, literary endeavor, and lectures on scholarly topics presented by the Faculty.\textsuperscript{186} The new Athenaeum flourished, and by 1892 it had a membership of twenty-five.\textsuperscript{187}

Perhaps the revived Athenaeum was too ambitious in purpose, for it too had disappeared by 1894.\textsuperscript{188} In January, 1895, interest in debate was revived when the Debating Club of Zion Hill Church challenged the Trinity students to a debate to be held in the social rooms of the church. The students were delighted to accept the challenge of the “colored gentlemen,” and before an audience of about sixty people, the two teams debated, “Resolved, That ambition has more influence on the human race than fear.” The judges, three Trinity men of the Class of 1895, awarded the prize of three chickens to the Zion Hill men “to the satisfaction of all present.”\textsuperscript{189}

As a possible consequence of the pleasant evening spent at Zion Hill, a debating society was organized shortly thereafter.\textsuperscript{190} The new organization took the name of the Trinity College Debating Union.\textsuperscript{191} This time, somehow, the Trinity debaters abandoned the traditional philosophical, moral, and academic subjects, and in their stead were introduced topics “of current and social interest,” typical of which may have been the debate of June 3, 1895, “Resolved, That Strikes are Justifiable.”\textsuperscript{192} A Pittsburgh Alumnus, writing to the Tablet, perhaps summed up the new approach to debate at Trinity College. Twenty years ago, he wrote, debate appealed only to prospective lawyers and clergymen. Now, says he, business conditions and practice have so changed that young men who look forward to careers in trade, industry, or commerce would do well to avail themselves of the training in public speaking which membership in a debating society affords.\textsuperscript{193} But even this utilitarian objective could not sustain the Athenaeum. After the Trinity Term of 1895, the society became inactive. There were sporadic attempts at intercol-
legiate debate in the early 1900’s, but the Athenaeanum was not again revived until 1928. 194

The completion of Alumni Hall in 1887 gave drama at Trinity its real start. Alumni Hall was both gymnasium and auditorium, and the upper floor was, for the time, a most complete college theater. In October of 1887, the dramatic association announced that it would attempt a season of “society melodrama or light farce; [and] perhaps, if successful in our efforts, we may undertake something of Sheridan’s.” And quite unselfishly, the association again announced that the proceeds from the performances would go to the Treasury of the Athletic Association.195 From that season on, the association, which in 1894 took the name of “The Jesters,”196 gave at least two plays each year.197

The dramatic group had its successes—usually with the lighter works—and its troubles. The college Germans were held in Alumni Hall, and those young men who were described by the Tablet as being “too shy to appear on the dance floor,” congregated on the stage and punched peep holes in the dramatic association’s curtain so as to watch the goings-on on the dance floor unobserved.198 In 1898, the Jesters rented Parson’s Theater for “Prince Nit,” a “comic opera in three acts,” with libretto by D. Parsons Goodrich, music by A. L. Ellis ’98, and lyrics by S. C. Olcott ’96. The “opera” was an artistic success, but there were serious financial complications. Mr. Goodrich had been engaged by the society to coach the chorus and, as he had not been compensated for his services, he sued the officers for $200 which he claimed was due him. The court awarded him $22.30 and ordered the defendants to pay court costs of $40.00.199

The old Trinity dramatic productions were done with full props and costumes.200 Undergraduates usually took both male and female parts, although occasionally, as in the presentation in 1892 of a farce entitled “Engaged,” young ladies from town participated.201 And it was not until the early part of the twentieth century that females regularly played female parts. In 1902, Henry Augustus Perkins succeeded William Lispenard Robb as Professor of Physics. Mrs. Perkins was a charming Danish woman who had had a brief career on the professional stage. The Jesters prevailed upon Mrs. Perkins to act as dramatic coach, and she most graciously accepted. Plays were rehearsed in the spacious living room of the Perkins home on Forest Street, and some of the most romantic town and gown relations are said to have begun in that same living room.202

For many years, the musical interests at the College had been quite informally provided for. During the earlier days, there had been such ephemeral organizations as the Calithumpian Band, the Trinity Hall Orchestra, and singing groups representing practically all classes and secret societies. Two organizations had survived the Pynchon years, the Glee Club and the Royal Egyptians. By the 1880’s, however, the Royal Egyptians had become more of a social organization than a group of performers, and although the number of “performers” remained constant,203 almost one-fourth of the student body was included in the “honorary” membership.204

The Glee Club had a checkered history. There had been repeated breaking up into smaller groups and always a reorganization, and at least once the Glee Club had functioned as the Chapel Choir.205 A sort of “Golden Age” of Trinity music began in 1887 when a Mr. Pratt was engaged to train the Glee Club.206 Under Pratt’s direction, the Trinity singers made unprecedented progress, and the successes of the Glee Club led to the creation of numerous other musical groups. A Banjo Club was active during the winter of 1887–1888, as were quartettes from each fraternity, an ’87 Sextette, an ’88 Octette, Ye Sweet Singers of Israel, the Psi Upsilon Banjo Club, and the indefatigable Royal Egyptian String Octette.207

During the next few years the Glee Club, usually assisted by the Banjo Club, gave concerts at the College and in Hartford.208 Sometimes a fraternity would give a musical entertainment in which all performers were from the same secret society. In 1889, for example, I.K.A. presented a public “musicale” featuring the I.K.A. Quartette, the I.K.A. Banjo Trio, and the I.K.A. Vocal Trio.
The program ended with a "Farce: 'The Three Blind Mice.'"²⁰⁹

In 1890, a Professor Sumner of Worcester, Mass., succeeded Mr. Pratt as coach of the Glee Club,²¹⁰ and under the new director the Glee Club became so proficient as to make them welcome in many quarters. During the winter of 1890-1891, the Glee and Banjo Clubs performed in Farmington, Stamford, and Windsor Locks, Connecticut; in Chicopee, Springfield, and Northampton, Massachusetts; and in Providence, Rhode Island. Closer to home they entertained the inmates of the Hartford Retreat for the Insane and the State Prison at Wethersfield.²¹¹ During the Easter vacation of 1895, the Glee Club, the Banjo Club, and the newly-organized Mandolin Club went on tour, performing in New York City, Poughkeepsie, Baltimore, Washington, and Wilmington.²¹² In 1894, joint concerts were given in Middletown and Hartford by the Wesleyan University and Trinity College Glee Clubs. So successful was this venture that it was repeated in 1895.²¹³

To judge by modern glee club and college orchestra standards, it would seem that the quality of the Trinity musical groups was somewhat less than we might expect of similar groups today. The instrumental performers were largely self-taught, but it is the do-it-yourself approach to college music, perhaps, which has always made it attractive. Few of the performers had any real skill, and the Tablet notices of the performances often pointed up their deficiencies. In reporting the Trinity-Wesleyan concert, the Tablet observed that the playing of the Mandolin Club was "ragged" and that "the playing of the Banjo Club leaves much to be desired."²¹⁴ But despite the Mandolin Club's shortcomings, Mr. Sedgwick of the Opera House Orchestra dedicated a new two-step, "Trilby," to the Trinity mandolin players.²¹⁵

The Tablet once commented that Trinity College was "deficient in college songs," and the editor made the gratuitous observation that there was hardly a college in the country which did not have at least four or five good songs, and that there was no good reason why Trinity men could not write a good college song or two.²¹⁶ Trinity not only had "a good college song or two," but she even had the editorially-suggested four-or-five!

Disregarding the old songs composed for the Burning of Conic Sections and the Cremation of Ana Lytics and the songs which have always been the common property of all collegians (such as "Gaudeamus Igatur"), there were real Trinity songs written by Trinity men. The oldest Trinity "Alma Mater," sung to the tune of "Auld Lang Syne," and "Lauriger Horatius," with words by Professor McCook, had been popular throughout the 1870's. "Annie Lisle," with words by McCook's classmate, James Walter Clark, was an old favorite, as was "College Days" sung to the tune of "Figaro" at Class Day.²¹⁷ During the early 1880's, an "Alma Mater" was sung to the tune of "America,"²¹⁸ and there was, of course, "'Neath the Elms," the most famous of Trinity songs, and interesting as a by-product of the student disorders which had occurred toward the end of the Pynchon administration.

Augustus Burgwin '82, the chapel organist, had been sent home to Pittsburgh under suspension in May of his senior year. One evening during the enforced vacation, Burgwin was having dinner with several friends at a cottage on the outskirts of Pittsburgh, and after dinner the group joined in singing "barber-shop ballads." During an intermission in the singing, Burgwin heard a Negro servant in the kitchen singing an old Negro tune, "On the Banks of the Old Tennessee,"²¹⁹ to which Burgwin immediately sup-
plied the words for "'Neath the Elms of our Old Trinity."220 Burgwin returned to the College in time to graduate with his class, and at the first chapel service after his return he played the melody "as a sort of afterlude." The students who heard it were delighted, and both words and music were included in *The American College Song Book*, which was then in preparation, as one of the Trinity songs. "'Neath the Elms" was printed in the Class Day Program and sung at the exercises of the Class of 1882, and ever since it has been the Trinity song.221

In 1901, the *Tablet* (issue of December 17) again deplored the dearth of Trinity songs. The editor observed that Trinity men sing "'Neath the Elms" very well, but there should be more songs - "half a dozen set to good music."222 Perhaps what the *Tablet* editor did not realize was that just a month before, Trinity had had a new song with words by one of the College's most devoted sons and music by one of the world's most popular composers. On November 12, 1901, at a "Trinity Night" of the Pittsburgh Opera, between the second and third acts of "Christopher, Jr.," the chorus of the Pittsburgh Opera Company sang "Trinity True," words by Joseph Buffington and music by Victor Herbert, the conductor of the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra.223 Not that "Trinity True" was a good song - it wasn't!

The Trinity men of the 1880's and 1890's were busy young men. There were, as we shall see, studies of course, but it would seem that the main business of the undergraduate body was that of being "collegiate." Old customs were maintained, new ones were introduced, and others were modified, but all were a part of the "Trinity Way." The planting of "class elms" had come to replace planting the "class ivies";224 Washington's Birthday fell by the wayside in the mid 80's225 and its place on the College Calendar was taken by the Prize Oratorical contest;226 the Burning of Ana Lytics had been forgotten, and a sophomore attempt to replace that conflagration with the Burning of Mechanics failed to arouse interest.227

---

**The three Lemon Squeezers**

The Lemon Squeezer was passed down from '80 to '82, to '85 to '87, to '88 to '90, to '92 to '94 and to '95, without incident, perhaps because the trophy was kept in a Hartford bank vault and brought to the campus on Class Day in a carefully guarded carriage. In 1895, however, the Seniors announced that the selection of the recipient class would be revealed on the evening of the first Monday in May at a gathering of all four classes on the front campus. The three lower classes appeared in groups as requested, but the seniors, instead of announcing a choice, retired, as they said, to make their selection. After what must have seemed an interminably long wait to the other classes, the Seniors returned, gave a cheer for the elected class, and then announced that the class of '97 had been awarded the Lemon Squeezer. The Class of '96 was much disappointed in not being recognized as the outstanding one, and '96 carefully laid plans to seize the Squeezer at the time of presentation on Class Day. Walter L. Parsons '96 was to make several presentations at the senior ceremony, and when he approached the speakers desk (where the trophy lay) for the second presentation, he seized the Lemon Squeezer and, with his classmates running interference, darted through the door of Northam Towers. The Juniors joined the Freshmen, and the Sophomores joined the Seniors, and rough free-for-all lasted for almost a quarter of an hour, while the well-laid plan of
the Class of '96 was carried out to perfection. Parsons had quickly run through Northam to a west bedroom window where the Squeezer was tossed to a student stationed below. The receiver hastily passed it to a man who was waiting on horseback who, as soon as he had acquired the trophy, galloped away. At a spot two miles from the College, another member of '96 tied the Squeezer to the branches of a pine tree some twenty feet above the ground. There it remained until the Class Day excitement had subsided, when it was taken down and placed in a bank vault. At the time of their graduation, '96 passed the Squeezer to a member of '99. Walter B. Sut­ton '99 passed it to Arthur R. Van de Water '01, and Van de Water presented it to Arthur C. Humphries '04. Humphries left Trinity during his sophomore year and took the Squeezer with him to his home in New York City. Presentations to classes of '06, '08, '10, '11, and '14 were "dry presentations," for the Squeezer had never been returned to the College. The Class of 1914 pur­chased a new Squeezer (in Trinity history, Lemon Squeezer No. 2), but it was spirited away by '15 just before it was to be awarded to '16. The Class of 1916 accepted the title of "Lemon Squeezer Class," and the title, but not a trophy, descended through '18, '20, and '22, to '23, in which year still another Squeezer (Lemon Squeezer No. 3) was presented by the Medusa. Number 3 was seized by '26 and it was passed to '28. In 1928, the plan to present the Squeezer to '30 collapsed when a fight broke out between '29 and '30, in the course of which the Squeezer was broken in two, and each class ended with half of the Squeezer. Attempts to bring about a recon­ciliation and thus unite the two halves failed, and for several years there was not even the designation of a Lemon Squeezer Class. In 1935, Lemon Squeezer No. 2 was presented to the Senior Class by a member of the class of '15, and '35 awarded it to '37, and '37 passed it on to '39, and '39 awarded it to '40. World War II brought an end to the Lemon Squeezer presentation, and it was not revived until 1947, when the college administration invited the Seniors, the first of normal size to graduate since the war, to make a choice for presentation. The Squeezer (No. 2) was then brought from the college vault where it had reposed since 1940.228

The Lemon Squeezer was a unique Trinity Tradition, and it is to be doubted whether there was a comparable one in any college in America. And another unique Trinity Tradition was St. Patrick's Day, which in the course of two decades evolved into one of the roughest college days known to man. How St. Patrick's Day had come to supplant Washington's Birthday as the College’s number one holiday could be explained, as a Tablet writer once declared, only as "one of those perversities of human nature,"229 but such had indeed been the case. Hartford's Irish had long made much of the day of their patron saint, and in addition to whatever religious and social observance marked the day, there was always a parade which, while the College occupied the old campus, was always routed past the Trinity buildings.230 Although the collegians had doubtless observed the parading Irishmen with amusement or perhaps disdain, in the spring of 1883 the students themselves formally ob­served St. Patrick's Day, giving as their reason the desire to assist "Poor Paddy" in "his efforts to honor his patron saint." And it might be remem­bered, too, that green was then one of the college colors.231

These early Trinity St. Patrick's Days probably involved little more than the "wearing of the green," but they were, nevertheless, celebrated every year,232 and soon the undergraduates had a parade of their own. Dressed in colorful cos­tumes, predominantly green, they marched down to Hartford,233 carrying banners of each of the four classes. In 1888, the Freshmen, not content to merely carry their class banner, attached their emblem to the weather vane atop the cupola of Alumni Hall,234 and at this point began the cus­tom which was to make heroes, but fortunately no permanent cripple, of generations of Trinity men—the St. Patrick's Day Banner Rush. Until the 1920's, when the college authorities put an end to the sport, Freshmen and Sophomores
fought for possession of the rival class emblems. In pre-World War I days, the banners were displayed downtown, and it was not at all a surprise to see a class banner flying from the upper stories of a business building or from the angels' wings of the Memorial Arch in Bushnell Park. Because of the hazard to life and limb, later classes fought the St. Patrick's Day scrap on the front campus and the objective of the "game" came to be to see whether the Freshmen could fix their banner to a specified tree and then keep it there.

An indication of the roughness of the sport was the incident which brought the custom to an end—the clobbering of one student by another with a "two by four." All of this was "collegiate"—and collegiate, Trinity style. But Trinity was also collegiate in a more conventional way, for in whatever way the Trinity customs were unique, there were almost countless others in which they were rigidly conformist. Through the "Exchanges" published regularly in the Tablet, the undergraduates were
always made aware of what was going on at other colleges, and often the reporting of a new development elsewhere was followed by imitation at Trinity. Trinity in this regard had two models—the English universities and the ranking American colleges for men.

The young men of Trinity College were very much concerned with what constituted the correct attire of proper collegians. Perhaps Trinity men had always been concerned with dress, but as fashions in street dress came and went, the perennial concern seems to have been whether or not to wear the Oxford cap. In the past the Oxford cap had several times been “voted in,” and almost as many times it had been “voted out.” Once it had been abandoned because of ridicule by the “town toughies,” but it was to come to student attention at the time of the move to the new campus. At that time it had been argued that the custom, as followed at the English universities, would be appropriate to the new campus where the buildings had been designed on an English pattern. The argument apparently carried little weight, for the disorders (of conduct and otherwise) which accompanied the move prevented the “settling down” that the introduction of “English custom” assumed, and it was not until a decade later, when things had changed under the administration of President Smith, that the upperclassmen again began talking about adopting the Oxford cap. A bit of propagandizing caused the Juniors to adopt the Oxford cap (by then also called the “university cap” or the “mortarboard”) in the winter of 1888, and before long there was even talk of wearing the academic gown. Although the “custom” was not revived in the fall of 1888, it was the example of other colleges which set off a new agitation for wearing academic costume in the fall of 1895. The Tablet reported that the cap and gown had been adopted at Yale, Princeton, and Amherst, and the editor urged that the Seniors wear cap and gown at Sunday Chapel and at all other “public collegiate occasions.”

The Seniors met several times to debate the matter, and the Class President appointed a committee to consider whether academic gown might be worn from Easter through Commencement. Nothing was done about the matter by the class of ’96, but in the spring of 1899 the Seniors voted to wear cap and gown throughout the Trinity Term on all public occasions. The Class of 1900 continued the custom, but this was the last group to take official action. Later classes posed for their Iony pictures in gown and mortarboard, and in individual or group pictures a mortarboard could occasionally still be seen. They were not, however, worn with official class sanction, and their use soon came to be limited to Class Day and Commencement.

In the 1880’s, the Freshman came to Trinity, as to other colleges, wearing (with minor geographic variation) the clothes of his station—the reasonably cultivated, well-to-do, middle class. From home he brought a suit of matching coat and trousers, a derby hat, and a stiff shirt with starched cuffs and high collar. During the first few weeks of college, however, he visited the local haberdasher and tailor or dropped in at Brooks Brothers when he got to New York, where he added soft shirts, a turtle-neck sweater, and a cap. If he belonged to the Cycle Club or merely owned a bicycle, he added golf knickers and wool stockings. In the spring he wore a stiff straw hat, and for afternoon social affairs he wore white trousers of flannel or duck. For informal evening wear he sported a “loud” shirt and a bow tie, and for formal evening wear—first for Glee Club and Mandolin Club performances, and later at the College Germans—he wore evening clothes, more likely than not, purchased according to filled-in self-measurement forms from Sears, Roebuck & Co.

As the century neared its end, the collegiate dress became a bit more elaborate at Trinity. A member of the Class of 1901 has given a most complete description of the wardrobe of the “fin de siècle” Trinity collegian. The basic items were the suit with “short sack coat buttoned high with a collar with narrow lapels, tightly-fitting trousers, high shoes, . . . stiff shirt and collar. . . . The ascot tie with a gold horse-shoe pin was very fashionable, and a stick pin of some sort was de rigueur. Cuffs were stiff and round. The derby
was the correct hat, and many students had a high silk hat for dances and other formal occasions. ... Sweaters invariably were thick, closely woven of heavy yarn with high double collars that folded just under the ears and chin. ... Everyone, whether or not he needed the protection for football, wore his hair exceedingly long, in a thick mat that fell away over his eyes on the least provocation.249

This was essentially the dress that lasted until about 1914—the collegiate variation (or Brooks Brothers variation) of the Edwardian fashion—with little modification. There were, of course, slight changes in the cut of the coat, in the "peg" of the trousers, and in the width of the hatband, but always the wearer was recognized as a collegian.250

In appearance, the Trinity undergraduate probably differed little from his counterpart at Princeton, Williams, or Yale. But if the Trinity man was the victim of the spirit of conformity in the selection of his clothes, there was ample opportunity for him to express an individuality so far as the larger world was concerned and, at the same time, to adopt the symbols and mores of College and Class. As befitted the Trinity undergraduate of the "mauve decade," class colors became much more "precious" than the pink, cherry, lilac, and maroon of the 1870's.251 The Class of 1883 selected silver-gray and red, '84 chose peacock blue and old gold,252 '85 chose dark crimson and dark blue, '86 selected marine blue and white, '87 boasted magenta and gold, while '88 would settle for nothing less than Indian red, peacock blue, and old gold, to which the editor of the Icy added "Sky Blue, Verdent Green, and the rest of the Rainbow."253

The classes also selected class yells, and very "collegiate" they were. In 1891, the Senior yell went "Hi-yi-yi! X-C-I—I—T-R—I—N—I—T—Y!" The Juniors cut loose with "Wah-hoo-wah! Hoo-wah-hoo! Trinity, Trinity, Trinity, '92!" The Sophomore yell was "Hika-Hika-Hika! Rah-Ray—Ree! Trinity—Trinity—Trinity—Ninety-three!" The Freshmen in that year went classical with "Rah—Rah—Rah! Rah—Rah—Rah! τέσσαρας και εινεκώντα."254

Class yells were to be used at any appropriate time when the several classes would be gathered together. This was "collegiate." But there were also college yells, and these, too, were collegiate. In 1895, at the beginning of the football season, a College Meeting was held in Alumni Hall, and three students, E. Parsons '96, Hendrie '96, and Carter '98, were appointed to lead the singing, and Barbour '96 was appointed to lead the cheering at the forthcoming Trinity-Wesleyan game.255 The cheerleaders drilled the students for some time before the game and, during the game, which was played on November 16, "the cheering was incessant." The valiant efforts of the cheer-leaders and the students notwithstanding, Trinity lost by a score of 14—6.256

The undergraduates had college and class colors, class and college yells, Trinity pins,257 gold footballs which were awarded to the outstanding members of the football team,258 books of Trinity poetry (Trinity Verse, a well-received collection of poems which had appeared in the Tablet),259 and Trinity prose,260 and a small, souvenir Trinity tie (not to be worn about the neck, but "just the thing for German favours").261 The students had once considered the selection of a Trinity flower to take a place with the Harvard crimson carnation and the Yale violet. The Tablet made the suggestion of the blue aster which, with its gold center, would have been ideal.262

The matter of the college flower was apparently never put to student referendum, but the College did acquire a team mascot which placed it in the best of company. In the spring of 1899, Judge Joseph Buffington was a guest of honor at a Princeton Alumni Banquet held in Pittsburgh. In his response to a toast, "to the sister colleges," Buffington spoke of the football rivalry between Princeton, Harvard, and Yale—"the big chanticleers of the collegiate barnyard," compared to which Trinity was a mere bantam. But the Judge asked his Princeton hearers not to judge a bird by its size. The Trinity Bantam, he said, can be at home anywhere. "You will therefore understand, gentlemen, the spirit in which the Trinity bantam knocks at your door, steps in, shakes his plumage, and with a sociable nod to the venerable John [Harvard], and a good-na-
ured howdy-do to ponderous old Eli [Yale], steps into the collegiate cockpit, makes his best bow to the [Princeton] Tiger, says he is glad to be here, feels not a whit abashed at your huge-ness, is satisfied with himself and his own particular coop, feels he is up to date, [and has] no bats in his belfry."

Although Judge Buffington’s speech was printed in full in the *Tablet*, the undergraduates failed to realize its possibilities, and it was not until 1905 that a sports writer for the *Detroit Free Press*, because of Trinity’s heavy football schedule of games with such athletic “powers” as Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Brown, West Point, Holy Cross, Lafayette, Pennsylvania, Lehigh, Manhattan, Annapolis, Fordham, Syracuse, Wesleyan, Williams, and Amherst, referred to Trinity as the “game-bantam of the intercollegiate poultry.” Whether the Detroit newspaperman knew of Buffington’s previous use of the name “Bantam” is unknown, but other sports writers took up the name, and it has been used ever since. In the spring of 1905, the Trinity pennant appeared with a small bantam rooster over the word “Trinity.”

The Cooperative Association was short-lived, but its creation pointed up the need for a more satisfactory means of obtaining class and athletic supplies. Consequently, in the fall of 1890, a college store was opened in Northam Towers, with a full line of Wright and Ditson athletic goods, shaker sweaters, stationery, and college textbooks. The usefulness of the college store was greatly increased when the Hartford Post Office gave the store a stamp agency.

With all of their creature comforts looked after, and the constant social whirl, it is hardly surprising that collegiate life of the Gay Nineties should have been remembered as “gay.” James A. Wales ‘01 once recorded his impressions of life at the turn of the century, and his descriptions fulfill all expectations.

By the late ’90’s almost all of the students lived in the dormitories. Rooms were lighted by gas and heated by steam. Running water was available in the hall of the second floor of each three or four story “section,” and tin bathtubs and toilet facilities were provided in the “catacombs” — that maze of arches and passageways which extended from Northam Towers to the northern end of Jarvis Hall.

“...the nineties were an era of good feeling and bad taste,” and students reflected both in the decoration of their rooms. Radiators and steam pipes were gilded, and hideous curtains were draped over the leaded-glass windows. Walls were invariably adorned with literally hundreds of snapshots and cheap framed pictures. Some of the rooms boasted bamboo curtains, and everywhere were to be found pennants, Edward
Penfield posters, and piles of pillows of burnt leather showing Indian heads or Gibson girls.\footnote{271}

Each student had his own bicycle and, except for rainy days when he took the trolley, the bicycle was his normal means of transportation to downtown Hartford. Students thought nothing of cycling the fifteen miles to New Britain and back, or the sixty-six to New Haven and back on a Sunday after Chapel.

Card games were still very much in vogue. Bridge had not yet been invented, but there was whist, solo whist, duplicate whist, euchre, pinochle, hearts, and such non-card games as chess and parcheesi. Undergraduates danced the two-step and the waltz, attended candy pulls, and went on straw rides. They gave “cider rackets” in their rooms and served lemonade and cakes, and always the guests “helped with the dishes.”

After dark there were beer rushes, bonfires on campus, “feeds” in the rooms, and occasionally there was hazing.\footnote{272}

By the end of the century, Trinity College had found a new sport which was able to bridge the long gap between the end of the football season in November and the beginning of baseball practice at the beginning of Lent. Basketball had been invented in 1891 by James Naismith of the faculty of what is now Springfield College,\footnote{273} and soon the game had dribbled across the Connecticut state line, where at Trinity College it was introduced to the “gym” classes as a pleasant diversion from the conventional work with Indian clubs, check weights, and dumbbells.\footnote{274} The game quickly found favor with the students,\footnote{275} and on December 8, 1894, a Trinity College basketball team defeated a team from Hartford Public High School. A week later, Hartford High defeated Trinity, 9-5. Both games were played at the Y.M.C.A.\footnote{276} In 1896–1897, Trinity played teams from the Y.M.C.A., Thompsonville, and the Connecticut National Guard.\footnote{277} In 1897–1898, Trinity entered collegiate competition in basketball, playing thirteen games with Wesleyan and Yale, winning eight and losing five.\footnote{278} In the spring of 1901, Trinity again made athletic association history when the New England Intercollegiate Basketball Association was formed largely through the efforts of James A. Wales ’01.\footnote{279}

With this recitation of events, it must be obvious that Trinity had come a long way from 1883 when George Williamson Smith had assumed the Presidency. If we have seemed overly concerned with the “organizational” side of Trinity College, that, to many of the undergraduates, was the College. And it was a side in which George Williamson Smith had little active part. What, now, about the other end of the campus scene? George Williamson Smith on the instructional and administrative side had been “a new broom.” He swept well – at first. But, as we shall see in our next chapter, his early promise was not sustained, and by the end of the nineteenth century most of the members of the College and many of the College’s well-wishers would have been happy to see him leave.

\footnote{230}
George Williamson Smith assumed the Presidency of Trinity College with the full confidence of the Board of Trustees. His humane and generous treatment of the undergraduates soon won him the support and even the love of the students. His frank and open manner in dealing with the Alumni made him the idol of the "old grads." With such unanimous support, President Smith was in a position to institute some much-needed reforms, and the first years of his administration were marked by many changes for the better. The general morale of the College was much improved, and the good name of the institution was soon restored. Excellent faculty appointments had been made, and there was reasonable progress, for a small college, along the lines of instructional equipment.

In view of our last chapter's lengthy description of student activities, it may seem that the energies of the College were directed entirely toward the extracurricular. Such, however, was not the case, for admission standards had been raised, the pace of instruction was appreciably accelerated, and considerable progress had been made toward a modernization of the curriculum.

Traditionally, students had entered Trinity by examination, and formal entrance examinations for sub-Freshmen had been held at Commencement time and again before the opening of the Christmas Term in September. These examinations were similar to those given by other colleges, but there was always the subjective element in such a system, and the College Association, of which Trinity was an active member, had long urged a standard system of admission to the member colleges. Trinity had taken her stand on the general matter of more regular and more rigid standards, and especially in the English requirement. But the admission question was being seriously complicated by the rise of the public high school which, particularly in the West, placed little emphasis on the Classics, long the core of the Trinity curriculum. By 1881, Trinity was obliged to announce that the College's admission standards were those recommended by the Association of Colleges in New England, and in 1884 Trinity began to admit students "by certificate."

In many respects, admitting by certificate represented a raising of the admission standards, as students could enter Trinity upon proof of graduation from any accredited (although the term was not then in common use) secondary school. In this regard, Trinity had merely fallen in line with most of her sister colleges. But in another way, admission by certificate could have been regarded as a lowering of standards as the important thing was no longer the content of the school course, but the completion of it.

The admission of students who had not previously studied Latin and Greek necessitated a change in the curriculum and, at the same time that the decision was made to admit by certificate, an accommodation in the curricular offering was made so as to permit those deficient in Classics still to graduate with a degree. The older B.S. program had been something of an accommodation along this line, but the course had never been popular, as the Trinity B.S. had, since it represented a shorter period of study than the A.B., been a sort of second-class degree. Although the course of study for the B.S. had been
lengthened from two and one-half years to four years in 1875, two years of Latin were still required, and it was still the intent of the Trustees to have the B.S. differ from the A.B. only in the inclusion of Greek in the Arts Course.

The big change came in 1884, when four distinct curricula were announced. One could still take the traditional A.B. with the usual Latin and Greek, but with a bit more Metaphysics, History, and Political Science. For the B.S. there were two curricula. Those who entered with considerable English, Latin, and Mathematics could complete the degree requirements in three years. Those who had little school preparation in these areas would take a four-year course with much Latin in the freshman year. For those whose interests were not expressly scientific and who had no inclination to study Greek, there was a fourth course in which the Greek of the A.B. course was replaced by Modern Languages. That was the course in Letters. Actually, the second B.S. curriculum was essentially an "Arts" course and was called the "Course in Letters and Science" in the College Catalogue. All curricula included rather generous election, so that the program of the senior year came to be largely elective for those who had been admitted without condition.

The requirements for the several degrees were apparently rigidly enforced, for students who entered as candidates for the Arts degree frequently slipped into the other less exacting curricula, and not infrequently a student failed to keep up with the curriculum of his second choice and spent his senior year as a "Special Student, not Candidate for a Degree." The curricular change represented a reform insofar as it placed Trinity in line with other colleges, but at Trinity there were almost as many problems created as were solved. The enhancing of Modern Languages by including them in the new curricula was regarded as a progressive step and one welcomed by the undergraduates. There was not, however, any provision made for the study of French and German beyond the second year, and the students felt that they were obliged to leave a Modern Language just before they were able to master it. Phi Beta Kappa, too, had its concern about the B.S. students (who usually completed the degree in three years) and who, because they pursued a less rigid course, were able to obtain higher grades. Election to Phi Beta Kappa had come to be based largely on class standing, and the question was seriously raised whether A.B. students were not being placed at a serious disadvantage, especially, since it was then assumed at Trinity, that the very nature of the Honor Society presupposed a knowledge of Latin and Greek.

The newer curricula did not immediately become popular, for as late as the academic year of 1890-1891, of the 122 students enrolled as candidates for bachelors' degrees, 87 were A.B., 19 were Letters and Science, 16 were Science, and one was Letters. And there seems to have been no serious effort made during the nineteenth century to improve the courses other than the A.B. The Arts students, who still seemed to be the chief concern, were pleased with the addition in 1891 of electives for the Juniors and an increase in the number of electives for Seniors. At that time, two-thirds of the senior work and two-fifths of the junior program became elective. The inclusion of Hebrew and Sanskrit as electives seemed (in the opinion of the Tablet editor, at least) to place Trinity "a step in advance of other small colleges." The addition at this same time of "compulsory work in the gymnasium" for Freshmen and Sophomores was not so enthusiastically accepted by those affected. In 1895, the freshmen and sophomore years were also "liberalized" when Freshmen were given an opportunity to study French and German. The students were now convinced that Trinity had "caught up" with the other colleges.

And, along with the admissions and curricular changes, came a reconsideration of the Trinity M.A. In 1884, the Alumni Association "voted to request the Trustees to make the degree of Master of Arts dependent on competition," an obvious attempt to put an end to the granting of the Master's degree "in course," ad eundem, or on a more frankly honorary basis. In reality, all Masters' degrees granted by the College were, strictly-speaking, honorary. "In course" simply
meant “in course” of time, and not “in course” of study. To be sure, the Master’s degree was totally meaningless at the time, so far as it represented, or did not represent, academic attainment. It was, however, a useful element in public relations, for its conferral gave the College a sort of second-class honorary degree, and the honorary degree (of whatever sort) was a means of gaining good will at no cash outlay.

Because of the usefulness of the honorary Master of Arts in this regard, the Trustees could hardly have become enthusiastic about its abolition. Nevertheless, after consideration by a committee appointed to study the question, the Trustees decided that “after the Commencement of 1888, the degree of Master of Arts will be conferred upon Bachelors of Arts of three years standing, who shall, by examination or otherwise, satisfy the Faculty that they have successfully pursued a course of study equivalent to the work of one academic year.” The new rule, however, was probably one of those honored more in the breach than in the observance, for the College continued to grant the degree of Master of Arts “in course” in numbers even greater than before the new rule had been adopted.

In 1898-1899, there were three resident graduates: James Riedell Tucker, a Yale graduate; Woolsey McAlpine Johnson, Russell Fellow and the son of Professor Charles F. Johnson; and Henry Jones Blakeslee, who held the rank of Assistant in the Physics Laboratory. By 1900, Trinity had come to be recognized as something of a center for graduate study, especially in Chemistry and Physics. The work in these departments by Professors Robert Baird Riggs and William Lispenard Robb was widely recognized, and in December of 1900 the College reported the presence at Trinity of several candidates for degrees at German universities who were carrying on their research in the Trinity laboratories.

Paralleling these developments were remarkable improvements in the College Library. In 1883, the book collection had numbered but 20,500 volumes, the Library itself was open but three hours each day, and the library staff consisted of the Reverend John Humphrey Barbour and whatever student help he could secure. Thomas Ruggles Pynchon had been the nominal Librarian until 1882 but Barbour, who was vicar of Grace Church in Parkville, was appointed Assistant Librarian in 1873 and since that time he had been, for all practical purposes, the Librarian. In 1889, Barbour resigned to become Professor of New Testament in the Berkeley Divinity School. Barbour was succeeded by Professor Hart who served until 1899 when he, too, left Trinity to join the Berkeley faculty.

Barbour had made a catalogue of the entire book collection, a card catalogue which replaced the earlier title catalogue which had been made forty years before, but throughout this entire period most of the work was done by “untrained though well-wishing student amateurs.” As a result, there were grotesque errors in cataloging, and many books were lost by mis-shelving.
The students constantly complained that the Trinity Library was not being kept up to date and that the book collection was more suitable to the older curriculum than to those curricula which had been adopted in 1884.\(^{32}\) In 1896, an outside observer noted that the "Library is somewhat wanting in new books," but that it was rich in the possession of some rare and valuable old books and manuscripts. This same writer noted the unique collections of English and Irish theological pamphlets published between 1700 and 1849, the almost complete file of General and Diocesan Convention Journals, the 250 volumes on Liturgics, the 200 volumes on Canon Law, the 130 Greek Lexicons, and the 180 medical works published between 1600 and 1750. He also mentioned that the Trinity Library had files of many scientific periodicals and a large and useful collection of government documents.\(^{33}\) But perhaps this visitor to the campus missed the large collection, for the time at least, of English Literature which had been built up under the direction of Professors Edwin E. Johnson and Charles F. Johnson,\(^{34}\) the scientific collection built up by Professors Bolton, Riggs, Cheesman, and Robb, and the many volumes in History and Political Economy gathered by Professor Ferguson. By 1900, the book collection consisted of 39,682 volumes, the library hours had been increased to five or six each day, and the College had at last come to employ a full-time librarian, Mr. William Newnham Carlton.\(^{35}\)

President Smith had a definite influence on the physical appearance of the Trinity campus and one which later generations were to deplore. It will be remembered that the original Burges plan had been modified several times and that President Pynchon had wisely persuaded the Trustees to construct only such portions of the Great Quadrangle as were necessary at the time of the move. But it will also be remembered that the first three buildings to be erected (Seabury, Jarvis, and Northam) were strictly in keeping with the Burges plan.

The original design called for a row of faculty residences as one of the sides of the smaller quadrangles, but in 1883 the Trustees decided to locate the President's mansion several hundred feet north of the outside line of the proposed North Quadrangle and quite close to Vernon Street. Not only was the building to stand outside the quadrangle, but it was constructed, as was the house nearby then being erected by Professor Ferguson, in the style known as "Queen Anne."\(^{36}\)

In his first Report to the Trustees, President Smith raised the question of whether, because of the great expense of building in the "Gothic" style, the Burges plan should be followed in the addition of new buildings at Trinity.\(^{37}\) And, as was true in so many other matters, Smith was able to convince the Trustees that his proposal had merit. On June 28, 1884, the governing body of the College "Voted - In the opinion of this Board, any buildings that may hereafter be erected should be located and constructed as existing needs and resources of the College may
The policy was put into effect with the construction of Alumni Hall. This combination gymnasium and auditorium was placed just east of what would have been the line of the North Quadrangle, and its architectural style was what was then called a “Spanish-Chateau Type.” The Jarvis Physical Laboratory, which was completed the year after Alumni Hall, was also placed outside the eastern line of the South Quadrangle of the Burges Plan and was built in the “Romanesque Style.”

While Jarvis Laboratory was nearing completion, the College received a most unusual gift. The Reverend Delgarus Robinson, vicar of Wormwood Scrubs, near London, England, presented “the stone frame and mullions of a window from the ancient palace of Whitehall,” which were described at the time of their arrival as in “the perpendicular style of architecture.” Although it was impossible to use the window in Jarvis Laboratory, the college authorities stated at the time that they “proposed to give the window a conspicuous place in some new college building.” But the gift was not even removed from the crates in which it had been sent. The containers were simply labeled “Old Stones From England” and were placed in a college basement where they remained until the construction of the present College Chapel in the late 1920’s when the stones were incorporated into the sacristy of the Friendship Chapel.

With the completion of Jarvis Physical Laboratory, the Trinity campus represented an appalling hodge-podge of academic architectural styles. Jarvis and Seabury Halls and Northam Towers were “Gothic,” two residences were “Queen Anne,” Alumni Hall was “Spanish-Chateau,” and Jarvis Physical Laboratory was “Romanesque.” The older three were of stone, and the newer two were of brick. And in addition to these obviously permanent structures, there were the flimsy, frame St. John Observatory and the old eye-sores which had existed since the occupation of the new campus. The old wooden shed which had been used by the stone cutters on Jarvis Hall (to the north of which building it stood) was finally taken down late in 1887, but the old gymnasium remained. After Alumni Hall had been built, the old gym had been used for a time as living quarters for the commons waiters. Later the building was used as a student reading room (for newspapers, magazines, etc.), by the Professor of Modern Languages as classroom and office, and for instruction in mechanical drawing. The old gym burned down in the spring of 1896, much to the delight of the students who stood by and cheered as flames consumed the...
unsightly old landmark. But this was not the end of this type of structure at Trinity, for hardly had the embers of the old gym cooled when an almost exact replica was erected to the south of Seabury Hall to provide a French classroom, a mechanical drawing room, and a reading room. The students called this building "Martin Hall" for Professor Winfred R. Martin, whose French classroom was located there. Fortunately, Martin Hall remained only a few years. In 1902, it was replaced by a commons building of two stories. The students called the new commons "Stickney Hall" for Mr. and Mrs. Stickney who managed the college dining facilities from 1900 until World War I.

The undergraduates, by their irreverent naming of the less sightly campus buildings, strongly indicated their disapproval of the Trustees' failure to carry out the great plan for the three magnificent quadrangles devised by William Burges. In an article for College and School, Professor Charles F. Johnson in 1890 simply stated that there was no immediate prospect of carrying out the Burges plan. Although this was doubtless the determined policy of the Trustees, Johnson went on to state, however, that "it is the dream of some of the younger and more enthusiastic Trinity graduates to see these [Burges] plans materialize in stone." And here was to be found the problem which could hardly find happy solution - a romantically-inclined alumni body which had accepted the completion of the Burges plan as necessary to the realization of the College's destiny and a Board of Trustees and an Administration which had abandoned the plan, largely, perhaps, because immediate needs of the College demanded compromise at worst and postponement at best.

Perhaps the intention of the College's governing board was to eventually carry out the Burges quadrangles, for in supplying material for encyclopedia and magazine articles, the administration consistently provided cuts of the Burges plan. But in March, 1891, the Tablet pointed out the incongruity of paying lip service to the plan and at the same time erecting inferior buildings. This policy, the Tablet stated, was especially disgraceful in view of the increased resources of which the College was boasting. The announcement, in 1891, that a biological laboratory was the next building scheduled for construction was to cause the Tablet to take up the plea once more for a return to the Burges plan. The Tablet deplored the scattering of "a heterogeneous collection of buildings of different architectural style" at random about the campus. The Tablet pressed for completion of the quadrangle rather than to erect buildings "of cheaper construction," arguing that the College must build not only for the present, but for the future as well.

The Tablet's plea was of little avail, for late in 1893 the Trustees published the plans for a Natural History Building which had been prepared by William C. Brocklesby '69. Brocklesby's design was a squat, two-storied, terra-cotta and brick building with basement and was as aesthetically pleasing as any first-class public high school building which might have been erected at the time.

The Natural History Building or the Biological Laboratory (the names were used interchangeably) was estimated to cost $40,000, and the Trustees wisely planned to raise an additional $20,000 endowment for the upkeep of the facility. During the fall of 1893, President Smith spent much time in New York City, urging the New York Alumni to contribute to the venture. It was hoped that construction could begin in the spring, but there was no immediate response to the Trustees' appeal for funds. Rumors of an anonymous gift of $25,000 were unfounded, and it seemed for a while that the $60,000 would not be forthcoming. Actually, the Trustees could hardly have selected a less opportune time to begin a major fund drive for, by mid-summer of 1893, the country was in the midst of one of the most severe economic panics the nation has ever experienced. Railroads failed, banks closed, factories were forced to shut down, and by the summer of 1894 there were over four million Americans without jobs.

At Trinity there were diversions - both from the depression and from the embarrassing inability to secure the funds necessary to erect a
Hall of Natural History. In the fall of 1893, the campus was brightened, both literally and figuratively, with the installation of electric lights and on June 27, 1894, a magnificent flagpole was dedicated with a parade of military companies and speeches by Judge Hamersley, Senator Joseph B. Hawley, and other notables.

The depression at least had the effect of reconciling some of the idealists to buildings which were "unpretentious but useful," and those who still hoped for a completed Gothic Great Quadrangle could take comfort in the Trustees' decision to place the Biology Building out of the way on the south end of the campus and in line with Jarvis Physics Building.

As the clouds of economic depression began to lift, the Trustees resumed their efforts to raise funds for the Hall of Natural History. By June, 1898, small contributions had totaled $460,62 and Trustee J. Pierpont Morgan had pledged $10,000.63 Even the students were making pledges. Two undergraduates together subscribed $45.00, resolving to wear last year's suits and to contribute the equivalent of new suits to the Building Fund.64 On June 27, 1899, the Trustees bravely broke ground for the new building even though the Natural Science Building Fund then stood at only $1,505.66 exclusive of Mr. Morgan's pledge and after they had rejected a proposal by the New York Alumni to advance $40,000 "from the principal funds of the College." By June, 1900, additional contributions of $16,693.34 had been received.68 The new structure was completed in July, 1900, and dedicated on December 7 of that year. The building, which a year later was named Boardman Hall in recognition, or anticipation, of a gift to the College from the widow of Trustee William Whiting Boardman, was somewhat different in its final form from the original plan by Mr. Brocklesby. It was somewhat larger, had more brick and less terra cotta, and was of three stories rather than two. But, it was still squat.

The dedication was a big day at the College. There were addresses by Dr. William H. Howell, Professor of Physiology at Johns Hopkins University, and by Dr. Henry Fairfield Osborn, DeCosta Professor of Zoology at Columbia University. There were letters of congratulations from Cambridge University, Queens College in Cork, Ireland, Queens College in Belfast, the Universities of Zurich, Würzburg, Edinburgh, Dublin, Leipzig, Giessen, Geneva, Lausanne,
Braunschweig, Göttingen, Utrecht, Bonn, Oxford, Toulouse, Moscow, Tokyo, and Freiburg, University College, Cardiff, Wales, and Trinity College, Dublin.\textsuperscript{71}

It was doubtless J. Pierpont Morgan's gift which made possible the completion of Boardman Hall, and it was this gift which caused Morgan suddenly to become interested in the College and especially in the Department of Biology. Morgan had been on the Board of Trustees since 1886, and his election to the Board was probably in recognition of the contribution made toward Alumni Hall by his father, Junius S. Morgan, who was then living in England. J. Pierpont Morgan never attended the Trustees' meetings and, despite his great wealth, he had never contributed to the capital funds of the College. Even his gift toward Boardman Hall had been made with some reluctance.\textsuperscript{72}

But as his contribution toward Boardman Hall had amounted to one-fourth of its total cost,\textsuperscript{73} Morgan came to feel a particular responsibility for the instruction which was to be carried on within its walls. And, it was most certainly to be expected that a building devoted to the study of Biology should be presided over by a Professor of that branch of science.

When Biology was introduced to the curriculum in the 1880's the instruction was first supplied by Herbert W. Conn, Ph.D., from Wesleyan,\textsuperscript{74} and then for a while by the Reverend Frederick Gardiner, Jr., A.B., of Pomfret, as Instructor in Natural Science.\textsuperscript{75} Biology was a popular study at Trinity,\textsuperscript{76} and when it was first suggested that a Chair of Biology be created, Bishop Williams had hoped that Gardiner might "be called to fill it," in which event, the Professor could serve as rector of St. James' Church.\textsuperscript{77}

Nothing, of course, came of the Bishop's proposal, for it was not until the time of the building of Boardman Hall that the Trustees were able to give serious thought to a Chair in Biology, and by that time there was no possibility of using the new appointment as an accommodation to the Bishop of Connecticut. The Trustees intended to appoint a scholar of the highest calibre, and it was J. Pierpont Morgan who came to the rescue in agreeing to underwrite the Professorship in Natural History to the extent of $3,000 per year for a period of five years.\textsuperscript{78}

With this guarantee, at a time when Trinity's highest-paid Professors were being paid $2,500 per year,\textsuperscript{79} the Trustees were in a position to attract a distinguished Biologist to the Chair which they named the J. Pierpont Morgan Professorship of Natural History. The man selected for the...
new position was Charles Lincoln Edwards, B.S., Lombard College, 1884; B.S., Indiana University, 1886; M.A., Indiana, 1887; and Ph.D., Leipzig, 1890. Edwards had been on the faculties of the Universities of Texas and Cincinnati and had been prominently associated with the learned societies of his field. His researches in Marine Biology had taken him to the coast of Florida and to the Caribbean, and his findings had been published in the scholarly journals. At a salary, princely for Trinity, of $3,750, Professor Edwards was a natural complement to the other Professors in the sciences, Drs. Riggs and Robb.

Trinity was equally attractive to Professor Edwards. Boardman Hall was equipped with five large aquaria and other up-to-date equipment for the study of Marine Biology. Such equipment and the generosity of Alumni and others in securing specimens for the Museum of Natural History led Professor Edwards to hope that the College might help him fulfill a lifelong ambition by providing him with a “Floating Laboratory,” i.e., a 90-foot sloop to be fitted out for summer cruises to the Bahamas. Princeton had sent an expedition to Patagonia, and Bowdoin had sent one to Labrador. Trinity might send one to the southern waters.

The Trustees gave their approval to the project, but they were insistent that the management of the Floating Laboratory should be independent of the College and the Trinity Marine Laboratory was, therefore, chartered under Connecticut law as a separate corporation. The idea was an interesting one, and one which inspired another Trinity song, “A Smart Trinity Man,” by Philip Curtiss ’06, the smart Trinity man being, of course, Professor Charles Lincoln Edwards. But good as the idea of a Floating Laboratory was, there was no great response from the Alumni, and the Laboratory was never put afloat.

Although J. Pierpont Morgan could not be induced to sponsor Professor Edwards’ Floating Laboratory, he paid his $3,000 each year toward the salary of the Professor, and when the original agreement expired in 1905, Morgan agreed to continue the arrangement for a short while, but without obligation to assume the entire amount of Professor Edwards’ salary, nor even for the $3,000 of the original agreement. The annual gift was reduced to $2,250 in 1906, and the salary of Professor Edwards was reduced at that time to $3,000. But Morgan once more raised his contribution to $3,000 the following year and continued to pay the amount until 1908. Edwards’ salary of $3,000 was continued until that time.

The Trustees had perhaps assumed that Morgan would ultimately endow the Chair of Natural History, but when he merely agreed to continue his annual contribution for a limited time, efforts were made to raise the money from the Alumni. During the summer and fall of 1908, the College Treasurer wrote to numerous friends of the College. Perhaps feeling that there was something strange about being asked to endow a Professorship bearing the name of one of the wealthiest men in the United States, most of those who had been dunned either ignored the request or sent replies in which all manner of excuses were offered for their inability to contribute, and by the end of November, 1908, only $493.25 had been raised. By the summer of 1909, an additional $1,068.25 (in amounts from $.25 to $200) had been contributed, but this sum was used to pay the salary directly, and none of it was retained as endowment capital. That year the Professor of Natural History’s salary was reduced to $2,000, and the following year just a bit more than half ($1,090) of the reduced salary was contributed by Alumni and friends.

In 1910, Morgan gave the College $100,000 which, although not specifically intended for the Professorship, yielded $4,155 for many years, and this more than compensated for the loss of the annual gift. In 1916, Morgan’s son gave Trinity an additional $150,000, this sum to be used for benefit of the Library.

It was during the administration of George Williamson Smith that great internal changes in the College occurred—changes which were to completely reorient the institution, and changes which were to bring crises which, had they not been happily resolved, could have destroyed Trinity College. Superficially, most of these prob-
lems may appear to have been financial, but *au fond* they were much less simple than that, for the financial problems (the perennial problems) were merely symptomatic of other matters which had to do with the personality and capacities of George Williamson Smith, the size of the student body, and the relationship of the College to the Episcopal Church and the Diocese of Connecticut. And, in a way, all of these more basic concerns were so closely related that they may properly be considered simply as facets of a single question: What was the place and function at the beginning of the twentieth century of the small, church-related college for men?

Ever since 1849 the Bishop of Connecticut had been Chancellor and Visitor of the College. The Chancellor had been a powerful force in the affairs of the institution and, as it was the Chancellor who presided at all meetings of the Board of Trustees, many of the policies of the College were, without doubt, determined by him. Bishop Brownell, the first Chancellor, was much respected as the Founder of Trinity and the office had, indeed, been created to honor Bishop Brownell as Founder.

Bishop Williams, the second Chancellor, had had a long connection with Trinity, a connection which had begun, in fact, with Williams' undergraduate studies at the College and which had continued, after his resignation from the Presidency, as Lecturer in History. Abner Jackson was a close friend of Chancellor Williams and it was to Williams that Jackson owed his appointment as President. Thomas Ruggles Pynchon, too, enjoyed the favor of Bishop Williams and, despite the fact that the Chancellor was sometimes referred to as "Dean of the Faculty," an informal title of which the good Bishop would hardly have approved, Pynchon pretty much went his own way, except for occasions when he got himself into difficulties from which he could extricate himself only with Bishop Williams' help. Both Jackson and Pynchon accepted the situation without question. Both had spent the greater part of their adult lives in the Diocese of Connecticut and, as the church-related college was then conceived, some sort of official relationship to the Diocese was assumed.

When President Smith came to Trinity in 1883, he came as a complete outsider. He was not a Trinity graduate; he had never been resident in the Diocese; he probably had never known Bishop Williams personally; and he had had little experience in academic circles. Certainly, he had not read the Charter and By-Laws of the College with any care for, when he began his actual work at Trinity, he found the Presidency somewhat less than he had expected, so far as the powers of office were concerned.

Smith soon learned that the President of Trinity College had no *real* power—that he had no authority to call meetings of the Board of Trustees, that he had no means of dictating any policy of his own, and that there was a constant appeal from him to a higher jurisdiction. Despite these frustrations, Smith's early years were, as we have seen, marked by notable successes. Although technically lacking in authority, Smith had been able to persuade, and by persuasion he had been able to bring about such revolutionary measures as a modernization of the curriculum and a modification of the architectural plan of the campus—certainly no mean achievements for one who regarded himself as second in command!

George Williamson Smith did not question the fact of Trinity's Episcopal heritage, nor the ideal of some sort of relationship with the Episcopal Church, and certainly he seems to have fully accepted Trinity's traditional attitude toward formal religious observance. One of his first acts was to revive the Sunday morning services and to raise the standard of music for the Chapel at a time when most of the singing talent was being drained off to paid positions in the boy choirs of the Episcopal Churches of Hartford. And in his first report as President of the College, Smith declared that Trinity would not follow the trend of American colleges in de-emphasizing religion, arguing that Trinity could equal but not excel the "secular colleges" in academic matters and that it was in the religious and moral emphasis that Trinity could find her reason for being.
There was considerable evidence that Trinity was doing just what President Smith had claimed. Charles McLean Andrews '84 noted that when he went to the Johns Hopkins University as a graduate student he found the atmosphere less “decidedly Christian” than at Trinity.97 Morgan Dix, rector of Trinity Church in the City of New York, noted the “Christian stamp” upon the graduates of Trinity College,98 and the Rev. Dr. McConnell, rector of St. Stephen’s College, remarked at a meeting of the Philadelphia Alumni that the Trinity men he had known had “always impressed him as being gentlemen and Christians.”99

Smith was proud of his successes and felt that he had begun a work that would bring personal satisfaction, and this feeling had prompted him to decline consecration as Bishop of Easton in 1885. But despite outward appearances, there was considerable friction between the Chancellor and the President. Professor Martin, who knew and respected them both, declared that Bishop Williams “had an instinct and gift to rule as pronounced as that of any cardinal,” and that Smith, when he attempted to resist Williams’ rule, “found himself in the chill of a practical diocesan excommunication.”100

The conflict came to a head in November, 1888, when Smith was elected Bishop-Coadjutor of the Diocese of Northern Ohio.101 There were again the earnest entreaties that Smith decline the honor and remain at Trinity. Although the students felt that this time Smith would leave, they urged upon him an obligation to remain to complete the good work which he had begun, and they asked him to stay at Trinity to preserve the “firmer and healthier college tone” which had been evidenced during his administration.102 Numerous individuals among the Alumni wrote letters to the President praising his work and deploring the possibility of his leaving,103 and local alumni groups drafted petitions and resolutions to the same effect.104 The Trustees, too, declared their “unanimous approval and entire confidence” in President Smith.105 Hartford’s most famous citizen, Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain), wrote to President Smith suggesting that he “tell those Ohio people . . . that people are very well satisfied with you where you are, and are tired of this meddling. We can’t afford,” he wrote, “to furnish bishops for any Maryland and Ohio that comes along, and we cannot have ourselves being annoyed and made uneasy all the time this way.”106

President Smith suddenly found himself in a strong position and one in which he could again afford to be just a bit coy. Despite the unanimous expressions of approval, Smith was slow in indicating his decision, so slow, in fact, that after a delay of over a month, the Tablet, which had been so enthusiastic in its support of the President’s remaining at Trinity, began to editorialize on the matter of the Trinity Presidency. Noting that Trinity had lost three Presidents to the Episcopacy and with the possibility of losing still another, the editor of the Tablet again raised the question of the desirability of having a clergymen as head of the College. The better the President, he pointed out, the greater attention he receives and thus is increased the possibility of removing a man from the very work in which he achieves his reputation. Laymen are not subject to this danger and a layman as President would, furthermore, dispel “the impression that we are merely a divinity school.” And then the editor came to the particular case of President Smith, pointing out that as a clergymen-resident in the Diocese of Connecticut, he was doubly responsible to the Bishop – because of his canonical residence and because of the Bishop’s position as Chancellor of the College. As “the bishop is practically president,” he wrote, “… if any conflict arises between them [Bishop and President] as to a matter of discipline[,] the President[,] by reason of his position in the diocese[,] may be unable to enforce his authority.” Although the editor expressed hope that Smith would not leave, he also suggested that if such were to be the case, the Trustees would select one who would be “thoroughly unfettered” – in other words, a layman.107

Student journalists, as well as others, often editorialize on subjects of which they have imper-
fect knowledge. In this case, however, the Tablet's editor had, by intuition or by information, gained a perfect understanding of the internal situation at the College. But what he could not have known was that the Trustees were already acting along lines similar to those suggested in his editorial. Certainly, none were more aware of the tensions between Williams and Smith than the Trustees. Professor Martin has suggested that President Smith agreed to stay at Trinity if the office of Chancellor were to be abolished and if the President of the College were to be made President of the Board of Trustees. But whether there was actually a "deal" or not, it was Bishop Williams, who could be gracious as well as dictatorial, who at a meeting of the Board of Trustees held on November 21, 1888, suggested that the Trustees petition the Connecticut General Assembly to repeal the amendment to the Charter which had made the Bishop of Connecticut ex-officio Chancellor of the College. The motion was carried, and a Trustee Committee was appointed to prepare a bill. On January 24, 1889, the bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by a Mr. Sanger of Canterbury, and on February 20 it was passed by joint resolution of both houses. Thus was ended Trinity College's forty-year official tie with the Episcopal Diocese of Connecticut.

In mid-January of 1889, after the Trustees had voted to amend the College Charter, but before the bill had actually been introduced, George Williamson Smith announced that he had declined consecration as Bishop-Coadjutor of Northern Ohio and that he would continue as President of Trinity College—a decision that met with general satisfaction. Late in February, Mark Twain accompanied President Smith to New York City to attend a meeting of the New York Alumni where he immodestly, but characteristically, took the credit for Smith's continuing in the Trinity Presidency.

The charter amendment of 1889 had simply repealed the amendment of 1849, and the act of the General Assembly merely repealed the article of the Charter which had created the office of Chancellor. But although the Chancellor's office now had no legal sanction, the title was retained by Bishop Williams as Chancellor and Chairman of the Board of Visitors until his death in 1899. The Board of Visitors, too, was continued, although without legal sanction, but as the members died no replacements were made, and the last Catalogue to carry a list of the Visitors was that of 1905-1906.

The severing of the tie with the Diocese of Connecticut did not mean that there would be an immediate secularization of Trinity College. There were, of course, those who would have preferred to have it so, but there were many more who supported a strong Christian, and even Episcopalian, emphasis. President Smith had been careful to see that there was no proselytizing, and his administration had been praised for this stand. Those who wanted to retain the moderate Episcopalian influence were always articulate, and such persons were particularly hostile to the idea that Trinity's Anglican tradition (and connection) had impeded the College's progress. And those who were most ardent in support of an Episcopalian emphasis felt that Episcopalians had a particular responsibility to Trinity and to the other colleges which had been founded by Episcopalians. In an address to the New York Alumni Association, Bishop Potter had deplored the fact that Episcopalians were largely indifferent as to the choice of college to which they would send their sons and this, thought Bishop Potter, was not true of other churches. In 1886, Bishop Paddock, Trustee and Visitor, published An Open Letter from a Trustee to a Friend and Fellow-Alumnus in which he lamented that while Episcopalians, and others, criticize the College and point to the small student body as a damning feature, Episcopalians do nothing to help it grow. Bishop Paddock's brief publication brought forth a letter to the Tablet by a Congregationalist Alumnus in which the writer stressed the liberal attitude of the Trinity Faculty toward non-Episcopalians. This writer, who signed himself "Nu," stated that he would want the Episcopalian Faculty at Trinity to teach his own sons and that Episcopalians
are overlooking a splendid opportunity in sending their sons to such non-Episcopalian colleges as Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Dartmouth, or Amherst. President Smith, too, as well he might have, regretted that Episcopalians did not support their colleges.

With the severing of the direct tie to the Diocese of Connecticut, Smith thought that the charge of "sectarianism" could be made no longer and that there would be a rapid increase in the size of the student body. One of his first pronouncements after his agreement to remain at the College was that a new dormitory and library would have to be built and that both would cost some $300,000. The President was able to convince the Trustees of the desirability of enlarging the student body, a move the Alumni had long urged, and the governing board obligingly decided not to limit the number of enrollments and to admit all qualified applicants. The Trustees soon came to think in terms of an undergraduate body of 200, and this at a time when the students, both regular and special, numbered but 136.

But whatever the hopes of the President and Trustees, the number of students did not increase. Nor did the reference to Trinity as a "sectarian" institution subside. These two points were joined in an article in the *New York Evening Post* which compared the Catalogues of Trinity College for the late 1830's with that of 1890-1891. Particular mention was made of the fact that the College had experienced a remarkably small growth during the last fifty years, and the comment was made that such was the characteristic of "sectarian" colleges. And in commenting on the article, the *Tablet* noted that Trinity College was a double loser—non-Churchmen do not support the College because of its Episcopalian influence, and Episcopalians do not support the College any more than they do "secular" institutions.

President Smith had his own ideas on the problem, and they were not entirely without merit. His plan was to totally dissociate the College from the affairs of the Diocese of Connecticut and at the same time achieve some sort of informal relationship to the Episcopal Church at large. His success in eliminating the office of Chancellor had not been his first step, nor was it to be his last in this direction. Traditionally, the President of Trinity College had been elected to the Board of Trustees of the Episcopal Academy of Connecticut and all Presidents except Eliot, Kerfoot, and Jackson had been so honored. Smith had been elected in 1886, but he resigned the following year, probably in the interest of dissociating himself (and the College) from the affairs of a strictly Diocesan institution. In June of 1891, President Smith asked the Trustees to look into the matter of Trinity's relation to the Berkeley Divinity School, a Diocesan school, but one which had actually begun as the Theological Department of Trinity College. The Trustees appointed a committee (Bishop Williams and Luke A. Lockwood) "with reference to a change in the Berkeley Divinity School, so as to relieve the President [of Trinity College] of his compulsory membership on the Board of Trustees of that Institution." The committee, however, made no report to the Board.

A year later, President Smith asked the Trustees to request the next General Convention of the Episcopal Church to enact a canon to give the clerical Faculty at Trinity College the same standing "as officers in a general institution or chaplains in the army or navy." The committee to which the proposal was referred recommended that the matter be dropped because of the many complications which might arise. The committee report was accepted but not made the vote of the Board, for the Trustees immediately resolved to petition the General Convention as the President had originally requested.

A memorial to the General Convention was drafted and on October 10, 1892, it was presented to the House of Bishops at the Convention held in Baltimore, Maryland, by Bishop Niles of New Hampshire, a Trustee of the College. The petition was referred to the Committee on Memorials which, in turn, referred it to the Committee on Canons. The Committee on Canons recommended a change in Canon 15 which would permit "Professors in any institution of learning"
to retain canonical residence in a Diocese other than the one in which the institution was located. The motion was adopted by the House of Bishops and, upon ratification by the House of Deputies, the clerical members of the Trinity Faculty were removed from the absolute control of the Bishop of Connecticut. But although the amending of Canon 15 of the Episcopal Church removed one more possible restraint upon the Trinity Faculty, it in no way recognized a special connection of the College to the General Convention, nor did the canon mention Trinity College, or any other institution, by name.

President Smith still had one final piece of unfinished work in his efforts to extricate Trinity College from the Diocese of Connecticut—the ex-officio position of the Trinity President on the Board of Trustees of Berkeley Divinity School. Perhaps emboldened by his previous successes, Smith began to fight the question out at the meetings of the Berkeley Trustees. On December 8, 1894, he asked that the Berkeley Charter be amended so as to remove the President of the College from the Berkeley Board of Trustees. As the Berkeley Trustees took no immediate action, Smith opened the question two months later, and this time he became quite insistent. The connection of the President of the College to the Divinity School was injurious, he said, to the College. And the relationship, he argued, did not reflect the true situation, for he noted, perhaps incorrectly, that the understanding had always been that the Trinity graduates should go to the General Seminary rather than to Berkeley. In an attempt at mollification, the Berkeley Trustees assured President Smith that the arrangement between the Divinity School and the Trinity President was intended simply “to honor the Head of the College.” Smith was urged to withdraw his request, but he would not, and the Trustees of the Berkeley Divinity School ultimately succumbed to George Williamson Smith’s demands.

Trinity’s President had finally cut all ties with the Diocese of Connecticut, but he had not secured a new and larger connection with the whole Episcopal Church, and it might be seriously questioned whether this was what he really intended to do. At any rate, Trinity College had been legally “secularized”—so far as any official relationship to any portion of the Church was concerned.

But the legal “secularization” had little immediate effect upon the everyday affairs of the College. The old schedule of Chapel Services, for example, was maintained—evening services as well as morning, even though evening chapel had, by this time, been abandoned at most of the older colleges. The special services, such as the reading of the Litany daily during Lent, continued. Students, of course, had their complaints about chapel. One wrote to the Tablet insisting that compulsory chapel was “an infringement on the personal rights of religious thought and action,” and the editor of the Tablet once asked that more “outside” preachers be invited to the Chapel, but many of them suffered in silence and simply “read Sunday newspapers under the pews.”

The religious organizations continued in their former fashion. The Missionary Society continued to meet regularly, to support a scholarship in St. John’s College, Shanghai, and to provide leadership for a boys’ club at Grace Church and Sunday School teachers for various parishes in Hartford. During Lent of 1897, the Missionary Society sponsored a series of lectures by “outside speakers,” and the attendance of forty persons at the meetings attested to the fact that the society was still an active institution on campus. And in 1890 the Missionary Society was joined by a second religious organization—the St. Paul’s Guild, whose stated “object was to deepen the spiritual life of the students.” President Smith gave the guild his blessing and addressed the first regular meeting of the group. Unfortunately, however, the life of the organization was short.

Nor did the ending of the official ties to the Diocese of Connecticut result in the hoped-for increase in the number of students. President Smith could slant a report by a clever use of statistics to show a slight increase, but the conclusions must have deceived nobody. In a report to the Alumni for 1893, he stated that there had
been a notable growth of the College and a growth which could be attributed to the newer curricula which he had introduced in 1884.\textsuperscript{144} The \textit{Catalogue} partially confirmed Smith's claim, but not entirely. During the academic year of 1893–1894, there were listed eighty students in the Arts course (nineteen seniors, nineteen juniors, nineteen freshmen, and twenty-three sophomores), eighteen in Science, nine in Letters and Science, and one in Letters. There were also twelve special students.\textsuperscript{145} Thus, it could be argued that the Arts students had maintained the same strength as before the introduction of the new curricula and that the increase was in the newer courses. But there was another side to the matter of undergraduate statistics. In 1893–1894, there had been 122 students enrolled in the College, but nine were "special students not candidates for a degree." In 1894–1895 the number rose to 123. Twenty of these students were "specials," leaving only 103 students actually candidates for degrees, a situation to be accounted for largely by the Trustees' resolution of 1889 to admit "all qualified applicants."\textsuperscript{146}

The growth of the College was, to be sure, disappointingly slow, but it still had to be accounted for. In 1894, the \textit{Tablet} blamed the retention of the study of Latin and Greek,\textsuperscript{147} but no mention was made of the B.S. courses which did not require these languages. On another occasion, the \textit{Tablet} blamed the College's name of "Trinity" which suggested that the institution was either "in some way a Theological Seminary, or a place preparatory to such a seminary."\textsuperscript{148}

Sidney George Fisher, who could always serve as a catalyst in any unresolved situation at the College, published a little pamphlet which he hoped would clarify matters regarding Episcopal colleges in general and Trinity in particular. \textit{Church Colleges: Their History, Position and Importance, With Some Account of the Church Schools}\textsuperscript{149} appeared in the summer of 1895, and in it Fisher restated many of the ideas regarding church relationship which had been expressed during the past few years. A brief account was given of the secularization of the College of William and Mary, and there were definitions of the relationships of such institutions as Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania to the Church. There were also sketches of Kenyon, Trinity, Hobart, St. Stephens, and the University of the South, a statistical table of church schools, and reprintings of several addresses on the subject of higher education by George Williamson Smith.

Fisher's pamphlet inspired the Reverend Dr. Charles F. Hoffman to invite the heads of those colleges, seminaries, and schools which had either historical or active connections with the Church to a conference which was held in December of 1895 at his home in New York City. Hoffman was particularly interested in securing a uniform standard for granting the A.B. degree for the Episcopalian colleges, and his efforts led to the organizing of the Association for Promoting the Interests of the Protestant Episcopal Schools, Colleges, and Seminaries. George Williamson Smith was elected one of the vice presidents.\textsuperscript{150} The "Association" had little success, for it never developed into the "accrediting agency" which its founders intended. On May 1, 1896, the association met in New York City, and all that was agreed upon was to offer the three prizes of $300 each to the students at Trinity, Hobart, Kenyon, St. Stephens, Lehigh, and the University of the South. Although the scheme was intended "to bring the colleges into closer relationship with each other,"\textsuperscript{151} the \textit{Trinity Tablet} complained that the prizes were hardly in keeping with the newer developments in college curricula as they were to be awarded not in special competition, but for an examination to cover Latin, Greek, English, Mathematics, and Physics, and this would eliminate from the competition all except the A.B. students.\textsuperscript{152} The "Association" was badly conceived and it, fortunately, soon disappeared.

At this same time, President Smith was becoming involved in a grandiose plan to convert Trinity College into a university! For a college president who was under constant pressure from the Alumni to increase the number of students, the involvement was a natural one – perhaps one of desperation. And, in a way, the new movement was something of a turning to the Hartford Com-
munity when it was felt that the Episcopal Church had withheld the financial support which the College needed. The movement began somewhat nebulously when in 1895 several members of the Hartford Board of Trade proposed that there be created in Hartford a scientific school somewhat along the lines of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology or the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, which would train young men from the Hartford area "in mechanical engineering and applied mechanics."133

The technical school idea had not originated at the College, but President Smith and Professor Luther were active members of the committee which was appointed to formulate the plans, and from the beginning it was assumed that the institution would be an adjunct to Trinity College and that it would make use of the Trinity facilities. The Executive Committee of the Trustees was receptive to the idea and voted to provide whatever land the technical school should require.134 There was some question at first as to how the expense of the undertaking should be shared between the College and the city of Hartford and as to whether other institutions would be included in the arrangement, but as evidence of good faith the Trustees voted to "gladly cooperate in the establishment of Colleges in the City of Hartford in connection with Trinity College under university Government."135

There was, naturally, a great deal to be explained to those most directly interested in the welfare of the College, especially as the Catalogue had for many years explicitly stated that the sole purpose of the College was "to afford the opportunity for obtaining a liberal education."136 President Smith attended the meetings of the local alumni groups assuring them that the technical school project was not incompatible with the objectives of the College, but that it was to be encouraged as a means of "bringing the college more in touch with the citizens of Hartford."137 If the Alumni were not convinced of the merits of the project, the students were, for both President and students had hopes, although for different reasons, of enlarging the student body.138

The Trustees had approved the plan in principle, but there was much difficulty in getting down to particulars. The Hartford people were insistent that there be free tuition for Hartford students, as the technical school was intended to be "pre-eminentl y a Hartford institution." Even the most conservative estimate assumed the raising of $300,000—a new building and equipment would require $50,000; the endowment of two Professorships (one of applied mechanics and one of steam engineering) would need $100,000; and an endowment of $150,000 would provide for assistants, working engineers, and technicians.139 And it was, perhaps, this large sum of money to be raised which saved Trinity College from becoming permanently committed to a program which would most certainly have changed the very nature of the institution.

The Hartford community was still suffering the effects of the Panic of 1893, and no money was in sight from that quarter—even though the hope of Hartford money was what made the project so palatable to the college authorities. And even a broadening of the sponsorship to include civic leaders from neighboring towns brought no contributions. Smith continued to press the technical school idea among the Alumni, but again with no success.140

The technical school project, obviously, was not gaining much support. Smith, vainly having spent his energies during the winter of 1895–1896 for the proposed technical school, asked for a six-months leave of absence. The Trustees granted the leave and appointed Thomas Ruggles Pynchon as Acting-President,141 and under Pynchon (or perhaps any Acting-President) it was hardly to be expected that the technical school plans would have been furthered. And even the most optimistic promoters felt that it would be unwise to begin a formal canvass for funds until the nation's economy had recovered.142

So far as Trinity College was concerned, the technical school idea was "put in moth balls." But not so the "University" plan to which the Trustees had subscribed in June of 1896. Here several arrangements were made with other edu-
cational institutions which were intended to broaden the range of instruction open to Trinity students and to pool the resources of the several cooperating organizations. An arrangement was made between the College and the Hartford Hospital whereby the facilities of the hospital were opened to the Trinity students who intended to study Medicine. The Trinity students were permitted to observe surgical operations and to “follow interesting cases under the careful explanation of noted physicians.” Some of the Trinity students availed themselves of this facility, and the early success of this program prompted the Executive Committee of the Hartford Hospital to admit the Trinity students “to the course of lectures delivered before the Training School for Nurses.”

A similar arrangement was made with the Connecticut League of Art Students, which opened their studios and instruction to the Trinity students as an elective course. This arrangement was reciprocal, and members of the League were permitted to attend lectures and recitations at the College. Although there was no great number of “cross-registrations,” several members of the league attended lectures at the College during the Christmas Term of 1897-1898, and the Catalogue as late as 1900-1901 described the offerings of the Art League and the Hartford Hospital as “Instruction in Art and Medicine.”

With the temporary “shelving” of plans for the technical school, President Smith began to play down the university idea to the Alumni. Speaking in Boston on February 10, 1898, he told the Alumni that “Trinity is not a university[,] but a college in the true sense of the word,” and that Trinity is “not prepared at present to cast aside the time honored studies.” But further developments in Hartford made it obvious that while the President was “playing down” the university idea to the alumni, he was “playing it up” in Hartford. For several years the College Catalogue had noted that the Hartford Public Library, the Watkinson Library, the Library of the Connecticut Historical Society, the State Law Library, and the Case Memorial Library at the Hartford Theological Seminary were available to the Trinity students. In 1900, the Trustees took “steps . . . looking to a closer affiliation and inter-relation of the different libraries in the city of Hartford.”

Trinity’s graduate work in the Sciences had attracted much attention, and there was some feeling that the offerings might be extended to the Humanities. As the Hartford Theological Seminary developed the Program in Missions which in 1911 was to be organized as the Kennedy School of Missions, many courses were instituted at the Seminary in Oriental Languages. Professor Martin of the Trinity Faculty was teaching several of these courses, and there was serious thought given to offering them at the College rather than at the Seminary. The suggestion was never put into effect, and it may have been the presence of two women in Professor Martin’s course that stood in the way of carrying out the suggestion. President Smith, no matter how badly he wanted new students, made it clear that he did not favor co-education. At the Commencement Dinner of June 27, 1900, he responded to the Hartford sentiment toward co-education with a stern, “Gentlemen, we won’t do it that way.”

In 1901, the technical school plan was revived — perhaps largely by President Smith. The local press took up the cause once more and urged not only a first-class scientific school but also “a great school of commerce.” And this time the university idea received the support of a much respected member of the Faculty, Professor Martin. In the Trinity College Bulletin, a publication authorized by the Trustees in June, 1899, and intended to serve, in part, as a vehicle for publication of the results of the Faculty’s scholarly research, Professor Martin boldly declared that “the College has no alternative but to go on, and that rapidly, until Trinity College becomes a University universally regarded as a center of the highest intellectual work.” Princeton, his Alma Mater, Martin noted, had evolved under President Woodrow Wilson from a small college to a great university, and Trinity could do the same. Trinity should acquire a first-rate Faculty — at
least one scholar in each department, and a first-rate man, he said, would be "cheap at $7,500 per annum, the sum paid such men at Columbia and at Chicago." And as a first step toward achieving this goal, Martin suggested a huge endowment ($100,000 or $150,000) to attract a single renowned scholar to the Trinity College Faculty. 

This was the "last gasp" of the university idea. Martin's suggestion was not followed—perhaps it could not be followed. George Williamson Smith ended his services as President of Trinity College in 1904, and a single announcement was made regarding the possible opening of the technical school at the time his successor assumed office, and thus died the grandiose idea of the technical school and the university of Hartford which was to result.

The technical school plan was a fiasco, as was that of the university, but the resignation of George Williamson Smith came not over this issue, but rather, as in the case of his predecessor, Thomas Ruggles Pynchon, over a serious matter of student discipline.

President Smith, as we have seen, had met with many frustrations as well as successes, and some of his greatest disappointments had immediately followed his greatest victories. The year 1888 was, it would seem, the turning point in George Williamson Smith's career at Trinity College. Smith had been instrumental in breaking the official ties with the Episcopal Diocese of Connecticut, but he had not been able to place the College in a more favorable relationship with the General Convention of the Episcopal Church. This "secularizing" of the College had aroused an understandable hostility on the part of Connecticut Episcopalians which was only to increase through the years. And when the President turned to the Hartford community for support, the former close association with the Episcopal Church always stood in the way. The College maintained its old Episcopal characteristics and did not make any great appeal outside Episcopal circles and this despite the fact that Episcopalians in general never seem to have felt any particular affection or responsibility for Trinity. As late as 1897, almost the entire Senior Class were Episcopalians. At that time there were twenty-one Episcopalians, one Romanist, one Congregationalist, and two with "no particular religious belief." Of the Class of 1900, all but six were Episcopalians. That year two were Congregationalists, one Presbyterian, one Reformed, one Christian Scientist, and one with no affiliation. But in the statistics for the Class of 1900 was revealed a genuine indication of the secularization of the College. Of the Alumni whose occupations could be determined in 1900, 225 were clergymen, 129 were lawyers, 59 were physicians, 43 were in mercantile pursuits, and 41 were engaged in manufacturing. Of the 21 members of the Class of 1900, only two intended to study Theology. The chapel preachers were still Episcopalian clergymen, and it was not until March 24, 1901, that the first non-Episcopalian, the Reverend Joseph H. Twitchell, pastor of the Asylum Hill Congregational Church, was invited to preach at the College. Episcopalians still controlled the College, but no longer the Episcopal clergy! By 1903, there were only five clergymen (excluding the President) out of twenty-three on the Board of Trustees, and at that same time only three clergymen on the Board of Fellows.

With the Alumni, too, 1888 was the turning point. At first they had rallied 'round the new President and had given him unreserved support. Alumni contributions swelled the College coffers, and the Old Grads thought that a bright future awaited the institution. But when Smith alienated Connecticut Episcopalians and failed, at the same time, to secure a new base of support in the Hartford business community, he was obliged to make new demands upon an already generous Alumni, which they were naturally to resist. The Alumni refused to support the Floating Laboratory, they would have nothing to do with the proposed technical school, and they could never be brought to endow the Morgan Professorship. Even the contributions to the cost of erecting Boardman Hall seem to have been made under protest. President Smith had not lived up to his expectations, and especially displeasing to the
Alumni was his failure to enlarge the student body!

Perhaps President Smith retained the confidence and respect of the Trinity undergraduates longer than that of any other interested group. There were, to be sure, occasional lapses from the good order which Smith had restored, but his first years at Trinity were marked by an unusual propriety on the part of the students. The collegians occasionally took to breaking bottles on the "Long Walk," but President Smith was generous enough to overlook these lapses. In 1888, he felt so confident in his dealings with the students that he told a newspaper reporter that "there is no need of discipline at Trinity in the old sense of the word." But 1888 may also have marked the "beginning of the end" of the friendly relations between President and undergraduates, for it was at just about that time that the St. Patrick's Day rushes became a regular part of the Trinity extracurriculum. And as time went on and the St. Patrick's Day brawl became more bloody, there were occasions when even the most permissive college president would have been disturbed. The Lemon Squeezer incident of 1895 suggested a throwback to the disorderly days of Samuel Eliot, and as the century drew to a close there was a new rash of hazing which, too, was suggestive of practices at the College in the unhappy days of President Pynchon.

These trends, naturally, annoyed President Smith, and for once he seemed unable to exert his former paternal influence. Strained relations with ecclesiastical authorities and Alumni were soon reflected in his dealings with the students. And the undergraduates, formerly so respectful to his authority, now made the President the butt of some mild practical jokes. When Smith was on leave of absence, a "For Sale or To Rent" sign was placed on the President's house, and once in the "Ivy Dictionary of College Slang," defined "PREXY" as "A man with a gray moustache who is seen on Vernon Street several times during the year, but is more often off on a trip somewhere."

Once more the vicious cycle began, for as the students became less respectful of administrative authority, the President, supported by the Faculty, became more repressive.

The outbreak of the Spanish-American War provided a distraction which postponed the inevitable break. The students at first were in high spirits. King Alfonso XIII was burned in effigy, and during the spring of 1898 the students properly voiced the slogan "Remember the Maine!" A military company was organized, first in "a spirit of jest," but the members soon got down to regular drill under students who had come to Trinity from military preparatory schools or who had "received military training in some of the state organizations." Professor Robb was called by the federal government to assist in laying electric mines for the defense of New London, and by Commencement, 1898, nine Trinity undergraduates and twenty-three Alumni had answered the call to the colors. The number of volunteers would have been much greater had not most of the undergraduates been minors who failed to get parental permission to enlist.

The war again almost brought a general demoralization of the student body, and the big "blow-up" came in March, 1899, when, as punishment for a particularly brutal hazing session, four Sophomores were suspended. When the undergraduates signed a petition denouncing the alleged tyranny of the Faculty, the entire Sophomore Class was summoned before the Faculty and ordered to give a full account of both the hazing incident and the Class' part in circulating the student petition. The Sophomores appeared before the faculty but, as the local press reported the affair, followed a "know nothing policy," whereupon the entire Class was suspended for six weeks.

Once more the newspapers were filled with reports of events on Hartford's College Hill. The Faculty and administration were much embarrassed by the publicity, but they held firm on the matter of the suspension. The undergraduates were indignant, and once again they found support from the Alumni. The New York Association took immediate action and sent a committee to Hartford to meet with President Smith. The President refused to be moved by the demands.
of the New York Alumni, and it was finally the Board of Fellows who came through with a proposal for a compromise. The fellows suggested that the College delete the rule against hazing and that the students vote to abolish the custom. Early in May a College Meeting was held, and by an almost unanimous vote the students formally abolished hazing. The Senior and Freshman Classes then petitioned the Faculty to reinstate the suspended Sophomores, and the Faculty yielded to the extent of shortening the suspension by ten days.\textsuperscript{195}

But the damage was done! The students showed their distaste for President Smith by asking that the Baccalaureate Sermon be preached by someone from outside the College. But here, again, the President stood firm and answered the request by reminding the Seniors that he had already decided to preach the sermon himself, "as it is the custom of Heads of Colleges to do." But fully aware of his low standing in student estimation, he added: "I shall very much regret if this arrangement is distasteful to the class."\textsuperscript{196}

Perhaps Smith, too, had lost his effectiveness as a teacher, for he was soon to be relieved of all teaching duties and allowed to devote his entire time to administrative affairs.\textsuperscript{197}

The unfavorable newspaper publicity which had dealt with a tyrannical Faculty and a rowdy student body had a terrible effect. Several parents withdrew their sons and, during the summer of 1899, it seemed that there might not even be a Freshman Class for the coming September. President Smith began searching the highways and byways for students. When normal recruiting techniques failed, the President secured funds from some of his friends, and with this money he was able to offer remission of tuition and even money for personal expenses. Forty students were gathered by this means, but even President Smith was obliged to admit that "they were not first-class men."\textsuperscript{198} In fact, many of them were so poorly-prepared for college work that Harold Loomis Cleasby, valedictorian of the Class of 1899, was appointed Tutor, in which capacity he was, as the Tablet wrote, "to under-

take the somewhat thankless task of aiding backward students in their classical work." But the Tablet also made the most of a bad situation by noting that the addition of a Tutor to the Faculty ("He will be a regular instructor," wrote the Tablet) was "an Oxford idea." And even Professor Martin went along with this suggestion, for he soon expressed the hope that "this class of teacher, ... so important in the English Colleges," would be retained.\textsuperscript{199}

Despite Cleasby's efforts, many of those who had been admitted as Freshmen in 1899 flunked out, and at the end of the year only nineteen of the forty remained.\textsuperscript{200} President Smith, who had always favored enlarging the student body, now was obliged to change his tune and to rationalize in favor of the small college. At a meeting of the Boston Alumni, he stated that "the old idea was never to want more than 100 students. A small college, but one of the first class." And in his attempt to make the lemon sweet, perhaps more to himself than to the Boston Alumni, Smith argued that an increase in the number of students would mean an increase in the expense of operating the College. Furthermore, a student body of three hundred would change Trinity's character, and the students in such a large college would lose all the present social advantages. Finally, he suggested: "If we want to grow into a large college we can do so as well as any other college, but do we want this?"\textsuperscript{201}

And the answer to President Smith's rhetorical question was supplied by Professor Luther with an emphatic "Yes!" To the Hartford Association of Yale Alumni, Luther said: "Trinity, still a small college, now has twice the number of students enrolled fifteen years ago; and we mean to double that several times and faster. Doubtless there is a maximum number of students in excess of which is not desirable that a single institution should accept candidates. Just what that number is I do not know. ..."

Professor Luther's ideas were more indicative of alumni feelings than were President Smith's defeatist rationalizations. Soon the Alumni urged the Trustees to reduce the tuition fees so as to
attract students. The idea, however, was not accepted by the Board because of the poor financial situation of the College\textsuperscript{203} and perhaps, too, because of the miserable results of President Smith's recruiting of the year before.

When the College opened in September, 1900, the students were dismayed at the small number of Freshmen. The Class of 1904 was the smallest class for many years, and the undergraduates feared that if subsequent classes were to be equally small there would be little possibility of Trinity's participation in intercollegiate athletics. The Tablet came up with an ingenious idea. Not content to have the Class of '04 remain small, that frequent giver of good advice, the Tablet, urged the students to undertake their own recruiting campaign by encouraging their friends to transfer to Trinity from other colleges. The undergraduates were urged to tell their friends in other institutions of the advantages (1) of going to Trinity, and to "have them spend a week or so at college with you. Surely," said the Tablet editor, "the spell will work upon them, and they too will learn to love life "neath the elms" . . . ."\textsuperscript{204} The plans unfortunately met with little success, and the Class of 1904 numbered only six men at graduation, the only year in which more Masters' degrees were granted than Bachelors'.\textsuperscript{205}

Although the undergraduates were unable to swell the ranks of the Class of 1904, they spent the academic year in serious efforts to see that the Class of 1905 should be at least of the usual size. The Press Club was revived, and news releases (all favorable, of course) of College events were sent to some fifty newspapers, including the large dailies of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Washington, and Chicago.\textsuperscript{206} Alumni, too, joined in the effort. Judge Buffington was particularly active and that most loyal Alumnus set his own goal of doubling the student body. Repeatedly, in the Tablet and in letters to friends, he urged that the student body be doubled. This, he said, could easily be done if each student in the College would bring in another man. And, most important of all, Buffington wrote countless letters to prospective students whose names had been supplied by Alumni and undergraduates.\textsuperscript{207} Frederick E. Haight '87, too, brought several students from St. Paul's School in Garden City, Long Island.\textsuperscript{208}

When the Christmas Term opened in September of 1901, it was found that the Class of 1905 was the largest for a number of years. The Tablet congratulated Judge Buffington "and his able associates among the Faculty, alumni, and undergraduates upon the result of their efforts in the 'student-getting' cause."\textsuperscript{209} but no mention was made of the greatest factor in the size of the Freshman Class. The Trustees had, in desperation, suddenly reversed their former policy on remitting college fees as a means of attracting students. Explaining that the College owed the city of Hartford something for its exemption from city taxes, the Board voted to admit without fee those Hartford youths who could not otherwise attend college. Twenty additional students from the Greater Hartford area\textsuperscript{210} both swelled the Class of 1905 and went far toward reorienting the College toward the Hartford community — so far, in fact, that under George Williamson Smith's successor, Trinity came to be called "The Hartford Local."\textsuperscript{211}

Again there were many "dropouts," and throughout the College there was a pessimistic spirit. Several football games had to be cancelled because of low morale,\textsuperscript{212} and there was some question as to whether there would even be a Trinity Ivy in 1903 because of the small Class of '04.\textsuperscript{213} George Williamson Smith, already a bitter and austere old man at sixty-seven years of age, had lost his former charm.\textsuperscript{214} Smith was unpopular with the students and with the Alumni, and both groups blamed him for the condition of the College — for the depressed spirit and for the failure to secure more students. And now financial worries were added to President Smith's list of vexations. The fiscal year of 1901–1902 had closed with a deficit of $62,281.70.\textsuperscript{215}

Perhaps Smith, like several of his predecessors, tried to please. At least he was to make one more turn in his losing battle to enlarge the College and at the same time revive the sagging finances.
Having lost the support of Episcopal Churchmen, and having failed to inspire much confidence among the Hartford community, President Smith finally gave thought to securing state support for Trinity College. Suddenly he sang the praises of the state universities of the western states and expressed regret that the older states of the Northeast had done so little to support higher education. Comparing Connecticut to Kansas, Michigan, and Iowa, where a higher education was open without tuition fees to all young people of the state, President Smith suggested that Connecticut might at least go as far as New York, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and provide free scholarships to all who might be qualified for college admissions.216

But he could hardly have made a less welcome suggestion to a College which, although always small and sometimes less than academically select, was nevertheless eminently proper and proud of the social standing of the undergraduates and Alumni. Smith's new hint of admission of "all comers" and of state subsidies was unthinkable. Sydney George Fisher, writing to the Tablet, expressed fears that an increase in the student body along the lines suggested by President Smith would "let in a flood of persons who would destroy the social character of the college as the alumni recollect it."217 The Board of Fellows, which had been meeting regularly to consider the general condition of the College, responded to the President's latest proposal with a demand that the Trustees remove George Williamson Smith from the Presidency of Trinity College. This was serious business. The Trustees gave Smith a copy of the Fellows' Report and advised him to prepare his defense.218

Smith's reply to the Fellows' Report was a thirty-five page Confidential Report...to the Trustees in which he defended his administration, chided the Fellows for having "discharged no useful function during the past twenty years." The Fellows had insisted that there was much discontent on the part of the Alumni, but Smith declared that he had seen no evidence of such discontent, and that any dissatisfaction on the part of the Alumni would have been brought to his attention by the alumni representatives on the Board of Trustees. The Fellows noted that Trinity had "not kept pace in growth with other New England colleges," but Smith supplied statistics which revealed that Trinity's enrollment, while not keeping up with several of the leading institutions, was about the average of all New England and Middle Atlantic Region colleges and that other colleges than Trinity had not grown. To the more specific charge that Trinity's enrollment had actually decreased during the past twelve years, Smith found several convenient explanations. Trinity's high tuition and living fees had taken the College out of competition with comparable colleges; many young men now prefer to attend scientific schools rather than liberal arts colleges; several students went along with Dr. Robb when he resigned in 1902; and the bad publicity given to student disorders in 1899 had given the College an undeservedly bad name. The Fellows also noted that President Smith had been relieved of instructional duties so as to raise money, but that he had met with little success. The defendant here had no direct answer, but he was able to point to the recent depressed economic condition of the country and the increased cost of operating a first-rate college.

And then the President went on to state what he thought was wrong with Trinity College. The troubles of the institution, he felt, were largely the fault of the Alumni and Fellows who, "very much like a South American Republic, [find] 'the remedy for every evil, real or imagined, personal or Academic, being a Revolution.'" The College had been too much subject to alumni pressures in refusing admission to less affluent students. The College still had the "sectarian" stigma, which precluded support from outside the Episcopal Church, while Episcopalians accepted no responsibilities for the institution. Furthermore, the Episcopal Church was small in comparison with other ecclesiastical bodies, and such Episcopalians as do support Church colleges, "seem to work for the Church rather than the general welfare." Thus, George Williamson Smith defended his twenty years as head of Trinity College.

Whether the Trustees were convinced that
Smith's administration had been a success is much to be doubted, but at least they did not rush to carry out the recommendation of the Board of Fellows. After a lengthy discussion of both the Fellows' Report and the Report of President Smith, the Trustees voted to return the Fellows' Report and to advise the Fellows that the points raised in their report represented the opinions of individual signers and not the Board of Fellows and that the Fellows had acted upon a matter which did not fall within their province. The charges brought by the Fellows and the recommendation to dismiss President Smith were doubtless common knowledge, and the Trustees decided to do their own explaining of the internal situation at Trinity. They voted "to prepare a statement for distribution among the alumni and friends of the College, showing its condition and capacity for carrying on the work committed to it."220

The Trustees issued a brief pamphlet, The Aims, Accomplishments, and Needs of Trinity College: A Statement by the Trustees to its Alumni and Friends, which seemed to be more a vindication of President Smith than a confirmation of the charges brought by the Board of Fellows. The past twenty-five years were boldly described as a period of gains for the College. Trinity was described as a "family college for the liberal training needed as a preparation for the ordinary work of a cultivated man or for the pursuit of scientific or professional specialization." And so firmly was the College committed to that type of education that it had no intention of altering the traditional Trinity plan and purpose. Furthermore, Trinity recognized both the religious and intellectual elements in the curriculum with the chief purpose, however, being "educational, not ecclesiastical," and the religious emphasis intended "for developing the educated, Christian man." Also, Trinity would remain a small college! "The method is costly, but the noble impulse which prompts the devotion of some part of the accumulation of today for the benefits of future generations . . . is one that does not count the cost." And, in conclusion, the Trustees advised the friends of the College that a Trinity education could be ranked with the best that could be offered.

But this did not get President Smith "off the hook." It did, however, give him a chance to leave Trinity graciously and on June 5, 1903, he submitted his resignation to the Board of Trustees. In his communication to the Board, Smith asked that his resignation take effect on June 30, 1904, and that he be considered as on leave "for personal reasons" until that date.222 The resignation was accepted with the customary regrets. Professor Luther, as senior member of the Faculty, was made Dean of the College,223 and two weeks later he was designated Acting-President.224 There was doubtless much relief felt upon Smith's resignation, but there was apparently no unkindness. The Faculty passed resolutions expressing regrets,225 and the Hartford newspapers editorialized on the brighter sides of Smith's Presidency.226 Professor Martin attempted to explain to the Alumni that Smith's resignation was, given the circumstances, inevitable—and that President Smith was the victim of a situation over which he had little control.227 And Sidney George Fisher, in a pamphlet also intended for alumni circulation, described George Williamson Smith as "the best President Trinity ever had."228 The Trustees designated Smith President and Professor of Metaphysics Emeritus and voted him a lifetime pension of $3,000 per year.229 Following Commencement, 1903, Dr. and Mrs. Smith sailed for Europe, and during the eight months they were abroad Smith sent regular reports of his travels to Professor Martin who passed them on to the College family through the Trinity College Bulletin.230 Smith spent the summer of 1904 in Vermont and then lived in retirement in Washington, D.C.

At the time of the acceptance of George Williamson Smith's resignation, the Trustees had appointed a committee to nominate a successor. The Committee consisted of William E. Curtis, Luke A. Lockwood, the Reverend Francis Goodwin, Judge Buffington, and Colonel Jacob H. Greene.231 The committee's first choice as successor to George Williamson Smith was Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., then Secretary of Yale Univer-
sity, and one who had been eminently successful in raising funds. When it was known that Stokes could not be induced to leave Yale, the committee turned to Acting-President Luther. Late in January and early February, 1904, Luther was called to Pittsburgh by Judge Buffington. There, on a five-day visit, he met with the more prominent Pittsburgh alumni, was entertained at luncheons by several Pittsburgh clubs and societies, was taken to visit several preparatory schools in the Pittsburgh area and the Westinghouse Electric Company plant, and was guest of honor at a reception given by Judge Buffington at the Pittsburgh Club and at a smoker for all Pittsburgh Alumni. Obviously, the Pittsburgh people were “looking him over.”

On April 30, 1904, Flavel Sweeten Luther was unanimously elected President of Trinity College. The following day, the election was announced at the baseball game between Trinity and the Massachusetts State College. The announcement met with prolonged applause, and in the evening the entire student body marched to Luther’s house on Columbia Street and cheered him for almost half an hour. In an interview with a reporter from the Courant, Luther insisted that the election was a complete surprise and that the announcement had come “like a clap out of a clear sky.” And, in this same interview, Luther stated the policy which was to guide his administration of fifteen years. The College would be enlarged – there would be more students, more professors, and more money. And first of all, there would be a closer relationship between Trinity College and the Hartford community. Trinity was well on the way toward becoming “The Hartford Local.”

Luther’s election seemed to inspire a new confidence. The Tablet immediately declared that Luther became President “at a time when the students, the alumni, [and] the friends of Trinity are not only willing but anxious to be led by a strong man.” And as evidence of the new spirit, Trinity got a new song, “Dr. Luther,” sung to the tune of “Mr. Dooley,” seven stanzas and chorus, composed by none other than Judge Buffington. The Alumni Association, too, as we shall see in our next chapter, was inspired to undertake what was probably the most phenomenal fund-raising drive in the College’s history.

On Wednesday, October 26, 1904, Flavel Sweeten Luther was inaugurated with the most impressive academic ceremonial ever witnessed in Hartford. The day began at 8:30 A.M. with the celebration of the Holy Communion in the College Chapel. At 10:00, an academic procession with delegates from thirty-three colleges, universities, theological seminaries, and technical schools (all in academic regalia) formed on Prospect Street and marched to Parson’s Theater where the Inauguration Ceremony was held. At 12:00 P.M. the Inauguration Dinner was served in Alumni Hall, and at 3:30 P.M. a football game between Trinity and Stevens Institute of Technology (Trinity 5 – Stevens 0) was played on the Athletic Field. At 5:00 P.M. there was a reception by President and Mrs. Luther, and from 7:00 until 9:00 P.M. there was an illumination of the College and “singing by the alumni and students on the campus.”

The high spot of the day was, of course, the inaugural address, in which President Luther stressed the idea of “Education for Service.” Although he had no fault to find with the content of the traditional arts curriculum, Luther injected a new practical objective. “The object of education,” he said, “is to fit men and women to serve.” And this, it may be said, was to be the guiding philosophy of Luther’s administration.
The Hartford Local

Our last chapter has presented a rather grim picture of the academic and administrative side of Trinity College at the turn of the century. That it was a "low" period in the College's history is confirmed by the testimony of graduates of the period, but then, it was a low period in general for higher education in the United States. For some colleges, the period between 1880 and 1905 was simply one of stagnation. Those which had made the transition to more modern curricula suffered from the low scholarship which resulted from too liberal an elective policy, and those which had refused to abandon the classical curriculum found themselves without students either willing or able to undertake the prescribed courses. Institutions which had been transformed from colleges to universities were suffering from the problems of adjustment and organization, and those which had tried to become universities but had failed were feeling both frustration and embarrassment.

The Trinity picture, however, was not wholly dark, for the College had assets which were to insure its permanence. A loyal and devoted Alumni was not the least of these. A successful Alumni made the asset even more precious, for in 1904, the College could take pride in the fact that Trinity had 4.1% of her living Alumni listed in Who's Who in America, the highest percentage of any college in the United States! And there were other statistics in which the College could rejoice. In 1902, only Stanford University exceeded Trinity's faculty-student ratio of 1-8, with a ratio of 1-7. Trinity was tied with Cornell, and followed by Columbia, Yale, and Pennsylvania with 1-9, and then trailed off Harvard with 1-11, Minnesota with 1-13, California with 1-14, Princeton with 1-15, and Chicago with 1-18.

The Faculty was in many ways an exceptional one, and few colleges in the country could boast so high a percentage of Ph.D.'s. Almost all of the appointees since 1885 had the Doctorate, including Flavel Sweeten Luther's homemade one, and most of the degrees were from German universities, a fact of which the undergraduates of the time were notably proud. It was hardly the salaries being paid that attracted and kept Professors at Trinity, but the College was apparently doing all in its power to provide adequate compensation. Fortunately, the Professors either had independent means or they held, in the case of the science men, positions outside the College.

And then, there was the "psychic pay" of a congenial academic atmosphere and a place in Hartford society. The Faculty, too, had every reason to be comfortable in being obliged to teach only in the areas of their special competence. Certainly, one of George Williamson Smith's most significant accomplishments was that of bringing Trinity into line with the larger colleges and universities in defining academic departments. With the expanding knowledge in the several disciplines, the old non-specialist who could (or perhaps would) teach everything from Greek through Mathematics, Metaphysics, Chemistry, and Ethics could find no place in the college of the twentieth century. Across the country, even the older departments of the second half of the nineteenth century were becoming obsolete and were being divided and then further subdivided. Departments of Modern Languages were becoming, for example, Departments of
German and Departments of Romance Languages; Departments of History and Political Economy were giving way to Departments of History and Departments of Political Economy; and in the larger institutions Departments of Political Economy were fragmenting into Departments of Political Science, Departments of Sociology, and Departments of Economics. And so it was at Trinity. The last of Trinity’s non-specialists, Thomas Ruggles Pynchon, who had served as President, Librarian, Chaplain, and Professor, and who had, in the course of his many years at the College, taught Chemistry, Ethics, and Metaphysics, continued until 1902 as Brownell Professor of Moral Philosophy. In his classroom in Seabury Hall, “Old Pynch” droned on, probably little more inspiringly than in his earlier years but comfortably beneath the portrait of his idol, Bishop Butler, the eighteenth-century Anglican theologian, a canvas presented to Trinity by Pynchon himself “to forever remind the students of the religious foundations of the college.”

Samuel Hart, called “Sammy” by the undergraduates, left the College in 1899 to join the faculty of the Berkeley Divinity School, but during his long tenure at Trinity he had endeared himself to the college community and had achieved more than local recognition as a classical and liturgical scholar. He had been president of the Connecticut Historical Society and the American Philological Association. In 1892, he had been made Custodian of the Book of Common Prayer, and in 1898 he was made Historiographer of the Episcopal Church.

Hart, one of the few bachelors on the Faculty, was, without doubt, the most fastidious in his appearance. He was always immaculate in his black doeskin suit, clerical collar, and highly-polished shoes. Always, he wore his Phi Beta Kappa key, and sometimes he sported an Oxford cap. Hart loved good food and good wines, and he dined each evening at the Heublein Hotel. But Hart also loved his fellow men, and every evening on the way to the Heublein he stopped at the Hartford Hospital to visit the sick. When Hart left Trinity, the Alumni undertook to raise a book fund of $5,000 in his honor.

William Lispenard Robb, Professor of Physics since 1885, had a fine reputation among American physicists. Until his leaving Trinity in 1902 for a professorship at the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Robb had attracted graduate students to Trinity in considerable numbers and, indeed, it might be said that he was the one largely responsible for the development of the graduate program at Trinity. Robb was quiet and retiring, he never strayed far from his laboratory in Jarvis Physics Laboratory, and he seldom, if ever, attended Chapel.

Until he left Trinity in 1906 to become rector of St. Paul’s School in Concord, New Hampshire, Henry Ferguson was probably the most popular teacher at the College. The annual Commencement Supplement of the Trinity Tablet in reporting “Class Statistics” consistently listed Ferguson as the students’ favorite lecturer. And well he might have been, for “Fergy” was a kindly and generous man. He and Luther had come to Trinity in the same year (1883) but Luther’s appointment had been made, as Luther once put it, five minutes before Ferguson’s. Thus Luther had a technical seniority, and when George Williamson Smith resigned, Luther was made Acting President on the basis of this technicality. During the early years of Luther’s Presidency, Ferguson was a tower of strength to the new executive.

Ferguson was a man of considerable financial means, and he never hesitated to use his wealth for the benefit of the College. During his years at Trinity, he endowed the Hartford Admittitur Prize for the highest-ranking Freshman from Hartford Public High School and the Ferguson Prizes in History and Political Science. He contributed the College’s share to institutional membership in the American School of Biblical and Oriental Study at Jerusalem. He also provided the Department of History with a complete reference library, and from time-to-time he supplied the Library with journals and periodicals and also gave the money to have them bound. He made sizeable contributions to the College for the
upkeep of the gymnasium, for the purchase of equipment of the athletic teams, and for the improvement of the grounds. And when the students urged that "outside preachers" be brought to the Sunday chapel services, Professor Ferguson underwrote the honoraria.

As Northam Professor, Henry Ferguson was obliged to teach History, Economics, and Political Science. When the course offerings in these three disciplines expanded to the point where they could no longer be taught by one man, Ferguson asked the Trustees to provide an Instructor in Economics. When the Corporation explained that the financial condition of the College would not permit such an addition, Ferguson himself paid the salary. In 1903, he gave $10,000 toward the endowing of a Professorship in Economics.

Charles Frederick ("Boo-Hoo") Johnson was the campus "character." He had once taught Mathematics at the United States Naval Academy, and in 1883 he was brought to Trinity by George Williamson Smith to teach English. Although he was recognized as something of an authority on English Literature and was a poet of sorts—his publications included *English Words* (1897), a textbook; *Three Englishmen and Three Americans* (1890); *Elements of Literary Criticism* (1898); *What Can I Do For Brady and Other Poems*; *Outline History of English and American Literature* (1900); and *Shakespeare and His Critics* (1909)—his hobbies (designing bridges and experimenting with gravitation) reflected his earlier associations. For many years he served as literary critic for the *Hartford Courant*. Although he attempted, with considerable success, to practice both, Johnson drew a sharp distinction between "artistic literature" and exact scholarship.

Johnson was popular with the students, and he reciprocated by following Trinity athletics with a keen interest. He was enthusiastic about his subject and tried to have his students share his love of Literature, so much so perhaps, that he showed some favoritism to those he felt were "kindred souls." Johnson's classroom humor delighted his students, and his jokes were responded to with applause and stamping on the floor. Professor Ferguson occupied the classroom immediately below that of Professor Johnson, and he sometimes expressed considerable displeasure. Once, after a particularly noisy session, Ferguson met Johnson in the entry with a complaint. "Boo-Hoo" quickly replied, "Hmm, keeps your class awake, does it?"

But "Boo-Hoo" was often the victim of practical jokes. Students would occasionally engage him in conversations while others would steal the quiz papers and carry them from the room. Once six alarm clocks went off in the room simultaneously. Johnson doubtless enjoyed the undergraduates' jokes as much as his own.

The Reverend John James McCook was the campus "Saint." "Johnny McCook," as he was called by Faculty and students alike, taught French and German. Although one alumnus once declared that McCook's severity in the classroom nearly turned his hair white and another thought him "lacking the tenderness, sympathy and consideration that go with . . . a Christian gentleman," the consensus was that McCook was gentleman, scholar, and saint.

McCook was graduated from Trinity in 1863, and following his graduation he had studied Medicine briefly and then proceeded to the Berkeley Divinity School. After graduation from seminary, he served several parishes before settling down at St. John's Church at East Hartford. In 1883, he joined the Trinity Faculty and, until...
his retirement in 1922, he served the cause of
secular learning at Trinity and God at St. John's,
East Hartford. He served St. John's Church, it
might be noted, without remuneration. McCook
was a High-Churchman, so much so in fact, that
Presidents Smith and Luther both discouraged,
if not actually forbade, student attendance at
St. John's. But whatever the College authorities
thought of McCook's churchmanship, Trinity
granted him a D.D. in 1901 and the LL.D. in
1910. Upon his retirement in 1922, he was elected
a Trustee of the College.

John McCook loved sports, and on several oc­
casions he was instrumental in raising money for
athletic purposes. Cricket was his favorite game,
and once on a trip to England he purchased
cricket equipment and attempted to re-introduce
the sport at the College. McCook was also some­
things of a practical sociologist, having made
elaborate studies of the American hobo, vagrancy,
poor relief, and the penal systems. 18

Winfred Robert Martin held the title of Pro­
fessor of Oriental Languages, but in addition to
teaching Sanskrit, Arabic, and Hebrew, he also
taught Spanish and shared the instruction in
French with Professor McCook. Martin was tall
(6 feet, 4 inches), gaunt, and dignified. His
height accounted for his nickname, "Shorty."
Martin always wore a Prince Albert coat, and he
was seldom seen without his pipe or a cigar.
While lecturing he would light match after
match, allowing the flame to proceed almost to
his fingers before letting the matchstick fall.

"Shorty" was the son of the Reverend Dr.
W. A. P. Martin, the founder and first president
of the Imperial University at Peking, China. As
Professor of Oriental Languages, Martin taught
the Old Testament portion of the course in
"Piety." And as a devout Presbyterian, he went
to great lengths to explain the Old Testament
miracles on rational grounds. When asked about
the New Testament miracles, however, he was
quick to respond that they must be taken on faith
rather than reason.

Always regarded as a man of profound learn­
ing, Martin was a "Marathon Talker." A col­
league once declared that when addressing a
large group, Martin became "hypnotized by his
own eloquence and never knew when to stop." But
despite this shortcoming, Martin was held in
highest esteem by the undergraduates. When he
was given a leave of absence to visit Palestine
during the Trinity Term of 1902, the students
held a special College Meeting and presented
him "with a case containing three handsomely
mounted pipes, and an amber gold-mounted ci­
gar holder."

Martin dearly loved Trinity and worked in­
cessantly for her welfare. He was one of those
most genuinely interested in raising the academic
tone of the College. But perhaps he was some­
what out of his element in a college which pro­
vided enrollments in his Sanskrit courses of from
one to four students. When the "University Move­
ment" collapsed, Martin felt that his dreams of
academic excellence could not be realized at
Trinity. In 1907, he resigned his Professorship to
become librarian of the Hispanic Society of
America in New York City. Shortly before his
death in 1915, he was honored by the King of
Spain by being made a Knight of the Order of
Isabella the Catholic. 19

In the Chair of Greek was Frank Cole Babbitt,
Ph.D., Harvard. Babbitt's Soap was a much-ad­
vertised commodity of the time, and the students
gave the Professor of Greek the nickname of
"Soapy." Babbitt was one of the younger mem­
bers of the Faculty but one of the great Ameri­
can authorities on Greek Literature. Both the
Professor and Mrs. Babbitt were popular as chap­
erones and as sponsors of campus social affairs.
Babbitt was fond of sports. He was a great ten­
nis player, and in 1904 finished second out of
twenty-eight in the College's Fall Tennis Tourna­
ment, having been, in fact, the only member of
the Faculty to enter the competition. He was
also a member of a "Walking Group" which had
been formed by William Newnham Carlton, the
Librarian, and which also included Professor
Riggs, Tutor Cleasby, and Edgar F. Waterman,
the College Treasurer. The Walking Group was
a congenial party which made several expedi­
tions each year, walking as far as Meriden or New
Haven, eating dinner at a hotel, and returning to
Hartford the following day by train. Babbitt was regarded as one of the more popular teachers, and for many years he was Secretary of the Faculty.

Charles Lincoln Edwards was perhaps the member of the Trinity Faculty best known in the academic world and certainly the one who did most to make Trinity's name heard in scientific circles. Edwards had many friends among the leading biologists of his day as well as among the physical scientists. Largely through Professor Edwards' efforts, a Conference on Physiography and Geology was held at Trinity immediately following the dedication of Boardman Hall. Papers were read by Professors from Wesleyan, Smith, Mt. Holyoke, and Harvard, and there were also guests from Yale, Columbia, Massachusetts Normal School, and several New England preparatory schools and high schools.

In 1903, Professor Edwards introduced the seminar method of instruction to Trinity. The course numbered "Natural History 10" was a biological seminar intended to take advanced students in Biology beyond the usual material covered in undergraduate courses. Students were introduced to the periodical literature of the Biological Sciences, and they were required to prepare serious papers based on their reading and laboratory experiments. And it was Dr. Edwards' Biology Seminar which first offered instruction to women at Trinity. In 1903, in addition to four undergraduates and Dr. Genthe, Edwards' assistant, the seminar had two women members—a Miss Stone of Hartford Public High School and a Miss Watkinson of Smith College.

Because of his extensive training in the German universities, Edwards set high standards for himself and his students. Each year he published several articles in the major scientific journals, and his objective for the Trinity undergraduate biology student was to get him into a first-rate graduate school. Consequently, Edwards' courses were among the most difficult ones offered at the College. But although Edwards was most exacting in his demands, students found him "very exciting," and his enrollments were large.

The "Bright Young Man" on the Trinity Faculty was Herbert Müller Hopkins, Ph.D. Harvard, 1898. After three years at the University of California, Hopkins came to Trinity in the Christmas Term of 1901 as Instructor in Latin. He had come with remarkable qualifications, for already he had published articles on Latin Philology in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association and several poems in The Bookman. Also, he had more than usual musical talent, and he soon took over as Chapel Organist. He was popular with undergraduates, Faculty, and administration, and soon he was advanced from Instructor to full Professor of Latin.

But it was Hopkins' literary interest which made his stay at Trinity unfortunately short. In addition to writing scholarly articles and poetry, Hopkins had published several novels, none of them, however, of any real literary merit. The first novel, The Fighting Bishop, attracted little attention, but the second, The Torch, published in 1903 by Bobbs-Merrill Company, created quite a stir on the West Coast. The novel dealt with the downfall of Dr. Babington, the greedy and immoral president of the University of Argos, a state university located somewhere in the Far West. Reviewers thought that the University of Argos was Stanford University and that Dr. Babington was Stanford's president, David Starr Jordan. Hopkins felt obliged to issue a statement to the effect that no characters in The Torch were taken from life and that the University of Argos was purely the creation of his own mind.

In 1905, Hopkins published a third novel, The Mayor of Warwick, in which, with little or no disguise, Warwick was Hartford and St. George's Hall was Trinity College. This was neither the first nor the last "Trinity novel." In 1875, Miss Julie P. Smith of Hartford wrote Courting and Farming with scenes in Trinity College and Litchfield, Connecticut. And in 1911, Samuel Richard Fuller, Jr. '00, writing under the pen name of Norman Brainerd, published Winning the Junior Cup: or The Honor of Stub Barrows, the scene of which was laid at Washington College, where commencement exercises were held in front of the statue of Bishop Darling in the shadow of Southam Towers and where the stu-
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Students sang "'Neath the Elms of our Old Washington." The great difference was that practically every character in The Mayor of Warwick could be identified with someone on the Trinity Faculty or in the Hartford community. The mayor was a well-known Democratic politician and the ecclesiastical characters were obviously intended as caricatures of the Anglican Hierarchy of the Diocese of Connecticut. The Faculty at St. George's Hall could find obvious counterparts at turn-of-the-century Trinity, and few of the characters in the novel came off in a very flattering fashion. Thus, it was hardly coincidence that Professor Hopkins resigned from the Trinity Faculty in the spring of 1905 to enter the General Theological Seminary to prepare for Holy Orders.

Henry Augustus Perkins came to the College in 1902 as Professor of Physics. He was then one of the younger members of the Faculty, so young in fact that he grew a beard to distinguish himself, as he once said, from the Freshmen. And Professor Perkins kept the beard throughout his lifetime. Perkins' appointment, as has already been indicated, broke the tradition of appointing only men with Ph.D.'s, and, as his training had been in Engineering rather than in Theoretical Physics, it was perhaps quite natural that Perkins' teaching was more in the direction of the practical (or industrial) application of his branch of Science. It was this interest that caused Perkins to cultivate connections with the electrical industry and to have him take his class on regular "field trips" to the General Electric plant in Schenectady, New York.

Perkins' students held him, despite his youth, in high regard, and their admiration was enhanced by the fact that he purchased one of the first automobiles (a 1903 Oldsmobile) to appear on campus. His colleagues insisted that he had never really learned to drive and that to ride with the Professor of Physics was to take unnecessary chances. Perhaps Perkins shared their views, for as he grew older he came to rely on his bicycle to take him from his home to the College. Perkins was an amateur musician, and he enlivened his lectures on sound waves with practical demonstrations on the zither, flute, clarinet, and trombone. To quote his friend and later colleague, Morse S. Allen: "He played tennis and was a
member of the Hartford Golf Club; he painted; he collected stamps; he sailed; he rode horseback. Akin to his love of music was his delight in dancing. At a Senior Ball many years ago, the effect on him of 'The Blue Danube' was unforgettable. He persuasively begged the permission of an instructor's pretty young Belgian wife to waltz in the Viennese fashion. And they began a performance which, with its flowing grace and swooping élan, soon became a solo which ended with a round of applause. 27

Karl Wilhelm Genthe, Ph.D., Leipzig, had come to Trinity in 1901 as a protegé of Professor Edwards. Genthe was a young man of extraordinary talent. He served as curator of the museum collection which occupied so large a portion of Boardman Hall, he taught courses in Geology, and he shared the instruction in Biology with Dr. Edwards. Genthe was a most prolific writer on scientific subjects, and for several years hardly an issue of the *Trinity Tablet* appeared without mention of another article having come from his pen. He was also a consultant for the Smithsonian Institution and the United States Bureau of Fisheries.

Although Genthe's early status was that of Instructor, his abilities were recognized by the administration, and he was soon promoted, doubtless on Professor Edwards' insistence, to Assistant Professor and then to full Professor of Natural History. This final promotion upset the traditional "table of organization" of the College, for never before had there been two full Professors in a single department. So long as J. Pierpont Morgan had assumed the payment of Professor Edwards' salary, there was no problem, but when Morgan's annual contribution could no longer be assumed, the presence on the Faculty of two top-rate biologists came under serious question by the President. In his *Report* of 1908, President Luther recommended that the "Department of Natural History be put in the hands of a professor and a tutor rather than in the hands of two professors," and that Professors Edwards and Genthe be advised of this policy. President Luther was asking *somebody* to make a choice; the Trustees could choose which one of the two Professors was to be retained, or the two Professors themselves could decide which one of them would leave. It was the Professors themselves who made the choice. They had virtually come to the College together and they left together and, thus, because of the shortsightedness of Flavel Sweeten Luther, Trinity lost two of her most valuable assets. 28

Gustavus Adolphus Kleene, Ph.D., Pennsylvania, became Professor of Economics in 1902, when History and the Social Sciences went their separate ways at Trinity. Professor Kleene was a popular member of the Faculty both on campus and in town. His courses were well received by the undergraduates despite the fact that Kleene's discipline was a new one for that time. He was also a popular lecturer in Hartford on economic subjects. 29

A most unusual member of the Trinity College Faculty was the Librarian, William Newnham Chattin Carlton. Born in England in 1873, he was the son of an English army officer who migrated to the United States in 1882. Young Carlton attended the Holyoke, Massachusetts, public schools and then spent a year at Mt. Hermon School. After a short stint in the Holyoke Public Library, he came to Hartford as an assistant in the Watkinson Library. While in Hartford, he continued his education under the direction of Professor Hart of the College Faculty until Hart's resignation in 1899. Hart recommended Carlton as his successor in the Trinity Library, and thus the College for the first time in its history was
able to secure the services of an experienced librarian.

And it was most fortunate that Carlton came to Trinity at that time. The book collection was expanding rapidly, largely through the efforts of Sydney George Fisher, who was then working diligently among the Alumni to secure books and money for book purchases. The library space, too, was expanding, for with the removal of the Department of Natural History to Boardman Hall, additional stack space was made available in Seabury. And as the curriculum was broadened and the method of instruction was modernized, new demands were made on the Library. There was no question as to whether the College needed the services of a full-time librarian.

Despite the limitations of his formal education, Carlton was something of a scholar, and during his years at Trinity he compiled several important bibliographies and wrote two treatises on Scandinavian literature. In 1902, Professor Johnson was given a sabbatical, and Carlton was selected to take over Johnson’s classes in English I. Carlton was given an honorary M.A., and in the fall of 1902 he was made Instructor in English. As a teacher, Carlton was as competent as he was as Librarian. Students loved his sociability and his evenings with them at the Heublein. The Faculty, too, held Carlton in highest regard; he served as Faculty Secretary, and at Faculty Meetings and on Faculty Committees his wise counsels were much respected.

Carlton served Trinity until 1919, when he resigned to become head of the Newberry Library in Chicago. Later, he entered the rare book business with George D. Smith, the noted dealer in New York. Smith’s sudden death put an end to this venture, and Carlton then served successively at the American Library in Paris, the Hamilton, Ontario, Public Library, and Williams College.

The Trinity Faculty in those Days of the Giants (and the older Alumni will insist, with justice, that they were Giants) was obviously far better than the College had any reason to expect. With small salaries and a small number of students to teach, the Professors shared the common denominator of having an intense love for the institution and the hope for a better day. Several of them, as we have seen, ultimately lost the hope of Trinity’s ever rising to an academic greatness which they thought would be commensurate with their own worth, but others—and perhaps of equal ability—preferred to remain with the ship and refused to admit that it was sinking.

Most conspicuously loyal to Trinity was President Luther, who had assumed the administration of the College’s affairs at one of her lowest points. Luther was an incurable optimist, and only an optimist could have induced himself to become President of Trinity College in 1904. Luther had been on the Faculty since 1883, and he had seen the remarkable developments of the early years of George Williamson Smith. He had also witnessed the “secularization” of the College and the alienation of a large body of the institution’s erstwhile supporters. He had gone along with President Smith in his proposals for a closer relationship of the College and the Hartford community, and he had been one of those most ardent in urging the establishment of the technical school. And many of the policies adopted by his predecessor as negative measures of desperation became the positive positions of Flavel S. Luther after 1904.

Luther’s devotion to the College had been repeatedly demonstrated beyond question. In 1895, for example, the Reverend Doctor Theodore Sterling resigned as president of Kenyon College. Luther had been the successful headmaster of the Kenyon Grammar School for twelve years before his coming to Trinity, and the Kenyon Trustees elected Luther to fill the position. Luther was sufficiently interested in the honor to go to Ohio to meet with the Kenyon Trustees but, after due consideration of what must have been a most flattering offer, Luther decided to remain at Trinity. Five years later, after what a colleague described as “continuous toil of seventeen years,” Luther was granted a sabbatical leave for a year’s study at Cambridge, England.

Although Luther was not the most popular teacher (student opinion of his abilities seems to have reflected the student’s own preference or distaste for Mathematics), he was greatly be-
Flavel Sweeten Luther
loved by the undergraduates as an individual. Luther was always present at the athletic contests, and his occasional appearances for Sunday dinner at the College Commons were much appreciated by the students. And of the College Faculty, Luther seems to have been the most acceptable chapel preacher.35

Luther was well known in Hartford. Several important local industries had long retained him as consultant, and he was known in Hartford manufacturing circles for having “made the reckonings for the famous Pope bevel gear chainless bicycle, and for the first scientific velodrome track built in this country.” He was an active member of the Hartford Board of Trade. He was a public speaker of considerable ability, and he was in great demand both as a public lecturer and as a preacher. Luther was one of the organizers of the Workingmen’s Club of Hartford, and he frequently appeared as a lecturer before that group.36

But what were Luther’s qualifications for the Presidency of Trinity College? In physical appearance, he cut no remarkable figure, and it may be said that he totally lacked the cold dignity of his predecessors, Pynchon and Smith. He was of medium height, just a bit stout, moustached, and careless in his dress. His trouser legs were usually three or four inches shorter than were worn at the time,37 and he smoked cigars incessantly—down to the last inch.38

At first thought, it may seem that since Luther was the Trustees’ second choice as President, the Corporation had simply reverted to the old policy of placing the senior member of the Faculty in the President’s chair—especially as the financial situation of the College would not very likely have made the position attractive to someone from the outside. On the other hand, Luther had qualities and attitudes which were quite typical of the day, and he had evidenced interests and sympathies which doubtless indicated to at least some members of the Board the direction in which the College would be obliged to turn.

Luther had a fine sense of humor, and this quality had always made him welcome at the meetings of the local alumni groups. He was an Alumnus of the College, and influential Alumni and Trustees recalled that the College’s last great President, Abner Jackson, too, had been a Trinity man. Luther had had some success as a fund raiser, for between 1900 and 1902 he had been the driving force in securing $10,000 for the grading and draining of the College athletic field.39 He had also at least partially resolved the technical school problem by instituting, during his Acting-Presidency, a curriculum in Engineering which met some of the demands from the Hartford community for technical instruction at the College.40 Luther had thus demonstrated a capacity to provide accommodation to local pressures without following a course of action which would have heightened the fears of the Alumni that the essential nature of the College would be changed.

Luther’s canonical status, too, was a strong point in his favor. When he had gone west in the early 1870’s, Luther had taken Deacon’s Orders, probably because it was expected of him as headmaster of an Episcopal preparatory school, but he had never been ordained priest. Perhaps this anomalous position was an advantage, for it could have satisfied both those who preferred a clergyman and those who preferred a layman as head of the College.

But what perhaps most commended Flavel Sweeten Luther to the Presidency of Trinity College were his political views. Luther was an ardent Progressive, a strong advocate of social reform, a personal friend of President Theodore Roosevelt, and a great admirer of Lincoln Steffens, the Muckraking reformer who had attracted national attention with his shocking book, The Shame of the Cities.41 Although Luther had once described himself as being “a good deal inclined to socialism,”42 he was a staunch Republican, and in 1906 and 1908 he was to be elected to the Connecticut State Senate on the Republican ticket.43

“Progressivism” was in the academic air, and with it had come ideas which were to make a lasting mark upon the American system of higher education. The most obvious of these new Progressive ideas was one regarding the very func-
tion of the American college and university. The Progressive educational philosophy was neither the traditional English idea of producing "gentlemen aristocrats" nor the German idea of producing scholars. The American function had come to be one of "service,"44 and President Luther's inaugural address had been an unequivocal commitment to this ideal. Throughout his administration Luther was to repeat the "theme song" of "Education for Service," and whether on campus or in the wide world,45 he would hammer away at his idea. Even his sermons were full of the idea of "service," and his Baccalaureate sermon of 1914 was concerned largely with the theme of "Christian scholarship devoted to public service."46

Luther's political Progressivism was infectious. The Courant, in an editorial for the opening day of the Christmas Term, 1906, reported that "Trinity College is better equipped than ever for the work of contributing to American citizenship well-taught, well-mannered, healthy-minded, public-spirited Christian gentleman."47 The Tripod, too, reflected Luther's idea of "service," and the masthead of the undergraduate newspaper (founded in 1904) regularly carried one of Luther's oft-repeated challenges: "Now then - Trinity!"

And perhaps it was the Tripod which helped make the undergraduates politically conscious, and politically conscious along the lines suggested by President Luther. Luther's political career was, of course, closely followed by the student paper, and there were frequent editorials which urged the students to make political commitments and to support good government on local, state, and national levels. A Tripod editorial in 1911 perhaps caught the spirit of the College when it stated that "the dominant note in everything pertaining to Trinity College is progress."48

And from the Tripod, the Progressive interest in politics filtered down to the general undergraduate body, if metaphors may be cruelly mixed, almost to the saturation point. Students regularly held electoral polls, and invariably they decided in favor of the Republican candidates.

In 1906, when Luther was running for the state senate, 153 of the 183 students volunteered to work at the polls, and so earnest were the intentions of the undergraduates that the Faculty ordered the Freshmen "Volunteers for Luther" to attend classes on election day rather than divert their energies toward the election of the College President.49 In the spring of 1907, a Political Club was organized by the undergraduates, but although the intent was to have the group represent bi-partisan interests, the political preference of the undergraduates was reflected in the party affiliation of the four officers of the club - three Republicans and one Democrat.50 And because of this one-sided political interest, the Political Club soon gave way to the Trinity Republican Club, which affiliated with the Inter-collegiate League of Republican Clubs.51

But there were also many non-political manifestations of the Progressive spirit at Trinity. Professor Frederick Rudolph has catalogued a number of areas in which this spirit entered the life of the American colleges in the early twentieth century. In addition to the Political Science Club, good government clubs, and similar organizations which proliferated on the campus, says Professor Rudolph, there were introduced student chapters of the Y.M.C.A., student government bodies, senior honor societies, and the honor system.52 Each of these current developments had
Like his predecessor, George Williamson Smith, President Luther accepted the fact of Trinity's Episcopal heritage, but Luther was hardly in a position to emphasize the "heritage" in quite the same fashion or to quite the same degree as had his predecessors beginning with Bishop Brownell. Although it had always been the function of the College's head to maximize the "heritage" when dealing with Churchmen and to minimize it among non-Episcopalians, Luther came up with what might have been an adequate rationalization—adequate for the time, that is. "Trinity is an Episcopal College," Luther delighted to repeat, "but it is Episcopalian not because it makes Episcopalians, but because Episcopalians made it."53

Luther accepted enough of the "heritage" to enable him to permit the traditional religious life to go on for a while without radical change. Luther himself prepared an annual Confirmation Class, and each year the Bishop of Connecticut made his Confirmation Visitation.54 The services in the Chapel were continued on their traditional schedule, and President Luther, despite his repeated complaints regarding undergraduate indifference or hostility to daily Chapel, showed no disposition to tamper with the system.55 Luther made serious efforts to make Sunday Chapel a high spot in the college week. In response to student requests, the Sunday preachers were almost invariably distinguished Episcopalian clergymen who after the Evening Service had supper with the student body in the College Commons and then met informally with the students in the Library.56

When Luther assumed the College's administration, the Missionary Society was a small, but still active, organization, and soon the Missionary Society was to be joined by a student chapter of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew. There was much undergraduate interest in the Brotherhood, and the new religious group entered into a friendly rivalry with the older Missionary Society in its attempt to stimulate religious interest.57 In the Christmas Term of 1905–1906, Trinity students participated in the Connecticut Valley Missionary Conference held at Mt. Holyoke58 and in the Church Students' Missionary Association Convention held in Cambridge, Massachusetts, at the Episcopal Theological School.59 But by this time, and although the undergraduate body was still predominantly Episcopalian,60 there were pressures from the college authorities to combine the Missionary Society and the Brotherhood of St. Andrew in a new organization, to "be conducted," as President Luther suggested, "along lines similar to the Y.M.C.A. rather than being bound to the work of the church."61

Both the Missionary Society and the Brotherhood survived the first attempt at forced amalgamation. For several years the Brotherhood was able to report considerable activity, and in 1909 it was host to a Conference of Churchmen of the New England Colleges which was held on the campus February 20–22.62 The Missionary Society lost some ground to its newer rival, but there were serious efforts to re-vitalize the oldest student organization on the campus. The Reverend Henry N. McNulty, general secretary of the Church Students' Missionary Association, ad-
vanced the reasonable suggestion that the name of the society implied limited interest. McNulty proposed that the name be changed to the Brownell Society and that the work of the group be extended to include Bible study and personnel work and service in the Hartford community.63

Here was a proposal for "service" which President Luther might well have welcomed. But Luther preferred the non-Episcopalian approach to undergraduate religious activity, and when the Missionary Society and the Brotherhood of St. Andrew refused to surrender, a student chapter of the Y.M.C.A. was organized in the fall of 1910 as a third distinct organization.64

Although there was no apparent enthusiasm for the Y.M.C.A., the new group received every encouragement from the administration and the Tripod.65 In 1911, the Y.M.C.A. was entrusted with the sponsorship of the Freshman Bible (later called the Freshman Handbook), an attractive little volume which contained the rules of the College, information about college customs and societies, and the athletic schedules. And each fall the Y.M.C.A. was the official sponsor of the reception (with refreshments and speeches of welcome) which was held for the Freshmen.66 Soon the Y.M.C.A. encroached upon the domain of the Missionary Society by conducting Bible study classes and missions classes, and of the Brotherhood by undertaking a program of social service among the "underprivileged" of Hartford.67

In the Trinity Term of 1913, the Y.M.C.A. even took over the Sunday evening 5:30 Vesper Service. This was a most interesting development, for it was the first time in the history of the College that a formal religious observance did not follow one of the Prayer Book services. Instead of the Choral Evensong which had been used since Reconstruction days, the Y.M.C.A. Vespers consisted of three hymns, the Lord's Prayer, a reading from the Bible, and a short talk by a student, a member of the Faculty, or a visiting Y.M.C.A. official.68 The rationale of the Y.M.C.A. Vespers is perfectly obvious. By the time of its institution, the religious make-up of the student body was vastly different from what it had been twenty years earlier. The Episcopalians comprised only 57.2% of the undergraduate body, while Congregationalists accounted for 14.8%, the Roman Catholics for 10.5%, Methodists for 5.1%, Jews for 4.3%, Unitarians for 1.9%, and Baptists for 1.6%.69 With the Episcopalians representing little more than half the student body, it was easy to argue that a non-Episcopalian service would be more acceptable. But the Y.M.C.A. service was voluntary, and when the rationale was put to the test it pleased nobody. Episcopalians doubtless felt cheated in being deprived of what they rightly regarded as part of the College's "heritage," Romans and Jews would not have been expected to attend under any circumstances, and the Protestants represented little more than 20% of the College. The result was precisely what might have been expected. Attendance was notably poor.70 and in 1915 the President of the Y.M.C.A. was obliged to report that attendance averaged from fifteen to twenty men.71

President Luther was much disappointed in the poor reception given his "Progressive" religious program, but he could not be moved to admit that the Y.M.C.A. was anything less than eminently successful. By 1910, both the Missionary Society and the Brotherhood had fallen upon such hard times that neither could afford inclusion in the 1911 Ivy; and in his Report for 1911 Luther reported that the religious life of the College was at a low ebb and that students attended church and chapel services "grudgingly." At that time, Luther suggested that a full-time Chaplain be appointed, but he also expressed doubts as to whether a competent man could be secured "except at a salary much larger than we are paying our Professors."72

But if a Chaplain was beyond the College's limited means, Luther soon came to feel that a paid Y.M.C.A. Secretary was not, especially when it was learned that the "going rate" for such a position was $1,000 per year. And so President Luther set out to raise the necessary funds. It was his hope to raise $250 from the undergraduates and the remainder from the Alumni. The
Trustees approved of the project but appropriated no money. The students again were not to be stampeded into support for an organization in which they had little interest. Two fraternities pledged $55.00 jointly, but the total student contribution amounted to a mere $165.00. In fact, the students had no idea whatsoever about the duties of the Y.M.C.A. Secretary, and the *Tripod* was obliged to carry an article describing the duties of such an officer. The Secretary, said the *Tripod* would: 1) conduct the campus religious census (traditionally the function of the *Tripod* staff), 2) sponsor Bible and missionary study classes (essentially the function of the Brotherhood and the Missionary Society), 3) bring the college men in touch with the social service work of the city of Hartford (a service already being performed by the Brotherhood), 4) encourage attendance at religious conferences, 5) assist needy students in securing employment, and 6) to be a counselor to the undergraduates in moral and religious matters.

It must have been obvious to all that the appointment of a Y.M.C.A. Secretary would have been a most wasteful duplication of effort, but the "hard sell" came from an unidentified Pennsylvania Alumnus writing to the *Tripod*. Singing the praises of the Y.M.C.A., that individual insisted that, as the student body represented so many different religious groups, the older Episcopalian societies had no real place at Trinity College, and that they would have to give way to the "Y." But the greatest shock came a few months later when the student officers of the Trinity "Y" distributed tickets for a Billy Sunday evangelistic rally to be held at Wesleyan University. Now it happened that President Luther was something of an admirer of the baseball player turned preacher, and he had once praised Sunday in an article in the *Hartford Sunday Courant*, in which he defended the evangelist's unorthodox style of preaching and absolved him of the commonly made charges of vulgarity.

Perhaps it was Luther's wish, rather than that of the Y.M.C.A. officers, that the Trinity undergraduates should hear Billy Sunday preach. Forty undergraduates accepted the tickets and made the trip to Middletown where they were treated to a performance which included prayers which began with "Hello, God. This is Billy," and a sermon well-sprinkled with "hells" and "damns." The association of the "Y" with these two ventures probably hastened its long-postponed de-
mize, for other than raising $1,000 for the “War Friendship Fund” and $350 for the support of the missionary work in India of former Professor George O. Holbrooke, the Y.M.C.A. was totally inactive until its ultimate petering out in 1918.

Perhaps the Billy Sunday episode brought its own reaction, for there was an immediate return, at whose insistence is not clear, to the more conventional campus religious activity. In February, 1917, a Teaching and Preaching Mission was held at the College with the Reverend Arthur Gammock of Christ Church, Fitchburg, Massachusetts, as missioner. The Episcopalians on campus were much encouraged by the large attendance at each of the sessions which were spread over several days.

And immediately after the Mission ended, Trinity was host to a meeting of the Conference of Churchmen for the New England Colleges. Delegates were present from Bowdoin, Rhode Island State, Williams, and M.I.T. The conference was declared to have been a great success, and at last “Progressive Religion” was a thing of the past at Trinity!

But what about the other elements in what has been described as Progressivism in higher education? What about senior honor societies, student government, and the honor system?

When Luther took office, the Medusa was already in existence. There was, of course, a difference between Medusa and the typical honor society of the Progressive period whose membership “represented the values for which the Progressive temper stood: honor, character, a certain wholesomeness bordering on utter innocence, [and] . . . an outlook that at a later day would make a good Boy Scout . . . and, at the time, a good member of the campus Christian Association.” Medusa represented, rather, the campus sophisticate who had shown enough ingenuity to have himself “tapped,” and membership was, furthermore, self-perpetuating and there was no attempt whatsoever to apply any democratic process in the selection. There was occasional criticism of the Medusa’s exclusiveness, and there was some dissatisfaction with the Medusa’s having designated itself as the senior honorary society. But whether the Medusa’s honor was an academic or social one, Medusa truly was an honor society, and it was probably the presence of such a group at Trinity which precluded the “key-society” type of organization which appeared elsewhere.

Student government began at Trinity in the spring of 1909. Some years before there had been some half-hearted agitation for a “senate” to handle matters of campus discipline, but President George Williamson Smith at that time (1885) was so well satisfied with his personal success in preserving the campus peace that he refused to encourage the movement. Luther, however, could approach the matter from an altogether different angle. Luther liked “government” — government of any type, civil or academic — and the undergraduate request to organize a college senate was warmly received.

In March, 1909, a College Meeting gave approval to the plan, and an undergraduate committee soon worked out a constitution. Membership followed the traditional lines of student activity at Trinity. Included in the Senate were one man elected by the College from the Senior Class, one for the Junior Class, the president of the Athletic Association, the editor of the Tripod, the managers of the football, track, and baseball teams, each for one-third of the academic year, one member from each fraternity not already represented, one neutral if the neutrals were not already represented, and one man from Medusa on the same basis.

Although the Senate had been organized without any clear understanding as to what its function should be, the student governmental body soon found many areas in which to operate. In May, 1910, the Senate adopted rules “regarding the insignia and its wearing for the minor athletic teams,” and two years later, the Senate formulated rules for the Freshman-Junior Banquet. In 1913, the Senate vainly attempted to change the “cut-system” from sixteen class “cuts” per term (under which system students saved up “cuts” to extend vacation) to one cut per week.

In 1914, the Senate supported President Lu-
ther's plans for a College Union which was to occupy the old Library quarters in Seabury Hall after Williams Memorial had been erected. Luther's idea was to provide recreational quarters with pool tables, card-game facilities, and a reading room. This naturally appealed to the undergraduates, and the Senate agreed to undertake the management of the Union. The Trustees appropriated $1,000 for equipment, and the College Union was opened on November 28, 1914.

There was, however, one difficulty. As it turned out, use of the new facility was not open to the undergraduates unless they became members of the Union and paid regular dues. This was not the way the students had understood the original proposal, and there was no immediate rush to join. In fact, response was so poor that President Luther threatened to close the Union unless more undergraduates joined. As the students came to accept the fact of dues, membership increased, and the Union remained a useful campus facility for many years.

The Senate thus soon came to be a most important phase of undergraduate activity, and it might have been expected that the honor system would also have taken its place as a Progressive reform. When the plans for the Senate were first being laid, some students were discussing the honor system informally. The Tripod perhaps mildly favored some sort of honor system, and the editor offered his columns to a discussion of the subject. But the response was a most discouraging one, for such communications as the Tripod received revealed that most of the undergraduates did not even know what was meant by the term. The editor tried to "spell out" as simply as possible by explaining that all that was meant was the student was put on his honor not to cheat.

With that, the matter of the honor system was allowed to drop. It was not until six years later that the subject was again brought up—this time by the Trinity Debating Association, which argued the question—"Resolved: That the Honor System should prevail in college exercises." The debate was decided in the affirmative, and the victorious team cited the successes of the "system" at such colleges as Colgate and Hamilton. One debater, Francis Stuart Fitzpatrick '14, presented arguments that were shot-through with the Progressive spirit. An honor system, he said, "trains students for their duties as citizens in this self-governing country, ... and it has trained honorable men that [sic] must bring about the reforms that are needed in our government." The affirmative carried the day, but the honor system was never instituted. Why? Perhaps Professor Frederick Rudolph has supplied the answer. In The American College and University he points out that the honor system had had a long history in the southern colleges where "gentleman's honor" was accepted as part of the academic way of life. In the North, says Professor Rudolph, the honor system made less appeal except in such small colleges as Bowdoin, Haverford, Wesleyan, Williams, Princeton, and Hobart, "where the clientele could be addressed in terms of the gentlemanly tradition and be expected to know what was meant."

And here is perhaps the key! For by 1912 Trinity was no longer the small, homogeneous institution it had been twenty years before. The student body had increased to 257, Episcopalians accounted for little more than one-half of the enrollment, and the proportion of "town students" had been increasing each year. Trinity had truly become the "Hartford Local!"

This transformation had been partly by Luther's design, but it had also been partly a trend of the times. The late Professor Harry T. Costello once pointed out that there were two types of New England men's colleges: the rural and the urban. The rural colleges became, according to Professor Costello's observation, "gentlemen's country clubs," and the urban institutions became commuters' colleges with an emphasis on "practical" courses. Trinity's location, at the time of the move to the new campus, would perhaps have permitted description as a "rural" college, and the description of undergraduate life given in a previous chapter would go far to confirm this classification. But as the city of Hartford expanded to the campus and far beyond, inclusion within the built-up area once more made Trinity
by definition an "urban" college. Trinity was able to resist most of the pressures to make the institution a "practical" college, but, given the circumstances, there was little that could be done to prevent it from becoming a "commuters" college.

George Williamson Smith had failed to enlarge the student body as both Alumni and undergraduates had expected him to do. Flavel S. Luther succeeded where Smith had failed, and each year the enrollments showed a steady increase. And each increase showed a larger number of Hartford students. In November, 1904, Luther addressed the Hartford Board of Trade. He declared that Trinity College was essentially a Hartford institution, that 55 per cent of the College's resources had been contributed by Hartford residents, that more than a quarter of the enrollment was from Hartford, and that the College would ask for more money from Hartford and also more students from the local community.

Two years later, Luther could boast that in the past four years (1902-1906) Trinity's growth had been "proportionately greater than that in any other New England college." This statement was expanded by the Tripod to be the "largest gain of any college in the United States," and from time to time the Tripod supplied such comparisons which would have done any Chamber of Commerce secretary proud.

Although committed to admitting more and more town students, Luther did not want to see Trinity become exclusively a "commuter" college. Alumni were urged to recruit new students and Luther, from time to time, made extensive tours on which he visited preparatory schools with the idea of attracting well-trained students from a greater distance. In February, 1910, Luther made a two-week trip to the Midwest, where he visited the Racine Grammar School and Saint John's Military Academy in Wisconsin, St. Albans School in Illinois, Howe School in Indiana, DeVeaux School in Niagara Falls, New York, and the High Schools in Buffalo, Milwaukee, and Chicago. A similar tour was made in 1912. But despite these efforts to attract students on a national level, a breakdown of statistics for enrollment at the close of the Christmas Term of 1914-1915 showed that of the 248 undergraduates, 70 were from Hartford, and an additional 69 were from Connecticut exclusive of Hartford. Only 26 were from New York, only 15 from Pennsylvania, only 12 from New Jersey, and only 9 from Massachusetts.

These changes had a decided effect upon the Trinity way of life. A smaller proportion of the student body had been prepared in the preparatory schools and a proportionately large number of them had come from the high schools, a trend not displeasing to President Luther, who, in his Baccalaureate Sermon of June 17, 1917, declared the dual system of preparatory schools and public high schools to be "most ominous - freighted with danger to the republic." In that sermon Luther made a frank statement of his belief in "the complete or partial public support of schools[,] grading from the kindergarten to the professional degree...[as] an absolute necessity..." There was also to be noted a decline in the number of activities in which undergraduates could participate. Instead of the scores of clubs and societies of the late 1800's, there were only the fraternities, the athletic teams, the undergraduate publications, the moribund religious societies, and a few "strays." In 1906, the question was even raised in the local press whether there might not be too many different athletic teams at Trinity, considering the number of students!

Also, proportionately fewer men were joining the fraternities, for as the student body more than doubled, the number of fraternities had been increased by only one. The new fraternity was a local, Sigma Psi, organized in June, 1911, which took over the house at the corner of Broad Street and Allen Place which had formerly been occupied by Alpha Chi Rho and which in 1918 became a chapter of Sigma Nu. Although each of the fraternities was initiating more men each year than in the past, more boarding students found their way into the chapters than did the town students, and the fraternities were on a fair way toward becoming the exclusive preserve of the boarders.
Many were aware of the uncomfortable division of the students into these two groups. President Luther deplored the fact that the fraternities tended "to separate the college body into cliques not always in agreement," and that a student's failure "to make" a fraternity was often a "serious disappointment." And yet, Luther also conceded that "the good resulting from these fraternities is very great and in my mind quite over-balances the evils...."\(^{124}\)

**Twenty-fifth reunion of the Class of 1881**

Older Alumni were commenting on the situation. One "old grad" noted, too, that the College was becoming more "impersonal," and that there were fewer contacts between students and Faculty. But this same Alumnus felt that the day student was the chief object of concern and that "some means [should] be found to bring the town men into closer connection with life at the college."\(^{125}\) Anyone who would have made the most cursory perusal of the *Ivy* for any year during the Luther period would have noted that in each graduating class there were men, mostly "town men," who had passed through four years at Trinity College without having participated in a single student activity!

And was there also a moral and scholastic breakdown? Perhaps a case can be made for the affirmative. There were, unfortunately, several scandals, and these in an area which was particularly embarrassing to President Luther. The President was devoted to sports, and he had been a strong supporter of Trinity athletics from the time he had played first base on the Trinity baseball team. He was a firm believer in the beneficial effects of football upon undergraduate life. But he disliked the commercialization of athletics which had swept over the American colleges at the turn of the century, and he was the first to deplore betting, the noisy celebration of victories, and the hysterical grief which he felt followed each defeat. As a remedy to these situations, Luther wanted to do away with "gate money," and to select the athletic coaches from the regular Faculty rather than employ outside professionals.\(^{126}\)

President Luther succeeded in effecting the second proposed reform when Northam Professor Raymond G. Gettell was made football coach in 1908. Gettell served until the end of the football season of 1913.\(^{127}\) and there was little fault to find with the coaching arrangement. But on the matter of "undergraduate professionalism" there was no happy solution. In the spring of 1905, Trinity engaged Union College at Schenectady in an all-day track meet, and Trinity came home with the victory pennant. Word soon got out that Trinity had played a "ringer" -- "a prominent Y.M.C.A. athlete from Hartford" -- and that Trinity's victory of 57-51 was due to points scored by the outsider. Although he had not been paid for his services, the Y.M.C.A. man played under the name of a regular member of the team who did not participate on that day. When the matter was brought to the attention of the Graduate Athletic Committee, a student was sent by the committee to return the trophy and to apologize for the track team's dishonesty. The undergraduates, too, took action in holding a College Meeting at which resolutions deploring the dishonesty of the team were adopted.\(^{128}\)

President Luther was shocked beyond belief, and in his report to the Trustees on June 26, 1905, he spoke of the low moral tone of the College, noting that evidence of dishonesty was not limited to athletics, but to academic work as well.\(^{129}\) The President found himself in an especially embarrassing situation, for just two months earlier he had spoken to the Trustees in favor of adopting an honor system.\(^{130}\)

The College's forthright handling of the track team scandal had a salutary effect upon student
morale. The *Tripod* endorsed Luther's stand against professionalism, \(^{131}\) and the students in College Meeting adopted a most unusual resolution in "requesting the faculty to raise the minimum number of hours which a man must pass in order to represent the College on any of the teams."\(^{132}\)

But this was not the end of athletic professionalism, for even though the students could make a moral case against the over-emphasis of athletics, there were those among the Alumni who could not. With the constant efforts to increase the size of the student body, there had been considerable recruiting on the part of the "old grads," and some of these gentlemen had paid the tuition and other fees of promising athletes. This practice brought severe criticism of the College, and President Luther, who shared, of course, the alumni interest in a larger student body, found himself in a dilemma. Fortunately for his own peace of mind, Luther was able to resolve the problem, for in his Presidential Report of 1908 he declared that he could "see no reason why a wealthy alumnus should not defray the expenses of a young man in college for any reason which seems to him good, provided the young man is able to pass his examinations for admission and to maintain satisfactory standing as a student." As to the question of whether athletic scholarships were demoralizing, Luther insisted that he could see no reason why a student sent to college under such incentives should be "more likely to suffer demoralization" than any other. And while expressing his ideas on the general subject of college athletics, President Luther added that, so far as he was concerned, there was nothing wrong with a young man's playing professional baseball during the summer and then playing on a college team in the fall.\(^{133}\)

Perhaps Luther's statements represented moral equivocation, but subsequent Presidential Reports were to suggest a reaffirmation of his earlier stand against low morals and low academic achievement,\(^{134}\) and once he was to lament that "the College hero is not the prize winner but the athlete and the leader."\(^{135}\)

Trinity, throughout this period, was still a small college with enrollments from between 200 and 250. And yet, Trinity's athletic competitors were all larger institutions with enrollments ranging from Bowdoin's 400 to Columbia's 6,000. Under circumstances such as these, it was certainly to be expected that the College should have wanted to make use of every eligible player. "Eligibility" at Trinity was usually taken to mean any bona fide student who was a candidate for a degree. Rival colleges appreciated Trinity's situation and they respected Trinity's honesty in
refusing to resort to the "special examination" the night before the game, or permitting professionals to play under assumed names. The only formalized statement of Trinity's policy was an agreement with Wesleyan of 1907 regarding one-year eligibility for transfers. 136

In the fall of 1915, George Brickley of Everett, Massachusetts, entered Trinity as a Freshman. Brickley's brother, Charles, had played at Harvard during the football seasons of 1912, 1913, and 1914, and he had been credited with many a "Crimson" victory during these years. George Brickley had played semi-professional baseball during the preceding summer, but it probably never occurred to him that his going out for football at Trinity should bring the charge of "professionalism." Brickley's "eligibility" was not challenged at the early games of the season. Norwich, Brown, Bates, and Amherst raised no question, but a few minutes before the scheduled start of the Williams game, the Williams manager demanded that Brickley not be permitted to play. Trinity refused to comply, and the game was played with a victory of 38-0 for the Bantams. Williams had, in a sense, the last laugh, for Trinity was removed from Williams' schedule, and it was not until 1920 that athletic relations between the two colleges were resumed.

Williams' protest was widely publicized, and both Columbia and New York University cancelled their Trinity games. The I.C.A.A.A.A. put Trinity under the ban and ruled that any college which would play Trinity would lose its amateur status. Wesleyan defied the ruling, invoked the 1907 agreement, and argued that Wesleyan had already prejudiced its amateur status in playing Springfield Y.M.C.A. College, which should properly be classified as a professional team. Tufts also defied the I.C.A.A.A.A. ruling and played Trinity to a 0-0 tie.

In the controversy regarding Brickley's eligibility, the New York press made sport of the refusal of Columbia and N.Y.U. to play Trinity. The Trinity Graduate Advisory Committee sent sharply-worded defenses of Trinity's eligibility policy. The college administration firmly stood by the football team in its insistence that Brickley play, and Acting-President Henry A. Perkins reaffirmed President Luther's earlier stand that the College would not disqualify a student who had played professional baseball. 137

But in his bold support of the recent action of the Trinity football team, Professor Perkins was willing, also, to admit that the athletic situation left something to be desired. In speaking of the criticisms leveled against the College, Perkins said that "some of [them] . . . were wholly unmerited and unfair; some were due to a frank difference of opinion; and a few, unfortunately, were deserved." Although perhaps reluctant to do so, Perkins admitted that Alumni were still recruiting athletes from preparatory schools and other colleges, and he insisted that "the practice must stop if we are to retain our self-respect and the position of high athletic morality of which we have been so proud in the past." 138

The outward defiance of the whole athletic and academic world was something of a cover for an inwardly contrite Trinity heart, for hardly had the football season of 1915 ended than a careful reappraisal of the eligibility code was undertaken. The Committee on Eligibility Rules came up with what must have been a shockingly strict set of regulations. After January 1, 1916 (and the rules were not to apply to men already in college), no student who had played for a baseball team belonging to a classified league or who had ever accepted pay for any sport would be permitted to compete on a Trinity team, the one-year transfer rule was reaffirmed, participation in college athletics was to be limited to four years, and no student over twenty-six years of age would be allowed to represent the College. 139 At last, Trinity must have felt that her heart was pure and her hands clean.

These unfortunate incidents may have impaired the "Trinity image" in the larger world, but to the Hartford community "The Hartford Local" was still Hartford's college! Luther was determined to keep it so, and almost everything he did was, apparently, with an eye to enhancing this good feeling which prevailed between the College and the city and also with an eye to
extending Trinity’s services to the local community.

Luther was a man of many ideas — few of them, however, original, and most of them reflective of the Progressive spirit of his day. One of these ideas was that of “acceleration.” In the early years of Luther’s regime, several of the nation’s foremost educators had come out in favor of speeding-up the educational process by one method or another. William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago was preaching against the “four-year fetish,” and Harvard was encouraging graduates of the better preparatory schools to enter as Sophomores. Johns Hopkins assumed three years for the A.B., and encouraged two. Chicago developed the four-quarter system and encouraged year-round attendance.140

On the other side of the “acceleration” argument, Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia thought that three years were not adequate for “the simple profession of gentlemen,” or for “the generous and reflective use of leisure.” And Butler’s feeling was that much of the argument in favor of acceleration was based on the assumption that the educational process took place solely in the classroom.141

With this “nonsense” of the colleges and universities as training schools for “gentlemen,” Luther had little sympathy, for if the purpose of higher education is training for “service,” the sooner the young man be released to serve, the better. In his President’s Report for 1905, Luther came out in favor of a summer term based on the year-round system of the University of Chicago. Why, he argued, should the college plant be idle for three months of the year when it might be placed at the service of the community?142 The same plea was repeated in 1913.143

To this proposal there was no response, but in the closely-related idea of university extension (or what would now be called adult education) Luther was at least given a chance. In the Christmas Term of 1905, Trinity began a program of university extension studies in cooperation with the Hartford Y.M.C.A. Free non-credit courses were offered by Trinity Faculty in college classrooms, with offerings in Chemistry, Mathematics, Biology, Economics, and American History and Government.144 But there was no response from the Hartford people. Only Professor Kleene’s course in Economics was actually given, and it met with little success. President Luther blamed the failure on the “inaccessibility” of the College, and in the fall of 1906 classes were scheduled to meet in rented rooms in downtown Hartford.145 Again the program aroused little interest, and the question might well be asked whether it was not the “non-credit” feature which doomed the program from the beginning.

To recount these incidents is not to suggest that Flavel Sweeten Luther’s administration at Trinity College was strewn with failures. Given the situation when he assumed office, it might be said that his part in preserving the institution’s mere existence was no mean achievement. But, on the other hand, it must be said that other than to dramatically increase the size of the student body Luther’s administration was marked by no spectacular success. And once more it must be said that the problems and difficulties of the College were basically financial.

Luther had once had some success in raising money for the improvement of the athletic field, and it was hoped that he would be able to set Trinity’s financial house in order and break the Trinity tradition of ending each year with a deficit. Such, however, was not to be the case. The deficit for 1903–1904, the last year of George Williamson Smith’s term, was $23,031.88. Luther’s first year saw a reduced deficit of $9,323.64, but the fiscal year 1905–1906 ended with an all-time high deficit of $23,964.08, which was accounted for, in part, by the exceptional expense of repairing the college heating system. For 1906–07, which saw no capital expenditure, the deficit was $12,062.10.146 Two things were obvious: 1) Luther had not brought prosperity to the College, and 2) the time had come for a large-scale, fund-raising drive!

But the Trustees were in no mood to set out to raise money, nor had they been for some time. In 1900, the Trinity Corporation had given consideration to raising $1,110,000 for buildings, endowment, additional professorships, and general
expenses. The Trustees at that time had agreed that the money would have to be raised, and the matter was referred to the Board of Fellows. The Fellows recommended that Professor McCook be relieved of teaching duties and that he be permitted to devote his energies to raising money for the College. President Smith had concurred because of "his own personal disinclination to undertake the work," but the Trustees, instead of putting McCook in charge of fund raising, voted to relieve the President of his regular responsibilities in order to enable him to raise money.

Nothing, of course, came of this action, and three years later, Dr. Jacob Ewing Mears '58149 prodded the Alumni Association into passing a resolution requesting the Trustees to raise $5,000,000—one-half for endowment and one-half for new buildings and current operations. The Alumni Association pledged to raise $100,000 and then passed the resolution on to the Trustees.150

The Trustees received the recommendation of the Alumni Association just after George Williamson Smith had resigned from the Presidency, and the summer of 1903 was hardly an ideal time to launch a fund-raising drive. Alumni committees continued to meet with the Trustees on the matter of college finance151 and President Luther attempted to cultivate his connections with the Hartford community. All this, however, was to no avail, and the College turned next to the philanthropic foundations.

When Trinity applied to the Carnegie Foundation for participation in the pension program for retired faculty, the question was again raised regarding the relation of the College to the Episcopal Church. It was then the stated policy of the foundation to exclude from participation all church-related or church-controlled institutions, and it was because of this policy that President Luther had a long correspondence with several officers of the foundation. Although Luther rightly insisted that the Episcopal relationship had become one of tradition rather than of law, the foundation repeatedly reminded Luther that Trinity was listed as "denominational" in Whittaker's Almanac and that the College advertised regularly in Episcopalian periodicals. For once, Luther made a very convincing case, and Trinity was admitted to participation in the Carnegie retirement program.

With the General Educational Fund, however, Luther had no success. When Luther wrote to the General Educational Fund requesting a grant of funds, George Foster Peabody, the Fund's executive officer, replied in terms which could have been little less than insulting. Peabody made it clear that the fund had a policy of assisting only clearly-defined projects and that Trinity's request for assistance in meeting operational expenses did not qualify under these terms. Furthermore, the fund gave money only on a dollar-matching basis. And to add to the College's embarrassment, Peabody added a postscript to his letter suggesting that Trinity might do well to encourage support from the Episcopal Church. "Apparently," he wrote, "the Episcopal Church as such is less interested in higher education than any other Church Organization."

And with this rebuff Luther was obliged to state that the "financial outlook" for Trinity College was "dark." He was also willing to admit that the situation was "very likely . . . due to my own inability to master the problems of college administration." As a remedy, he said that he was "quite ready at any time to allow someone else to try to meet the situation which so far I have not been able to meet."

The Trustees, however, failed to act upon this wise suggestion, and the next year, even with gifts from Alumni and friends amounting to well over $20,000, ended with a deficit of $14,810.98. The Treasurer called attention to the fact that the "deficit for the past nine years . . . [had amounted] to the large sum of $118,274.36, all of which it has been necessary to meet by diminishing the principal of the Academic Fund each year."157 When President Luther once more urged "the desirability of appointing some person under salary, other than myself, to devote his entire time to this undertaking of raising money," the Trustees finally decided to act.
On October 31, 1908, the Trinity Corporation appointed Professor John J. McCook as financial agent for the College. McCook and College Treasurer Edgar F. Waterman compiled an elaborate set of statistics regarding the College’s finances, and in December personal letters were sent to Alumni and friends. By April, 1909, almost $300,000 had been pledged by sixty-nine individuals, and by June over $354,000 had been subscribed. This was one of the most unusual financial campaigns ever conducted, for it was not until the June meeting of the Trustees that the general public became aware of what had been going on. Even then the report on the campaign’s progress had been made only to the Alumni Association without intending that it should be sent to the public press. The Alumni were so pleased and amazed at the campaign’s progress that the Trustees were finally obliged to inform the newspapers of McCook’s successes, and when they received the news, the Hartford papers—the Courant, the Times, the Post, and the Sunday Globe—gave enthusiastic editorial support. Beyond the Hartford community, other Connecticut newspapers, as well as the Associated Press, gave wide publicity.

In the fall, a canvass was undertaken in the more distant cities where there were active alumni groups—Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, New York City, and Reading, Pennsylvania. And at Christmastime, 1909, the campaign went into its final phase. McCook organized an all-out attempt to raise the remaining $100,000 of the half-million. “Follow-up” letters were sent to non-contributors. Members of the secret societies wrote to their fraternity brothers, and Alumni wrote to their reluctant classmates. Lists of subscribers were published regularly in the Hartford newspapers. Although it was hoped that the half-million would be raised by the end of 1909, on the morning of December 31 there still remained $37,823 to go. More than a score of Hartford Alumni devoted the whole day and night to personal solicitation. By midnight, the $500,000 had been oversubscribed by $47.

The final figure of $566,522 revealed that Trinity’s friends could be induced to support the College if proper leadership were provided. And a breakdown of the campaign statistics must have made it abundantly clear that Trinity need not resign herself to remaining a commuter college or a “Hartford Local!”

Of the half-million, 595 alumni (68% of a total of 875) contributed $223,471 or 44.1% of the total. Fifty-seven of the 217 undergraduates contributed $970, even though no special appeal had been made to the students. Contributions were made from 21 states, one U.S. territory, and two foreign countries. And although Connecticut led with 34% of the pledges, New York followed with 31.3%, Pennsylvania with 17.1%, and Ohio with 10%. Perhaps the most significant percentage was that, although $436,304 came from the North Atlantic region, $12,327 came from the South Atlantic states, and $56,215 from the North Central states.

When the campaign ended, Johnny McCook was the Trinity hero. For his extra services he had received no compensation and, although the Trustees had offered to relieve him of his teaching duties, McCook had not even accepted this benefit. The Trustees, however, urged him to take a vacation to rest from his strenuous labors, and this he consented to do. At the beginning of the Trinity Term of 1910, McCook and his family sailed from New York for Jacksonville, Florida, thence to Miami, to Nassau in the Bahamas, back to Miami, and home to Hartford by train. On April 21, he was given a testimonial dinner by the New York Alumni Association and all, when speaking of the half-million, referred to it as the McCook Endowment Fund.

During the Commencement Week of 1910, there was considerable sentiment for raising a second half-million dollars. And well there might have been, for the recently-concluded campaign had not provided a full solution for Trinity’s financial problems. The salaries of the “nine oldest professors in point of service” were raised from $2,000 to $2,500 and the new resources enabled the Trustees to decline with a good conscience an attractive offer by the Plymouth Congregational Church to purchase a portion of the southern end of the campus. But
the McCook Endowment did not end the traditional deficit. For each of the fiscal years ending July, 1911, and 1912, the deficit was slightly in excess of $13,000.169

Professor McCook had no illusions that the half-million would alleviate all of the College’s economic ills. In the midst of the campaign, he once stated that Trinity actually needed $2,000,000,170 and at the campaign’s close he declared himself willing to undertake whatever fund-raising program the Trustees should decide upon.171 Perhaps a second campaign would have been begun immediately had it not been for another development for which McCook himself was largely responsible.

The largest contribution to the half-million was J. Pierpont Morgan’s $100,000.172 Although the sum amounted to almost one-fifth of the total, it was hardly a munificent one for a man of Morgan’s wealth—especially since he was a Trinity Trustee and in view of his generosity to the Wadsworth Atheneum and the Metropolitan Museum. Professor McCook had visited Morgan in New York and had suggested that the philanthropist might wish to do something further for the College173 but, as was his wont, Morgan made no immediate commitment. In October, 1912, however, Morgan came to Hartford to visit his cousins, Francis and James J. Goodwin, both of whom were Trinity Trustees, and to inspect the Morgan Wing of the Atheneum which was then under construction. Following the visit to the Atheneum, Morgan and the Goodwins drove out to the College and called upon President Luther. In talking of the College’s needs, Luther mentioned the desirability of a new College Library, and Morgan at once said that he would be pleased to provide such a building as a memorial to his late friend, Bishop Williams.174

The news of a new Library was most welcome. As a memorial to Bishop Williams it was regarded as a double blessing, for in 1899 the Trustees had voted that the College erect “some splendid memorial” to Bishop Williams,175 a plan which had never been realized because of the College’s limited financial resources. Nor could there be any doubt that a new Library was needed. Since the completion of Boardman Hall, the Library had occupied the entire southern portion of Seabury Hall, but with rapid growth of both the book collection and the student body, the Library was becoming desperately pressed for space.176

But the most significant thing about the new building was its location at the north end of the Long Walk at precisely the point specified in the original campus plan prepared by William Burges. The Burges Plan had long since been abandoned, but it had never been forgotten, and from time to time voices had been raised to keep alive the hope of completing the Burges Quadrangle. In 1897, the Tablet had urged a permanent Chapel to be erected according to Burges’ design,177 and in 1899 Professor Martin spoke of the dream of completing the Burges Plan. Charitably, he referred to the building of Boardman Hall, then under construction, as “the interval of rest before completing the great plan,” in which “structures of a more transitory type have been reared to answer immediate need.”178 And, somewhat ironically, the “Program” for the Groundbreaking Ceremony for Boardman Hall carried the instructions that after the benediction “the procession will be re-formed and will return to the Great Quadrangle”179—which then consisted, of course, of a single string of buildings: Seabury, Northam, and Jarvis. The Ivy for 1901 paid its disrespects to Boardman Hall by following the description of that new building with a seven-page presentation of the Burges Plans for Chapel and Library. Although the Ivy writer conceded that it might not be possible to ever carry out the three-quadrangle plan, Chapel and Library should be located at opposite ends of the Long Walk, thus completing three sides of the intended central quadrangle.180 The location of the new Library suggested that a first step had been taken toward the ultimate completion of the Burges Plan.181

As his architect, Morgan selected Benjamin Wistar Morris ’93, of the New York firm of La Farge and Morris, who had recently designed the Connecticut First Regiment Armory and the Morgan Wing of the Wadsworth Atheneum.182
Morris designed a building to combine library and administrative offices in a style he described as "an English treatment of French Gothic." The exterior fabric was of Portland brownstone with Ohio sandstone trim to harmonize with the older buildings of the Long Walk, and the interior was to make use of an interesting combination of tile and oak.\textsuperscript{183}

J. Pierpont Morgan died in late March, 1913, in Rome, Italy,\textsuperscript{184} and it was not until the summer that actual construction was begun. There were many delays. There was a vexing problem of transporting materials—particularly stone.\textsuperscript{185}

And when the Ohio stone finally arrived, President Luther was not satisfied that it would be durable enough for the building. Only a test proving that it would bear up under a pressure of 6,250 pounds to the square inch (a test conducted by the engineering firm of Ford, Buck & Sheldon) convinced him that the right choice of material had been made.\textsuperscript{186}

There was no cornerstone ceremony—in fact, there was no cornerstone. The College was eager to proceed with the construction, and Luther did not want additional delay of any sort.\textsuperscript{187} By the opening of the Christmas Term of 1914-1915, Williams Memorial was practically finished. The administrative offices were already in use, and the reading and stack rooms of the Library then were being fitted.\textsuperscript{188}

The new building was formally dedicated on October 31, 1914, with appropriate ceremonies in Alumni Hall. There were speeches by Walter B. Briggs, the Librarian; Samuel Hart; Arthur A. Hamerschlag, director of the Carnegie Institute of Technology; William N. C. Carlton, the former Librarian; and by the architect, Benjamin Wistar Morris. Morris' informal address was filled with good advice for the College. First, he pleaded for a course in Art History in which the students would be familiarized with representative works in Architecture, Painting, and Sculpture. Secondly, he urged that the beautiful Trinity Campus be developed according to a regular plan. Although he admitted that Burges' original plan was much too ambitious for an institution of Trinity's size and potential, he urged that a permanent committee on Grounds and Buildings be appointed, and that this committee develop a general campus plan, "broad in its principles and elastic enough to meet the requirements of the future which none can predict." Only then, he said, could the College be saved "from irreparable blunders and enduring regrets."\textsuperscript{189}

The excitement which the erection of Williams Memorial engendered provided temporary relief from the serious financial straits of the College. The deficits of $15,987.90 and $16,579.81 which ended the fiscal years of 1912-1913 and 1913-1914, respectively,\textsuperscript{190} were perhaps hardly noticed, or at least as little was said about them as was possible. There was talk in unofficial quarters—in this case very unofficial quarters: the Trinity Tripod—of a plan to raise $1,000,000,\textsuperscript{191}
but all that was actually being considered was another of Luther's proposals to seek local support. At the Trustees Meeting of June 23, 1914, "the President submitted a proposition looking toward a closer connection between the City of Hartford and Trinity College, whereby the City may extend financial support and the College be coordinated more closely with the system of public instruction."192

Nothing came of the proposal beyond the appointment of a Trustees Committee to consider the matter.193 There were still repeated requests from the friends of the College to undertake a fund-raising campaign, but in the fall of 1914 the Trustees decided that the financial situation of the country made it inadvisable to attempt to raise funds at that time.194

The fiscal year 1914-1915 ended with another deficit - this time of $20,333.23.195 Luther was now ready to throw in the proverbial sponge! In a letter to the Trustees he respectfully asked permission to retire as President, effective July 1, 1916. And Luther's letter was that of a defeated old man. "I am utterly weary - tired out," he wrote. "With difficulty have I driven myself through the last two years, leaving many things undone that ought to be done."196

But the Trustees were not convinced that Luther's day of usefulness had passed. Instead of accepting his resignation, they granted him a year's leave of absence with full pay and appointed Professor Perkins as Acting President.197

Luther spent the winter of 1915-1916 in the West - mostly at Pasadena, California, where he had friends. For several months he enjoyed a complete rest, and in the spring he returned to Hartford in the best of spirits.198

In March, the Trustees decided that conditions at last were such as to insure success to a financial campaign. A committee was appointed by the Trustees to study the financial condition of the College, and in mid-March the committee (F. L. Wilcox, Charles G. Woodward, and Henry A. Perkins) presented a detailed report. The committee felt that the College's chief financial difficulty came from the large number of students who paid no tuition fees to the College. In fact, it was revealed that 69% of the student body was receiving free tuition - either on a formally endowed scholarship or by simply having all fees remitted. The committee also noted that if only the endowed scholarships were continued the student body would be reduced by fifty men. The committee, therefore, recommended a cautious approach to any measure which would deplete the undergraduate body, but they did recommend two alternatives. First, they suggested that only the formal scholarships be filled and thus let the student body decline to 175, reduce the size of the Faculty, and "carry on the work of the College at about the same level as it was in 1906." Secondly, the committee proposed as the alternative: raise $1,000,000 in additional endowment - a $500,000 fund to cover the deficit, $250,000 to raise Faculty salaries to $3,000, and $250,000 for additional physical equipment.199

The Trustees accepted the second proposal and decided to raise $1,000,000. Formal announcement of the campaign was made by President Luther in an address to the Hartford Chamber of Commerce on April 5. Luther asked for $600,000 from the city of Hartford. "We are seeking this endowment," he said, "not because we are in debt, for the College doesn't owe a cent - not because of any loss, for our Trust funds are absolutely intact."200 Luther's words may have sounded strange in a community which had so long heard of the College's debts and deficits, but for once, and for the first time in sixteen years, there was actually a small surplus of $429.36. This changed financial picture had come about during Luther's leave of absence, but not, on the other hand, because of Acting-President Perkins. The Trustees had saved the day by subscribing $15,650 toward operating expenses, and there had been several sizeable legacies.201

The campaign got under way late in April. Great care was taken to insure cooperation from all sections of the college community, and a joint committee was created "to consider the educational, financial, and administrative policy of the College." From the Trustees, there were appointed Henry Ferguson, Edward B. Hatch,
Frank L. Wilcox, and Edgar F. Waterman. And, wisely, included were representatives of the Board of Fellows: Walter S. Schutz, E. Kent Hubbard, and Shiras Morris. To coordinate the work so far as alumni giving was concerned, the Trustees approved a plan (incidentally, initiated by the joint committee) to establish an Alumni Council. And as “advertising literature,” the Trustees published an attractive, illustrated brochure, entitled Trinity College: Historical and Descriptive.

No outside promoter was employed, nor, for some reason, did the Trustees accept Professor McCook’s standing offer to head the campaign. Despite President Luther’s repeated apologies for his own ineptitude in matters of raising funds, Luther was placed in command by the Trustees. The President was relieved of “such administrative details as he may desire,” and Professor Perkins was given powers to act in an executive capacity during Luther’s absence from the campus.

Early in December, President Luther opened an office in New York City, 27 Cedar Street, Room 1202. As usual, the New York Alumni were enthusiastic. By January 9, 1917, almost a quarter of a million dollars had been subscribed, but then came America’s declaration of war on Germany, April 6, 1917, and the fund raising campaign, to all practical purposes, came to an end. The First World War was to have a great effect upon Trinity College, as it did on all others, and President Luther quickly closed his New York office and returned to Hartford to try to gear his college to a program of wartime “service.”

But long before the declaration of war, the “war spirit” had pervaded the campus. In the summer of 1916, the Congress of the United States passed the National Defense Act which permitted the colleges to provide Reserve Officer training. Only sixteen colleges applied for R.O.T.C. sponsorship, but the Trinity undergraduates were eager to have Trinity participate in the program, and they seemed to care little whether the courses were to be given with or without academic credit. President Luther was an advocate of military training, even as part of the peace-time curriculum, but the proposed course was strongly opposed by the Faculty.

Despite the faculty opposition, Luther sent a questionnaire to the undergraduate body asking whether the students would enroll for a course in military training if such a course were to be offered. Luther presented the possibility in most attractive terms, assuming that the instruction would be provided by an officer from the regular army and that arms, uniforms, and equipment would be supplied by the federal government. Only one-half of the students replied, but Luther, nonetheless, assumed that the response had been sufficient to apply to Washington for assistance in setting up the course in military training.

Military training was begun at Trinity on a volunteer basis on March 22, 1917, by Captain Emerson Gifford Taylor of the Machine Gun Company, First Connecticut Infantry Regiment. When the Connecticut National Guard was mobilized and Captain Taylor was called into active service, Captain J. H. Kelso Davis ’99 volunteered to assume Taylor’s place. By March, students were already being ordered into military service. Luther advised against enlisting and suggested that the students wait and see what the nation would expect of college men— as he put it, “until we are sure where we are most needed and most capable.” As the term wore on, students became increasingly uncertain as to their immediate futures. Class Day was first cancelled and then re-scheduled. The question of granting credit for the military training was solved, after a fashion, first by allowing students to substitute the course for one other course and later by substituting it for History.

When the Christmas Term opened in September, 1917, Military Science was made a compulsory course. Uniforms of dark gray wool, barracks caps, and puttees arrived late in the term, and Captain Davis issued orders that the uniforms were to be worn on the campus at all times.
Early in 1918, a Congressional Act replaced the R.O.T.C. with the Student Army Training Corps (usually known as the S.A.T.C.), an ill-conceived program whereby the Government, instead of adapting the training to the special skills of the colleges, literally turned the campuses into army camps. None of the colleges was to benefit academically from this move, for the indiscriminate admission by the War Department to the Training Corps brought to the colleges many young men who were totally incapable of profiting from even the much diluted form of higher education which was being carried on for the Army. There were long hours of drill, and this left little time for study. President Luther soon reported that the scholastic work of the College had fallen to a deplorable low, and that the students were “thinking and talking of very little except the war: their chances of ‘getting in,’ and the awful fate of being, even unjustly, termed ‘a slacker.’”

Under the new S.A.T.C. program there were changes in personnel. Colonel Calvin D. Coles was placed in charge of the program, and Captain Davis was retained as Coles’ assistant. And as so much of the students’ time was taken up with military drill, there was a reduction in the number of academic courses taken and a consequent pressure to reduce the size of the Faculty. The Trustees felt that all heads of departments should be retained, but that a reduction should be made in the lower ranks. In April, 1918, the Trustees voted to terminate the contracts of all junior Faculty but one (Edward C. Stone, Assistant Professor of Chemistry) and to have President Luther “confer with Professors Barrett, Kleene, and Barrows in regard to their obtaining positions elsewhere.” Luther carried out his unpleasant duty and was able to report that of the Professors concerned, two accepted, “good naturedly” and one “resentful.”

At this same time another Trinity Professor, Wilbur Marshall Urban, Brownell Professor of Philosophy, was coming under sharp criticism in the Hartford community for his alleged “Pro-Germanism.” Before America’s entrance into the War, Urban had been outspoken in his sympathies for the German cause, and after war had been declared he was still remembered as one who had spoken well of the present enemy. The Trustees yielded to the community pressures and called Urban before the governing board to explain his position. The Trustees were somewhat less than satisfied with his statement, and a Committee of Investigation was appointed. The committee reported (on June 14, 1918) that although Professor Urban did not support the war effort in his classroom—as the Faculty were expected to do—he had at least remained neutral, and there was no evidence upon which a charge of “disloyalty” could be based. The unpleasant situation was soon happily resolved, for Urban was invited to teach at Harvard during the Trinity Term, and thus the only professor of questionable “patriotism” was removed from the Trinity scene for the duration of the war.

Trinity Term of 1918 marked the high tide of the “war spirit at Trinity.” The Political Science Club, under faculty leadership of Professor Edward F. Humphrey, held regular meetings which featured militaristic programs and speeches. The campus east of the Gymnasium was ploughed up for “war gardens” in which plots were assigned to residents of the neighborhood by the Home Gardens Commission. And at an “Open Air Patriotic Service,” which was held on
Sunday, June 18, 1918, the day before Commencement, Ex-President of the United States Theodore Roosevelt delivered an address which urged the Trinity community to the greatest heights of patriotic endeavor.\textsuperscript{203}

On October 1, 1918, all Trinity students physically fit for military service were inducted into the S.A.T.C., made subject to all military regulations, supplied with uniforms, and paid $30.00 per month.\textsuperscript{204} And then came sweeping changes in the Trinity routine. The War Department ruled that "fraternity activities and military discipline are incompatible in the very nature of things," and all "Fraternity activities" were temporarily suspended.\textsuperscript{205} But the most radical measure taken by the War Department was to abolish compulsory Chapel.\textsuperscript{206}

Hardly had these measures been adopted, when the Armistice was signed on November 11. There followed an immediate rescinding of most
of the War Department orders. Fraternity activity was resumed, compulsory Chapel was restored, physical training was substituted for the purely military drill, and the course in Military Law was replaced by one in Contemporary History taught by Professor Humphrey. On December 14, 1918, the S.A.T.C. was formally disbanded.

In retrospect, President Luther had mixed feelings regarding Trinity's participation in the war effort. Although he was obliged to admit that "from an academic standpoint the work of the term was a distinct failure," he felt that "the effect of the military training upon the students was distinctly and obviously good," in that "it taught them that many of those things which had been called for many years features of 'college life' were unnecessary." At Trinity, as elsewhere, the first months following the Armistice were months of chaos. Although most of the S.A.T.C. men left the campus as soon as they could be discharged, those who remained as civilian students did little to assist in the return to academic "normalcy." Few of them were prepared for college work, and a great portion of them represented backgrounds with no intellectual tradition.

But slowly the College did return to "normalcy." By January, 1919, the College Union had re-opened with an all-college smoker, and Juniors and Seniors were already making plans for "proms." Soon a basketball team was formed and the Jesters revived, a Literary Club organized, and on March 17, that most characteristically Trinity affair, the "St. Patrick's Day Scrap," was held.

On December 7, 1918, Flavel Sweeten Luther announced that he had been a casualty of the war when, on that date, he submitted to the Trustees his resignation as President of Trinity College. Luther stated that he would be in his seventieth year, that he had been in poor health for several years, and that he was, consequently, unable to discharge his duties properly. He asked that his resignation take effect on July 1, 1919. Luther's resignation was accepted by the Trustees on January 18, and a committee (William E. Curtis, the Right Reverend Chauncey B. Brewster, William G. Mather, Robert Thorne, and Charles G. Woodward) was appointed to consider the choice of a successor.

The Committee could come to no speedy decision and, as July 1 approached, no selection had been made. Professor Perkins was then made Acting-President and Luther was made President Emeritus by vote of the Trustees. The Carnegie Foundation gave the President Emeritus a pension of $3,400, and the College Trustees generously voted an additional $1,600. Following his move to California, a number of Luther's former students, in a most gracious gesture of affection, raised "by periodic subscription" another $1,500, "which added amount enabled him to live in comfort and enjoy many needed luxuries that he would otherwise have had to forgo." After Luther's death, the Carnegie Foundation continued to pay his widow $1,700 per year, the College Trustees continued their annual $1,600, and Luther's friends among the Alumni contributed an annual $1,500 as a "Luther Fund."

Professor Perkins assumed the acting headship of Trinity College at a most distressing time, for it fell upon him to lead the College back to a peacetime "normalcy," to meet the persistent alumni demands to restore the institution's national prestige, and to deal with the problems which went with the moral disintegration of American society in the immediate post-war years. Under such conditions, it was understandable that Perkins was not happy with his new duties. His daughter later remembered that the Acting-President was much withdrawn from his family and that "sometimes he wore a preoccupied look." On October 27, 1919, Congress passed the National Prohibition Enforcement Act (Volstead Act) over President Wilson's veto. The Act forbade the sale of any beverage containing more than ½ of 1% of alcohol, but the Trinity students had no difficulty in obtaining wine and spirits in Hartford. Perkins, in fact, felt that the students drank more after "Prohibition" than before, and he was particularly shocked when it was reported
that certain alumni had provided intoxicants for the students, a deed which both Acting-President and Faculty regarded as "a deliberate corruption of student morals by older men."\textsuperscript{249}

Although the post-war moral breakdown was probably no more serious at Trinity than elsewhere, Perkins felt particularly annoyed about the form it took at the College under his temporary direction. There was much rowdyism and there were several transgressions of the code of propriety and decency, incidents which Perkins conveniently blamed on low moral standards which were being set by the music halls and motion picture theatres. There was much cutting of classes and of the restored compulsory chapel. The level of academic performance remained lower than both Faculty and Administration desired, and there was a remarkably large number of failures in courses and suspensions for academic deficiency.\textsuperscript{250} The athletic teams, too, were making a showing which was somewhat less than spectacular. In 1919, the Football Team won only two of the six games played, and in 1918, the single game scheduled was lost to Amherst by a score of 21-0.\textsuperscript{251} These were situations over which Perkins had little control, but one important incident—the affair of Professor Humphrey—was solely of the Acting-President's making.

Edward Frank Humphrey had come to Trinity in 1915 as Northam Professor of History. Humphrey was a westerner and a graduate of the University of Minnesota. Although he had taken both Master's and Doctor's degrees from Columbia and had studied at the University of Paris, he retained many of what were thought to be "western" personality traits. Not the least noticeable of these was a frank and open way of dealing with both persons and questions. During the war, he had been most ardent in his patriotism, and on more than one occasion he had clashed verbally with Professor Urban on the matter of the latter's "neutrality." Urban had been on leave to teach at Harvard during the closing months of the war, but he had returned to Trinity at the opening of the first term in which Professor Perkins was in acting command. Humphrey had held the popular positions during the war, but with the return of Professor Urban there was found among Urban's friends a small faculty clique which soon demanded that Professor Humphrey be removed from the Faculty.\textsuperscript{252}

In mid-January of 1920, Perkins met in conference with nine members of the Faculty who were demanding Humphrey's dismissal. After a further conference with several members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, Perkins advised Humphrey that, because of "temperamental incompatibility," he resign from the Faculty. Perkins insisted that he had presented the suggestion as a bit of friendly advice and, as Perkins had provided to pay Humphrey a year's salary and to use his good offices "in his behalf towards securing a suitable professional position elsewhere," the Acting-President believed that the suggestion would be accepted and that the forced resignation would receive no publicity.\textsuperscript{253}

But Humphrey did not act as expected on the "friendly advice," nor could the secret be kept for long. One of Professor Humphrey's friends, whom the Professor had asked for advice, was so incensed that he informed the newspapers of the situation. The local papers carried many columns devoted to what they described as the "schism." Public indignation was exceeded only by that of the students who held a mass meeting to protest the injustice done to Professor Humphrey.\textsuperscript{254} The students adopted a strongly-worded resolution: "Be it resolved, that Professor Humphrey has the unanimous support of the student body, the greatest respect as a teacher, and as a professor, working always for the best interests of the College. Be it further resolved, that the student body request that the question of Professor Humphrey's resignation be taken up with the trustees through the Advisory Committee on the State of the College."\textsuperscript{255} Following the mass meeting, the students hanged and burned an effigy of Odell Shepard, Goodwin Professor of English, and one of Humphrey's most articulate critics.\textsuperscript{256}

The Hartford Times sent a reporter to the campus to poll the Faculty as to their support of or opposition to Professor Humphrey. Voting against the Professor were Acting-President Perkins and Professors Urban, Kleene, Riggs, Babbitt, Adams,
Galpin, Carpenter, and Shepard. Those supporting Humphrey were Professors McCook, Rogers, Barrett, Swan, and Fischer, and Robert E. Bacon (Instructor in English). Assistant Professor of Chemistry Edward Collins Stone gave his position as "uncertain."257

Obviously, a majority of the Faculty sided with Professor Urban. All were full Professors, and these nine men were referred to in the local press as the "Old Guard." But the term "Old Guard" was hardly accurate, for in the ranks of those favorable to Professor Humphrey was Professor McCook, the senior member of the Faculty, and listed among the "Old Guard" was Professor Shepard who had come to the College only in 1917.258

As the conflict progressed, sentiment seemed to be on the side of Professor Humphrey. Alumni wrote letters to Alumni Secretary Johnson in support of the Northam Professor,259 and The Tripod carried an editorial endorsing the stand taken by the undergraduates at their mass meeting.260

When the undergraduates' resolution was presented to the General Advisory Committee on the State of the College, the Committee decided, after informal discussion, that "it does not lie within the province of this Committee to investigate the situation...." But this was not a matter of evading responsibility. The Committee requested the Board of Trustees to conduct "an investigation by them of the whole matter under consideration."261

The Trustees referred "the whole matter" to the Executive Committee, and on April 22, 1920, Professor Humphrey appeared before that body. The Executive Committee heard the Professor's side of the story and decided that the "Humphrey matter" had "in part adjusted itself" and that there was no longer any serious disharmony in the Faculty. They recommended that the Trustees retain Professor Humphrey for at least another year and that a public statement be made "that there are no charges against Professor Humphrey." The Trustees accepted the recommendations of the Executive Committee,262 and Professor Humphrey remained a useful member of the Trinity Faculty until he reached the age of mandatory retirement in 1948.263 Acting-President Perkins soon dismissed the whole affair as the work of the Hartford newspapers. In his last official report, he wrote: "The local press in particular, with that eagerness for sensation which characterizes most American newspapers, was determined that a schism must exist, and with the aid of hearsay evidence and innuendo vigorously exploited the situation...."264

On April 24, 1920, Remsen Brinckerhoff Ogilby was elected President of the College, his term to begin on July 1.265 Ogilby visited the campus several times during the spring, and each time he appeared he was greeted with much enthusiasm.266 Once more it seemed that all at Trinity would be "sweetness and light." The stormy interlude under Acting-President Perkins was coming to a close.
The End of an Era

President Luther was indeed prophetic when, at the time of his resignation, he suggested that there would be changes at Trinity College. Although perhaps few could agree as to what form these changes would take, everyone expected change. And many demanded change. In view of three decades of pressure for an enlarged student body, it must have come as a surprise to some that there should have been, at that time, suggestions that the College now be decreased in size rather than expanded.

While the Trustees Committee was still seeking a permanent successor to Dr. Luther, Philip Curtiss '06 of Norfolk, Connecticut, proposed that the change of administration might advantageously be the occasion of reversing the traditional policy regarding college admissions at Trinity. The pressures, he said, had been upon Luther to build up the student body, and Luther had followed orders. The results, he observed, had been far from happy. And Curtiss' solution to the problem was shockingly simple: admit only the most highly-qualified students, fail those who cannot maintain the highest standards and, if necessary, let the size of the College drop to one student, one Professor, and one classroom. By offering quality education, he said, let Trinity gain the reputation of the foremost college in the country! A short while later, after the selection of the new President had been made, Curtiss' suggestion was endorsed by another Alumnus, Charles W. Bowman '87 of Brownsville, Pennsylvania, who optimistically enjoined: "We have a new President; let's make a fresh start, and not repeat the mistakes of 1904."

These were, of course, bold statements, but they represented merely the extremes of a generally widespread feeling among the Alumni that the College would have to return to a policy quite the opposite of that which had been followed during the Luther administration as well as during the latter years of that of George Williamson Smith. And not only would the academic standards of the College have to be raised generally, but there would also have to be, as the pronouncements of the College Senate and the Committee on the State of the College made clear, a policy of admission which would make Trinity College as socially prestigious as it had been in the 1880's and 1890's. And perhaps there should even be a return to a closer tie with the Church. It was this philosophy which guided the search for a new president and which, incidentally, made the quest such a difficult one.

The Committee entrusted with the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency of the College was headed by the Honorable William E. Curtis '75 of New York City. Of those who had been considered by the committee, Rensen B. Ogilby seemed to have the requisite qualifications. Ogilby was a clergyman of the Episcopal Church, he had considerable experience in educational administration, he was an individual of strong character, he had the enthusiastic recommendation of the Right Reverend Charles H. Brent, Bishop of the Philippines, and he had the social background which had been so notably lacking in President Luther. And there was, indeed, much in Ogilby's record which commended him to the position.

At the time of his appointment, Ogilby was thirty-nine years old. He had been graduated from Harvard in 1902 and the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in
THE END OF AN ERA

Remsen Brinckerhoff Ogilby

289
1907. After graduation from college, he had taught for two years at Groton School, and from 1909 until America’s entrance into the First World War, he had served as Headmaster of Baguio School in the Philippines. During the war, he served as a chaplain in the United States Army. After the Armistice was signed, he accepted a position at St. Paul’s School in Concord, New Hampshire, and it was from St. Paul’s that he was called to the Presidency of Trinity College.4

The Trustees had full confidence that the new President would lead the College into a new period of prosperity. Despite the understanding between Ogilby and the Trustees that the President would not have to raise money,5 by the time the Christmas Term opened in September, 1920, plans were already under way to provide new facilities — chapel, gymnasium, science building, and possibly a nine-hole golf course.6

Ogilby was inaugurated on November 17, 1920. Delegates were present from forty-one colleges, universities, seminaries, and secondary schools. There were statements in several of the addresses which might have been taken as indication of what might be expected from the new administration. The Right Reverend Chauncey B. Brewster, Bishop of Connecticut, spoke for the Board of Trustees. The Bishop emphasized the liberal religious provisions of the College Charter as well as the Episcopalian heritage. And he also made much of the Christian spirit in which the College had been founded and the traditional relation of Trinity to the Episcopal Church.7 Professor McCook, speaking for the Trinity Faculty, welcomed the new President as a fellow Priest of the Church.8 And the President himself made much of Trinity as a Church College. “Trinity men,” he said, “know that our college is still a church college and, please God, it always will be.” But then he went on to ask, “What do we mean by a church college?” Trinity, he pointed out, is no longer under either general or diocesan ecclesiastical authority. The Faculty is no longer predominantly Episcopalian. The student body is only 43.5% Episcopalian, while Roman Catholics count for 18%, Congregationalists for 16.5% and eleven other religious bodies constitute 22%. Yet Ogilby was still content to call Trinity a “Church College.” Trinity, he said, admits all students without regard to their particular religious affiliation, but once admitted to the College, Trinity puts “before them without apology or compromise the conception of Christianity which our Church holds dear. . . . Along such lines as these Trinity is a church college.”9 Apparently, the Episcopalian, or at least the Christian, “heritage” was to receive more emphasis than in the immediate past.

President Ogilby had kind words for former President Luther’s idea of “training for leadership and service.” He made no apology for the college man going into business, and even suggested that this trend would increase, but he also made clear that he conceived of Trinity’s mission as being that of providing a broad, liberal education strongly based in the Humanities, rather than in vocational or professional preparation. His most unusual remarks, however, were those regarding the “social” aspect of higher education. He summarily dismissed the old idea of higher education
for the wealthy only, and he was equally harsh regarding the idea of "supporting an aristocracy of birth by an aristocracy of wealth." Trinity, he said, must be open to all comers, and scholarships must be provided for those who could not come otherwise. And to make his point, he informed his hearers that in his own undergraduate days, Harvard had provided him with a scholarship to the extent of 40 per cent of his expenses and that he had earned the remaining 60 per cent himself. The aristocratic element at Trinity was to be one of intellect, rather than one of wealth or birth.

And then Ogilby turned to the size of the College - a question which had perplexed the Trinity community for almost half a century, but to which the happy solution had yet to be found. Trinity could, he said, greatly increase the size of the student body without appreciably enlarging either Faculty or physical facilities. But this would be neither beneficial to the institution nor to the advantage of the individual student. Trinity, as a small college, has a definite task to perform. She can enrich the social nature of the graduate of the small high school, and she has a particular obligation to the boys from boarding schools who are accustomed to the routine of daily chapel, small classes, and close relationships to their teachers.

Finally, Ogilby turned to the ideals which he thought should be set for Trinity College. Trinity's aim is "to produce leaders rather than specialists, . . . and to intensify the cultivation of such qualities as will make for leadership rather than for expert technical knowledge along a single line." And thus the new President outlined what was to be his philosophy and program for the College whose leadership he had just assumed.

Immediately following his formal installation, Ogilby visited several of the larger local alumni associations - Boston, Hartford, New York, and Buffalo - and everywhere he went, Alumni pledged their support to the new President and his administration. In early April, 1921, the College began the long-awaited drive to raise $1,500,000 - actually as a "Centennial Fund" in anticipation of the coming hundredth anniversary of the College's founding in 1823, and again Ogilby received the full support of the Alumni.

In the spirit of the fund-raising campaign was indicated the change in spirit which had come to Trinity with President Ogilby. The principal speaker at the banquet (held at the Hartford Club) which got the campaign under way, was Joseph Buffington '75, who had once been among those who had felt that Trinity's future was dependent upon a large student body. Buffington's speech was devoted largely to the idea and ideal of the "small college," and it was in Buffington's remarks that the slogan, later to be much used at Trinity, "The Personal College," was first used.

For weal or for woe, the pressures for a larger college had ended - for the time, at least. As the campaign went on, President Ogilby pointed out what he recognized as the advantages of a small college, and whenever he met with alumni groups he made clear that the $1,500,000 was being raised to improve the quality of the instruction, and not to enlarge the College. Along this same line, even the student body was becoming reconciled to the plans to keep Trinity among those colleges of lower enrollment. An editorial in The Tripod, entitled "Forlorn Hopes," pointed out the folly of Trinity's competing in athletics with such large institutions as Princeton, Holy Cross, and Yale, and urged that Trinity's athletic schedule be rearranged so as to include only colleges of comparable size.

Ogilby conscientiously stood by his plans to raise educational standards and willingly he ac-
cepted the idea of the “Personal College.” The “personal” element, indeed, began at the top, for from his office in Williams Memorial, President Ogilby directed the day-to-day affairs of Trinity College in a more “personal” fashion than the institution had ever seen. Ogilby was usually to be found in his office at the head of the “Long Walk,” puffing on his pipe, walking about the office lost in thought. On frequent occasions he would open the casement window to hail a passing Professor or student and engage in a few minutes of conversation. Students soon came to know President Ogilby as a friend. A student in trouble with the Hartford police would soon find “Prexy” ready with bail money. A student in Hartford Hospital soon found “Prexy” at his bedside with earnest solicitation as to his well-being. Students in financial difficulties always found him willing to help. And students who were having academic difficulties found him a most comforting adviser. Ogilby was easy to know and easy to love, and so Trinity truly became “The Personal College.”

But there were other ways in which Trinity became “personal.” A system of Faculty Advisers was set up, and each student was assigned to an Adviser who was to help him in the selection of courses and in other academic matters. In 1925, the first College Dean was appointed, Edward L. Troxell, who had come to the College in 1919 as Assistant Professor of Geology. Here the “personal” element was again evidenced, for the Dean took over the disciplinary function which had previously been exercised by a Faculty Committee. And the Dean’s duties were especially onerous during the early years of Prohibition.

Like his predecessor, Dr. Luther, Ogilby was fond of sports and rarely was an athletic event scheduled – whether football, baseball, or track – at which he was not present. Ogilby believed that sports helped develop leaders, leaders of men, but he gave little concern to whether Trinity lost or won or whether Trinity’s athletic budget was large or small. To him, the important thing was whether or not “our boys like their games.”

In the matter of the religious life of the College, too, Ogilby had definite ideas. Although he was proud to boast that Trinity had no legal ties to the Episcopal Church, he rejoiced that the Episcopal “heritage” had been strengthened from the time of his assuming the Presidency. And although he always took pride in the liberal spirit which he felt made members of other Christian communions, and particularly Roman Catholics, welcome, there was something of a reaction to the Latitudinarian spirit which had prevailed during the Luther administration.

Ogilby insisted that as Trinity was a Church College, and even as he loosely defined “Church College,” that the Ecclesiastical calendar be observed. Once early in his administration, Ogilby was walking to Chapel, puffing on his ever-present corn-cob pipe, when he was met by Francis Bunnell Creamer ’23, business manager of the Jesters. Creamer, a pre-theological student, asked the President for permission to hold a performance of Cyril Maud’s play, The Monkey’s Paw, “two weeks from Thursday.” As Creamer later reported, Ogilby’s “red hair stood on end, his pipe bellowed white-hot smoke and he took from his pocket a calendar. ‘Two weeks from Thursday? Do you know what day that is?’ ‘No sir,’ replied Creamer. ‘It is Maundy Thursday, and if you are contemplating Holy Orders, I would advise you to keep a closer tab on your Church Calendar.’” And, it may be added, the presentation of The Monkey’s Paw was deferred until after Easter.

Remsen Ogilby was a High Churchman, but a High Churchman who was more concerned with the externals than the theological basis of High Churchmanship, and one who was most interested in “the quaint and picturesque elements of Catholicism.” He delighted, for instance, in wearing ecclesiastical vestments, but he seldom wore a clerical collar. And, later in life, he always opened the sailing season at his summer home at Weekapaug, Rhode Island, by blessing the sailboats as they passed in review before him. Hence, it was hardly unexpected that the worship of the Trinity Chapel should have taken a more
"liturgical" turn, or that Ogilby should have set as one of his goals for the College a magnificent new Chapel which would dwarf the buildings which comprised the "Long Walk."

Nor did Ogilby hesitate to state his position—even when it was an unpopular one—in politics. Even before his inauguration as President of Trinity College, he had become involved in the political affairs of the city of Hartford and the state of Connecticut. The Hartford Courant had been carrying paid advertisements in support of the re-election of Frank E. Brandegee to the United States Senate. Ogilby was a strong proponent of the League of Nations and Brandegee's opposition to the League, as well as his lack of sympathy for the Women's Suffrage Movement, was particularly displeasing to Trinity's President. The Hartford Times had refused to carry the advertisements, but the strongly Republican Courant did not see anything wrong with either the senator's stand or the revenue which the advertisements provided.25

In what could be described as anything little short of a fit of anger, Ogilby stormed into the office of Emile Henry Gauvreau, managing editor of the Courant, and demanded that the paper apologize to its readers for carrying advertising of this sort. When Gauvreau insisted that the advertisement, and any others like it would not be apologized for, Ogilby declared that he would never again read the Courant. Gauvreau politely asked his visitor to sit down, picked up the telephone, called the circulation department and said, "This is Gauvreau. You have a subscription in the name of Ogilby. Trinity College. Cancel it! And send Dr. Ogilby a check for the full amount he has paid." The managing editor then walked to the door and ushered President Ogilby out with a polite "Good day."26

But this was not the end of the affair so far as Ogilby was concerned. At a regular Sunday chapel service he preached a sermon in which he both castigated the Courant and expressed the hope that Brandegee would be defeated at the polls.27 Ogilby's attack on the senator was, however, of little avail, for two weeks and two days after the much-talked-about chapel sermon, Brandegee won re-election as part of the Republican landslide which swept Warren G. Harding to the Presidency of the United States.28

During his first year at Trinity, President Ogilby once more used the pulpit to denounce a politician with whom he disagreed. George Harvey, President Harding's Ambassador to the Court of St. James and one of the most articulate opponents of America's joining the League of Nations,29 was described in Ogilby's first Baccalaureate Sermon (preached in Christ Church Cathedral on June 14, 1921) as one whom future historians would not hold in high regard.30

In strictly academic matters, Ogilby was pledged to two objectives: 1) to maintain the size of the College at about 250 students,31 and 2) to develop such a program of studies as carefully selected young men might find most useful in preparing for positions of leadership.32

There was, of course, no particular problem in holding the student body at the desired level, but considerable difficulty was encountered when the Admissions Committee sought to impose a higher standard of selectivity. So long as the College was engaged in raising the "Centennial Fund," it was thought best to leave the matter alone, especially as it was hoped that the city of Hartford would contribute a considerable amount of money towards the "Fund." During the early Ogilby years there was, therefore, little change in the makeup of the undergraduate body. The number of "townies" remained at almost one hundred—all day students,33 few of whom belonged to fraternities or otherwise participated in student life.34

Standards of academic performance remained low, and the freshmen classes seemed to show little improvement. In 1920-1921, the President reported that during the past academic year, 12% of the student body were required to withdraw because of low grades.35 The following year (1921-1922) there were similar figures, and the President noted that the poor performance might be accounted for, in part, by the fact that so few of the entering students came from families in
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which there was any tradition of higher education. And as evidence of this, Ogilby reported that of the 117 freshmen who entered Trinity in the fall of 1921, only 17 were the sons of college men.36

Particularly distressing at this time was the fact that so many of the scholarship holders were among those whose work was of an inferior standard. This indifference to serious academic work brought forth new rules for scholarship men. By vote of the Trustees, upperclassmen on scholarship would have to earn grades of at least four C's and one D; Freshmen would be allowed three C's and two D's; and in neither case would failures be permitted.37

The Faculty soon noted another discouraging trend. The number of transfer students was increasing, and young men were coming to Trinity in increasing numbers (17 in the fall of 1922) after they had failed elsewhere. The Faculty urged that the rules of admitting transfer students be made more rigid.38

There were those who hoped that the Centennial Celebration would mark a turning point in the life of the College, and in a way it did. The drive for the Centennial Fund did much to unite the Alumni. Bishop Brewster and the other New England Bishops pledged their support39 and President Ogilby, acting in conjunction with the heads of four other Episcopalian Colleges,40 was able to induce the Presiding Bishop and the General Council of the Episcopal Church to make a grant of $10,000 per year for a period of three years.41 The President also scored an unexpected victory when he was able to, once and for all, lay the old ghost of "sectarianism" and to receive a grant of $125,000 from the General Education Board.42 This, it will be noted, was at the very time the College had received its first and only appropriation from the Episcopal Church.

The Centennial Fund was raised with difficulty. The goal had been lowered by one-third, and despite the valiant efforts of Johnny McCook and J. H. Kelso Davis, the $1,000,000 mark was reached only by the end of the Centennial Celebration in June, 1923,43 but friends and Alumni had once more made a strong commitment to the College.

Centennials always fascinate the historically minded, and Trinity's Centennial was the occasion of historical sketches in the Ivy, the Tripod, and the Hartford newspapers. Unfortunately, there was no full-scale history undertaken at that time,44 but Professor McCook's address at

The Trowbridge-Livingston plan
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Founders' and Benefactors' Day, given on March 8, 1922, was one of the most delightful sketches of Trinity and her sons yet to appear. As a series of new buildings was one of the purposes for which the Centennial fund was being raised, it was quite natural that attention should have turned once more to campus architecture. Great must have been the rejoicing of those admirers of the Burges Plan when The Tri-pod, in a special Sub-Freshmen Week-End, Pictorial Issue of April 21, 1923, carried an architect's sketch of a proposed modification of the three quadrangles. The bird's-eye view, which had been prepared by Samuel B. P. Trowbridge '83 of New York City, showed an open quadrangle with the "Long Walk" forming the west side, an open north quadrangle with Williams Memorial and a splendid Gothic Chapel facing the south side, and a south quadrangle with dormitories and a Gothic Library occupying the same position in the south quadrangle as the Chapel to the north.

Ogilby was particularly partial to the Gothic style, and it will be remembered that he had begun his Inaugural Address with words of high praise for the buildings of the "Walk." In June, 1925, the Trustees agreed upon the advisability of employing an architect to prepare a general plan for future buildings and, most significantly, it was then decided that the Burges Plan would be followed insofar as was practical in view of the needs of the College. Trowbridge was engaged as the architect, and he at once proceeded to prepare a new plan somewhat in modification of the one he submitted in 1923. Trowbridge, unfortunately, died before the revised plan was finished, but the work was completed by his architectural firm, Trowbridge and Livingston, with the assistance of Howard T. Greenley '94. And it was this plan which was to be followed with reasonable care in the planning of the particular units which were erected during the 1930's and 1940's.

The Centennial Celebration itself was a grand affair. It began on Sunday, May 13, 1923 ("Charter Day" in the Trinity Calendar), with a religious service at which the Reverend Dr. S. S. Drury Hon. '10 of St. Paul's School preached a sermon and the Trinity Choir sang a "Centennial Hymn" with words and music by Professor Shepard. Class Day (Friday, June 8) was unusually elaborate, and the occasion was graced by the presence of a Japanese beauty, Princess Hime, the daughter of Count Koen Otani, head of the Shinsu sect of the Buddhist faith in Japan. Alumni Day (Saturday, June 9) featured a Centennial Midway in which the fraternities operated booths and sideshows to the enjoyment of all. Sunday, June 10, was observed as "Memorial Day" with an Open-Air Service at 11:00 with an address by Major-General J. G. Harbord, Chief of Staff, A.E.F. Before the service, various martial units paraded from the State Capitol to the campus. And at 3:00 P.M., at a special service in Alumni Hall, there was presented to the College a portrait of Professor McCook who had retired after forty years on the College Faculty. At 8:00 P.M. the Baccalaureate Sermon was preached in Christ Church Cathedral by the Rev. Dr. Karl Reiland '98, Rector of St. George's Church, New York City. Commencement was held on campus, Monday, June 11, at 10:00 A.M. In the afternoon, Trustees, Faculty and Alumni paraded to the State Capitol Building where Bishop Brewster dedicated a tablet marking the site of the old campus.

With the celebration past, President Ogilby looked for Trinity's settling down into a pleasant academic routine. He had no spectacular plans to propose, and it was only a modest—perhaps too modest—goal which he set for the College. New buildings were needed, particularly a chemistry laboratory and a chapel, but these had long been a recognized need. Additional instructors would be engaged, but this was to relieve several overworked Professors; Political Science should be detached from History, Sociology from Economics, and Psychology from Philosophy. Trinity settled into a routine, but not, perhaps, such as President Ogilby had anticipated. Old problems persisted and new ones arose. There was criticism of the President that he was trying to run the College in the fashion of a "prep school," and Ogilby was the first to admit that such failures as he had made could be attributed...
to his "sticking too closely to preparatory school methods of handling the youth."54

The requirement that all boarding students attend daily chapel smacked, the students felt, of "prep school" regulations. And the fact that "townies" were not required to attend except on Wednesday led to a general demand for the abolition of compulsory chapel. The Tripod polled the student body and found that while eleven students favored compulsory chapel, 186 were opposed to it. Not only did the matter of compulsory chapel widen (if that was even possible) the rift between boarders and "townies," it led to a growing feeling of antagonism between the under-

graduates and Faculty, who, the Tripod assumed, were unanimously in favor. Ogilby called a meeting of members of the Faculty and the Senate at his home to discuss faculty-undergraduate differences, and while there was no "meeting of the minds," the students at least felt that the Faculty could not be entirely hostile to their interests.55 A Senate petition to the Trustees requesting the abolition of compulsory chapel was rejected by the Board on December 1, 1923,56 and so compulsory chapel remained as a Trinity institution until 1962!

In 1925, Trinity took two significant steps. To provide a formal pension program for the Fac-
ulty, the College joined the Teachers' Insurance and Annuity Association of America, and to provide instruction for members of the Hartford Community, the College began a program of extension studies which was to develop into Trinity's present graduate and summer studies organization.

Trinity had made, as we have seen, repeated efforts to develop advanced graduate study and to offer courses for non-matriculated students, but none of these had been particularly successful. The excellent graduate work in the sciences which had flourished at the beginning of the century petered out as those who had instituted the program were replaced by Professors who had little interest either in research or in teaching highly specialized courses. An arrangement entered into in 1919 with the Hillyer Institute whereby Trinity Faculty would teach courses at the Hartford YMCA (with those who had completed three years equivalent in institute courses being eligible for senior matriculation) never fully went into effect. But in response to the demand for some sort of Trinity instruction to be offered the Hartford community, in 1925 the College, in cooperation with the Hartford school system, began to offer several courses each year to teachers in the Hartford schools. The Extension program was carried on in classrooms of Hartford Public High School, and courses were given on both graduate and undergraduate level. It was not until the end of World War II that the program came to be centered completely on the campus.

The undergraduates may have felt that the College was being run as a "prep school," but they seemed to have had a good time. Athletics were strongly supported, the Glee Club flourished, and the Jesters were giving well-received performances. Interest groups, such as the Political Science Club, added much to the intellectual life for those who availed themselves of them. And there were more and more special lectures by both Faculty and outside authorities on an almost infinite variety of topics.

The student body remained about the same as it had been since the war, and from year to year the number of undergraduates varied from 255 in 1923 to 284 in 1925. This was more or less in keeping with Ogilby's commitment to the "small college," but it was not entirely in keeping with the wishes of most Alumni, who (despite the suggestions at the beginning of Ogilby's administration that the College concentrate on quality rather than quantity) still could think of Trinity's potential greatness only in terms of student numbers.

Students, especially Hartford students, were easily attracted to Trinity as Freshmen, but the undergraduates seemed less adequately prepared for college work than ever before. The College refused to admit graduates of high school commercial courses, but even many of those who had been graduated from the preparatory courses found the going difficult. In the fall of 1924, thirty-five per cent of the Freshman Class failed, and this record prompted the Faculty to approve a tutoring program whereby the better students would give special help to the weaker ones. The Tripod, incidentally, was quite frank in announcing that the program had been adopted "to hold athletes."

Quite naturally, there were those who thought that Trinity was making no "progress." The Hartford Alumni Association became particularly critical of President Ogilby. First, they appointed a Committee to Create Interest in the College — and particularly in the preparatory schools in the Hartford area. The committee was especially entrusted by the local association with recruiting athletes and to point out to promising high school players that, while the College would not give athletic scholarships, the Hartford businessmen could be counted upon to provide part-time employment. And later the Hartford Alumni inaugurated a "Bigger Trinity" plan whereby the alumni groups of the larger cities would be coordinated for purposes of providing the publicity which the Hartford men thought was so seriously lacking.

This was, of course, a reversal of the commitment to the "small college" idea which Ogilby had so readily made the official policy of the institution. But the sharpest criticism of the Ogilby
administration came from certain Alumni who felt that the idea of a smaller college was commendable enough, provided the students themselves were of the sort who had traditionally found their way into the Trinity fraternities.

The alumni members of Delta Psi were particularly concerned about the future of the fraternity system at Trinity and of Epsilon Chapter in particular. Following World War I, Delta Psi had fallen upon evil times. The chapter was short of men, only fourteen were graduated. Most of the initiates remained at Trinity for only a year or two. In 1927, only one man was initiated and he was not an undergraduate, but a member of the Faculty. There was talk of Epsilon Chapter giving up its "Charter" in the fraternity and there were even fears that the national fraternity would ask Epsilon to surrender the charter.

By 1926, it became clear that the other Trinity fraternities were in the same straits, but it was the Delta Psi men who were able to work out a plan of action which would save their chapter, the fraternity system at Trinity and, as they may have felt with some justice, the College itself. On April 20, 1927, the Trustees of the chapter met at the St. Anthony Club in New York City. A revolving fund was set up to help defray the college expenses of eligible Delta Psi prospects and thus enable them to remain in college. Colonel W. E. A. Bulkeley 'go agreed to raise money for the rehabilitation of the chapter house, and the Alumni members began an earnest program of student recruiting. But most important of all, a committee consisting of Henry L. G. Meyer '03, Robert B. O'Connor '16, Robert Thorne '85, and William H. Eaton '99, undertook a thorough study of the chapter, the fraternity system, and the College. The committee invited all Epsilon men to a dinner held in Hartford on May 11, 1928, and at this meeting an elaborate program of action was outlined and a second committee was appointed to ascertain the "underlying causes" of the College's failure to revive. The committee consisted of Martin W. Clement, W. H. Eaton, R. B. O'Connor, W. E. A. Bulkeley, and C. B. F. Brill.

On June 17, 1928, the committee reported to Epsilon Chapter, and the findings gave little encouragement. It was noted that "the morale of the student body [was] low," and that there was a "consequent lack of spirit and therefore [an] absence of the pleasures, enjoyments and friendships which alone engender the desire to continue in college in men of the character Delta Psi wanted." The committee, furthermore, reported that there was "a widespread belief that the college placed more emphasis upon rigid conformity with scholastic requirements than on a well-rounded development of its students." And, most alarming to the friends of the fraternity system, the committee concluded that "the number of qualified men entering Trinity [was] too small to maintain the senior fraternities."

So far, the movement had been entirely one of Delta Psi, but the other fraternities were soon drawn in. Psi Upsilon and Alpha Delta Phi immediately expressed sympathy with the program which had been instituted by the Delta Psi Committee. Soon all the Trinity fraternities were united in the Inter-Fraternity Committee, and a direct approach was made to the Corporation through President Ogilby.

The Inter-Fraternity Committee started its work by meeting with the President of the College at the Hotel Griswold in Groton, Connecticut, on August 28, 1928, to place before him proposals for the reform of the College along lines acceptable to the fraternity Alumni. And in presenting the proposals to Ogilby, the committee delineated what might even be described as an ultimatum: the College had too long been a local institution, and the institution would have to regain its national reputation. The College would, furthermore, have to be restored in such a fashion as would suit the fraternity Alumni and in such a fashion as would permit fraternity life to thrive.

The committee discussed every phase of college life with the President - the college personnel, the kind of students the committee wanted, the size of the College, and the curriculum. Ogilby was much perturbed that the Alumni would criticize
On the matter of the size of the College, Ogilby acceded to the committee's principles, and at the close of the meeting the President remarked, "This is the first time in my Trinity experience that I felt Alumni breathing down my neck, and it's a good feeling."79

With Ogilby's assurance of cooperation in revamping the College, the Inter-Fraternity Committee appointed a sub-committee which was to prepare a detailed report and to make recommendations to the President, the Trustees, and the Board of Fellows. The committee met regularly during the winter of 1928-1929, and the members gave unstintingly of their time. Other colleges were visited, and headmasters were interviewed. In the spring of 1929, a comprehensive report was presented to the college authorities. The report was signed by Charles E. Tuke '02 and James A. Wales '01 for Alpha Chi Rho; by Richardson Wright '10 and Blinn F. Yates '11 for Alpha Delta Phi; by William George Wherry '04 and Leonard J. Dibble '09 for Delta Kappa Epsilon; by Arthur V. R. Tilton '21 and Richard E. Peck '01 for Delta Phi; by Hill Burgwin '06 and A. Northey Jones '99, and C. B. F. Brill '19 for Delta Psi. What had begun as a measure of desperation undertaken by Delta Psi ended in a report and recommendation signed by some of the College's most loyal and respected Alumni, six of whom subsequently became College Trustees, three of whom became College Fellows, and all of whom evidenced their genuine concern for Trinity College by helping to implement the recommendations they had made.80

The content of the report was hardly revolutionary, judged by later standards of alumni recommendations at least, and it merely set forth most of the principles already agreed to by President Ogilby at Groton. What was of utmost significance was the fact that the Trinity Alumni had demanded a share in forming the policy of the institution. As the geographic imbalance of the student body had initially prompted the conferences which had brought forth the report, it was hardly surprising that something was said regarding the large number of "townies" at Trinity. Hartford students, the report suggested, should not exceed twenty per cent of the total enrollment, and even these should be selected with the utmost care. Hartford students should be admitted "not on the basis of what Trinity College can do for these day students, but what can these day students do for Trinity." Even the boarding students should be more carefully screened, and special efforts should be made to work with the headmasters in recruiting freshmen from the preparatory schools. There should be a "better rounded" athletic program and improvement in the athletic facilities. There should be improved relations between college administration and Alumni. Instructional facilities should be expanded - new laboratories, more classrooms, and additional Faculty. And to bring Trinity in line with the other New England colleges for men, the curriculum should be modernized along the lines of: 1) less emphasis on the Classics, and 2) new courses in Fine Arts, the Humanities, and the Social Sciences.81

Changes were to come, and they were to come quickly. Even before the Inter-Fraternity Committee Report had been submitted, President Ogilby had already announced new policies and developments which were to fulfill the promises he had made at Groton. In his Report to the Trustees of December 1, 1928, Ogilby made clear that there would be a radical change in the makeup of the undergraduate body. Trinity would hereafter, he said, resist the pressure of numbers from Hartford applicants to the Freshman Class. Day students (who were perhaps more interested, he felt, in a practical, vocational education) would be admitted only in such numbers as not to deter the College's intellectual or social tone.82 Boarding students, too, would be more carefully chosen. Trinity would make much of her Episcopalian heritage. A new chapel, this thanks to the generosity of Trustee William Gwinn Mather '77 of Cleveland, Ohio, and a new gymnasium would
be erected immediately.\textsuperscript{83} Each of these promises was carried into effect.

Five hundred students was set as the ideal size of the College—one small enough to make possible the close faculty-student relationships so much stressed by the defenders of the small-college ideal, and yet one large enough to provide a sufficient reservoir upon which the fraternities and the athletic teams could draw. Besides, an enrollment of 500 would place Trinity roughly in the same category, so far as size was concerned, with Wesleyan, Williams, and Amherst. As to the number of Hartford students, 125 was set as a “quota.”\textsuperscript{84}

There was a rather rapid increase in the number of students toward the goal of five hundred. In 1929–1930, there were 312 students enrolled,\textsuperscript{85} and the following year the number had risen to 351.\textsuperscript{86} In 1931–1932, the enrollment shot up to 426,\textsuperscript{87} and in 1932–1933 it stood at 439.\textsuperscript{88} Slight gains in the next two academic years took the enrollment to 455\textsuperscript{89} and 485,\textsuperscript{90} and in the fall of 1936 the goal of 500 students was passed when the enrollment reached 516, a figure which included 7 graduates, 12 non-matriculated students, and 2 specials.\textsuperscript{91}

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this phenomenal growth of the College was the fact that it occurred during the years of the Great Depression, a time when many of the smaller American institutions were hard pressed to find students able to pay the tuition fees.

But almost equally noteworthy was the fact that the growth had brought back to Trinity a national clientele, a sharp reduction in both the number and proportion of local students, and a closer spiritual tie with the Church whose members had brought the institution into being.

Alumni, and particularly the fraternity Alumni who had been on the Inter-Fraternity Committee, personally canvassed the preparatory schools in the New York and Philadelphia areas,\textsuperscript{92} and among the increasing number of undergraduates there was soon to be found a proportionately larger number of men from the better preparatory schools. And although Ogilby insisted that there was no such thing as a “Trinity-type” of student,\textsuperscript{93} the fraternity Alumni were immensely pleased with the sort of young man who was being attracted to the College.\textsuperscript{94}

There was, as had been hoped for, an enrichment of the social life of the College. Despite the economic depression, the fraternities entered a period of prosperity, and athletic teams and other undergraduate activities found a new vitality.\textsuperscript{95}

These developments, however, should not suggest that Trinity had taken on the atmosphere of a “country club.” There was, rather, a steady improvement in the undergraduates’ academic performance. Despite their greatly increased numbers, students were coming to Trinity much better prepared than formerly, and there were fewer dropouts and fewer dismissals for low grades. The all-college average rose steadily even in the face of higher standards having been set by the Faculty for classroom work. Holders of Trinity degrees were bringing credit to themselves and their Alma Mater by success in the leading graduate schools, and there was every reason to believe that the quality of a Trinity education was the highest it had been in the institution’s history.\textsuperscript{96}

Despite the fact that the country was in the midst of its greatest financial depression, Trinity enjoyed an economic prosperity which was a new element to be injected into the College’s history. Year after year ended with a surplus rather than a deficit,\textsuperscript{97} and this, fortunately, without the “cutting of corners” which enabled the less fortunate institutions to make ends meet. During these depression years, the salary of the Professors was doubled,\textsuperscript{98} the endowment greatly increased,\textsuperscript{99} and almost countless improvements were made on the college grounds.\textsuperscript{100} But the most “visible” improvement in the College was the series of splendid buildings which was erected during these years.

Cook Dormitory and the beautiful Hamlin Dining Hall were completed in 1931. The same year also saw the completion of the Trowbridge Memorial, a most modern swimming pool and squash courts, dedicated to the memory of the campus architect, S. P. B. Trowbridge. 1932 saw the completion of the Trinity Chapel, a magnificent, English Gothic, limestone struc-
ture, designed by Frohman, Robb and Little, the architects of the Washington Cathedral, and presented to the College by William Gwinn Mather '77, the Cleveland industrialist and philanthropist. The Chapel was President Ogilby’s “Great Project,” and from the time of the ground breaking in December, 1928, through the cornerstone laying on June 15, 1930, to its consecration on June 18, 1932, it was his chief concern.\(^{101}\) And the actual building brought out all that was Medieval and Catholic in President Ogilby’s High-Church soul. The workmen were encouraged to live together on the job-site and, as the building took shape, Ogilby conducted a daily service for them in the Crypt. Although few of the masons, carpenters, or bricklayers were Episcopalians, Ogilby was able to inspire them to a love for the building. The workmen were encouraged to try their hand at stone-carving, and the five prize-winning works were incorporated into the fabric of the building along with tile, brick, and stones from such diverse places as Trinity College, Cambridge, Mount Sinai, and the Great Wall of China. The workmen came to share much of Ogilby’s love for the Chapel, and throughout the years they made gifts to the Church. Each year they return to a meeting of the “Chapel Builders’ Alumni Association” at which time they hold a memorial service in the Crypt Chapel for their deceased fellows and then enjoy a banquet held by the College in Hamlin Hall. Lewis Wallace, master mason during the Chapel’s construction, became so attached to the building that he stayed on at the College, serving as Chapel Verger from 1933 until 1943, and then as Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds. Earl Sanborn, the creator of the magnificent stained-glass windows, asked that his ashes be buried under a slab in the Crypt floor.\(^{102}\)

The Chapel’s consecration, Saturday, June 18, 1932, was one of great solemnity. At Mather’s request, the consecrating Bishop was the Right Reverend Chauncey B. Brewster. Others present and participating in the service were the Bishop Coadjutor of Connecticut, the Presiding Bishop, and the Bishops of North Carolina, Delaware, South Dakota, and North Dakota. Five separate
processions formed in the old Chapel and proceeded to the new structure, where five Bishops consecrated different parts of the Chapel simultaneously, and then these processions later joined for the consecration of the whole. The workingmen were present, all in the work clothes of their several crafts. Among the many memorials in the Chapel was the Plumb Carillon of thirty bells, presented to the College by John F. Plumb ’91 and his wife in memory of their son John ’26 who had died in his senior year. Ogilby learned to play the carillon, taught his students and colleagues to play, and in 1934 he brought together at Trinity the twenty-two performers on the instrument who formed the Guild of Carillonneurs in North America.

Trinity’s Chapel was truly one of the most noble examples of English perpendicular Gothic to be found in America, and it was doubtless the finest collegiate chapel in the country. But there were those who felt that President Ogilby’s “Great Project” had taken precedence over more pressing needs. The facilities for teaching Chemistry were particularly inadequate. The Chemistry Department was crowded into the basement of Jarvis Physics Laboratory, and Professor Vernon Krieble, head of the Department of Chemistry, made his point by converting an abandoned coal bin into an auxiliary laboratory. Professor Krieble felt that construction of a Chemistry Building should have taken precedence over a new Chapel, for as Krieble put it to President Ogilby, “God can be worshiped anywhere, even out of doors; Chemistry can be taught only in a laboratory, and only in a well-equipped one.”

Ogilby’s response to this argument was that
money for the Chapel had been made available by the generosity of an Alumnus and that a Chemistry Building would be erected as soon as funds were provided. Professor Krieble believed that the money could be raised by soliciting the chemical industry, and in his quest for funds he turned to Martin W. Clement. In 1934 the two of them raised the necessary amount. Construction was begun in the fall of 1934, and in 1936 it was completed as the termination of the south end of the quadrangle according to the Burges Plan as modified by Trowbridge and Greenley. The new structure was a model of its type, and for many years it was visited by faculty and trustees of other colleges who were laying plans for a similar facility. It was the hope of the chief (anonymous) donor that the laboratory should be named for Martin W. Clement, but it was not until Clement's retirement from the Board of Trustees in 1963 that the Chemistry Building's principal fund-raiser gave his consent. In the fall of that year, the building was appropriately designated the Martin W. Clement Chemistry Laboratory, and the auditorium was named, with equal justice, for Vernon K. Krieble.

Architecturally, the erection of the Chemistry Building considerably to the east of Hamlin and Cook Halls left a "blank" in the southern end of the Great Quadrangle. The student body had been growing steadily, and the dormitories, as well as the fraternity houses, were being crowded to capacity. As the commitment was to an almost wholly residential college, it was hoped that a series of dormitory units could be constructed between the Chemistry Building and Cook Hall and thus close the gap in the southern walk.

Although the financial situation of the country caused the Trustees to proceed with caution, when the student body reached 567 in the fall of 1939, the Board decided that the proposed dormitory could be put off no longer. Under the leadership of College Provost Harold Jacquith '12 and Trustees Charles F. Weed '94 and Allen Northey Jones '17, a campaign was launched to raise the $125,000 needed to complete the unit. The results were most gratifying, for $131,549 was soon subscribed by 1,067 individuals. As had been the case in the Chapel, there were numerous memorials. A beautiful arch was given by the grandmother of William Nickerson Bancroft '37, and several of the rooms were dedicated as memorials to the alumni fathers of the donors. The oak paneling and the fireplace in the commons room (now Goodwin Lounge) was taken from the former New York home of James L. and Jose-
The Chemistry Building

At the ceremony naming the Clement Chemistry Laboratory

Construction of Goodwin and Woodward dormitories

Goodwin and Woodward dormitories

The Chemistry Building was named by the Trustees in honor of James J. Goodwin and P. Henry Woodward, both of whom had sons who faithfully carried on the family tradition of benefaction and service to the College. In 1914, the Trustees chose to honor two former Trustees, James J. Goodwin and P. Henry Woodward, both of whom had sons who faithfully carried on the family tradition of benefaction and service to the College.

While Goodwin and Woodward Halls were under construction, plans were announced for still another dormitory. Delta Psi Fraternity had long recognized the inadequacy of facilities in its old chapter house which had been erected in 1878. Delta Psi men entered into an arrangement with the College whereby Delta Psi would raise the money for construction and the College would purchase the site, provided the College would lease the dining facilities to the fraternity and permit a limited number of rooms to be occupied by Delta Psi men. Martin W. Clement again raised the money, this time receiving the $150,000 from an anonymous donor. The College purchased the lot on the northeast corner of Vernon and Summit Streets, and two Delta Psi men, Robert B. O'Connor '16 and C. B. F. Brill '19, prepared the plans. The lovely brick building, designed to accommodate twenty-six students and two Faculty members, was completed in 1941 and subsequently named Ogilby Hall.

While these physical improvements were being made, there were many developments which gen-
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erally reflected a strengthening of the College. Despite the tremendous expenditures for build-
ings and equipment, and despite the fact that the
nation’s economy had made little progress toward
recovery, each fiscal year ended with a slight sur-
plus. There were gifts and bequests that raised
the College’s total assets from $4,641,490 in 1928–
1929 to $7,346,604 in 1937–1938. During this
same period, the annual budget had steadily in-
creased from $218,318 to $353,970. And as the
student body increased from 276 to 537, the Fac-
ulty had an almost proportional growth from 39
to 59. There were generous sabbatical leaves, and, except for several rather infantile faculty
feuds, a general spirit of faculty loyalty prevailed.
To bring about better understanding between
Trustees and Faculty, a Trustees-Faculty Dinner
was held in Hamlin Hall each year, and in
April, 1940, the Trinity Faculty even entertained
at dinner the Faculty of Wesleyan University.

The decade of the 1930’s was, doubtless, one of
the College’s most prosperous and progressive
periods. From the institution with such a provin-
cial orientation as to deserve the name of the
“Hartford Local,” Trinity had regained her na-
tional clientele and, at the same time, something
of a national reputation. The scholarly works of
Professor Thomas Hume Bissonnette in Biology,
Odell Shepard in English, and James A. Notopou-
los in Classics were widely recognized as being of
superior quality. And no little honor came to
Trinity when Professor Shepard was awarded a
Pulitzer Prize for his biography of Bronson Al-
cott. Standards of undergraduate academic per-
formance continued to rise, and many a Trinity
Alumnus proceeded to distinguished work in the
graduate and professional schools of the major
universities. Undergraduate social life was
much improved, and the athletic teams enjoyed a
series of most successful seasons. All-in-all, it
was one of those “comfortable” periods which an
institution briefly experiences in the course of its
history and, in many ways, the Ogilby years may
be compared with the Presidency of Abner
Jackson, of which so much has been made in this
volume. But the decade of the 1930’s was, too, the
end of an era – perhaps an “Indian Summer” of
the “old Trinity” – for events were soon to occur
which would disrupt the pleasant tenor of Trinity
life, break some of the institution’s most hallowed
traditions, and set the College along a path which
would remove it from the “small college” pattern
which, by choice or necessity, it had traditionally
followed.
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236. The Tripod, November 9, 1918.
237. The Tripod, November 12, 1918.
238. The Tripod, November 26, 1918.
239. The Tripod, January 7, 1919.
240. The Students' Army Training Corps at Trinity College, pp. 9-10.
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5. Ogilby said many times to R. B. O'Connor that he came to Trinity with the specific understanding that he would not have to raise money. R. B. O'Connor to Owen Morgan, March 11, 1942, in possession of R. B. O'Connor.
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18. In Memory of the Rev. Dr. Remsen Brinckerhoff
Ogilby, unapaged. Because of his firm jaw and red hair, Ogilby was affectionately known to the students as “Red Mike.” *New York Times*, August 8, 1943.
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31. *Report of the President of Trinity College*, October 1, 1923, p. 3.
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44. Earlier, there had been two abortive attempts to prepare a College History. In 1884, the Alumni Association voted to expend $25 annually for the purpose. (*The Trinity Tablet*, July 2, 1884.) J. H. Barbour, the Librarian, was appointed editor-in-chief. Authors of the several chapters were to receive $10.00 per chapter. Few of the chapters were completed, and Barbour put the correspondence and the few completed pages in an envelope which he labeled “College History Data.” W. N. C. Carleton later added a personal note: “The Record of a Pithetic Failure, W. N. C. C.” The envelope is in the Trinity Collection, Trinity College, Hartford. In 1912, the Treasurer of the College, E. F. Waterman, wrote to all Alumni: “We are endeavoring to collect all available biographical data concerning our alumni, former presidents, members of the faculty, etc., with a view to publishing them eventually in book form, as has been already done by many colleges.” (Treasurer to various Alumni, March 18, 1912; copies in Alumni Files, Trinity College, Hartford.) Waterman did not intend to write a full-scale College History. His plan was to do biographical sketches of the Alumni in the fashion of Sibley’s *Harvard Graduates* (Interview with Edgar F. Waterman, March 29, 1960).
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103. Ibid., p. 57. The Chronicle, a Low Church publication, was shocked that the Bishops wore copes and miters, made the sign of the cross, that a crucifix was carried in procession, and that incense was used (XXXII [July, 1932], pp. 244-245).
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105. The Hartford Times, July 30, 1964. On July 29, 1964, an inscription was placed on the Chapel Tower door commemorating the founding of the Guild.
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116. For a tabular summary see the Report of the Treasurer of Trinity College, October, 1938, p. 3. The first deficit was for $5,750.88 in 1938-39. Ibid., p. 11.

117. See the President's Reports for the decade of the 1930's.

118. R. B. Ogilby to the Members of the faculty of Trinity College, December 16, 1940, in Morse S. Allen Papers. Trinity Collection, Trinity College, Hartford; Morse S. Allen to the Members of the Faculty of Trinity College, January 2, 1940, in ibid.
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121. Report of the Dean of Trinity College, October, 1940, p. 20; ibid., October, 1941, pp. 24-25.
CHAPTER: I The Charter Oak Pew-End was given by the descendants of Captain Joseph Wadsworth, who carried off the Royal Charter. The panel shows Captain Wadsworth on tiptoe about to place the Charter in the oak while the oblivious rabbit in the foreground is a silent tribute to the Captain’s stealthy tread. On the arm, with an overturned candlestick on the table before him, is shown Governor Andros in a towering rage at the theft of the Charter. Below the table are carved some oak leaves, with what may be acorns, or possibly wooden nutmegs. The finial at the top is the British coat-of-arms.

II The Washington Pew-End was given by the class of 1932 at graduation time in the Washington Bi-centennial year. The panel represents Washington stopping on one of his trips through Connecticut to greet his friend, Jonathan Trumbull, “Brother Jonathan,” in front of the little store at Lebanon which was kept by Trumbull for many years. The finial is in the form of an American eagle, whose scornful eye is turned toward the British coat-of-arms across the aisle, while on the arm-piece is a Continental soldier on guard. Below the soldier is a little fox head; it is not generally known that in the British army during the Revolution Washington was known as “the old fox.”

III This end was given by graduates of Pomfret School in tribute to their headmaster from 1897–1931, the Reverend William B. Olmsted, Trinity ’87. Since he went to Pomfret from St. Mark’s School, we note the lion of St. Mark. On the arm-piece is the Trinity mascot, a bantam rooster, and on the panel a bas-relief of the first Trinity College Chapel, according to College tradition, designed by S. F. B. Morse, inventor of the telegraph. At the top of the panel is the Pomfret School shield, designed by Mrs. Olmsted.

IV Misericord Seat showing a college janitor.

V Misericord Seat showing a student of mathematics.

VI The gift of the Reverend Godfrey Brinley ’38, this pew-end was presented in 1933, the one hundredth anniversary of the Oxford Movement. Newman, Keble and Pusey are seen conversing in the quad of Oriel College, with the arms of Oriel and of the Oxford University on a shield above. The arm presents Bishop Hobart.

VII The finial is Henry VIII, founder of Trinity College, Cambridge. On the arm is the British Lion, crowned and holding a shield bearing Henry’s arms, carved after the finial of the famous Trinity fountain. The main panel shows Trinity, Cambridge, with a small figure of Isaac Newton, a Trinity Cambridge graduate, watching the famous apple fall from a tree as he discovers the Law of Gravity. Beneath is the seal of that College, of which the donor, Lucius James Knowles, was a member.

VIII A tribute to gardens and gardeners, the finial shows the Civil War Memorial Arch, familiar landmark of Bushnell Park in downtown Hartford. The main panel depicts the original Garden or Park, still unfallen, as is evident from the fact that the
serpent still has his legs. St. Abelard, Patron of Gardeners, is on the arm, while below is the flower, Poeticus.

IX This kneeler-end was given by members of the class of 1941 in memory of Edward Foster Chapman, who died early in his freshman year. It represents the youthful scholarship of the Venerable Bede.

X This pew-end was given in tribute to the Police Department of Hartford. The police parade is seen walking down the street, while on the arm-piece is an old-fashioned "cop" cautioning a little boy. Above is the patron saint of the Police Department, the centurion who said to the Master, "I say to this man 'Go' and he goeth, and to that man 'Come' and he cometh."

XI This second "workmen's" kneeler-end shows St. Joseph, the patron saint of the carpenters who worked on the Chapel; the little figure kneeling is a mason, to represent the most important craft in the building. Originally intended to honor the builders of the present Chapel, its use here honors the builders of Seabury and Jarvis Halls.

XII In memory of the class of 1896, the football referee on the finial is William Langford '96 in his time one of the greatest authorities on football. The Owl on the arm-piece recalls the '96 delegation of Psi Upsilon, while the baseball player below portrays the donor's teammates of that year. Whimsically, the wood-carver depicted the player as a left-handed pitcher. The main panel depicts the Rape of the Lemon-Squeezer.

XIII Given by the class of 1940 in tribute to their classmate, Philip McCook, who was killed in an automobile accident in his senior year. His grandfather, the Reverend John J. McCook '63 for forty years a professor at Trinity, is represented conducting a service.

XIV The St. Mark's School pew-end, handsomely carved with six different scenes, was a gift to the College from the alumni of St. Mark's School and Trinity College.

The pew-end's finial, or top-most part, is a carving of the winged lion of St. Mark. The base, upon which the lion is standing, contains the School motto, "Age Quod Agis," or freely translated, "Whatever you do, do well."

Beneath the lion are two panels. One shows St. Mark preaching in Rome; the other contains two foreground figures, the late Dr. William G. Thayer, headmaster of the School from 1896 to 1930, and his wife. The arm-rest figure represents the late William W. Barber, a Trinity graduate of 1888, who subsequently joined the St. Mark's faculty and became nationally known as a teacher of Greek. He is shown holding a book, the pages of which show, symbolically, the first four letters of the Greek alphabet.

The upper arm-rest panel shows St. Peter dictating the Gospel of St. Mark and in the lower one are the seals of St. Mark's and Trinity.

XV This pew-end, with the wooden cross on top, was given by members of the class of 1897 on the occasion of their fortieth anniversary, in memory of two classmates, W. S. Danker and H. S. Hayward, who were killed in World War I. Danker, a chaplain, is shown on the arm-piece preaching to his men, while on the panel he is ministering to the wounded. Below, Hayward is leading a file of his men forward into the front-line trenches through a ruined village.

XVI This pew-end was given in memory of the late Dr. Ogilby. On the finial are the Ogilby Arms. The arm-piece represents Dr. Ogilby granting a diploma at Commencement. The main panel shows the Chapel, which in so many ways is "his building," while below are the seals of his schools, Roxbury Latin, Harvard, and Trinity.
Appendix B

## PRESIDENTS OF THE COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Church Brownell</td>
<td>1824–1831</td>
<td>Flavel Sweeten Luther</td>
<td>1904–1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Sheldon Wheaton</td>
<td>1831–1837</td>
<td>Henry Augustus Perkins, Acting President</td>
<td>1915–1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Totten</td>
<td>1837–1843</td>
<td></td>
<td>1919–1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Williams</td>
<td>1848–1853</td>
<td>Remsen Brinckerhoff Ogilby, Acting President</td>
<td>1920–1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Raynes Goodwin</td>
<td>1853–1860</td>
<td>Arthur Howard Hughes, Acting President</td>
<td>1943–1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barrett Kerfoot</td>
<td>1864–1866</td>
<td>Arthur Howard Hughes, Acting President</td>
<td>1951–1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brocklesby, Acting President</td>
<td>1866–1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>1953–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abner Jackson</td>
<td>1867–1874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ruggles Pynchon</td>
<td>1874–1883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Williamson Smith</td>
<td>1883–1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix C

#### ALUMNI TRUSTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of office</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Term of office</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1883-1886</td>
<td>Rev. Thomas Gallaudet</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>1929-1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883-1884</td>
<td>E. Winslow Williams</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1931-1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884-1887</td>
<td>E. Winslow Williams</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1933-1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-1891</td>
<td>Luke A. Lockwood</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1933-1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886-1889</td>
<td>William E. Curtis</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1935-1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889-1895</td>
<td>Robert H. Coleman</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>1938-1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1894</td>
<td>Charles D. Scudder</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1939-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894-1897</td>
<td>John S. Smith</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1941-1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-1903</td>
<td>Sydney G. Fischer</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1943-1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896-1902</td>
<td>William S. Cogswell</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1945-1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897-1900</td>
<td>Robert Thorne</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1947-1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1918</td>
<td>Joseph Buffington</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1949-1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902-1917</td>
<td>Robert Thorne</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1951-1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903-1910</td>
<td>Frederick E. Haight</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1953-1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-1913</td>
<td>Charles C. Barton</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1955-1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-1917</td>
<td>Rev. Samuel Hart</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1956-1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-1926</td>
<td>William S. Hubbard</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1957-1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-1922</td>
<td>E. Kent Hubbard</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1958-1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-1930</td>
<td>J. H. Kelso Davis</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>1964-1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1927</td>
<td>Henry C. Black</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1965-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-1929</td>
<td>Owen Morgan</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1966-1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928-1931</td>
<td>Lewis G. Harriman</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRESIDENTS OF THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of office</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Term of office</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1831-1833</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1839-1841</td>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833-1835</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>1841-1843</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835-1837</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1843-1845</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837-1839</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1845-1847</td>
<td>1837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1845-1883 HOUSE OF CONVOCATION

Dean:
1845-1848 Rev. Jacob L. Clark 1831 1866-1868 Rev. David H. Short 1833
1848-1852 Duncan L. Stewart 1845 1868-1870 Rev. Levi B. Stimson 1848
1854-1858 Pliny A. Jewett 1837 1876-1882 Rev. George M. Hills 1847
1864-1866 Rev. Henry Olmstead 1842

1886-1888 William S. Cogswell 1861 1930-1932 Robert B. O’Connor 1916
1888-1892 John H. S. Quick 1858 1932-1934 A. Northev Jones 1917
1892-1894 Rev. Brady E. Backus 1870 1934-1936 Adrian H. Onderdonk 1899
1894-1896 Percy S. Bryant 1870 1936-1938 George C. Capen 1910
1896-1898 Rev. Henry M. Barbour 1870 1938-1940 Frederick C. Hinkel 1906
1898-1900 William C. Skinner 1876 1940-1942 Robert S. Morris 1916
1900-1902 George L. Cooke 1870 1942-1946 Eliot L. Ward 1913
1902-1904 Frederick E. Haight 1887 1946-1948 Alex W. Creedon 1909
1904-1906 Frank L. Wilcox 1880 1948-1950 John R. Reitemeyer 1921
1906-1908 Walter S. Schutz 1894 1950-1952 Hugh S. Campbell 1932
1916-1920 Jacob H. Greene 1891 1960-1962 Glover Johnson 1922
1920-1922 Philip J. McCook 1895 1962-1964 Herbert R. Bland 1940
1926-1928 William G. Wherry 1904 1966- Andrew Onderdonk 1934
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Bristow, B. H., 160
Brocklesby, John, 87, 101, 102, 108, 118, 120, 125, 134, 135, 139, 144, 145, 147, 151, 155, 164, 165, 174, 180, 196, 352
Brocklesby, William Clairborne, 184, 236
Brosen, Tilton, 39
Brown University, 13, 59, 64, 105, 115, 120, 160, 169, 170, 199, 210–212, 226, 284, 309, 310, 315, 318
Brown, Daniel, 4
Brownell, Thomas Church, 10–15, 26–28, 33, 34, 37, 40, 44, 45, 47, 50, 53–55, 60, 64, 66, 68, 69, 71, 84, 85, 89, 92, 94, 104, 111, 113, 121, 124, 175, 240, 269, 299, 310, 315, 352
Bryant, Percy S., 354
Bryant, William Cullen, 160, 313
Buchman, Frank, 288
Buck, Dudley, 339
Buckley, Bernard, 350
Buffalo Alumni Association, 291
Buffington, Joseph, 224, 228, 229, 251, 253, 254, 291, 353, 354
Buffington, Orr, 215
Buildings and Grounds Staff, 48
Buildings, architectural style, 36, first at the College, 27, 82
Bulkeley, W. E. A., 298
Bulkeley’s Hotel, Middletown, Conn., 18
Bull, Ole, 100
Bulletin, Trinity College, began 1869, 247, 253
Burges plan for the new campus, 180–183, 185, 232–236, 278, 298, 303, 339
Burges, William, 178, 179, 214, 276
Burges, George, 86–89, 91, 93
Burgh, Augustus, 223
Burgwin, Augustus, 223
Burgwin, Hill, 295, 353
Burhans, Daniel, 10, 23, 39
Burrill, George W., 175
Burning of Conic Sections, 51, 52
Burton, Richard, 339
Bushnell Park, Hartford, 319
Butler, John A., 146, 327
Butler, Nicholas Murray, 275

C

Cabinet Room, or College Museum, 75, 76, 79, 109
Cady, J. Cleveland, 214
Calendar, College, 50, 120
California Alumni Association, 207
California, University of, 255, 259
Cambridge University, 237
Cameron, Henry Glover, 169
“Campus Trinity,” Mount Gretna, Pennsylvania, 213
Campbell, Hugh S., 353, 354
Campbell Minstrels, 100
Campus, new, purchased, 177
Campus, description of Old Campus in the 1860’s, 146, 177
Capen, George C., 235, 354
Card-game clubs at Trinity, 162
Carilloneurs, Guild of, in North America, 302
Carlton, William Newnham, 234, 258, 261, 262, 279
Carnegie Foundation, 276, 284
Carnegie Institute of Technology, 279
Carpenter, Frederick Walton, 287
Carter, Bernard M., 195
Catalogus Senatus Academic, et Eorun qui Munera et Officia Academica Gesserunt, Quisque Alquius Vos Credit De Noventi Fuerunt, in Collegio Washingtoniensae, 89
Centennial Celebration, 294, 295
Centennial Fund, 291, 293–295
Central Congregational Church, Hartford, 60, 66
Cerberus Club, 197, 336
Chancellors, Office of, created, 92, 93, 118, 124, 240–242; Visitor to the College, 93
Chapel, on new campus, 185
Chapel on old campus, description of, 135
Chapel Builders’ Alumni Association, 301
Chapin, A. B., 87, 318
Chapman, Asa, 10, 17, 39
Charitable Society for the Education of Indigent Pious Young Men for the Ministry of the Gospel, 16
Charity Fund, 82
Charter Oak Nine, Hartford baseball team, 166, 167
Chase, Carlton, 55, 93
Chase, Phyllander, 10, 21, 55, 64, 80, 308
Chase, Samuel, 88
Cheerleaders, first, 226
Cheesman, L. M., 214, 23, 39
Cherubin Harmonio Christmas, 214
Chesire, Connecticut, 5, 7, 12, 15
Cheshire, Joseph Blount, 147, 152
Chess Club, 156
Chicago, University of, 248, 255, 275
Chicago and Rock Island Railroad, 116
Christ Church, Boston, 73
Christ Church, Fitchburg, Massachusetts, 269
Christ Church, Hartford, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 60, 63, 84, 86, 87, 92, 94, 111, 112, 118, 133, 139, 154, 293, 307, 315
Christ Church Cathedral, Hartford, 293; see also Christ Church, Hartford
Christ Church, Middletown, 43
Christ Church, New Orleans, 70
Christy’s Minstrel Band, 133
Church Chronicle and Record, 80, 81, 89
Church of England, 86
Church of England, Washington College seeks support of, 20
Church Register, 42
Church Students’ Missionary Association Convention, 266
The Churchman, 89
Churchman’s Magazine, 16
“Churchmanship,” 84–89, 91, 93, 112, 127, 137, 152, 154, 292, 299, 301, 318, 328, 348
Cincinnati, University of, 239
Civil War, 124, 129–132, 137, 138, 147, 324
Clark, Jacob Lyman, 92, 354
Clark, James Walter, 223
Clark, Thomas March, 93, 113, 114, 141
Clark, Mrs. Walter, 304
Claremont Academy, St. Augustine, S.C., 316
Class organization, 110, 111, 172
Clay, Henry, 22, 35, 118, 312
Clay, Harold Loemis, 250, 258
Clements, Samuel L., (Mark Twain), 150, 241
Clement, Martin W., 298, 299, 303, 304
Cleveland, C. F., 175
Clifford, Samuel Washington, 148
Clio Literary Society, 218, 335, 336; see also Delta Kappa Epsilon
Coaching Club, 197, 210
Cobb, Charles K., 178
Cobb, Charles K., Jr., 178
Cogswell, William S., 131, 353, 354
Coit, Henry Augustus, 142, 143, 201
Coit, Thomas Winthrop, 92, 96, 113–115, 118
Coleman, Robert H., 186, 205, 213, 214, 353
Coles, Calvin D., 282
Colgate University, 270
College Archers, 101
“The College Association,” 135
College Choir, 109
College colors, 54, 211, 225, 228
College store, opened 1890, 229
College Union, 270, 284
Colt Trust Association, 161, 215
Coly, William U., 161
Coly’s Band, 111, 134, 148, 184
Colton, Calvin, 118
Columbian College, Washington, D.C., 73, 155
Commemoration Ball, 63
Commencements, 60, 62, 63, 88, 111, 112, 118, 149, 155, 162, 184
Committee on the State of the College, 288
Committee to Create Interest in the College, 297
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Commons, 185
"Compensation Day," 165, 329
Conference of Churchmen of the New England Colleges, 266, 269
Confirmation Class, 84, 266
Congregationalism in Connecticut, 3, 4, 7, 8
Conn, Herbert W., 238
Connecticut Church Scholarship Society, 40
"Connecticut Churchmen," see also "Churchmanship," 85
Connecticut General Assembly, 7
Connecticut Historical Society, 76, 247, 256
Connecticut League of Art Students, 247
Connecticut Mirror, 25, 28, 57
Connecticut Scholarship Society, 49
Connecticut School Fund, 39, 40, 41, 311
Connecticut Society of Natural History, 76
Connecticut State Library, 98, 111
Connecticut, State of, College petitions Legislature for aid, 79
Connecticut State of, College receives appropriation from, 79
Connecticut Valley Missionary Conference, 266
Considerations Suggested by the Establishment of a Second College in Connecticut, controversy between the founders of Washington College and the Congregationalist opposition to the College, 29
House of Convocation, 92, 96, 104, 111, 171, 172, 198, 199, 205-207, 354
A. D. Cook & Sons, Hartford mercantile house, 23
Cooke, George L., 354
Cooperative Association, the, 229
Corax Club, 320
Cornell University, 160, 198, 213
Cornwall, Nathaniel E., 92
Costello, Harry T., 270
Courage of a Student, novel by Julie P. Smith, 259
Coxe, Arthur Cleveland, 87, 88, 91, 93, 94, 108, 113-115, 117, 125, 143, 178, 319
Crary, Isaac Edwin, 63, 316, 354
Crawford, Thomas, 119
Cramer, Francis Bun nell, 292
Credon, Alex W., 354
Cricket, or wicket, played in Hartford in 1850's, 106, 210
Croswell, Harry, 16, 24, 28, 86, 92, 94
Croswell, William, 92
Curriculum, 32, 64-66, 119, 159, 231, 232
Curtis, William E., 160, 172, 198, 199, 253, 284, 288, 353
Curtiss, Philip, 239, 288
Cushman, Elisha, 16, 27, 39
Cutler, Timothy, 4
Cycle Club, 197
Czar Alexander II, 160
D
D. D. degree, first conferred, 60, 171
Dartmouth College, 32, 34, 54, 105, 115, 170, 198, 209, 210, 212, 243, 289, 318
Daves, Edward Graham, 103, 131, 132
Dawes, Sir John, 4
Davis, William G., 117
Davis' Ethiopian Serenaders, 100
Dawson, J. H. Kelso, 281, 282, 294, 353
Dean, College, 292, 347
Debating Association, 270
Debating Society, "The Whatley," 221
Debating Union, 221
Declamation prizes, 58
Degrees, 322, 323; see also: B.S., Bach., of Music, D.D., L.L.D., M.A., Ph.D.
Deischmüller, Fritz, 203
Delta Kappa Epsilon, 215-218, 299, 335, 336
Delta Phi, 299
Delta Psi, 107, 161, 211, 214, 215, 217, 293, 299, 304, 336
Delta Upsilon, 161, 328
Democratic Club, 221
Democratic Party, 78, 133, 150, 151, 265
Denison University, 115
De Noris, Joseph, 65
Departments first organized, 120
De Peyster, James F., 70
Depression, Great, 205-207
Depression, Great, 213, 290, 291, 300, 316, 340, 345
Eaton, William, 137
Eldredge, Theol of G., 116, 323
Elliott, William W., 71, 72, 143, 315
Ely, Joseph F., 133
Emerson College, Cambridge, 309, 331
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 101
Emergy, Rufus, 98
Emory University, 120
Engineering Course, 117, 132
Engineering Department, 116, 246
"English Diploma," partial course, 65
English influence, College organization and terminology modified according to English practices, 92
English, James E., 177
Episcopal Academy of Connecticut, 5, 6, 11, 12, 15, 17, 34, 39, 73, 219, 243, 307, 314, 322, 332, 336
Episcopal Church, early relationship to, 84
Episcopal Church, first formal ties of "College to," 92
Episcopal Church, relation of the College to, 17, 18, 20, 93, 153, 171, 212, 240, 242-245, 248, 252, 266, 276, 290, 292, 294, 300, 316, 340, 345
Episcopal Home Missionary Society, 108
Episcopal Theological School, 266, 288
Episcopal Watchman, 20, 41, 53, 75
Erwin, James B., 169
Euterpean Society, 156, 162, 163
"Evangelical Movement," 85; see also "Churchn"sm,
Mr. Everett's School, Hamden, Connecticut, 111
Extension Program, 297
F
Faculty, 72, 119, 189, 190, 197, 198, 255, 258-262, 310; attitude toward academic scholarship, 117, 118; first 27; first sabbatical leave, 98; Law, 71, 115, 315; Medicine, 72, 115, 247, 315; ranking, 120; salaries, 39, 73, 80, 120, 122, 174, 300, 315, 342; sketches of, 256, 257; Theology, 89, 71, 113, 114, 315; turnover, 73
Fairfield, Connecticut, 5
Federalist Party in Connecticut, 9
Fees, College, 37, 38, 99
Fellows, Board of, 89, 91, 172, 205, 250, 252, 253, 276, 299, 337, 342
357
INDEX

St. John’s College, Annapolis, Maryland, 73, 212
St. John’s College, Flushing, N. Y., 137
St. John’s College, Shanghai, 244
St. John’s Military Academy, Wisconsin, 271
St. John’s Mission, East Hartford, 93
St. Margaret’s School for Girls, Waterbury, Connecticut, 164
St. Mark’s School, Southborough, Massachusetts, 182
St. Mary’s Church, Manchester, Connecticut, 94
St. Mary’s Episcopal Cathedral, Edinburgh, Scotland, 178
St. Patrick’s Day, celebration at Trinity, 225, 226, 249, 284
St. Paul’s Church, Boston, 68, 126
St. Paul’s Church, Troy, N. Y., 43, 44
St. Paul’s College, College Point, Long Island, 224
St. Paul’s Guild, 244
St. Paul’s School, Concord, New Hampshire, 142, 201, 210, 256, 290
St. Paul’s School, Garden City, Long Island, 251
St. Stephen’s Church, New York City, 90
St. Stephen’s College, 156, 241, 245
St. Thomas’s Church, New York, 86
Sanborn, Earl, 301
Saratoga Regatta, 329; 1874, 168, 169; 1875, 169
Scholarships, 83
Schutz, Robert H., 354
Schutz, Walter S., 281, 354
Scientific Apparatus, early, 22, 39, 75
Scott, Sir George Gilbert, 178
Scott, Joseph, 89, 354
Scovill, James M. L., 115, 116
Scovill Manufacturing Company, 115
Scovill Professorship of Chemistry, 115, 121, 146
Scovill, William Henry, 115, 116
Scudder, Charles D., 353
Scudder, Edwin M., 169
Scudder, Henry Joel, 126, 172, 199
Scudder, Willard, 211
Seabury Professorship, 44, 45, 73, 78, 83, 131
Seabury, Samuel, 4, 5, 16, 44, 314
Secret society, freshman, 218; see also Sigma Pi Upsilon
Sigma Pi Upsilon
Senate, Academic, 91; College 288
Senatus Academicus, 89, 127; see also Senate, Academic
Sequoyah, Thomas H., 54
Shakespearean Club, 164
Shannon, Joseph Wellington, 233
Shattuck, George C., 72, 137, 138, 142
Shattuck, George C., Jr., 115
Shattuck School, 219
Shaw, Barclay, 353, 354
Shaw, Joseph Medforth, 116, 323
Sheffield Scientific Institute, Yale, 116
Shepard, Odell, 287, 295, 305
Sheridan, Philip, 160
Sheriff, Herbert F., 218
Sherman, H. B., 132
Sherred, Jacob, 11
Shipman, William Davis, 72
Short, David H., 354
Sidman, John E., 214
Sigma Alpha Epsilon, 217
Sigma Nu, 271
Sigma Pi Upsilon, 218
Sigma Psi, 271; see also Sigma Nu
Sigourney, Charles, 8, 10, 16, 17, 23, 26, 27, 32, 37, 57, 66, 69, 89, 315
Sigourney, Lydia Huntley, 57, 66, 185
Sill, Preston D., 103, 104
Simonson, M. Leopold, 104, 122, 155
Sitting Bull, 160
Skinner, William C., 354
Smith College, 259
Smith Forks Academy, N. Y., 322
Smith, George D., 262
Smith, Harold L., 353
Smith, John S., 353
Smith, Julie P., 259
Smith, Nathaniel, 17, 24, 40
Smith, Seymour E., 354
Smyth, James D., 189, 490
Soccer, first played at Trinity 1858, 106
Social events, 221
Society for the Increase of the Ministry, 135
Society for the Promotion of Religion and Learning in the State of New York, 81
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 3, 4, 5
Songs of Trinity College, 162, 223
Sontag, Madame, 10
Sophomore Debating Club, 159
Sophomore Dining Club, 336
Sophomore Literary Society, 159
South, University of the, Sewanee, Tenn., 245
Spanish-American War, 249
Sports, 52, 104, 134, 164-168, 170, 208-210, 212, 230, 231-272-274, 286, 292, 297, 320, 321; see individual organizations
Springfield College, 230
Springfield Regatta, 1858, 105, 1873, 168
Springfield Republican, 199
Springfield Y.M.C.A. College, 274; see also Springfield College
Stamatikis, Demetrios, 66, 314
Stanford University, 259
Stanley, Sidney, 132
Starkey, George W. B., 353
Starr, Jonathan, Jr., 17
Starr, Samuel, 354
State Bank Building, Hartford, 161
Stedman & Gordon, Hartford mercantile house, 23
Stedman, Griffin Alexander, 130
Steele, Isaac N., 354
Steffeins, Lincoln, 264
Steiner, Bernard C., 64
Sterling, Theodore, 262
Stevens Institute, 209, 212
Stewart, Duncan L., 73, 97, 92, 111, 120, 121, 137, 319, 334, 344
Stickney, Austin, 103, 121, 133, 134, 155, 189
Stickney Hall, 236
Stimson, Levi B., 354
Stockbridge, Lyman, 313
Stoddard, James, 117
Stokes, Anson Phelps, Jr., 253
Stone, Edward C., 282, 287
Stratford, Connecticut, 5
Student activities and organizations, see also individual activities; dress, 50, 54, 277, 288, 313, 327, 337; expenses, early, 37, 39; John, William, 159, 197, 220, 251; life, early, 37, 54, 99; pranks and disorders, 51, 58, 102, 104, 110, 134, 139, 149-152, 190-196, 229, 249, 250, 312, 326; rooms, description of, 48, 98; Senate, 296, 299; Volunteer Movement, 268
Student body, decline of, 98; religious preference of, 248, 267, 270, 290, 343; size of, 129, 173, 245, 251, 300, 305, 317; size of and geographic origins, 34, 73, 129, 146, 310, 316; geographic and social origins of, 49, 59
Sumner, George, 27, 34, 55, 72, 75
Sunday, Billy, 268
Sutton, Walter B., 225
Swin, Horace Cheney, 287
Syracuse University, 160, 229
T
Tablet, The Trinity, 151-154, 156, 159, 163, 166, 170, 176, 180, 183, 191-193, 196, 197, 200, 203, 206-208, 211, 212, 216, 221, 224, 229, 226, 241, 243-245, 250, 256, 261
Taylor, Bayard, 160
Taylor, Emerson Gifford, 281
Teachers’ Insurance and Annuity Association of America, 297
Technical school idea, 246, 264
Telescope, first purchased for College, 75
Temperance Society, 57, 59, 108
Tennis, 210, 211
Tennison, Alfred, 160
Texas, University of, 239
Theta Beta Phi, 59
Theta Delta Chi, 216
Theta Xi Psi, Omega Alpha Rho, fraternity spoof, 108
Thorne, Robert, 254, 296, 353
Tibbits, William B., 127
Tilton, Arthur Jr., 230
Tilton, Arthur V. R., 299
Tokyo, University of, 238
Toleration Act of 1708, Connecticut, 3
Toleration Act of 1869, England, 3
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"... the bill passed both houses of the Connecticut Legislature without incident, and the Charter for Washington College was granted on May 16, 1823. Great was the rejoicing in Hartford, and that evening cannons were fired and bonfires were lighted. All that remained to be done was to raise the sum of $30,000 demanded by the Charter, select the site, gather a faculty, and open the College for instruction." – Excerpt from Chapter II.

Thus began the struggle to establish the second institution for higher learning in Connecticut. The problems facing the first body of Trustees, headed by Bishop Thomas Church Brownell, might have seemed insurmountable to men of less conviction or dedication of purpose.

This book, the first of two volumes planned, covers more than 100 years of history and tradition, from the founding of the institution in 1823 as Washington College, into the 1930’s and the presidency of Dr. Remsen B. Ogilby.

It faithfully records the difficulties of the early beginnings of the College, its growth and periods of transition, the blunders and triumphs. The campus scene over the span of years in terms of student life is abundantly illustrated with photographs and drawings, many of which have never before been published.

The History of Trinity College is the product of exhaustive research that occupied the author for more than five years. It is a record to be read with absorbing interest by alumni and friends of the College, by devotees of Connecticut and New England history, and the general community of historians.

About the author:

In the Introduction to The History of Trinity College, Dr. Albert C. Jacobs, President of the College, commenting on the author, states: "... we found ourselves uniquely fortunate in having on our faculty one who was ideally suited to undertake this arduous and very demanding task. ..." Dr. Glenn Weaver, Associate Professor of History at Trinity, is a specialist in Colonial America and the history of the American Church and has published numerous works in these subjects.

After receiving his B.A. degree from Catawba College in 1941, Dr. Weaver received a B.D. degree from Lancaster Seminary in 1944; an M.A. in History from Lehigh University in 1947; and his A.M. degree in 1951 and Ph.D. in 1953 from Yale University.

Dr. Weaver has taught at Lehigh, Yale, Albany Teachers College, Connecticut College for Women, and his alma mater, Catawba. He joined the Trinity faculty in 1957 as Assistant Professor of History.

He is author of Jonathan Trumbull: Connecticut's Merchant Magistrate and the Centennial History of The Hartford Steam Boiler Inspection and Insurance Co. He has been a frequent contributor to such scholarly journals as the William and Mary Quarterly; Church History; The Connecticut Historical Society Bulletin; Social Studies; Pennsylvania History; The Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church; and The Lutheran Quarterly. He is also a contributor to the Encyclopedia Britannica.

In 1956 Dr. Weaver was named "outstanding teacher in the field of American history in a Connecticut school or college" by the Connecticut Chapter of the National Society, Daughters and Founders and Patriots of America, Inc.