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GETTYSBURG COLLEGE
GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
To all of us who ever lived there
INTRODUCTION

Standing dignified and understated in the center of campus, as it has since 1837, Pennsylvania Hall is almost the symbol of Gettysburg College. Were buildings able to talk, it would have much to tell about the origins and development of the college. Because we are by nature present-minded, it’s all too easy to forget that Pennsylvania Hall was once the college edifice, housing students, library, chapel, dining facility, literary societies, classrooms, faculty offices and serving as home to two presidents. Both Charles Krauth (1834-1850) and Henry Baugher (1850-1868) resided with their families in a wing of Pennsylvania Hall’s second floor, as part of the college’s commitment to close supervision of its young scholars.

Because Pennsylvania Hall has served as an administrative center since its last major renovation (1969-70), generations of alumni know it mainly as a place they ambled past on a regular basis, or visited periodically for a meeting, or as a natural backdrop for a photo when family and friends visited. But there are still many alumni who remember when Pennsylvania Hall resounded with life as the college’s signature dormitory, albeit, by the 1950s, an increasingly decrepit one!

The author of this compact history, Charles H. Glatfelter, lived there during World War II. He made lifelong friends and memories as part of his experience. It is to residents of Pennsylvania Hall that Glatfelter originally dedicated this book, though his intended audience includes everyone who cares at least a little about Gettysburg College and its history.

Inextricably linked to the story of Pennsylvania Hall is the history of Gettysburg College, practically from its founding in 1832 by a determined Lutheran educator named Samuel Simon Schmucker and a cohort of forward-looking town leaders who recognized the cultural and economic advantages of having a college in their community. Glatfelter deftly connects Pennsylvania Hall and the evolution of Gettysburg College to national currents, notably educational trends, wars and depressions. He describes what happened in and around the building in the first days of July, 1863, starting with President Henry Baugher’s memorable words dismissing his restless students as the first artillery volleys could be heard west of campus on July 1: “We will close and see what is going on, for you know nothing about the lesson anyhow.”

In fact, soldiers soon swarmed through the campus and into the college edifice. While it is unlikely that Robert E. Lee used the Cupola as a viewing point to assess the terrain at Gettysburg, as suggested by Professor Michael Jacobs and subsequent college authors, there’s
no question the battle transformed Pennsylvania Hall. Hundreds of wounded Confederate and, after July 3, Union, soldiers were carried into the building for medical attention. Many of them did not survive their wounds.

In the aftermath of the battle, Pennsylvania Hall and the college gradually returned to normal operations; but the edifice would become a place of remembrance and commemoration, as Glatfelter reminds us, most notably on special anniversaries of the battle, when soldiers and dignitaries (and more recently, flocks of historians) have visited to pay their respects and re-assess what Gettysburg meant to the Civil War.

A “chaste specimen of the Doric order,” as one observer described its Greek Revival form, Pennsylvania Hall was and continues to be an iconic campus building. But it did not remain the only significant part of the built environment for very long. It was joined by the student-constructed Linnaean Hall in 1847, a presidential mansion in 1860, Stevens Hall (for the preparatory department) in 1867, a faculty dwelling in 1868, McCreary Gymnasium in 1872, and an astronomical observatory in 1874, as well as several service buildings. The primary challenge to Pennsylvania Hall’s ascendancy occurred in 1889 with the completion of Recitation Hall, later renamed Glatfelter Hall in recognition of the philanthropic support of the P.H. Glatfelter family. The sheer size and architectural distinction of Glatfelter Hall overshadowed Pennsylvania Hall. But more important, it led to the latter’s conversion primarily to a dormitory, since much of the campus teaching, administration, and extracurricular life would henceforth be based in Glatfelter.

During its service as what students would affectionately refer to as “Old Dorm,” the building enjoyed a number of upgrades and renovations. A steam heating system was installed by the early 20th century, electricity by 1912, hot and cold running water by 1919. Floors, stairs and doors were replaced on more than one occasion, and by 1925 the three separate sections of the building were eliminated as walls between them were razed. A North Portico, named in honor of Charles Beachem (a highly regarded alumni secretary) was completed and dedicated in 1937, occasioning Milton Valentine Jr.’s observation that while Pennsylvania Hall had long since lost its dominant place in the built campus, it had “not lost its eminence in the hearts of those who rejoice to call Gettysburg College their alma mater.” The same could be said on October 24, 1970, when the building was again re-dedicated, following a million-dollar renovation that restored its luster and enhanced its utility.

Charles Glatfelter’s meticulous account of Pennsylvania Hall’s evolution was welcome in 1970 as the building began yet another phase in its storied history. It is welcome today, as Gettysburg College marks the 175th anniversary of its founding. *Yonder Beautiful and Stately College Edifice* is a building story more than a social history. For life as lived in Pennsylvania Hall one can consult old issues of college publications. Untold stories reside in
the memories of living alumni who recall the clanking pipes, silverfish in the bureau drawers, leaky faucets, pranks and pratfalls, as well as serious conversations about politics, coursework, relationships, and the meaning of life. The re-issue of this well-wrought study is a salutary reminder of how much the college experience matters to each of us—and how much Pennsylvania Hall has meant to Gettysburg College.

Michael J. Birkner
Professor of History
Benjamin Franklin Professor of Liberal Arts
January 2007
PREFACE

The purpose of this account is to tell the story of Pennsylvania Hall, or Old Dorm, the earliest building to be erected on the campus of Gettysburg College. Begun in the spring of 1836, it was first occupied in the fall of 1837. The account is prompted by the fact that, after 131 years of use, first in a major way and then almost entirely, as a dormitory, the building underwent a complete interior renovation in 1969-1970 and was converted into an administrative center.

All of the officers of the college having records in their custody have been most helpful in making them available and in providing information from other sources at their disposal. I am especially indebted to Mrs. Lillian H. Smoke and her colleagues on the staff of the Gettysburg College Library for their unfailing courtesy and helpfulness. Unless otherwise indicated, all of the pictures used are from the Gettysburg College Archives.

Among the other organizations and individuals who have offered assistance and criticism are the following: Adams County Historical Society, Gettysburg; Bucks County Historical Society, Doylestown; Cumberland County Historical Society and Hamilton Library Association, Carlisle; The Franklin Institute, Philadelphia; The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, Harrisburg; The Pennsylvania State Library, Harrisburg; Norman L. Annis; Mrs. T. H. Krebs Benchoff; Robert L. Bloom; Joe L. Carver; William C. Darrah; Donald G. Oyler; Frederick Tilberg; Wilbur E. Tilberg; Arthur Weaner; Abdel R. Wentz; and Earl E. Ziegler. While gratefully acknowledging the help of these organizations and individuals I must state that the responsibility for what follows rests with me.

Charles H. Glatfelter

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania
October 7, 1970
IN JANUARY 21, 1834 THADDEUS STEVENS, a freshman member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives from Adams County, rose in that body to speak in favor of a bill appropriating a sum of money to the new college at Gettysburg in whose fortunes he had become deeply interested. After answering the arguments of his colleague from Adams County, who had just spoken against the bill, Stevens undertook to explain in a few words the predicament in which the fledgling college found itself:

It has been chartered two years; and organized about eighteen months.

It has now ninety-eight students, without a house to put them in; a library or an apparatus.¹ Thanks to the efforts of Thaddeus Stevens, and many others, the bill was passed, and the house that was needed was soon built. It is still standing and in use today. Its story over more than 130 years is the central theme of the account which follows.

As Thaddeus Stevens reported, the history of Gettysburg College begins in 1832. Governor George Wolf signed the act of incorporation, which had passed both houses of the legislature, on April 7 of that year. The Board of Trustees met, organized for business, and selected a faculty on July 4. The faculty held its initial meeting on October 29. The first academic year began on November 7, 1832. Without a break, the instructional program thus inaugurated has continued to the present day.

The new college took its place among the approximately sixty-six then in existence in the United States. Very few of them were in anything like a flourishing condition. A dozen or more were, in fact, colleges in name only, lacking either the financial resources or the students, or both, to carry on an adequate educational program. In the entire country there were probably fewer than 6000 students in college, and only about twenty institutions with more than 100 students. Some observers believed that there were already too many colleges in the country. One writer, surveying the general state of education in 1832, thought that certain

---

¹ Quoted in the Adams Sentinel, Feb. 10, 1834.
religious groups had established colleges “rather to pre-occupy the ground and to serve as caveats against others, than with any view to the public necessities.” Others had different estimates of the public necessities, however, and during the 1830’s some forty new colleges were established.

In 1832 there were in Pennsylvania ten institutions authorized to award college degrees: the University of Pennsylvania, successor of the colonial College of Philadelphia (1755); Dickinson College (1783) in Carlisle; Franklin College (1787) in Lancaster; Jefferson College (1802) in Canonsburg; Washington College (1806) in Washington; Allegheny College (1817) in Meadville; Western University of Pennsylvania (1819), now the University of Pittsburgh; Lafayette College (1826) in Easton; Madison College (1827) in Uniontown; and the new college (1832) at Gettysburg. Of these, Franklin College had never in forty-five years awarded a college degree. Lafayette did not open until May 1832, six years after receiving its charter. Dickinson, Allegheny, and Madison were closed, or closing, temporarily in 1832, for financial reasons. Western University was also in financial difficulty. At the time, only the University of Pennsylvania, Jefferson College, and Washington College appear to have been in reasonably good condition. What would be the fate of the new college at Gettysburg remained to be seen.

---


"a salutary influence in advancing the cause of liberal education."
(1832)

Samuel Simon Schmucker (1799-1873)
Served as president of the seminary (1826-1864) and as trustee of the college (1832-1873). Active in community and synodical affairs, he wrote numerous books advocating a liberal Lutheranism and Christian unity.

The chief founder of Gettysburg College was the Rev. Samuel Simon Schmucker (1799-1873). Born in Hagerstown, Maryland, where his father was a Lutheran pastor, he decided to follow in the paternal footsteps. There then being no college or theological seminary in the United States under Lutheran auspices, he studied at the University of Pennsylvania and taught in an academy at York before entering the theological seminary at Princeton in 1818. Leaving two years
later, he took charge of several small congregations in the valley of Virginia. From the start, parish duties did not by any means absorb all of his energies, and he was soon busy at work on other things as well. At the time of his leaving Princeton, he later wrote, there were three definite goals clearly before him: the translation of a German theological work into English, the establishment of a Lutheran theological seminary, and the founding of a Lutheran college.¹

The first of these goals was achieved in 1826. The second became a reality in the same year, when the seminary which the General Synod of the Lutheran Church had decided to establish, in response to Schmucker’s strong prodding, was organized at Gettysburg. This site was chosen partly because of its central location within the area of the seminary’s constituency and partly because of the financial inducements which the community offered. The young pastor became the new school’s first professor.

The seminary occupied space in the building which is still standing at the southeastern corner of South Washington and High streets. Very quickly Schmucker became interested in the academy which had been begun there about 1813. The success of the seminary depended in no small measure upon its having students who were academically qualified to do the level of work which he believed should be required. The academy having failed, and other support for it appearing unlikely at the time, he persuaded the seminary directors to assume responsibility for its revival, first as the Gettysburg Classical School (1827) and then as the Gettysburg Gymnasium (1829). “A well conducted Classical School,” the directors resolved in May 1827, “would not only promote the cause of education in this place, but also be highly conducive to the welfare of the Seminary.” The announcement that the school would open under their auspices the following month informed the public that it was intended to qualify “young gentlemen for admission into any College in the Union, and to give to others, who may wish it, the higher branches of an English and Scientific Education.”²

A complication soon developed. There was a debt on the academy building in which the classical school and seminary were meeting. Since one of the inducements for the seminary to come to Gettysburg in the first place had been

² Quoted in the Adams Sentinel, May 23, June 6, 1827.
rent-free quarters until other facilities were available, there was no source of income to be used in liquidating this debt. A town meeting in December 1828 decided to investigate the feasibility of the borough’s buying the property to be used for educational purposes. When nothing came of these efforts, and the Bank of Gettysburg pressed for payment, the local court ordered the building sold at sheriff’s sale. At this point Schmucker proposed to community leaders that, if no one would bid against him at the sale, he would make certain promises: to use the premises for public educational purposes, to afford the borough first chance to buy them if they were to be utilized in any other way, and to impose the two foregoing stipulations on anyone to whom he might sell them. At the sale in August 1829 Schmucker bought the academy for $1160, which was the amount of the indebtedness. In order to raise the money, he asked about twenty of his Lutheran clerical colleagues each to give $50. In return, they could elect the trustees of the school (which now became the Gymnasium) and enroll their children without paying tuition.

Gettysburg Academy Building

Located at the southeastern corner of South Washington and High streets and once used as an academy building, this first home of the seminary and college was later the location of a school for girls. Once known as Linwood, it has long been a private residence.
The ability of the Gettysburg Classical School and its successor, the Gymnasium, to attract and retain students persuaded Schmucker that the time was ripe to explore the possibilities of establishing a college. Convinced that he could not attract the help which he needed solely, or even largely, from his ministerial colleagues or from the Lutheran Church, he decided to seek the assistance of some of the community leaders of Gettysburg. Since these were men with whom he had discussed and arranged educational matters on at least two previous occasions, what followed was not a new experience for him or them. In the fall of 1831 he invited six or seven men to meet with him at the Bank of Gettysburg. Included in the group were several merchants, a newspaper editor, a former sheriff and militia officer, and the cashier of the bank. These were persons eager to promote what they took to be the best interests of the town and county, as well as their own interests. At a time when the state was spending large sums of money on a system of canals and railroads in an effort to recapture for Pennsylvania some of the Western trade being lost to New York and Maryland, they wanted to see Adams County participate in the transportation boom. Several of them at this very time were seeking to get a charter for a corporation which hopefully would bring the railroad into Adams County.

Schmucker outlined his educational plans to these men. He wanted their help, first in organizing and then in supporting a college to be located in Gettysburg. The institution he had in mind, he explained to them, would be unsectarian in its instruction, but it would be under prevailing Lutheran influence and control. This proposed arrangement was no different from that under which the classical school had begun in 1827. It was controlled by the directors of the seminary, but its initial announcement explained that, while there would be religious instruction, "every thing of a sectarian nature shall be entirely avoided." Schmucker's listeners, most of whom were not Lutheran, agreed that his was a reasonable proposition and told him that they would support it. One of their number, General Thomas C. Miller (1789-1860), was designated to accompany Schmucker to Harrisburg to secure a charter.4

---

3 The Adams Sentinel, June 6, 1827.

4 In 1863 Schmucker wrote an account of the classical school, gymnasium, and early years of the college, in which he elaborates on some of the events described here. This account was printed in The College Mercury, III (Mar. 1895), 3-6.
In the capital, Schmucker and Miller spent several weeks conferring with leaders of the legislature and also with Governor Wolf, himself a Lutheran and a strong supporter of educational ventures. They learned that a charter was not to be had simply for the asking; there was lobbying to be done. It was necessary to show a need for another college by securing petitions from different parts of the state, asking that a charter be granted. Also, they were advised, further convincing was probably necessary. Governor Wolf suggested that a meeting with members of the legislature might be arranged, at which Schmudder would present his case in person.

Schmucker prepared petitions and sent them to Lutheran ministers in about thirty counties. Many were signed and duly submitted. He did speak to legislators, in the hall of the House of Representatives, arguing that there was no college functioning as such (Franklin College had been so intended) which the large body of Pennsylvanians of German extraction, who had already made an important contribution to the state, could call their own. Finally, in a room in the Capitol, he completed another task, and brought closer to realization the third, and last, of the objectives which he had set before himself twelve years earlier.

At this time it was the practice for the text of corporation charters to be the text of bills which the legislature considered and acted upon. It was Schmucker’s task to draw up a draft of a bill which, if enacted into law, would be the charter which he and General Miller were seeking. It is obvious that he examined such earlier charters as those of Dickinson, Jefferson, Washington, Allegheny, and Lafayette colleges, and decided that there was a standard form to be followed, with local variations. Line after line in the bill which he prepared can be found verbatim or almost verbatim in the other five documents. All of them included the ideas incorporated into the following provision:

at elections either for patrons, or trustees, or teachers, or other officers, and in the reception of pupils, no person shall be rejected on account of his conscientious persuasion in matters of religion, provided he shall demean himself in a sober, orderly manner, and conform to the rules and regulations of the college.

The preamble which Schmucker wrote for the bill might well be regarded as the climax of his lobbying, of his effort to persuade the legislators that the “public necessities” fully justified their prompt consideration and favorable action:
Whereas, the literary and scientific institution in Gettysburg, Adams county, in this commonwealth, known by the name of Gettysburg Gymnasium, is resorted to by a large number of young men from different portions of this state, and elsewhere, and promises to exert a salutary influence in advancing the cause of liberal education, particularly among the German portion of our fellow citizens.\textsuperscript{5}

Schmucker had done his work, and had done it well. The rest was now up to the legislature. A bill to provide “for the erection of the Gettysburg Gymnasium into a college” was reported by the education committee to the House of Representatives on February 10, 1832. There was little controversy; it passed, by a vote of 61 to 20, on March 29. The Senate gave its approval by voice vote on April 6, and Governor Wolf signed the measure the next day. It is worth noting that on the previous day he had signed into law a bill incorporating the Adams County Railroad Company, three of whose first commissioners were men who had conferred with Schmucker in the Bank of Gettysburg.\textsuperscript{6}

The railroad was never completed, but a different future awaited “Pennsylvania College of Gettysburg.” Until 1921 this was the corporate name for the institution long popularly known as Gettysburg College.

On the eve of its opening, the \textit{Adams Sentinel} reported (November 6, 1832) that “the number of Students with which the Institution goes into operation, is highly respectable.” Whether it was a “highly respectable” number or not is a matter of opinion, but it is a fact that the school was firmly enough established to hold its first commencement in September 1834. Except for 1836, when there was no one to be graduated, there has been at least one commencement each year since.

\textsuperscript{5} The charter as finally enacted is printed in \textit{Laws of \ldots Pennsylvania, 1831-1832} session, pp. 365-369.

\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 294-305. The three men were Thomas J. Cooper, John B. McPherson, and Thomas C. Miller.
"After three years of persevering effort we have not only obtained a charter for a College, but succeeded by the divine blessing in placing that College on a permanent and most respectable basis."

(1834)

Promoters of Educational Institutions in 1832 were in general agreement about what a good college should have and what it should be. Certainly there had to be faculty and students, and, as Thaddeus Stevens put it, library and apparatus. In addition to these things, though, there needed to be a "house" in which the students lived, in company with each other and with one or more of the faculty. Here, under the watchful eye of their parents away from home, they would eat, sleep, study, recite, and take their recreation. Here, also, as they passed into manhood, they would develop both intellectually and morally along desirable lines.

These houses were to be located preferably in a rural area, and for three good reasons. First, it was cheaper. This was a strong argument, since most advocates of colleges at this time were trying to meet the frequent criticism that these institutions were not deserving of popular support because only the wealthy and snobbish could afford them. Second, rural air was thought to be cleaner and more healthful. Third, a location in the country was considered removed from those temptations of the city which young men should avoid. Parents ought to be able to send their sons to a good college with only the slightest concern for their health, welfare, and safety.

This was the model which Schmucker and his associates had before them as they moved quickly to the tasks of getting the college into operation. At the first meeting of the trustees, the faculty was asked to prepare a set of appropriate rules and regulations.1 These were carefully reviewed and then adopted at the next meeting, on September 26, 1832, even before the college.

---

1 Minutes of the trustees, July 4, 1832. The original minutes of the trustees and faculty from the beginning are in the custody of the college. Except in cases where no dates are given in the text or where there is some doubt as to clarity, there will be no further footnote references to these sources.
opened. At this same meeting, the trustees considered the fact that the academy building as it stood, with only four rooms, was simply not adequate for the purposes which they wanted to serve. This was true in spite of the fact that the theological seminary was about to move into its large and impressive new building on the ridge west of town. Apparently the trustees did not give much thought to moving in with the seminary, which would not need all of its available space for many years. Instead, they decided to appoint a committee to apply to the legislature for a grant of money which could be expended in the construction of a college building. The committee was instructed to use its discretion whether to apply immediately or wait for what its members might take to be a more propitious moment.

It is reasonable to assume that, even as early as the time of the first meeting in the bank, Schmucker and his associates were thinking ahead to the day when they would ask the state for money for a building. Local newspapers kept people informed of what was happening in other colleges. Schmucker and the others well knew that the state had long since committed itself to a modest support of the academies and colleges to which it had given corporate existence. In the last decade, scarcely a year had passed without one or more such grants. Between 1821 and 1832, six colleges had received $85,500, much of which had gone into buildings. Realistically, what other source was there for this purpose? Tuition income would never suffice. Large private donors were all but unheard of. In the case of Pennsylvania College, Lutherans were being urged to help pay for the seminary building.

In the fall of 1832 there was reason to believe that the policy of aiding academies and colleges was about to be criticized and reviewed. The program of internal improvements was more costly than had been anticipated, and while there continued to be the prospect of large income from the system of canals and railroads, present realities were otherwise. Furthermore, the public was debating the establishment of a system of free public education in the state. Many agreed that, while this might be desirable, it would be a heavy additional financial burden.

The committee of Pennsylvania College trustees decided that, notwithstanding these complicating factors, they would seek an appropriation from the 1832-1833 session of the legislature. A measure introduced in January soon passed the Senate, but an omnibus bill, providing for aid for Pennsylvania and
three other colleges, went down to defeat in the House on April 4, 1833. The vote was 39 to 45. One of Adams County's representatives, claiming to reflect the views of his constituents in this matter, voted against the measure.

Undaunted, the trustees prepared for the next round, which would come in the 1833-1834 legislative session. On November 8, 1833, eight resident supporters of the college, most of them trustees, issued an address "To the Citizens of Adams County," which appeared in local newspapers. In it they made four major points. First, for the benefit of those in whose minds the seminary and college were confused together, they made it plain that these were two separate and distinct institutions. While "the Seminary belongs to one religious denomination alone," the college "is the property of all denominations." Second, for those who harped on colleges as places benefitting only the rich, they had this to say: "Of Pennsylvania College it may emphatically be said, that it is the poor man's institution. Three-fourths of the students (now amounting to near 90) are in limited circumstances; and of this number about twelve are entirely indigent." Moreover, they asked, how can the barriers between rich and poor be lowered, except through education at all levels? Third, after explaining in detail how many countians benefit from the local expenditures of college students and faculty, and by how much, they inquired "what other public object is there, which annually brings an equal sum of money into Adams County, and distributes it so extensively among so large a portion of her inhabitants?" Fourth, since it was obvious to them that the county was not going to benefit directly from the current public expenditures for canals and railroads, the signatories insisted that an appropriation to the college would bring back into the county some of its tax dollars. Otherwise, the money would simply go to colleges in other parts of the state. The eight hoped that this "plain and honest exposition of their views and motives" would convince an enlightened public that a state grant to the college would benefit both them and it.²

At this point in the effort to provide a "house" for Pennsylvania College another participant enters the picture. Up to this time Thaddeus Stevens (1792-1868), a native New Englander, an attorney in Gettysburg since 1816, and even today a highly controversial figure, remained outside the circle of Schmucker and his associates. Yet he was well-known as an ardent friend of

² For the text, see, for example, the Republican Compiler, Nov. 12, 1833.
education. In the town meeting of 1828, it was he who argued that the borough should buy the academy building. While townspeople questioned what religious beliefs, if any, he had, in 1829 he made a liberal contribution to the seminary. During 1833 he was passionately involved in the Anti-Masonic movement, which thanks in part to him was especially strong in Adams County. A number of the local supporters of the college were Masons, and there was little love lost between them and Stevens. In the rank and file of the Anti-Masonic party there were many who were not well-disposed toward the college, who probably saw little value in formal education at any beyond an elementary level. Some of these people expected Stevens to oppose the college and especially any state appropriation to support it.

Thaddeus Stevens (1792-1868)

His contributions to secondary and higher education in Pennsylvania are recognized in this idealized painting made by Jacob Eicholtz in 1838. Stevens left Gettysburg in 1842 for a more lucrative legal practice in Lancaster. Was a member of Congress (1849 - 1853, 1859 - 1868). After the Civil War was a key leader in the fight against Andrew Johnson and a lenient Southern policy.
Stevens had no difficulty in making his decision on this issue. On the day after the legislature rejected the aid bill, he presided over a “very large” town meeting which expressed its “deep disapprobation” of the conduct of the representative who voted against the measure and sent a delegation to Harrisburg to set the record straight concerning the attitude of Adams countians.\textsuperscript{3} When he became a candidate for the state House of Representatives in 1833, he made it clear that, if elected, he would support an appropriation for Pennsylvania College. Both he and the man who had voted against the measure earlier were elected. (Adams County at this time had two representatives in the lower house.) Early in the 1833-1834 session Stevens took the leadership in presenting the college’s case. When the measure came up for debate in the House, he delivered what was perhaps the most effective speech of the session. “Bring in a bill to improve the breed of hogs; to discover some mode of fattenning them with less corn,” he exclaimed, “and these worthy gentlemen [who oppose expenditures for education] would be enthusiastic in its favor. But attempt to improve the race of men, and it costs too much!” As for himself, he said, he “would rather hear the approving voice of one judicious, intelligent and enlightened mind, than to be greeted by the loud huzzas of the whole host of ignorance!”\textsuperscript{4}

With a considerable assist from Schmucker, who had returned to Harrisburg to do what he could in its behalf, the measure passed both houses and was signed by Governor Wolf on February 6, 1834. “To-morrow morning I expect to return to my duties at Gettysburg,” wrote Schmucker once passage was certain, “with a heart not a little cheered by the fact, that after three years of persevering effort we have not only obtained a charter for a College, but succeeded by the divine blessing in placing that College on a permanent and most respectable basis.”\textsuperscript{5} Within a matter of weeks the legislature also appropriated money to Washington, Allegheny, and Lafayette Colleges, all of which were engaged in building programs.

The act “for the endowment of Pennsylvania College at Gettysburg” provided for six annual grants of $3000 each, “to be applied to the lawful purposes of said institution.” The conditions attached were similar to those then being

\textsuperscript{3} *Star and Republican Banner*, one page extra, Apr. 1833.
\textsuperscript{4} Quoted in the *Adams Sentinel*, Feb. 10, 1834.
\textsuperscript{5} Letter of S. S. Schmucker, Harrisburg, Feb. 3, 1834, quoted in the *Republican Compiler*, Feb. 25, 1834.
imposed upon other colleges receiving state aid. The first grant of $3000 was to be "applied exclusively to the purchase of a site, and erection of a college edifice." In order to qualify for this first grant, the trustees were required to assure the governor to his satisfaction that they would be able to raise $3000 for the same purposes from other sources. Also, the trustees had to agree to "cause gratuitous instruction to be given to fifteen young men annually, (if that number apply from this Commonwealth) in the elementary branches of an English education, in such manner as the said trustees shall deem best calculated to qualify them for teachers of common schools." This provision is quite understandable when one remembers that within sixty days of the passage of this measure, on April 1, 1834, the legislature enacted Pennsylvania's first free public education law, which would be ineffective without qualified teachers. Finally, the endowment act specified that the trustees should never charge any student in the building more than $5 room rent per year.\(^6\)

The trustees wasted little time in making their next moves. At a meeting on April 15, 1834 they made plans for raising the $3000 which the act required of them in order to qualify for the first payment. Ten weeks later they were able to furnish Governor Wolf with satisfactory evidence of their success, and on July 11 he ordered the first payment from the state treasury.\(^7\) When the trustees met again on September 17, they adopted a resolution presented by Thaddeus Stevens, who at this session began a tenure as trustee which terminated only with his death in 1868. The Stevens resolution was "that Nine Thousand Dollars of the State appropriation, together with the Three Thousand to be otherwise provided, be applied to the erection of a College Edifice."

The matter of selecting a site was delayed until the following year. Three alternatives were considered when the trustees met in April 1835. One was to build on the corner of South Washington and High streets where the academy was located and where some additional ground had been purchased the year before. Another was to move south of town, to what is now known as Cemetery Hill. A third was to move north of town, to what is now the west side of the 300 block of Carlisle street. The choice of the second site would have made it possible for the college to follow the example of many other schools, and place its building on a hill. But on the second ballot the third site was chosen.

---


\(^7\) Pennsylvania Archives, Ninth Series (1931-1935), X, 7998.
by a close vote, and a committee of local men was authorized to make the purchase. Thaddeus Stevens was chairman. When the trustees met again in September, they learned that the property in question was not available on the terms that had been agreed upon. There is the hint at least that antagonism toward Stevens—a frequent reaction among those who knew him—might have had something to do with the impasse. Over the recorded protest of at least one trustee, the others decided to reconsider the location. New sites were proposed. After two inconclusive ballots they decided by majority vote to purchase from Thaddeus Stevens a six-acre tract west of North Washington street. This deal was consummated, although the deed was not secured until December 1841. The size of the tract conveyed was six acres and one perch; the consideration, $646.⁸

Earlier, at the meeting in April, the trustees adopted a motion by Stevens that a committee be appointed to solicit and receive plans for the new building. The members of this committee were Charles P. Krauth (1797-1867), president of the college; John B. McPherson (1789-1858), cashier of the Bank of Gettysburg and treasurer of the college; David Gilbert (1803-1868), local physician; Schmucker; and Stevens. Obviously, further progress had to wait the outcome of the efforts of these men.

---

Elevation drawing and floor plan of college building

Undated and uninscribed, this drawing was probably one of the earliest papers John C. Trautwine submitted to the building committee in 1835. Numerous changes were made before the final plans were adopted and carried into effect.
O evidence has come to light to indicate how the plans committee made its choice of an architect to recommend the form which the new building should follow. It was not a foregone conclusion that the services of an architect would be secured. In 1835 the function of architect was still in the process of separating itself from that of builder. Many large projects were yet being undertaken using plans which the builders themselves devised. There is no known evidence, for example, that a professional architect prepared the plans for the building into which the theological seminary moved in the fall of 1832.¹

Without a doubt one of the three or four best known and most highly respected architects in the United States in 1835 was William Strickland (1788-1854). Reared in Philadelphia, he was apprenticed at the age of fifteen to Benjamin Latrobe (1764-1820), who is considered to be the father of the profession of architecture in the United States. Latrobe is best known for work done while he was architect of the United States Capitol, but his first major design in this country was the Bank of Pennsylvania (1798), in Philadelphia. Evidence of his work closer to Adams County could be found in the Dickinson College building (1804-1805) and the Baltimore Cathedral (1805-1818).

After working for five years with the master, Strickland began on his own. Although he could call himself an engineer, surveyor, engraver, or artist, it was as an architect that he did his best work. He designed so many halls, churches, theaters, and homes in the Philadelphia area that he became known as the “city architect.” Among his most memorable projects here were the Second United States Bank building (1818-1824); the United States Naval Asylum (1826-1833); the Delaware Breakwater (1828-1841); the tower for Independence Hall (1828); the United States Mint (1829); and what many consider his masterpiece, the Philadelphia Exchange (1832-1834). During the course of his long and successful career Strickland drew from a number of traditions for the buildings which he designed, but he is best known as a highly talented and imaginative promoter of what is often called the Greek Revival movement in American architecture. Its first monument was Latrobe’s Bank of

¹ Dr. Abdel R. Wentz, historian of the seminary, has found no such evidence.
Pennsylvania, but almost a generation passed before Strickland and other students of Latrobe began popularizing it. American sympathy with the Greek revolution in the 1820’s made their task much easier. From then until the 1840’s or 1850’s, the Greek revival was the dominant force in American architecture, and Philadelphia was its major center.  

The letter which Dr. David Gilbert of the plans committee of Pennsylvania College sent on August 7, 1835 was addressed, not to William Strickland, but to one of his recent former students, John Cresson Trautwine (1810-1883). At the age of eighteen he had begun studying architecture and engineering with Strickland, and had assisted him with the Delaware Breakwater and the United States Mint. Now on his own, he had just prepared the plans for and helped erect the new building at Bristol College, near Bristol, in Bucks County. This was an even younger institution than Pennsylvania College, having been chartered in February 1834. Closer to Adams County, Trautwine had designed the Second Presbyterian Church in Carlisle, which was built in 1834. Dr. Gilbert’s letter reached him at Wilmington, where he was located temporarily while serving as principal assistant engineer for a projected Philadelphia-Baltimore railroad. In agreeing to Dr. Gilbert’s request, he wrote that he would “as you suggest send at first merely crude outlines from which you

---

**John Cresson Trautwine**  
(1810-1883)  
Architect and engineer. Designed the Penn Township Bank (1828), Moyamensing Commissioners’ Hall (1833), and First Moravian Church in Philadelphia, in addition to the buildings mentioned in the text. Contributed many articles to the Journal of the Franklin Institute on railroad and canal engineering, and wrote numerous books and pamphlets on the subject.

---

*Courtesy Historical Society of Pennsylvania*

---

may make a selection and will afterwards prepare a set of working drawings."³

In his first letter, Dr. Gilbert had made it quite clear to Trautwine that cost was a key factor in any plans which his committee would recommend to the other trustees. Trautwine immediately understood and accepted this as a firm imperative. But before proceeding, he wrote (August 23), he needed to know two things: how many students were to be accommodated in the building and "the size and situation" of the lot on which it was to be built.

During the next several weeks the young engineer-architect was on his own. He was free to draw upon what he had learned directly from his own experience and from Strickland, and indirectly from Latrobe, in designing a building which, according to his best judgment, would be both useful and in good taste. Having decided, as he had in previous instances, to follow in the tradition which we call the Greek Revival, he did not thereby limit himself to a narrow range of choices. Most who worked in that tradition were bent upon developing an architecture which would give expression to what they took to be the distinctive characteristics of the American people and their republic. The classical Greek buildings or their Roman modifications, both of which most of them knew largely through books of reproductions, were not to be duplicated exactly upon some American hill or plain. Rather, they were models, to provide the initial inspiration which the architect sought in his efforts to break away from the long-established and increasingly elaborate British forms. In the sense that these men were trying to create a genuine American architecture, the word "revival" is scarcely accurate in describing their efforts.⁴

In his correspondence with Dr. Gilbert during the fall and early winter of 1835, Trautwine explained what he was trying to accomplish for Pennsylvania College and what expectations he entertained for the outcome of his plans. "The Portico is of the same order of architecture as the Bank of U. S. in Philadelphia," he explained in his letter of October 20. "The order is the Grecian Doric," he wrote on December 9, "and based on one of the most chaste remains of Athens." In the context in which he and his contemporaries in the Greek Revival used the word "chaste," it meant plain, simple, or unadorned. These were adjectives which described their conception of an ideal architec-

³ John C. Trautwine to D. Gilbert, Wilmington, Aug. 23, 1835. Gettysburg College Archives. There are nine Trautwine letters to Dr. Gilbert in these archives, and subsequent identification of them will be by date, in the text.

⁴ Talbot Hamlin, Greek Revival Architecture, pp. 61-62, 88.
ture for the American republic. Trautwine did not further identify the source of his inspiration, but it is possible that he had in mind what was left of an Athenian agora, or market place, which was known as the new market. Trautwine and his contemporaries were all quite familiar with the pioneer effort of the English painter, James Stuart, and the architect, Nicholas Revett, both of whom visited Athens in the early 1750’s and had drawings prepared of all of the architectural remains of Classical Greece which they could find. The very first specimen discussed in the first volume of their work, *The Antiquities of Athens*, is the Doric portico of the new market, with its four fluted columns. These could have been the “chaste remains” to which the young engineer-architect referred.5

In one of his letters (December 5), Trautwine revealed that he had “shown the drawings to Mr. Strickland, who approves of them entirely.” Not content with this, writing again several days later (December 9), he underscored the point: “I stated in a note which I sent you a few days ago... that Mr. Strickland approves entirely of the plans, and facade of the building. It may be satisfactory to the board to be aware of that fact.”

Trautwine’s willingness to accommodate himself to the particular situation in which Pennsylvania College found itself is evident from his statement (December 9) that “there are some ornaments peculiar to the order of architecture which I have selected which I judged it expedient to omit, from considerations of expense.” Similarly, he explained that he had placed question marks at several places in the plans, “intimating that those points had better be decided on by the Board, as I was not certain that my views might (in those respects) coincide with theirs.” He had the craftsman’s pride in his work and asked repeatedly that no changes be made without his approval in the exterior of the building, with which as architect he was more concerned than with the interior. “Let me again request,” he wrote in one letter (December 9), “that no external alterations be made without first acquainting me of them; as a very slight deviation in some parts would entirely destroy the effect of the building.” He was not averse to approving changes when he was consulted, as the correspondence clearly shows. Finally, Trautwine was proud of the idea which he had presented to Pennsylvania College. “It cannot fail to please you,” he wrote (December 9), “if carefully and accurately executed.”

---

5 (5 vols.; London, 1762-1830), I (1762), 1-6 and plates I-III.
"not only to be a temporary structure but to continue for ages and
for laudable purposes." (1836)

When the trustees met on September 16, 1835, in addition to changing
the site for their building they examined the initial plan which
Trautwine, acting most promptly, had sent. Then they adopted
Thaddeus Stevens' motion to authorize the construction of a build-
ing about 150 feet by 40 feet, finishing as much of it as they
could for $12,000. The committee on plans was authorized to select a final de-
sign. Also, a building committee was appointed and empowered to enter into
a contract to build. Its members were Gilbert, McPherson, Miller, Schmucker,
and Thomas J. Cooper (1797-1875), the latter a local merchant. They elected
McPherson chairman and Gilbert secretary.

Impatient to get under way, the building committee began late in Novem-
ber running advertisements in York, Harrisburg, Gettysburg, and Chambersburg
newspapers, soliciting proposals, first by December 18, and then, since the
drawings and specifications were not ready when the committee expected them,
by December 31. The ten bids received ranged from $13,800 to $21,400, with
lesser amounts quoted if the fourth story were left unfinished. When the low
bidder asked to withdraw from further consideration, since he had made an
error in calculating and could not get sufficient security, the committee de-
cided to ask the nine remaining bidders to resubmit proposals, with the under-
standing that specified changes would be made in the plans in order to reduce
costs. This time five bids were received, one of which must have caught the eyes
of the committee:

I know the importance of the trust placed in your Committee and in
consequence thereof would have the completion of the work done well,
as well for the honour of the Committee as myself, as this not only to be
a temporary structure but to continue for ages and for laudable purposes,
should you consider no applicant of your place, then please let me have
a preference.1

1 Henry Winemiller to J. B. McPherson, Chambersburg, Jan. 9, 1836. Gettysburg College
Archives. The letter is quoted as it was written.
The author of these words, Henry Winemiller, a Chambersburg contractor, was also the low bidder. Unfortunately, even leaving the fourth story and one entire wing unfinished, and with the other changes being made, his price was $13,350. The members of the building committee, aware that they had no authority to go above $12,000, decided (January 9, 1836) that they had no alternative to placing the matter before each trustee in a letter. Describing what they had done since the last meeting, they discussed Winemiller’s bid. “This the committee feel anxious to accept,” they said. “They and the Faculty believe the interests of the institution imperiously demand a building, and everybody admits that the price is low.”

Unless a majority of the trustees objected within two weeks, they would enter into a contract. Since only three did object, the articles of agreement were signed on February 9, 1836. When the trustees met in April there was considerable discussion of the larger financial commitment. It was considered a matter of such consequence that a vote was called for, and the five yea and three nays were identified in the minutes. The members of the building committee, having already voted decisively by entering into a contract, abstained.

In mid-March Henry Winemiller began advertising in local newspapers his need for large quantities of lime, straw, wood, and scaffold poles. On March 22 he wrote to Dr. Gilbert that “the time is drawing near to commence work” and that he was willing to begin “as early as the season may permit.”

As work on the building began and progressed, the correspondence between John C. Trautwine and David Gilbert came to an end. There was no longer any need for it. The committee had acted on the architect’s suggestion that it consider changes it might want to make as early as possible, before construction would actually begin. Many alterations were agreed upon before the committee found itself at the end of December in the quandary already referred to. It did submit to Trautwine changes which it then proposed in order to reduce the costs of building.

The engineer-architect was opposed to less sturdy walls and inside timbers than he had recommended, but most other suggestions met with his approval. When the committee proposed a change in the portico columns which would increase costs, he heartily concurred (December 19, 1835): “I recommended wood instead of brick for the columns of the portico as being cheaper,” he

2 Copy of letter sent to all trustees, Jan. 9, 1836. Gettysburg College Archives.
3 Henry Winemiller to David Gilbert, Chambersburg, Mar. 22, 1836. Gettysburg College Archives.
wrote, “although in the end brick is incomparably superior.” But, he warned, fluted brick columns are difficult to construct, and, he insisted, “I would not like to dispense with the Flutes on any consideration.” He had no objection to painting the building instead of roughcasting it, as he first proposed, “provided the brickwork be done smoothly.” After all, he explained, “The U. S. Capitol at Washington is painted outside.” As for the new building, he wrote, “the Colour will of course be white.” Quick and decisive was his reaction (January 5, 1836) to the suggestion a few weeks later that, to save money, it not be painted at all:

Respecting the leaving of the exterior red instead of white, it would entirely destroy all architectural beauty — you say a new coat would be required every 3 or 4 years — but I think one every 10 or 12 years would be too frequent — I know houses that have been painted 16 years, and to all appearances they will not require another coat for 16 more.

In his very first letter to Dr. Gilbert, Trautwine answered the question of the costs of his services by writing (August 23, 1835) that “they shall at all events be agreeable to the Trustees.” The figure eventually agreed upon was $100, which included some free advice to Dr. Gilbert on another subject. In May 1836, in an act of the legislature, six of the active supporters of the college, including three members of the building committee, were named commissioners to organize the newly chartered Wrightsville and Gettysburg Railroad Company. Apparently the railroad fever had also overtaken Dr. Gilbert, who broached the subject to engineer Trautwine. There came this reply (July 25, 1836): “Respecting your question, as to meddling with Rail-road matters, I would not advise it, unless in company with some good practical man, of considerable experience.”

Although Dr. Gilbert made at least one trip to Wilmington, there is no evidence that Trautwine ever came to Gettysburg, either when the building was under construction or later, when he could have determined for himself whether, indeed, his plans had been “carefully and accurately executed.” After 1836 his energies were devoted entirely to engineering, and his commissions took him to such places as Tennessee, Georgia, Colombia, Panama, Honduras, and Canada. In 1871 he published the first of many editions of The Civil Engineer’s Pocket-book. Carried on by his son and grandson, this work eventually reached more than twenty editions and 150,000 copies. Many
called it the engineer’s Bible.  

The contract with Henry Winemiller called for the completion of his work by September 1, 1837 and for a schedule of payments determined by the progress of his workmen. The foundations were dug in late March or early April 1836. The building was under roof by December. Whether because of the national economic downturn which began in 1837 or for other reasons, Henry Winemiller was forced in the summer of 1837 to turn over his assets to two assignees and, in a sense, declare bankruptcy. Meanwhile, progress on the building slowed. “The disappointment to the institution will be very great,” wrote Dr. Gilbert to the assignees in July, “were the house not ready by the time specified in the contract.” By September 1 it was clear that the more important deadline — the opening of the winter session — would be met. “The new and splendid edifice erected by the Trustees of the College,” ran the brief notice in the Adams Sentinel for September 25, 1837, “will be occupied next session, which will commence on the 2nd of November.”

Unfortunately, it was not Henry Winemiller, but his assignees, who turned over the keys to the new College edifice near the end of October. Equally or more unfortunately, they were keys to a structure still far from completed internally. With ten rooms ready for the steward and his family, two rooms for chapel and library, and six classrooms, there were but fourteen rooms for students. This explains why, when the trustees met on April 19, 1838, they adopted a resolution “that the college edifice be finished immediately.” The building committee promptly entered into a contract with Samuel Hunter (1788-1857), of Gettysburg, whose low bid was $2400. “The new College edifice will be entirely completed before the Commencement of the session” on November 1, ran the college advertisement in the Adams Sentinel for September 10, 1838. This prediction was substantially fulfilled.

It is difficult to determine from the records which have survived what the total cost of the “College Edifice” was. To the $15,750 paid on the Winemiller

---

4 Joseph Jackson, Early Philadelphia Architects and Engineers (Philadelphia, 1923), p. 169. For a good, brief sketch of Trautwine’s career, see the obituary written by Thomas U. Walter, Joseph M. Wilson, and Frederick Graff and published in the Journal of the Franklin Institute, Third Series, CXVI (Nov. 1883), 390-396. 

5 D. Gilbert to Messrs. Radebaugh and Berlin, Gettysburg, July 24, 1837. Gettysburg College Archives. In addition to serving as secretary of the building committee, Dr. Gilbert was its superintendent of construction. As such, he visited the site once or twice a day and made certain that the plans were being executed to the committee’s satisfaction. See his account of his activities in the minutes of the building committee. Gettysburg College Archives.
and Hunter contracts one must also add amounts for land, drilling wells, fill, grading, trees, outbuildings, furniture, and the like. Undoubtedly the total came to several thousand dollars more.

It is not difficult to determine from the surviving records that this building program stretched the college close to its financial limits. It is true that by June 1839 the state had paid a total of $18,000 and that the college had secured pledges of $3,000. In addition, it still could count the academy building as an asset; this property was not finally sold until 1848. On the other side of the ledger, not all of the pledges were ever paid and some of the state grant had had to be used to meet current expenses. An attempt to get a second grant from the legislature was made in the spring of 1837. The Senate approved a measure appropriating $5,000 “to be applied in the payment of debts contracted in the erection of a college edifice, now in the progress of completion.” The House referred it to a committee which had just recommended that all state aid to colleges and academies should cease.6 There the matter died. When the trustees met in April 1838, they learned that three members of the building committee had borrowed $3750 over their own signatures to meet some of the final payments on the Winemiller contract.

In the same month, April 1838, the college received an unexpected financial boon when the state legislature passed an act awarding $1000 per year to each college and university in the state. In order to qualify, an institution had to have four instructors and at least 100 students. The act was to remain in force “for ten years, and no longer.”7 Legislators believed that this aid was possible without increasing taxes and could be paid out of increasing yields from several sources, including income from the expected distribution of the federal surplus. Instead, in the hard years that followed, the state edged closer and closer to bankruptcy. Finally, in 1843 the act supporting higher education was repealed. While it was in force, Pennsylvania College received $5500 from this source. For the years 1841-1843 this was more than eighteen per cent of its total income.

Between 1834 and 1843 Pennsylvania College received a total of $23,500 from the state treasury. Unquestionably, the college would have experienced tremendous, if not insurmountable, difficulty in building and paying for its house without this help. Indeed, could it have survived without it?

---


An early representation of the College Edifice, about 1840

"The new College edifice will be completed and ready for occupancy before the close of next session. It is a chaste specimen of the Grecian Doric order of architecture, consisting of a centre building and two wings, with end projections, front and rear. Whole length 150 feet. The building is four stories high, with blocking course 2½ feet high, resting upon a heavy cornice around the entire building. On the centre is placed an octagonal cupola 18½ feet in diameter and 24 feet high, with an observatory on its top. The entire front of the centre building (46 feet) is occupied by a portico, consisting of four fluted columns four feet in diameter at their bases, and 22½ feet high, resting on abutments brought up to a level with the floor of the second story. On these columns rests an appropriate entablature, together with the roof, cornice and blocking course of the front of the centre building. The portico projects 14 feet from the centre building and is made accessible on the outside by a flight of steps equal in width to its whole front. The edifice is composed of brick, and the whole exterior will be painted white." 1837 catalogue.
“as nearly as possible after the manner of a well regulated family.”
(1834)

When the new building was finished and occupied, it quickly became the center of college activities. Except for those who had special permission to live elsewhere, all of the students roomed in the building, including those enrolled in the preparatory department which was established as soon as the Gymnasium was “erected” into a college in 1832 and which remained a part of the college until 1935. There were about fifty rooms for student use, most of them about ten feet by fourteen feet in size and located on the second, third, and fourth floors. About 100 students could be accommodated, but the number who actually lived there was frequently smaller. President Krauth gave up the house in town which the college rented for him and moved his family into quarters on the west end of the second floor, although their dining room was downstairs. The president’s office was to the left as one came through the main entrance. Also, one or two tutors employed in the preparatory department were required to live in the building. Their rooms were on the second floor.

On the first or ground floor at the west end lived steward Peter Aughinbaugh (1778-1857) and his family. Here in the dining room under the portico, at Mother Aughinbaugh’s table, it was assumed that most of the college and preparatory students would want to board. In addition, the carefully defined duties of the steward included keeping the rooms and halls clean, and tending all of the fires except those in students’ rooms. Elizabeth Aughinbaugh (1780-1876) was available to do the necessary washing and mending, as well as some mothering. The college assured the parents of prospective students that it had a steward “of sober habits and good character” who “gives his undivided attention to the comfort and convenience of the College students who board in the Refectory.”

---

1 No evidence has been found that the building was ever formally dedicated — until 1970.
2 Lutheran Observer, Nov. 2, 1838.
Six "recitation rooms" which also served as professor’s offices were located on the second and third floors. On the third floor the center section was divided into two large rooms, each forty-two feet by twenty feet, separated by a hallway running east and west. The northern room was the library; the southern room, the chapel. On the fourth floor space was reserved for the two literary societies. Phrenakosmian Hall occupied the western end and Philomathean Hall, the eastern (these rooms were nineteen by forty-two feet). Organizations such as "Phrena" and "Philo" played a significant role in the educational programs of most colleges at this time. Deliberate rivals of each other, they not only carried on a program of debates and lectures, but also each had a library which in the early days equalled or surpassed the college’s collection in size. The considerable space given on the fourth floor to their halls, to housing the libraries (on the north side), and later to their reading rooms, was thus justified.

The uses to which space within the College Edifice was put changed from time to time in the early years, but there was no major reallocation until 1860. The main entrance to the building was from the south portico. Until they were closed in 1860 or 1861, there were doorways on the second floor facing west, north, and east. In addition, there was a ground floor entrance for the steward. In September 1847 the trustees authorized the faculty "to purchase a bell not to exceed 300 lbs. in weight." Cast in Philadelphia the following year, this bell was placed in the cupola where, for more than forty years, its ringing reminded students and faculty of their regular classroom and other obligations.

If the assignment of space which was made in 1837 and 1838 seemed sensible at that time, it did not remain so for very long. By 1841 the total enrollment in the college and preparatory departments had almost doubled that of 1837, and the trustees were seriously considering a new building for the latter. The faculty strongly urged such a course of action, arguing that it was decidedly not a sound arrangement to have college and "prep" students living together under the same roof. The trustees could not dismiss the concerns of the preparatory department, since not until 1847 did the college proper have more students than "prep" had, and not until 1867 is there a year beyond which college enrollment remains greater. But, alas, there were hard days ahead in the early 1840's. What the faculty described as the "unpropitiousness of the times" prevented any new building. By 1843 enrollment was down by one-third.
Crowded conditions in the edifice were relieved in 1847, when the newly erected Linnaean Hall was ready for use. Located west of the main building, Linnaean served two purposes. On the ground floor were the recitation rooms for the preparatory department and on the second floor, the respectable and growing scientific collections of the college.

When Henry Winemiller and the building committee met to pick the precise spot on which to place the college building, they chose one in the middle of a field. When construction was finished, the task of creating a “college yard” or campus had to begin at the beginning. Workmen brought in large quantities of fill (1838) — almost 1000 cubic feet — and graded the area. Trees were planted, and planted, and planted again — more than 500 of them between 1839 and 1853. Walks and pavements were made around the buildings and toward town. Time and again fences were built, and occasionally they were taken away. What one student years later remembered as being “bare as your hand” in 1839, another student about a decade later called “a beautiful yard.”

Out back, north of the building, three or four wells were dug and pumps installed. For the use of the Aughinbaughs, there were a garden and the needed outbuildings: a washhouse which also served as the bakehouse, a smokehouse, and a stable, all constructed in 1837. A springhouse was added in 1840 and a cattleshed in 1851. There were also the inevitable privies, what was described as an “eight apartment” one for students and a “two apartment” one for the families of the president and steward. For some years students had their own wood piles in this area, until the trustees decided (1855) to build a woodhouse from which the steward could sell fuel to keep the scholars warm. In 1856 the college built a bathhouse northeast of the building; this was designed to serve also as a gymnasium. With such a collection of outbuildings, small wonder it is that there seem to be no pictures of the campus in the nineteenth century which show more than a glimpse of what it looked like behind the College Edifice.

With the house fully occupied and its surroundings properly appointed, it was at last possible for the trustees and faculty of Pennsylvania College to

---

attempt to establish a collegiate society which according to the generally accepted standards of the time was most congenial to sound learning. As early as 1834, in the first published statutes of the college, it was put with utter simplicity and directness: "The government of the College shall be administered as nearly as possible after the manner of a well regulated family." In the catalogue for 1839 the faculty assured the constituency that

the discipline of the Institution is, as nearly as possible, parental. The members of both departments, except in special cases, are required to room in the College edifice. The President, under whose immediate supervision the building is placed, lives in it with his family, and together with the Tutors and Professors, exercise a constant guardianship over the whole establishment; so that parents from a distance have all the security they may desire for the proper government of their children.4

In September 1837, prior to the move into the new building, the trustees adopted a revised and enlarged list of rules and regulations designed to insure that, "as nearly as possible," this large promise would be realized. The faculty added to the list, and in the 1843 catalogue published the regulations in full. The following examples give some idea both of what life in the house was like at the time and of what it was supposed to be like:

Each room of the Student shall be visited daily by the Senior Tutor, at such hour as the President shall from time to time direct.

The hours of study are from 7 to 8 and from 9 to 12 o'clock, A.M. and from 2 to 5 and from 8 to 10 o'clock, P.M. during which times Students must be either in their respective rooms or in the recitation rooms of their classes.

The hours of recreation shall be from 8 to 9 o'clock in the morning; from 12 to 2 o'clock; and from 4½ to 7½ in winter, and from 5 to 8½, P.M. during the summer.

The lot adjoining that of the College shall be appropriated for a College Campus, for the purpose of exercise and play by the Students in leisure hours.

The hour of retiring shall be 10 o'clock. The bell will ring for this

---

4 Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Pennsylvania College (1839), p. 15. Subsequent references to the college catalogue in the text will include the year of issue, and there will be no further footnotes accompanying them.
Engraving of campus buildings which appeared on a statement released by the faculty in 1849, showing a building east of the College Edifice and matching Linnaean Hall. It was never built.

purpose at 10, and at half past 10, the lights must be extinguished.

No student shall leave the College precincts without permission during the session of the College, except for exercise or amusement during the hours appropriated to that purpose.

If any student shall play at hand or football in the College edifice or College yard, or throw any thing, which might damage the College buildings or property, he may be fined; and if he refuse to desist, when required by any member of the Faculty, he may be suspended, sent home, or dismissed.

No Student shall be permitted to smoke in the halls of the College, or in any of the public rooms, or on the porches of the building.

At the time of his matriculation each student pledged in writing that he would obey these and the other rules and regulations in force. Much of the time in early faculty meetings was spent in handling infractions, and for many years an important part of the faculty's and president's report to the trustees dealt with how the students in the building had been behaving. One indication
of the seriousness with which the faculty took this responsibility is given in their report of September 1839. They were strongly in favor of having all students living in the building, they wrote, and opposed to any arrangement which "withdraws from the College many of the best young men and scatters them in every direction — so that whilst their influence is withdrawn from the institution the institution can exert but little moral influence upon them."\(^5\)

The trustees and faculty took what precautions they could to preserve the building and protect its inhabitants. They purchased fire insurance and installed a lightning rod. Always quite sensitive to anything which might suggest that they were not properly parental, they felt it incumbent upon them to act decisively in 1847, when many students left the college during the threat of a typhoid epidemic. Over the signature of the president, the faculty issued a circular reporting the findings of several local physicians. First, "the Borough of Gettysburg, than which there is no more healthy location in the United States, has, during the present season, enjoyed, and is up to this time enjoying, a degree of exemption from disease which could hardly be surpassed." Second, "the Edifice of Pennsylvania College, . . . has been unusually healthy, not a single case of alarming sickness having occurred in it, and particularly no case of typhus fever." Third, it is true that several college students who boarded at the seminary had died "from a fever of a typhoid or typhus type," but the disease had run its course and there was no need for further alarm.\(^6\)

Another constant danger worried the faculty: fire. In 1850 two students who were filling their burning lamp with camphene were injured when the lamp exploded. One of them died about a week later. When the trustees met in September they instructed the faculty "to prohibit the use of burning fluid in the house." It was partly with the fire hazard in mind that the college between 1858 and 1862 made the transition from wood to coal. The same consideration was a factor which led to the introduction of gas for lighting in 1860. Since an extra charge was made for gas and its use was optional, many students continued using other forms of lighting, especially kerosene.

---

\(^5\) Report of the faculty and president to the trustees, Sept. 14, 1839. Gettysburg College Archives.

\(^6\) College Circular, Jan. 27, 1847. Adams County Historical Society.
It is true that the faculty wished to emphasize that the location of the college was ideal, according to the generally accepted standards of the time. "The location of Gettysburg is not surpassed by any in the Union for health," ran the advertisement in the *National Intelligencer* for December 4, 1834, "and the town is remarkable for its morality." More precisely, the 1837-1838 catalogue stressed that the "College Edifice is a short distance from the village." At the same time, both trustees, faculty, and other supporters of the college wanted to make its existence known and excite interest. To this end the authors of the catalogue were careful to place Gettysburg within easy reach of such places as Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and Harrisburg. The stage connections with all of these places, they explained, are "$\text{frequent and easy},"$ offering "peculiar facilities" to persons coming from any direction. Significantly, in the mid-1850's the catalogue began to report the progress of the railroad as, at last, it approached Gettysburg, from the east. The trustees had a direct interest in what was happening, since from their meager resources they had bought about $1000 worth of stock in the venture. In 1859 the catalogue could proudly announce that the college facilities "$\text{have been greatly increased by the recent completion of the Railroad,}" and then with considerable exaggeration it claimed that this "$\text{brings us into direct communication with Philadelphia, Baltimore, Pittsburg, and other prominent points.}"
Engraving of Linnaean Hall and the College Edifice. Appeared in catalogues of the 1850's.
"The noise, the smell of the cookery, the evil of having girls about the establishment and the frequent follies or vices of the steward seem to outweigh all the advantages which we can find in the office." (1853)

By the end of the 1850's it was abundantly clear that two features of life in the well-regulated family as it was envisaged in 1837 and 1838 would have to be abandoned. The first of these was the residence of the president and his family in the building. When Henry L. Baugher (1804-1868) became president in 1850, he declined to occupy the quarters on the second floor vacated by Charles P. Krauth and family. A former teacher in the Gymnasium and a faculty member since 1832, Baugher had a fine home of his own on the Harrisburg road. Moreover, he was in an excellent position to know the disadvantages from a personal point of view of living in the building. Surely he was aware of the lack of enthusiasm which his predecessor had displayed thirteen years before, when Krauth wrote to the trustees:

The wish having been expressed that I should board at the College edifice, and believing it to be absolutely necessary that one of the professors should have the management of the house, I feel disposed, as no other one is willing to do it, to make the sacrifice of comfort, and to undergo the additional labour involved.¹

Now in 1850, the trustees persuaded a faculty member to move into the building, but within two years he vacated the quarters for reasons of health. The faculty reported to the trustees its belief that it was essential "to the successful discipline of the institution" that a professor reside in the building and, further, that he ought also to be the president. When the trustees met in September 1852 they authorized the faculty "to employ a suitable Tutor of advanced years, as soon as they can, to be Principal of the Preparatory Department and to reside in the College building." Instead, as a temporary device until more permanent arrangements could be made, Baugher agreed to move

¹ Proposals of Pres. Krauth on the subject of removing to College, Sept. 1837. Gettysburg College Archives.
in his study. Later, for additional compensation, he agreed to serve as "resident officer." In time, the catalogue reflected the change that had occurred. "The President," it announced beginning in 1858, "under whose immediate supervision the building is placed, with the other officers, exercises a constant guardianship over the whole establishment."

One possible solution to this problem would be to build a house for the president somewhere on the campus so that he could continue to function as a resident officer while still having an acceptable degree of privacy for himself and his family. The trustees were quick in realizing this, and in September 1853 named a committee to investigate the possibilities. Costs appearing to be prohibitive, the matter was dropped. Four years later another committee was appointed for the same purpose, and this time the objective was accomplished. The White House was built and occupied by the Baughers in 1860. In all, the families of six presidents lived there until it was put to other uses in 1952.

A second feature of college life which changed markedly in the 1850's was the arrangement for boarding students in the college building. This had been considered such an important part of life in the well-regulated family that in 1837 and 1838 college officials were willing to commit about one-fifth of their available space to it. Yet at the very beginning there were indications that students might have different ideas on the subject. In the fall of 1837 some of them, accustomed to making their own arrangements for bed and board, flatly refused to move into the college building, arguing that the amount the steward intended to charge for meals and cleaning their rooms was more than they were paying in town and more than they wanted to pay. The resident trustees persuaded Peter Aughinbaugh to reduce his charges and the incident came to an end.⁴

Neither trustees nor faculty were certain how strict they wanted to be in requiring students to board at the college. In fact, many exceptions were made. Students intending to go on to seminary were permitted to board there, while others took their meals in eating clubs in town or with faculty families. Never-

---

² Reports of the faculty and president to the trustees, spring and Sept. 1852. Gettysburg College Archives.
theless, most students did board in the college building, where conditions were as satisfactory as one can expect in these circumstances until the final departure of Peter Aughinbaugh in 1850.4 None of his successors remained very long, and there were times when all students were forced to eat off campus because no acceptable candidates for the stewardship could be found. During one such vacancy in 1855 the faculty, with some misgivings, permitted the students to eat in a local tavern, but only because the bar was closed. The matter was considered important enough so that the trustees at their next meeting gave their approval to the arrangement.

By this time the faculty had already reached the conclusion that the steward system as it was working in the college building was a mistake. As they had explained to the trustees in 1853:

In comparing the difficulties and disadvantages connected with the stewardship in college and the character of the stewards whose services we have been enabled to obtain with the evils almost necessarily incident to it the Faculty respectfully inquire of the Board whether it would not be better to abolish the office. The noise, the smell of the cookery, the evil of having girls about the establishment and the frequent follies or vices of the steward seem to overweigh all the advantages which we can find in the office. Besides many of the rooms below may be rented to the students.5

The trustees responded to this argument by resolving to continue the system. But conditions did not improve; one steward had to be told to stop conducting his own boarding house in the rent-free quarters which the college provided for him. Edward S. Breidenbaugh (1849-1926), who came to college in the 1860's, was told that students made "complaints and serious violent protests against the system and against the quality of food."6 In April 1859 the faculty repeated their earlier recommendation, urging the trustees to build some inexpensive facility "so that boarding may be reduced to a minimum price for the benefit of the students of limited means."7

4 He resigned first in 1847, but was rehired the following year.
5 Report of the faculty and president to the trustees, Sept. 15, 1853. Gettysburg College Archives.
7 Report of the faculty and president to the trustees, Apr. 27, 1859. Gettysburg College Archives.
When the trustees took up this matter in September 1859, they were more concerned about building a house on the campus for the president than they were with relocating an eating house. Consequently, the action which they took was simply to notify the steward that his contract would not be renewed when it expired on April 1, 1860. In the months that followed, the college converted the ground floor space which he vacated into seven rooms for students. The washhouse was enlarged and made into a residence for the janitor, John Hopkins (1806-1868), who served faithfully in the college building from the time he was first hired in 1847 until his death. The college did not again maintain a dining hall for college students until the preparatory department closed in 1935 and its facilities were used for the coeds. Except for temporary arrangements during World War II, the college did not maintain regular dining facilities for men until after 1946.

John Hopkins
(1806-1868)

First janitor in the College Edifice. Endeared himself to the students, who in an 1862 album from which this photograph was taken identified him as Vice President of the college. Was the subject of an appreciative poem, "Jack the Janitor." When he died, the faculty and students attended his funeral in a body. President Valentine and two faculty members conducted the services. Later, the trustees adopted a resolution in his memory.

---

8 Edward S. Breidenbaugh reports that after the steward system was abandoned not all of the students went to boarding houses or clubs. Some made their own meals, and for a time the milkman and baker made daily deliveries in the college building. "Pennsylvania College — Some Historical Notes — Past and Present," The Spectrum (1913), p. 14.
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"parental, mild and affectionate, but firm and energetic." (1848)

In spite of the change in the President's residence and the abolition of the steward system, the ideal of the well-regulated family in the College Edifice remained largely intact in 1860. One of the institution's first, and also most long-lived, alumni, the Rev. William F. Eyster (1822-1921) of the Class of 1839, believed that already in his day the ideal and the reality were close to being one and the same thing. Writing in 1902, when he was eighty, he recalled "the college at that day, was but a large family, under the direct supervision of men who felt for each student an almost parental solicitude."¹

Once the faculty had some experience with life in the college building, it was in a position to begin increasing the number of adjectives it used in describing the ideal. Advertising in the Lutheran Observer for September 1, 1848, it said that "the government of the students is parental, mild and affectionate, but firm and energetic. They attend three recitations a day, Church and Bible Class on the Sabbath, and are visited in their rooms so frequently as to preclude the danger of any great irregularities." Firm they were as they punished one student after another for infractions, and as they asked more than one father to come and take home the son guilty of "contumacious conduct." Mild they were as they accepted explanations or apologies and as, on the day after Christmas 1855, they asked the president to "have a conversation with John Kuhns in reference to his being out of his room and in the belfry at a late hour of the night on Christmas eve." Affectionate they were when they tried to protect students from local farmers who overcharged them for wood or when they encouraged the trustees to furnish them with inexpensive food apart from the college building itself.

Parental and energetic they were, yet it is clear that they rarely, if ever, succeeded in destroying the exuberance and resourcefulness of their young charges, if indeed that was ever their intention. There is ample evidence that

the faculty encouraged student initiative and that the young men frequently responded. Many examples can be given. In February 1834 the students had their own meeting in order formally to thank Thaddeus Stevens and the others for their efforts in getting an appropriation for the college. Students provided most of the initiative which kept the two literary societies going strong for years. For a time in the 1850’s they published their own catalogue. They furnished much of the initiative for, and much of the actual physical labor which went into, Linnaean Hall. For years one of their special projects was the care of the campus, or the front yard of the College Edifice. Time and again the trustees formally thanked them for planting trees, building fences, grading, or laying walks. One of the paths leading toward town was long called “via benedicta” in honor of the student who had supervised its construction. Nor was it beyond them to demonstrate their ability to make use of some of the ideas the faculty was trying to impart to them. In the spring of 1860 a committee of the Philomathean Society wrote to the trustees, complaining of the poor condition of the roof and cupola of the college building. It was negating their efforts to keep their quarters in creditable fashion. “It is but the dictate of a sound political Economy,” they lectured the trustees, “that this should be attended to. ‘A stitch in time saves nine’.”

---

2 Philomathean Society committee to trustees, Apr. 17, 1860. Gettysburg College Archives.
"Only a heart dispossessed of all feeling of humanity could refuse sympathy and help in such a time as that." (1863)

When Civil War began in the spring of 1861, most people in south-central Pennsylvania put aside their reservations concerning a course of action which might lead to hostilities and came to the support of the government in its efforts to preserve the Union. During the excitement which followed the firing on Fort Sumter and President Abraham Lincoln's call for volunteers, college students in general reacted in much the same way as others did. Those at Pennsylvania College formed a military company in June 1861 and drilled regularly. The "College Guards" and literary societies participated in the elaborate parade and celebration in town on July 4. In line with what was happening in hundreds of Northern communities large and small, the students placed a forty-foot staff on the cupola of the college building and then, with appropriate ceremony, raised what the newspaper called "a magnificent streamer, red, white and blue, with the thirty four stars upon the Union." The significance of this particular flag was that it had a star representing Kansas, which for some years the Southern states had prevented from entering the Union as a free state and which Congress promptly admitted in January 1861 after the Southern members withdrew.

The initial excitement, with its hopes for a quick victory, soon wore off. As the war continued, college enrollment dropped from 166 in 1861 to 131 in 1862 and 123 in 1863. It hit bottom with 114 in 1864 and 112 in 1865. Some students enlisted, as did many young men who might otherwise have become students. Some parents refused to allow their sons to come to Gettysburg because of its proximity to the Mason-Dixon line.


2 See report of the faculty and president to the trustees, Aug. 11, 1864. Gettysburg College Archives.
The campus, about 1862
One of the earliest photographs of the college property. This is how the campus looked at the time of the battle of Gettysburg.
From the start of the war, there were occasional threats of Confederate incursions into Adams County. One such occurred in the late summer of 1862, when the Army of the Potomac and the Army of Northern Virginia clashed at Antietam. A month later General J. E. B. Stuart's cavalry, in the course of a raid on Chambersburg, penetrated into the western townships of Adams County, less than ten miles from Gettysburg.

On June 15, 1863 Governor Andrew G. Curtin issued a proclamation calling upon able-bodied citizens of Pennsylvania to come to the defense of the state against a threatened invasion by the Army of Northern Virginia. Among the very first men to respond to this call were those of a company in which there were fifty-four students of Pennsylvania College, almost half of the entire enrollment. Mustered into service at Harrisburg a few days later, they were organized as Company A, 26th Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Militia. A week later their regiment was sent to Gettysburg, where the college students performed creditably, although they were no match for the seasoned Confederate troops who appeared in Adams County during the last week in June. In the skirmishing which followed, some students were captured, while others retreated with their regiment to Harrisburg, serving until they were discharged at the end of July.

As was its custom, the college faculty had announced that there would be no classes on the Fourth of July, but even with so few students present recitations were scheduled to take place in the college building July 1. On the morning of that day a great battle began to the west and north of the campus, and the instructional program was halted. Early that morning the normal routine was disturbed when Union signal officers came into the building. Michael Jacobs (1808-1871), Professor of Chemistry and Mathematics, accompanied one of these officers to the cupola, where he pointed out to him the strategic importance of the high ground south of town. A little later President Baugher told his class: "We will close and see what is going on, for you know nothing about the lesson anyhow." Discipline had broken down to such an extent that

---

3 M. Jacobs, Notes on the Rebel Invasion of Maryland and Pennsylvania and the Battle of Gettysburg July 1st, 2d, and 3d, 1863 . . . (Philadelphia, 1864), p. 25. Prof. Jacobs recognized that a number of Union officers coming into Gettysburg on July 1 quickly decided on the strength of their own observation that this ground was strategically important.

when one student suggested to his friend that they ought to get permission before leaving the campus to investigate, the latter replied: "Let the faculty go to grass and you come on."\(^5\)

During the course of the day on July 1 Union fortunes worsened. Its army retreated southward across the campus through the town and to the higher ground which it occupied for the remainder of the battle. In the late afternoon or early evening the Confederates took possession of the college building. There was no question but that they would use it for what purpose. With the number of wounded men increasing and soon to run into thousands, every large building around was likely to be pressed into service as a hospital.

The Confederates removed nearly all of the possessions of students from their rooms and piled them into the president's office, which was then locked and guarded. Student rooms, recitation rooms, the halls of the literary societies, and the libraries were filled with the wounded and dying. Most, but not all, of the patients were Confederates. A building which under normal circumstances housed about 100 students was now accommodating about 700 soldiers. During the course of the battle the building was hit several times, but no serious damage was inflicted.\(^6\)

In the fall of 1863 Professor Jacobs, a strong supporter of the Union cause who had carefully observed as much of the battle as he could and who spoke to many other eyewitnesses, published one of the first of innumerable accounts that have been written about the battle of Gettysburg. Though not free of errors, his book has the advantage of authorship by one who was close to the events which it describes and who had long experience as a disciplined observer in the area. In his account Professor Jacobs explains how General Robert E. Lee arrived at the decision to attack the Union center on July 3. He asserts that "during the day General Lee had reconnoitred our position from the College cupola — although, being a hospital, that edifice, by all principles of military honor, should have been free from every hostile use."\(^7\)

In an article which appeared in the January 1864 issue of the United States Service Magazine, Professor Jacobs dealt with this matter again:

---

\(^5\) Reminiscences of Rev. M. Colver, in ibid., p. 179.

\(^6\) Davis Garber to P. M. Bikle, Muhlenberg College, Mar. 5, 1877, quoted in the Pennsylvania College Monthly, I (Dec. 1877), 297.

\(^7\) M. Jacobs, Notes on the Rebel Invasion, p. 41.
In his eagerness to gain a victory, and to make good the rebel boast, repeated so frequently as to make it almost laughable, that "they could not be beaten," he [Lee] transcended the rules held sacred amongst belligerents, whilst he ascended the College cupola, for the purpose of gaining a nearer and more perfect view of our left centre, although that building was at the time used by the enemy as a hospital, and the usual flag designed to give information of that fact was floating in the breeze by his side.\footnote{M. Jacobs, "Later Rambles Over the Field of Gettysburg," \textit{United States Service Magazine}, I (Jan. 1864), 74.}

Writing in 1882 about the events of 1863 as they touched upon the college, the then president, Milton Valentine (1825-1906), returned to this subject:

The incident of Gen. Lee's ascent to the cupola for observations, on July 3, is well known to the citizens of Gettysburg, though attempts have been made to call it in question. It is, however, abundantly established by the positive testimony of a number of witnesses, some of whom are still living.\footnote{M. Valentine, "History of Pennsylvania College," in E. S. Breidenbaugh, ed., \textit{The Pennsylvania College Book, 1832-1882} (Philadelphia, 1882), p. 92.}

The attempts to call this incident into question have continued. Interestingly enough, a local newspaper was quite restrained in its reference to it in 1889 in a story about the anticipated influx of Civil War veterans for the dedication of a number of monuments:

the old college building should be a point of interest to veterans as it was one of our largest hospitals, and it is said that Gen. Lee, from its cupola, made observations of the field.\footnote{Star and Sentinel, Sept. 10, 1889.}

Scholars have argued that using a hospital facility for observation was out of character for Lee; that there would have been more advantage for him to have used the seminary building, which was also controlled by the Confederates, if he found it necessary to violate a ground rule of war; or that the account cannot be considered credible because there seems to be no corroborating evidence from the Confederate side that Lee was in the immediate vicinity of the college building on July 3.

Neither in his book nor in the article which followed did Michael Jacobs
actually claim to have seen Lee in the cupola, although it is possible that he did. He was reluctant to push himself forward in his writings. He did not identify himself as the “officer of the college” who had gone into the cupola with a signal officer on July 1 until someone questioned his account of the selection of the high ground south of town as a good defense position. Unfortunately, Milton Valentine did not identify any of the “witnesses” who could give “positive testimony” that Lee had used the cupola on July 3. Unless further evidence comes to light, we need to suspend final judgment on this matter.

After the repulse of Pickett’s charge on the afternoon of July 3, General Lee decided not to continue the fight on this field and prepared to retreat. On the night of the third or early morning of the fourth of July the Confederate military abandoned the college building and Union troops occupied it, taking charge of the hospital and its patients. In his report on the Gettysburg campaign, the chief signal officer of the Army of the Potomac states that a signal station was in operation “on the college in Gettysburg” as early as 5:40 a.m. and that it was continued for the rest of the day, relaying information on the Confederate retreat. Earlier in the report, he wrote that on June 30 “the signal officer with General John Buford, who occupied the town of Gettysburg, took position in the steeple of the college, and reported to General Buford the whereabouts and movements of the enemy.” It is possible that the author of this report confused the college and seminary, as other soldiers sometimes did, but in this case it is not probable.

Writing years later, an alumnus who was a college senior in 1863 and who had waited out the battle with several families in town, gave his recollection of what he found when he returned to the campus on July 6:

On our arrival we found in and around the building, according to the estimate given us, seven hundred wounded rebels. When I came to my room I saw it afforded ample accommodation for three — one on the bed and two on the floor . . . All rooms, halls and hallways were occupied with the poor deluded sons of the South. The moans, prayers and shrieks

---


of the wounded and dying were heard everywhere. Only a heart dis-
possessed of all feeling of humanity could refuse sympathy and help in
such a time as that. These unfortunates were of our then conquered foe.
But had even the tide of battle gone the other way still a sense of a
common brotherhood would have impelled us to feed our enemies and
our conquerors. While these men of the rebellion were with us they
received the courtesies and attention due them. Students and citizens
combined to act the part of the good Samaritan.\textsuperscript{13}

The faculty passed up its regular weekly session on July 7, with the secre-
tary dutifully making the following entry in the minute book: "No meeting,
in consequence of the excitement connected with the recent battles fought in
Gettysburg, July 1st, 2nd, and 3d." A week later they decided that it was im-
practical to attempt to complete the classes of the spring term. They agreed to
hold an informal commencement exercise for the students who were scheduled
to be graduated in August, and to award degrees.

Aware that under existing laws only part of their losses could be met by
federal funds, the seminary and college authorities quickly prepared an ad-
dress to the public. "Our quiet and orderly town," they said, "heretofore
known only for its nurseries of literature, science and religion, has been se-
lected as the theatre for one of the fiercest, most extensive and eventful con-
licts of the age." These institutions "have been made a sad scene of devasta-
tion and ruin." "The Seminary and College are, and for a month to come,
probably will, be occupied as hospitals for the sick and wounded of both
armies," they explained, "and will require not only many repairs, but also
much purification and painting, before they can again be occupied for their
appropriate purposes." They addressed their appeal not only to the Lutheran
church, but to all others as well, since, as they put it, "our institutions have
from the beginning been open to all denominations." With a sharp eye to the
future, they closed their appeal with a question:

Will it not ever be a pleasing reflection to each donor, that he has
contributed to the prosperity of institutions of literature and religion,
located in the place, hereafter ever memorable in our national history,
as the seat of one of the greatest battles and most glorious victories of
the federal arms? that he has contributed to those institutions, whose

students, in response to the call of the Governor, for 50,000 men, to expel the rebel army from our soil, formed the first Volunteer Company, that reached the place of rendezvous at Harrisburg.\textsuperscript{14}

The college building was used for hospital purposes from July 1 to about July 29, 1863. Shortly thereafter President Baugher presented to the Office of the Quartermaster General a claim for the use of and for damages to the building. In response, the Acting Quartermaster General replied that his office was authorized to compensate only for the use of the building as a hospital and for returning it to the condition in which it was on July 1. Any claims for damage to or loss of furniture and similar movable items would have to be made to some other office. The amount which he suggested as compensation was $625, which the college accepted.\textsuperscript{15} With this and the sum somewhat in excess of $1000 received from the appeal, the college was able to make the necessary repairs so that classes could resume on schedule in September.

The events of July 1863 made an impression upon the college building which more than a century has not erased. For years blood-stained floors and books used as headrests were vivid reminders of battle. The ability to identify blood-stained floors, real or otherwise, persisted well into the twentieth century. For later generations of inhabitants of the building there were tales of the grim reminders of past misery awaiting the courageous ones who would remove the floor boards on the ground floor and peer beneath.

Most of the soldiers who died in the building were buried in temporary graves nearby. Although subsequent effort was made to remove the bodies and reinter them elsewhere, not all of them were ever located. Off and on for years students came across pieces of human skeletons which a few, with their own sense of propriety, would display in their rooms.\textsuperscript{16} As late as 1937, while excavating for the north portico of the building, workmen dug up bits of human bone.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{14} The "Appeal in behalf of the Theological Seminary and College of Gettysburg" appeared in the \textit{Adams Sentinel} for July 21, 1863, in the \textit{Compiler} for July 27, 1863, and in many other papers.

\textsuperscript{15} Charles Thomas, Acting Quartermaster General, to H. B. Blood, Assistant Quartermaster, Gettysburg; Washington, Aug. 29, 1863. Copy in Gettysburg College Archives.

\textsuperscript{16} Reminiscences of George D. Stahley in the \textit{Gettysburg College Bulletin}, Alumni Issue, XXIII (Mar. 1934), 7. He says that students used their hatchets to cut bullets out of the trees.

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.}, XXVII (May 1937), 11.
"the old place is too narrow for the greater work now given to the institution." (1888)

The years between 1865 and 1900 were years of great economic growth in the United States, and also of rapid and often chaotic social and cultural change. In education, the modern university appeared and the number of colleges continued to increase. Curricular offerings were altered and their emphasis shifted away from the classical and toward the business and scientific. Enrollment in institutions of higher education in 1900 was about 238,000. While this was but four percent of the population between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one years, it was nevertheless a large increase over the approximately 52,000 students in college in 1870.¹

In her own way, Pennsylvania College participated in the changes of the post-Civil War generation. Her enrollment showed a tendency to increase, although not nearly as markedly as that of many sister institutions. Perhaps the major reason for her slow growth was the appearance, near the beginning of this period, on the territory from which she normally attracted students, of three new colleges under Lutheran auspices: Susquehanna (1858), Thiel (1866), and Muhlenberg (1867). In addition, fewer students than before the war now came from the South. Enrollment remained sensitive to the swings of the business cycle. At two periods after the war (1867-1871 and 1881-1884) the number of students in college, exclusive of the preparatory department, exceeded 100, only to drop below that figure again in depressed times. Not until 1887 do we come to the year when the college enrollment reaches and thereafter remains above the number of 100 students.

The college emerged from the war with its educational ideal of the well-regulated family apparently untarnished. An edition of its statutes published in 1876 preserves intact the language of more than forty years before on this

The College Edifice in 1887

Taken in the spring of 1887, shortly after the famous landscape gardener, William Saunders (1822-1900), invited to the campus by President McKnight, recommended that many old trees be removed to permit the grass to grow. Saunders designed the Soldiers' National Cemetery at Gettysburg and the Lincoln Memorial grounds at Springfield, Illinois. He was for many years superintendent of the grounds of the Department of Agriculture in Washington.
point. That is not to say that everyone was satisfied with the degree to which the ideal was being realized. In a moment of pessimism in 1866, the faculty reported to the trustees that "if our standard of government is that of the family, we have thus far failed to reach it." Regrettably, the suggestions which they had to offer were no more exciting than that there should be a tutor or proctor on every floor of the college building and that no recitation should be slighted or omitted. For years thereafter the catalogue, which the faculty still regarded an important and authoritative document, continued to reflect the traditional concerns. Yet there were changes taking place both on the campus and in the country which by 1900 had put a considerable strain on the old ideal.

Samuel G. Hefelbower (1871-1950) was president of the college from 1904 to 1910 and author of its centennial history in 1932. In reflecting upon the twenty-year administration of his predecessor, Harvey W. McKnight (1843-1914), President Hefelbower concluded that it was during his tenure that "the rigidity of the [old] system was so modified that we are justified in saying that modern college discipline began during Dr. McKnight's administration."3

The process was gradual, but one can identify small steps along the way. As early as 1869 the faculty omitted the customary evening visitation of rooms, explaining that it was "throwing the students on their honor for the observance of the rules and a frank reporting of any deviation, by themselves, and according to them a general confidence in their fidelity to their pledged word."4 In an address at the opening of the 1884-1885 college year, Professor Luther H. Croll (1834-1889) spoke on the topic, "In Loco Parentis," and, although he was far from ready to abandon the concept, he did concede that it had certain limitations when applied to a college situation. 5 A more official sign of the gradual change is to be found in the catalogue. After almost fifty years of proclaiming that the discipline of the institution was, to the extent possible, "parental," the 1887 catalogue said simply that

parents and friends can feel assured that all judicious efforts will be

---

2 Report of the faculty and president to the trustees, Aug. 9, 1866. Gettysburg College Archives.
4 Report of the faculty and president to the trustees, 1869. Gettysburg College Archives.
5 Pennsylvania College Monthly, VIII (Oct. 1884), 214-224.
made to secure the highest mental culture and to develop true Christian character among the young men enrolled as students in this institution.

But not until 1895 did the college discontinue the promise first made in 1839 that it would exercise "a constant guardianship" over the student body. In that year the catalogue statement headed "Supervision" was altered to read as follows:

The President and the Dean, residing on the campus, have special supervision of the buildings and are at all times easily accessible to the students. The college aims to secure the co-operation of each individual student in the preservation of good order and the attainment of a high standard of scholarship and manly conduct.

Yet, as already indicated, neither the old ideal nor the reality which it inspired was dead. In the fall of 1900 a freshman who wanted to go home to visit his father still had to wait upon the president of the college to secure his approval. If we are to judge from the minutes, a considerable part of the time of the faculty meetings was still spent in handling matters like this.

By 1900 significant changes had occurred in the position on the campus occupied by the college building, whose fortunes had been so intimately related to the ideal and the reality of the well-regulated family. The first period of change was in the decade following the end of the war. In 1867-1868 Stevens Hall was built and at long last the preparatory students vacated the old building. In 1868 a double house for faculty members was built, partly on the present site of the Schmucker Library. Four years later a gymnasium, named John B. McCreary Gymnasium, replaced the old bathhouse; it stood between Weidensall and McKnight Halls. In 1874 an astronomical observatory was built, partly on the present site of Hanson Hall.

These improvements were completed just ahead of the lean years of the 1870's, when enrollments dropped, repairs were held to a minimum, and the immediate future seemed highly unpromising. "The worn out, shattered, and ragged condition of the building . . . makes an unfavorable impression," reported the repairs committee in 1876, "and if not repaired soon will affect the institution injuriously." Nevertheless, they explained, in the interests of economy they had done as little as possible in the year past in the way of improving things.6

6 Report of the repairs committee, June 28, 1876. Gettysburg College Archives.
Within a few years there were unmistakable signs of a different spirit in the college, of an itch, of a desire to move the institution along. Probably this urge had several independent beginnings, but one definite source was the decision of the faculty in 1876 to begin publication of a monthly magazine. The cooperation of the two literary societies and of the alumni association was obtained, and the first issue of the Pennsylvania College Monthly appeared under these joint auspices in February 1877. The editor was Philip M. Bikle (1844-1934), then Professor of Physics and later, for many years, Dean. Filled with information about what was happening on campus and in the town of Gettysburg, on other campuses, and among the alumni, the Monthly was designed primarily to arouse greater interest among faculty, students, and especially alumni in promoting the college's welfare. As early as October 1881 an editorial in the magazine presented the need for a large new building and asked why this could not be realized during the semicentennial in the following year. This same theme was repeated in succeeding issues and a trustee committee discussed the proposal. The problem was financial, and there were trustees who remembered the difficulties encountered in paying for the most recent buildings. The semicentennial came and went. It was a happy occasion, but it produced no building.

The president and faculty kept hammering away. Speaking to an alumni gathering in Philadelphia in January 1884, President Milton Valentine reviewed the accomplishments of the college over half a century and then changed directions: "I wish to speak of her wants and desires, and turn your attention from the honorable past to the earnest present and the larger future." Pennsylvania College, he insisted, does not exist in a world to herself. "The wonderful enlargement of the universities and colleges of our land in the last few years," he said, "should be a stirring and effective appeal to us." Finally, he warned, "college work is advancing all along the line, and Alma Mater must advance."7

As one speaker and writer after another began calling for action, there was remarkable agreement among them concerning what the college needed. It should have increased endowment, a larger faculty, and more funds for library and apparatus. But these needs could not be satisfied until there was a large new building and until the old building was converted into a dormitory.

---

7 Quoted in the Pennsylvania College Monthly, VIII (Mar. 1884), 41. Milton Valentine was president of the college from 1868 to 1884.
The campus as it looked when the college celebrated its semicentennial in 1882.

Judging from the arguments advanced between 1881 and 1886, the most important part of the hoped-for new building would be its library space, and the most important feature of at least part of that space would be its resistance to fire. President Valentine explained to the Philadelphia alumni in terms all of them could readily understand why the existing situation was undesirable:

And a continuance of the libraries, now numbering together over 20,000 volumes, the accumulation of over fifty-one years, many of the works of much value and difficult of replacement, in the main building, with fifty-four fires going day and night, and an almost equal number of lamps, involves a hazard too great to be thought of with quiet nerves. Surely the College may reasonably ask its alumni and friends to preserve and make safe, by such new hall, what alumni and friends have given.\(^8\)

It was also agreed that larger recitation rooms were needed than were possible in the old building, larger rooms for the two literary societies, a more churchly chapel, and a large hall which would accommodate all of the students.

\(^8\) Ibid., 42.
The college building figured prominently in all of these plans for the future. "The old building is inadequate to present needs," wrote George D. Stahley (1850-1939) in 1884. "It has served admirably in the past, and by remodeling, and in a new role, it can still serve admirably in the future." In its new role, he said, it will provide more comfortable quarters for students and will bring all of them onto the campus. Rooming in town, he argued, "is an undesirable practice, and materially interferes with that companionship, and mutual sympathy, which should always exist between students of the same class, and of the several classes." A physician in the state hospital in Harrisburg when he wrote this, Stahley joined the faculty in 1889 and was Professor of Biology for many years.

---

9 G. D. Stahley, "Our College — Its Needs," in ibid., VIII (Nov. 1884) 254.
Milton Valentine, who was reluctant to assume the presidency of the college in 1868, having turned down the first offer, resigned to join the seminary faculty in 1884. His successor, Harvey W. McKnight, was an alumnus (adjutant of Company A., 26th Regiment, in 1863), a Lutheran clergyman, and a trustee since 1878. Accepting as already demonstrated the needs of the college, he began visiting potential donors to determine what funds were available. In 1887, with still far less pledged than what was needed, he urged the trustees to act. In the fiftieth anniversary year of the College Edifice, they authorized (June 1887) the construction of a large new building to its west and south. The new structure, whose architecture would contrast sharply with that of its predecessor, was intended to include libraries, classrooms, offices, society rooms, and a chapel. When the cornerstone was laid in June 1888, Milton Valentine gave the address. He referred to the "chaste Doric edifice" which had long "furnished place and convenience" for the college program. But, he said, "the old place is too narrow for the greater work now given to the institution." Hence the need for a companion.10 Dedicated in September 1889 at a cost of about $86,000, the companion was called the New Recitation Hall or Recitation Hall until the name was changed to Glatfelter Hall in 1912. Thanks to an unexpected gift which came to the college at the time the new building was being planned, a separate chapel, Brue Chapel, was built in 1889-1890.

The impetus given by the decision to build led to the suggestion that other changes should be made in the college plant. Despite the fears of some that the trustees would be unwilling to commit themselves further — they had already undertaken by far the most expensive building program in the college's history — the board decided in January 1889 to enlarge Linnaean Hall and convert it into a gymnasium, to change McCreary Gymnasium into a chemistry laboratory, and to build a central steam heating plant for the entire campus. Also, in January 1889 the trustees authorized the building committee "to make such alterations in the present College building as in their judgment may be deemed necessary and desirable to fit it for the changed uses to which it will be directed upon the completion of the new building now in course of erection."

In more than half a century the College Edifice had taken a considerable beating, both by the elements and by what President Valentine called the "so many renters and renters of all classes." As he once explained, it had been

10 Quoted in ibid., XII (June 1888), 186.
“tormented by day and by night by the laborious investigations of enterprising young men into the possibilities of things.” On more than one occasion its interior and portico floors and steps had been renewed; its doors and windows replaced; interior walls, relocated; exterior walls and interior hallways, whitewashed; and woodwork, painted. The original shingle roof had been replaced with tin and the long wooden steps of the portico renewed. Yet these were in fact only the kinds of things one would expect to be done in order to keep a building of this type in repair. No one questioned the soundness of the structure or the continuing need for it.

The building committee soon discovered that its first renovation plans were too expensive to carry out. Accordingly, they abandoned their intention of making a large addition to the structure by extending the center wing to the north. Instead, they divided the building into three independent parts, separated by walls. For some thirty-five years thereafter these parts were called the east, middle, and west divisions. Within each, major changes were made with plaster and wood. Extensions to enclose stairways were added to both ends of the building. In an effort to minimize the danger of fire, concrete hallways were poured and all of the stairways were constructed of iron and brick. Cast iron steps with brick cheek walls topped by cast stone replaced the wooden steps of the portico. Work on the renovation began in June 1889. The building was to be ready for occupancy in September, but work fell behind schedule. The faculty delayed the start of the fall term for two weeks, but even then some students had to find temporary quarters in town. It was late October before the rooms in the middle division could be used. In response to a request in the Pennsylvania College Monthly for “appropriate and striking” names for the three parts of the building, someone suggested “Gentlemen’s Retreat” for the eastern division, “Devil’s Den” for the middle, and “Fools’ Gallery” for the western.

For between $15,000 and $20,000, about the original cost of the building, the college now had a dormitory of 86 rooms designed to house about 150 students. Many of these were able to live in suites with separate study and sleeping areas. In addition, the old chapel on the third floor was kept and was used by the YMCA. Space on the ground floor was reserved for the reading

---

11 Quoted in *ibid.*, VI (July 1882), 176.
12 *Star and Sentinel*, June 18, 1889.
13 *Pennsylvania College Monthly*, XIII (Nov. 1889), 276.
rooms of the literary societies, and for many years the college bookstore was located in the southwest corner rooms of that floor. The old college bell, which had done its duty in the building since 1848, was moved to the tower of Glatfelter Hall. A few years later, when it proved too small to be used with the clock in that tower, a much larger bell was given to the college. The “old familiar bell,” as it was described in the Pennsylvania College Monthly, was then put into storage and remained there until it was installed in the steeple of Christ Chapel in 1963.\(^\text{14}\)

For six years in a row beginning in 1887 college enrollment established new records, going from 116 in that year to 175 in 1892. Thus almost immediately the hopes that the old building could house all of the male students vanished. Although there was a subsequent sharp drop in enrollment reflecting the depression of the mid-nineties, the trustees in 1897 authorized the construction of two or more additional dormitory buildings. One, and only one, was built. Completed in 1898 and known as South College until 1916, and since as McKnight Hall, it was intended to accommodate about fifty students.

\(^{14}\text{Ibid., XVI (Oct. 1892), 213. See the poem written about this bell while it was hanging in the tower of Glatfelter Hall, in Joseph Arnold and George T. Heintz, eds., Gettysburg In Verse (Gettysburg, 1908), pp. 167-168.}\)
"It certainly should have some specific name, and we know of no other more appropriate than the one we suggest." (1886)

For fifty-two years, from 1837 to 1889, the house which John C. Trautwine designed so dominated the campus of Pennsylvania College that there was no serious need to give it a special name. Neither Linnaean nor Stevens, nor any of the other structures, necessary and valuable as they were, threatened the monopoly which it had established in the fall of 1837. It had a name which it shared with similar buildings all over the country: it was the College Edifice. Or, one would always be understood if he called it simply "the College," "the College building," "the main building," or "the principal building." But things changed dramatically in 1888 and 1889. What neither Linnaean nor Stevens could ever offer in the way of competition the new Recitation Hall, imposing both in size and mission, could and did, immediately. There was no longer a College Edifice. There were now edifices, and some means had to be found to distinguish between them in conversation and writing.
There is no evidence that the trustees concerned themselves with this matter. It was not so easy for the faculty who were responsible for the 1890 catalogue to pass it by. They hit upon the name "the old main building," but this did not stick. In the following year, they may have considered the question settled when they chose as a name "The Dormitory Hall," and matched it with "The Recitation Hall." But when a second dormitory was built in 1898, this hitherto happy solution proved to be no solution at all. Some other designation had to be found, and it was. In the catalogue for 1898 the name "Pennsylvania Hall" appears for the first time. It has since remained the formal catalogue name for the old house.

This choice could have come as no surprise to anyone closely familiar with the college in the decade or so preceding 1898, for it was during those years that the name was first used and gained considerable currency. For example, the first Spectrum, or college yearbook, was published in 1891. Its editors used Pennsylvania Hall as the caption for a photograph of the building and their successors followed this precedent.

The earliest occurrence of the name which this writer has found was in the October 1886 number of the Pennsylvania College Monthly. Less than a year before the decision to construct Glatfelter Hall was made, the editors of the Monthly were still presenting the need for a new building "so that Pennsylvania Hall may be used wholly as a dormitory."\(^1\) Two months later, in the December issue, in an unsigned editorial probably written by Philip M. Bikle, the case for this name is made in a convincing manner:

We have said above that we think the main building should be called Pennsylvania Hall. It certainly should have some specific name, and we know of no other more appropriate than the one we suggest. The College bears the name of our State, and as most of the money for erecting the main building was contributed by the State, there is special propriety in having it bear the name of the State. We have a Linnaean Hall, Stevens' Hall, McCreary Hall or Gymnasium; let there be also a Pennsylvania Hall, and let the building erected chiefly with the State's money bear that name.\(^2\)

---

1 *Pennsylvania College Monthly*, X (Oct. 1886), 218.
After 1886 the editors of the *Monthly* continued to use the name Pennsylvania Hall. Within a few years the local newspapers began picking it up, and others as well.

The more informal name by which the building is known does not appear in print until later, although it may have been used in conversation for a long time. The 1907 *Spectrum* features a photograph of “Old Penn” by moonlight. The 1908 *Spectrum* refers to “Pennsylvania Hall (The Old Dorm).” In 1909 the *Spectrum* staff placed pictures of the two dormitories on opposite, facing pages, labeling one “Old Dorm” and the other “New Dorm.” Within a short time the name “Old Dorm” or “Old Dormitory” began appearing in the *Gettysburgian* (the student newspaper), the president’s reports, and elsewhere.³ It did not enter the catalogue, however, until 1936.

---

³ The building is identified as “The Old Dorm” in the frontispiece of Joseph Arnold and George T. Heintz, eds., *Gettysburg In Verse* (Gettysburg, 1908).
One of the few photographs of the interior of a room for students. About 1898.

The YMCA room on the south side, third floor of the center part of Old Dorm. About 1910.
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"the building had not lost its eminence in the hearts of those who rejoice to call Gettysburg College their alma mater." (1937)

Between the fall of 1889 and the spring of 1968 Old Dorm served Gettysburg College as a dormitory for men. During most of those years, between 100 and 150 students lived there. Although at times most of them were freshmen, more often they were fairly evenly divided among all four classes. On two occasions Old Dorm housed young men in uniform: soldiers in World War I and airmen in World War II. Some space was usually reserved for other than dormitory purposes. The reading rooms for the literary societies remained until about 1920. The YMCA hall was converted into dormitory space a few years later. On the ground floor, the college bookstore held on until 1939, when it was moved into a new building. After World War II, Old Dorm housed several faculty and administrative offices, a classroom or two, and storage space.

According to the standards of 1889, Old Dorm was up-to-date when the renovation occurred, but the availability of new conveniences and normal wear and tear assured that incessant rounds of repairs and renovations would be called for. Steam heat from the central heating plant was introduced in 1889. While this was a decided improvement which undoubtedly quieted the nerves of former President Valentine, some years were to pass before the system worked effectively. Students complained that the radiators did everything but radiate. One student observed that, while they might not be good for anything else, they were excellent for cracking nuts. An alumnus who took a room on the fourth floor of Old Dorm as a freshman in the fall of 1900 remembers that, even then, he was not always able to keep himself warm in cold weather.¹

Bathing and toilet facilities were installed gradually. In 1889 the college ran the pipes of its own water system into the ground floor of Old Dorm, giving it running water inside for the first time in its history. By 1906 there were showers and toilets on the ground floor, and by 1913 these facilities had been extended. The 1919-1920 catalogue stated that "sinks with running water are

¹ Interview with Dr. Abdel R. Wentz, Sept. 15, 1970.
located on every floor, and on the first, second, and third floors are complete lavatories with hot and cold water.” In 1912 the class of 1907 contributed to the college for having both Old Dorm and McKnight Hall wired for electricity. For years thereafter an additional charge was made for each “forty watt tungsten lamp bulb” which the student used in his room. Ten cents per week in 1912, this charge had increased to eighteen cents by 1920. It would be interesting to know how many alumni may still owe the college for the second lamp they whipped out or for the sixty-watt which they slipped in while the proctor was not looking. The extra charge for electricity was not dropped until after 1942, when one eighty-watt bulb cost $10 per year.

**Old Dorm before 1937**

*One of the few pictures showing Old Dorm without the north portico.*
The major internal renovation between 1889 and 1968 was undertaken during the summer of 1925, after the trustees decided (December 1924) that conditions in the building had reached the point at which “complete remodeling of the interior” was needed. Once again floors, stairs, and doors were replaced. The building was painted and its rooms were papered. The cost of the work done was about $13,000. It was at this time that the distinction which had been made among the divisions of the building since 1889 disappear from the catalogue. The hallway walls which divided the building into three sections had been removed some years before.

The exterior of Old Dorm was considerably changed by the addition of a north portico in 1937. This project had been discussed for more than twenty years, first as campus planning foresaw buildings north of Old Dorm and later as construction placed them there. Weidensall Hall was built in 1922; Breidenbaugh Hall and Eddie Plank Memorial Gymnasium followed in 1927. From the beginning of his administration Henry W. A. Hanson (1882-1962), who was president from 1923 to 1952, urged the construction of the portico. Eventually in 1936 the Alumni Association made its achievement their goal. Beachem Memorial Portico was dedicated on June 5, 1937. It was named after the popular first general secretary of the Alumni Association, Charles W. Beachem (1902-1937), who died while the project was being completed. The cost was about $14,000. On several occasions after 1937, college commencements were held from the new north portico.

In his address at the dedication, Milton H. Valentine (1864-1947), son of the former president and Professor Emeritus of English Bible, acknowledged that after many years during which Old Dorm “dominated, as was meant it should, the whole campus scene,” the time had come when “its old dominance of the entire scene was gone.” Yet, he continued,

there was this notable fact in the sphere of the invisible — the building had not lost its eminence in the hearts of those who rejoice to call Gettysburg College their alma mater. It was, in fact, the only one known and familiar to everyone who had ever studied here, both the living and the dead — as well known and familiar to the students of a hundred years ago as to the students of today, and of all the generations between.2

---

In 1937, and for more than a decade thereafter, Old Dorm was still known and familiar to most Gettysburg students in a very intimate way. All of those before 1889 had their classes in the building, and the great majority had lived there for at least one year. More than a few of them were accustomed to making little distinction between the institution and the building which housed it; both were thought of as "the College". After 1889, and up to 1937, most of the male students still spent at least one year in Old Dorm. During this same period (save for a few years in the 1930's) there were also women students enrolled as degree candidates. Except for appearing on the steps of Old Dorm to have their pictures taken with the rest of their class or patronizing the bookstore, they had no direct contact with the building. The coeds, who were a small fraction of the student body at this time, were the first group of students in the history of the college who did not regularly pass in and out of the portals of Old Dorm.

In his address, Professor Valentine asserted that the educational ideals that were the unseen creative force that reared this building a hundred years ago, and of which it was the concrete representative, have been preserved inviolate through the century and are the same forces that have gathered around this "Old Dorm" as nucleus, all that here greets the eye today.3

3 Ibid.
The front yard of Old Dorm was the center of things during the big battle anniversary celebration of 1913. Around Gov. John K. Tener (13) and members of the Pennsylvania Commission were his "distinguished guests," including six fellow-governors and representatives from about twenty other states. Pres. Granville (1) was also included in the picture.

Certainly many of the educational ideals of 1832 or 1837 were still as firmly held a century later. Yet by 1937 the ideal of the well-regulated family had undergone such marked change as to be scarcely recognizable. A student body of more than 500 went about its business on a greatly expanded campus, with a dozen buildings instead of one. And, although the image of the family was still used by college officials to describe the ideal campus situation for which they were striving, the code of conduct allowed students much greater freedom than before. The freshman of 1937 could visit his father without let or hindrance, though if he cut classes beyond certain limits to do it, hours would be added to his graduation requirements.

Because of its association with the battle of Gettysburg, there have been many occasions on which people have visited Old Dorm and several on which its facilities have been used during anniversary celebrations. In 1888, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the battle, Governor James A. Beaver of Pennsylvania and his staff had their headquarters in a tent on the campus. The celebration coincided with college commencement and the cornerstone laying of Glatfelter Hall, in the latter of which the governor participated. Some of the Confederate veterans who attended the reunion visited Old Dorm where they had been confined as patients a quarter century earlier.⁴

---

⁴ Gettysburg Compiler, July 3, 1888.
As the fiftieth anniversary approached in 1913, the college offered to make its facilities available to the state and federal governments. Between June 29 and July 6 the Pennsylvania Commission in charge of the celebration made its headquarters in a tent on the campus south of Old Dorm, where Governor John K. Tener and the chairman of the commission formally received specially invited guests. Some 527 of these were housed in the dormitories of the college and seminary, including of course Old Dorm.\(^5\)

On May 29, 1932, as part of the centennial celebration of Gettysburg College, the United States War Department presented a bronze tablet, which was placed on the south portico of Old Dorm. A son of the last surviving student member of Company A, 26th Regiment, unveiled the tablet during brief ceremonies. The inscription reads as follows:

U.S.A.

This building served as a Union signal station June 30, July 1, and July 4, 1863, and as a hospital for the care of both Union and Confederate wounded July 1 and for some weeks thereafter.

In 1938, on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle, federal and state authorities joined together again, this time to celebrate what it was frankly recognized would be the last great reunion of the Blue and Gray. Again the college offered the use of its facilities, and once more the offer was accepted. On this occasion, Old Dorm was returned to the function it had performed in 1863. In and around the building a regimental hospital of approximately 140 beds was set up. This was designed to care for veterans, almost all of whom were now in their nineties, and for certain others who might need medical treatment.\(^6\)

The centennial celebration of the battle of Gettysburg, lacking any survivors of the struggle itself, took a form different from the earlier observances. Old Dorm did not figure in the celebration, but on June 29, 1961, in brief ceremonies at the north portico, the college observed the 100th anniversary of the first raising of the thirty-four star flag over the building.\(^7\)

\(^{7}\) Gettysburg Times, June 30, 1961.
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"The building had ceased to be any longer a mere building. It had become a symbol, a visible embodiment of the whole life and spirit of the College." (1937)

College graduates, like other people, use their memories to make their lives easier and more rewarding, and sometimes simply more bearable. Over the years they may put together a recollection of college days in which the elements of truth are highly varnished, although even in that condition they may serve their intended purpose quite well. However accurate they are, these recollections may be scattered, or they may tend to focus upon former teachers or fellow-students; classes, societies, or fraternities; or a building which somehow symbolizes the institution.

In 1937, at the dedication of the Memorial Portico, Professor Valentine argued that, for many alumni of Gettysburg College, there was a focus for their memories. It was the old white building: somehow around it their affections had clustered. All that had made their college life memorable to them, all their fond associations with it, all the enduring friendships here formed and cemented, all their dear inextinguishable recollections of it had in some way woven themselves into a single fabric of memories in which this "Old Dorm," as it had come affectionately to be called, stood out like the central figure in some old and precious tapestry. The building had ceased to be any longer a mere building. It had become a symbol, a visible embodiment of the whole life and spirit of the College.¹

The "inextinguishable recollections" of Old Dorm to which the old professor referred fall into two neat categories: those activities which the faculty approved and those which it did not. Among the former were such things as studying; making new friends; singing on the steps of the south portico at dusk on spring evenings; and picturetaking, for which the steps of Old Dorm were long a favorite spot. The latter list is much, much longer. It includes

One of the first aerial views of the campus, showing Old Dorm. Taken in 1925.
such things as rolling cannonballs through the hallways, sometimes using balls that were heated for the special delight of the proctors who picked them up; setting off an explosion in class one day, which shook the building violently, and then wondering why it had not gone off rather harmlessly, like your friend's effort a few days earlier; locking in the belfry a group of visitors who had been especially nosy in their tour through the building, and making them wait for several hours until someone picked the lead out of the keyhole of the belfry door; starting fires in the dark corners of the hallways; starting fires in wastebaskets, and then rolling them down the stairways; dumping bags of water (and not only water) on passersby; littering the ground around the building with all kinds of paraphernalia; shooting mark from the north side; concealing certain persons not authorized to be in the building; and dragging a cow into the cupola, with fatal results for the cow. This list is by no means complete, as many alumni can testify, and perhaps should not be documented. ²

There were certain things about Old Dorm beyond these recollections which fitted it for the role of college symbol. With each passing year it became more properly ancient. It had a charm, which was evident even if almost everyone who tried to describe it did so in subdued terms. It failed to burn down. And — this is quite important — it was planted on a spot from which the college could expand and grow as its needs changed. Finally, for all students of the college, male or female, whether or not they ever ventured into the building at all, Old Dorm could be a symbol of the institution because of its continuing association with the events of July 1863. As many local observers, including Michael Jacobs, sensed it would, the Gettysburg battlefield began to attract visitors from the time the smoke started to clear, and they have been coming ever since. As we have seen, already in July 1863 the college began to identify itself with the battle and with the victory for Union arms. Although the means of identification have changed frequently over the years, the association itself has remained. The authentic and durable link between the college and the battle has been the old building in which, under the flag of mercy, men tried to wrest life from the jaws of death.

² Perhaps somewhere between those activities which the faculty approved and those they did not was the use of the south portico of Old Dorm as the location of the "tribunal," which in the 1930's and early 1940's meted out "justice" to freshmen found guilty of violating college customs.
"We cannot understand why the flag is not allowed to float every day, especially in a town of such military interest as Gettysburg."

(1895)

For many years there has been a daily reminder of Old Dorm's special role in the battle of Gettysburg: the American flag flying over the cupola, day and night, in fair weather and foul. Long ago, the "word" as it is passed from one college generation to another, sometimes aided and abetted by college authority, began to refer confidently, although always quite vaguely, to an act of Congress which had authorized this gesture of remembrance. A frequent assumption was that this was the only place, or about the only place, in the country where this departure from the usual practice of raising the flag at sunrise and lowering it at sunset was permitted. There was no explanation of why this or similar acts of Congress did not sanction continuous flying of the flag over Old Dorm at the seminary or, for that matter, over countless other buildings used as hospitals in areas where the Blue and Gray fought against each other.

The fact is that the United States Congress passed no legislation defining what is to be considered proper civilian display of the American flag until 1942. On December 22 of that year President Franklin D. Roosevelt approved a joint resolution containing a code of recommended flag use and display. Its provisions were based almost entirely upon those of a code adopted by the National Flag Conference which met in Washington in June 1923. Called by President Warren G. Harding, this conference was organized by a committee of the American Legion and was attended by representatives of about seventy organizations.

As adopted in 1923 and reaffirmed in 1942, the flag code states that "it is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open" and, further, that "the flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement." But there is

---

a qualification: “However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions where it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.” The interpretation of what constitutes “special occasions” or what is “a patriotic effect” is left to the judgment of those who wish to display the flag. To some, these terms are sanction for leaving it flying.

In recent years the General Reference and Bibliography Division of the Library of Congress has maintained a list of places which have reported continuous, day-and-night flying of the flag. At the time of this writing (August 1970) there are twenty-one places on the list, including Pennsylvania Hall, Gettysburg College. Of these, two (Flag House Square in Baltimore and Battle Green at Lexington) have been authorized by Congressional action and two (Fort McHenry in Baltimore and the Marine Corps Memorial at Arlington) by Presidential proclamation. Of the remaining seventeen, some fly the flag continuously by long-established custom and others by interpretation of the 1942 flag code. Old Dorm belongs with the former group. Its flag flies by long-established custom.

The national colors have flown over Old Dorm for a long time. As we have already seen, a thirty-four star flag was raised over the building in June 1861 and it probably continued to fly there regularly during the war. Earlier in the same month, on a form letter which President Baugher sent to parents, there is an engraving of Old Dorm which shows a very large flag. This may mean that flying the colors had been a regular practice for some time; one cannot be sure. After the war, as photographs abundantly show, the custom fell into disuse, although the flag staff remained and it may well have been used on certain patriotic occasions.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 161.
\(^4\) Two careful works on the history and use of the flag, both written before 1966, contained lists of places where the flag is flown day and night. Neither list included Old Dorm. See James A. Moss, The Flag of the United States: Its History and Symbolism (3rd ed., Washington, 1941), pp. 203-204, and Milo M. Quaife, Melvin J. Weig, and Roy E. Appleman, The History of the United States Flag, p. 168. Old Dorm was placed on the Library of Congress list as a result of correspondence initiated by that agency in 1966 with Pres. C. A. Hanson of Gettysburg College.
\(^5\) Henry L. Baugher to the parents of students, June 11, 1861. Gettysburg College Archives.
\(^6\) On the night of October 22, 1878 a storm “carried away the tall flag staff that surmounted the cupola of the College building.” Pennsylvania College Monthly, II (Nov. 1878), 292.
In 1894 someone in the college persuaded the students to contribute to a fund to be used to buy two flags, one to be flown over Old Dorm in good weather and the other in bad. But instead of flying them every day, the janitor displayed them only on national holidays. Disappointed, several students climbed to the cupola one night and raised the flag, only to find it down again in the morning. An editorial note in the College Mercury for June 1895 explained how students felt about the whole affair:

We cannot understand why the flag is not allowed to float every day, especially in a town of such military interest as Gettysburg. The only reason we can think of is the trouble which would necessarily be involved. But this should have been thought of before the students were asked to buy the flags.

When the idea was first mentioned, all were in favor of it, and now since we have the flags we think they should be used as they were first intended.  

Beyond the year 1895 we can begin to draw upon the memories of living persons, and we can continue to rely upon the evidence of photographs, at least those which can be dated. In an effort to determine when the practice of flying the colors continuously over Old Dorm began, this writer has talked to or written to more than a dozen persons who had some association with the college between 1900 and 1920. No one of the former students in this group can remember either the flag flying continuously while he was on campus or — significantly — that the Old Dorm flag tradition which many later alumni so vividly remember even existed at this time.

The testimony of Joe L. Carver on this subject is detailed and definite. Mr. Carver began a long tenure as college janitor on April 1, 1913. He states that one of his predecessors who was still living in town subsequently told him that a flag was to be flown over Old Dorm at all times. He remembers no conversations on this matter at any time with the men who were president and dean at the time he was hired. But he does recall very definitely being instructed in later years by President Henry W. A. Hanson (1923-1952) to keep himself supplied with flags so that he could promptly replace those which had worn out.

7 *The College Mercury*, III (Jun. 1895), 56.
Most pictures of Old Dorm taken just before and after 1900 show no flag flying, although a staff is very much in evidence. There are photographs taken by daylight after 1913 which do not show a flag. There may have been periods after that time when, for one reason or another, none was available. It becomes increasingly difficult, however, to find photographs of Old Dorm without the flag as one gets into the 1920's. Dean Emeritus Wilbur E. Tilberg, who served the college from 1927 to 1955, reports that the practice of flying the colors day and night was an established fact by the time he assumed his position in 1927. He also remembers during his tenure the development and refinement of the tradition.⁹ It is possible that the Old Dorm flag practice was begun years ago by a janitor, perhaps one who found the daily routine of raising and lowering the colors too irksome, and that the tradition followed at a considerably later date.

For many years the flag over Old Dorm was a current one, of forty-eight, forty-nine, or fifty stars. In 1961, after the thirty-four star flag was raised over the building during the Civil War centennial celebration, the college quietly continued using one which was current when the battle of Gettysburg took place.

⁹ Interview with Dean Emeritus Wilbur E. Tilberg, Aug. 29, 1970.
IT IS CLEAR THAT BEFORE 1889 it was extremely difficult to avoid making a close and intimate identification of Old Dorm and Gettysburg College with each other. After 1889 the story is different. In the 1890's the college was proud of its new Glatfelter Hall, Brua Chapel, and McKnight Hall. The older building now had stiff competition. In its catalogues and other promotional literature, such as view books, the college tended to give these four buildings about equal treatment. The judgment of the student editors of the *Spectrum* produced similar results. In none of the publications of this period is there much evidence at all of any particular sentiment for Old Dorm or of any desire to use it to promote nostalgia.

The first significant evidence of a change in attitude toward the building dates from about the time when the name “Old Dorm” first appears in the records. The 1907 *Spectrum* has a picture of “Old Penn by Moonlight.” Similar photographs taken at night appear in succeeding issues, and there are pictures showing Old Dorm bedecked from cupola to basement with strings of a thousand lights for a presidential inauguration in 1910. It was about this time when people began recalling the former custom of singing on the steps of Old Dorm at dusk and when students made an attempt to revive the practice. In the 1908 *Spectrum* there is a poem about “The Old Dorm in the Moonlight,” written by a member of the class of 1906. Later set to music, this was for many years one of the college songs which freshmen were supposed to learn. Another poem, entitled simply “The Old Dorm,” author unidentified, appears in the 1914 *Spectrum* and a third one, in the following year. There are poems about other campus buildings in the 1914 issue, but none with the seriousness evident in “The Old Dorm.”

This expression of sentiment was given a boost by President William A. Granville (1863-1943) during the early years of his administration (1910-1923).
THE OLD DORM IN THE MOONLIGHT

Have you seen the Old Dorm shining in the moonlight;  
And the silver softly sifting through the trees?  
Have you heard the fellows singing on the Dorm steps;  
And the mandolins a'tinkle in the breeze?

Ah, fellows, on the campus in the moonlight  
You can hear the sweetest music ever sung,  
And see beauties that surpass the Grecian sculpture,  
Whose praises in our ears have ever rung.

And fellows, do you ever stop to listen,  
When they play the mandolins upon the steps?  
Does your better nature swell and sway within you;  
Do the songs of this old College stir its depths?

Do you ever watch the Old Dorm in the evening,  
When the lights begin to flash out one by one,  
Like the eastern stars burn out upon the heavens,  
Upon the glorious setting of the sun?

And when the lights have dropped away at midnight,  
And the moonlight sheds its brightness over all;  
Do you ever stand and gaze in silent rapture  
At the grandeur of this old and noble hall?

Ah, fellows, how we love this old white building  
With its mighty columns, beautiful and strong,  
With its memories, haunting every nook and corner;  
It has been our second home place for so long.

Too soon we'll leave this grand and noble College,  
And leave behind this long familiar hall,  
But the picture that we'll always carry with us  
Is the Old Dorm and the moonlight over all.

— Wellington Roe Emmert, Class of 1906
At his prompting, the trustees in December 1913 appointed a committee to make a plan for the future development of the college. They were asked “to propose a comprehensive and harmonious scheme for utilizing all the land now owned by the College . . . for future building sites and campus purposes.” In his report the following June, by which time the plan had been drawn, President Granville described the place of Old Dorm in the “comprehensive and harmonious scheme.”
It will . . . be noticed that the "Old Dorm" faces the new campus as well as the present one, the idea being to eventually add a portico fronting north similar to the one facing south. In other words, the "Old Dorm" will be the central feature of the completed plans, a prominence which it richly deserves both because of its classic beauty and because of its historic importance. The Board has wisely ordered that as far as practicable the Doric style of architecture of the "Old Dorm" should be followed in designing new buildings.¹

Plans have a way of evaporating as unanticipated new situations arise. These plans were pushed aside, in part at least by World War I, after which the college’s development program took different directions than earlier projected. As we have seen, the north portico of Old Dorm did at last become a reality, and in his dedicatory address Professor Valentine reiterated the theme of President Granville about a quarter century before:

What we are doing today . . . is nothing more and nothing less than a visible restoration of this “Old Dorm” to its ancient primacy. For this portico is simply sign language, a physical and material vocabulary employed to express and proclaim a truth of the spirit viz the enduring central place of this time honored edifice in the life of the College and in the hearts of its sons and daughters. Never again will it stand with back turned to half the campus and its buildings. Never again will it look down, as in benediction, on only a part of the developing history of the College as it is written on the College landscape. Henceforth, like double-faced Janus, Roman god of avenues and gates, it will face both ways, and all the history and all of the College plant, the later and the latest equally with the earlier and the earliest, will again and evermore lie under its benignant smile.²

Yet the weight of the evidence points to this expression by Professor Valentine in 1937 as being the goal still to be reached rather than the achievement already won. For example, the Alma Mater sung at the dedication was a song written in 1922. It passes over Old Dorm entirely and refers to only one

---


college building by name — the chapel — and to its “worn walls” — which when the song was written were only thirty-two years old! A further bit of evidence is taken from a statement in the alumni bulletin in 1931, describing a series of memorial plates featuring various campus buildings:

To Gettysburgians, Old Dorm symbolizes the traditions and the social life of the college; Glatfelter Hall represents the intellectual training; the Plank Gym is symbolic of the physical development; and the Weidensall Y.M.C.A. is emblematic of the spiritual values taught.³

Here, it might be argued, Old Dorm, even if not accorded rank as the symbol of Gettysburg, is at least given the position of first among equals. Further, if she is the keeper of the traditions, she is in an enviable position indeed. Enviable or not, it reminds one of the predicament of the poor sinner in the gospel song, “Almost Persuaded.” The position was perfectly described in a third bit of evidence, again from the alumni bulletin. Discussing the north portico which was about to be built, the writer put the matter succinctly: “This historic Old Dorm, almost the symbol of Gettysburg College.”⁴

---

³ Ibid., XXI (Dec. 1931), 2.
⁴ Ibid., XXVI (Dec. 1936), 2.
THE "OLD DORM"

Impressive it stands like a castle, simple in style and in structure;
Towering up to the skies, like a snow-clad mountain in winter;
Staunch as a rock of firm base, through four score years well enduring
The onslaughts of tempest and gale; the fury of battle raged round it;
Rich in tradition and story, witness of pain and of pleasure,
Witness of scenes that are written deep in the hearts of our people.
In time of war from its tower, a general directed his army
On to the blood-stained field, where destiny welded our nation.
Through its halls the shrieks of the wounded, placed there for comfort and safety,
Mingled with groans of the dying, resounded ere battle was ended.
Long since, those scenes have faded, and may they be faded forever;
May honor and reverence be shown to this stately old home of our school days.

The poem above, which appeared in the 1914 Spectrum, and the one below, from the 1915 Spectrum, illustrate an important stage in the development of Old Dorm as the symbol of the college.

THE "OLD DORM"

The "Old Dorm" stands in the moonlight
Like a ghost of the days gone by,
Who guards o'er the sacred campus,
Where the soldier spirits lie.

She speaks of the cry of anguish,
Of the calm of the dying brave,
Of the tramp of the gray clad general
And the gray-clad men he gave.

Yes, her steps may still be blood-stained
And worn, where the soldiers trod,
And her walls may still be echoing
Their cry to a deafened God.

But there's peace in her solemn grandeur
As she stands in the moonlight glow,
And she stands but for sacred memories,
For men who still come and go.
Aerial view of part of the campus in the 1970’s.
XVI

"Gettysburg College is fortunate in having preserved its original building; perhaps even more fortunate that this symbol of its early days is a worthy piece of architecture." (1965)

When World War II ended in 1945 enrollment quickly doubled as Gettysburg College made a special effort to provide educational opportunities for returning veterans. Although many assumed that once these men had completed their training the size of the college would revert to its prewar levels, and that the college would remain small according to prewar standards, this did not happen. Year after year Old Dorm and McKnight Hall were fully occupied as most of the male students found quarters in fraternity houses, in town, or in temporary barracks on the campus. The word "temporary" can be used to describe these latter only if it can be stretched to mean something which lasted more than ten years.

Once the college decided that it wanted an enrollment of about 1200 students, it began a building program which in time dwarfed those of any previous period in its history. Not surprisingly, as this program developed, ideas about the desired size of the student body were further altered. Enrollment began increasing in the mid-fifties and continued upward until the decision was made in 1962 to hold it at an annual average of about 1800 students.

The postwar building boom produced Christ Chapel (1953), the Dining Hall (1958), the Student Union Building (1959), the Sieber-Fisher Infirmary (1960), Masters’ Hall (1961), the Henry T. Bream Physical Education Building (1962), Musselman Stadium (1965), and McCreary Hall (1969), as well as additions to or major renovations of other structures. Also, seven new dormitories were built. Stine (1956), Rice (1957), Paul (1957), and Apple (1959) Halls were for men students. Hanson (1950), Emma G. Musselman (1958), and Patrick (1958) Halls were for women.

The contrast between the newer and older men’s dormitories was striking. The differences were accentuated by the fact that during the period of strenuous building the college had been able to do little more than provide minimum maintenance for Old Dorm and McKnight Hall. Partly because the room rents
were lower, and partly because some students simply preferred living in the old buildings, the college had little or no difficulty in renting space in these two dormitories. How long this situation might continue was difficult to predict. Furthermore, although Old Dorm could perhaps be used with modest repairs for a long time, at some point a major decision about its future would almost certainly have to be made. At many places the exterior walls of the building were showing unmistakable and possibly dangerous signs of strain and wear. Internally there had been no renovation of any consequence since 1925, and the least one could say was that the facilities were outmoded. If Old Dorm were almost, or altogether, the symbol of Gettysburg College, obviously it was an increasingly decrepit one.

There were a number of things which could be done with Old Dorm. One available option was to tear it down and replace it with another building or possibly even with grass. This course of action seemed most sensible to those who believed that there were so many things wrong with the building that the cost of bringing it into a state of good repair would be prohibitive, given the many other pressing needs of the college. They pointed to the soft brick, badly weathered mortar joints, and deep cracks between the windows. Inside, they argued, walls, heating facilities, and much else would need to be replaced.

Another option was to tear the building down and construct a reasonably exact facsimile in its place. This possibility appealed to those who accepted the thesis that renovation of the building would be excessively expensive, but who at the same time frankly regarded Old Dorm as the symbol of the college which should not be destroyed. This course of action, they argued, would keep the symbol and yet give the college a modern building for whatever uses seemed most appropriate. A third option available was to remove the interior of Old Dorm; shore up the walls in one way or another, repairing them wherever necessary; and then rebuild the interior, again for whatever uses seemed appropriate. This option appealed to those who placed a high value on the historical and sentimental character of Old Dorm. They believed that, while there were a number of uses to which the building might be put without interfering with its symbolic value, the very walls which had stood since 1837 should continue to stand. As Professor Valentine had observed when the north portico was dedicated, these walls were about the only tangible thing Gettysburgians past and present had in common.
There was a related question about the future of the site which had to be answered. To what uses should Old Dorm or a successor building be put? Here again there were a number of possibilities. Least consideration was given to the idea of continuing to use it as a dormitory, especially after 1959-1960, when McKnight Hall was converted into a classroom-office building. Clearly, the campus residential area was now located to the north of Old Dorm. A second possibility was to repeat what had been done in the case of McKnight Hall, turning its older sister into a classroom-office building too. There was no question about the continuing need of more space for these purposes, especially for faculty offices. A third possibility was to bring together in Old Dorm all, or almost all, of the college administrative officers, who were scattered over the campus in about half a dozen different places. This was reminiscent of the goal of Henry W. A. Hanson in the 1930's. He wanted to move a much smaller administration into Linnaean Hall. A fourth possibility was to make more than one use of Old Dorm, with classrooms and offices for both faculty and administrators.

Preliminary and informal discussions about the future of the building were in progress when the college celebrated its 125th anniversary in 1957. The major feature of that observance was a Civil War Conference, to which were invited some of the nation's most productive scholars interested in the Civil War and post-Civil War periods. Repeated annually through 1961, these conferences at one time or another attracted to the campus most of the leading Civil War scholars in the country. They also provided another means for identification of the college with the war and the issues over which it was fought. As a result of this activity, there was a persistent suggestion that space in Old Dorm, whatever its major uses might become, should be reserved for a Civil War Institute or, failing that, for a museum and library of Civil War items. At the same time, it was agreed that items related to the history of the college also should be displayed in the building.

Willard Stewart Paul (1894-1966) was president of the college from 1956 to 1961. It was during his administration that serious discussions of the future of Old Dorm began. When a development program was inaugurated in the spring of 1959, its announced purpose was to meet what were described as four critical needs of the college: renovation of Old Dorm and McKnight Hall, and construction of a new physical education building and a new infirmary.
"Two of the College’s most beloved landmarks, Old Dorm and McKnight Hall, have reached the point where only complete renovation can save them,” the development brochure stated. “Their loss, particularly in the case of Old Dorm (a Civil War shrine and the very symbol of the College), is a loss which must not occur.”\(^1\) Old Dorm was to be rebuilt in order to house the administration, the Department of Art, and a Civil War Institute and museum. Although the dollar goals of this fund-raising effort were met, the proceeds did not permit work to begin on all of the projects intended. Old Dorm was the one scratched from the list.

As the aging structure continued to deteriorate, consideration of its future was taken up again in the administration of C. A. Hanson, who became president of the college in 1961. One of the first significant decisions came in 1962, when the administration resumed a moderate level of maintenance of the building. The exterior and major portions of the interior were given fresh coats of whitewash or paint.

Extensive discussions which occurred in the administrative staff during the summer of 1963 led to the conclusion that an effort should be made to restore Old Dorm and that the building should be planned as an administrative center. When these conclusions were presented as recommendations to the trustees in December 1963, they authorized the organization of an effort to raise the necessary funds for restoration. At the moment no one could be sure how much this would cost, although estimates ranged from $600,000 to $1,000,000.

Since at this time the college was engaged in planning for several other capital improvements, including a life sciences building, attention was again diverted from Old Dorm. Then in the fall of 1965, the property committee of the board of trustees, agreeing with the conclusion reached earlier that Old Dorm should become an administrative center, urged the president to secure the services of a qualified architect to examine the building and, if he concluded that restoration was wise, to draw up preliminary plans for its use as an administrative center. In September 1965 the college secured the services of G. Edwin Brumbaugh, Gwynedd Valley, Pennsylvania. An architect with wide experience in preserving historic buildings, Mr. Brumbaugh had planned restoration of some of the old structures at Valley Forge, Washington Crossing

\(^1\)“An Even Brighter Day: A Statement from the Board of Trustees of Gettysburg College,” May 1959, p. 8.
State Park, and the Ephrata Cloister, as well as three Greek Revival buildings. After a preliminary examination of Old Dorm, he presented a report in which he explained his reasons for recommending that it be saved:

Gettysburg College is fortunate in having preserved its original building; perhaps even more fortunate that this symbol of its early days is a worthy piece of architecture. The first structures at our Colleges are not always worthy of anything beyond nostalgic esteem. On the other hand, many schools, Princeton, Yale, Harvard, Dartmouth, to name just a few, do have, in their oldest buildings, well-designed representatives of early American architecture. And they are cherishing and preserving them.

Gettysburg’s Pennsylvania Hall, or “Old Dorm,” as it is affectionately called, is an unusually dignified and effective example of the American Greek Revival. This architectural style, . . . may properly be described as our earliest national architecture. . . .

Greek architecture was dignified, simple, easy to build, sparse in ornamentation, but large in scale and impressive in over-all effect, a perfect portrayal of national thinking. This is the significance of “Old Dorm.” Its character still reflects the essentials of basic Americanism. Even if it were in dilapidated condition, it would be worth restoring, but, fortunately, evidences of structural weakness are not alarming or critical.²

Using the findings and conclusions of the architect together with other information, the college promptly began seeking financial support. In 1966 gifts of $50,000 each from the Richard King Mellon Foundation and from John A. Apple, member and former chairman of the board of trustees, provided the impetus for two important decisions which the trustees made in September 1966. One was to commit the college to proceed with the restoration of Old Dorm. The other was to refine plans to raise funds for the work. Shortly thereafter, the architectural firm of G. Edwin Brumbaugh and Albert F. Ruthrauff was retained to begin preparing preliminary plans for the building.

During much of the year 1967 architects and college administrators were engaged in discussing and revising proposals for putting the available space to best use. Late in the year the architects were asked to prepare final plans and specifications on which estimates and subsequently bids could be secured.

This latest round of discussions concerning the future of Old Dorm had been carried on in a period of continuing inflation. Thus the estimates received indicated that the cost of restoration would be between fifteen and twenty per cent greater than would have been the case had the project been undertaken three or four years earlier. To delay longer would probably mean an even greater cost. As it turned out, 1968 was the year of final decisions. At the end of the spring term Old Dorm was withdrawn from use as a dormitory. In September the board of trustees approved the final plans of the architects and authorized the president to enter into a contract with R. S. Noonan, Inc., York, Pennsylvania. The amount of the contract was $1,042,380.

Work on the restoration of Pennsylvania Hall began on Monday, January 6, 1969. The entire interior of 1836-1838, as renovated in 1859-1860 and again in 1889, was carefully removed by means of an intricate engineering operation designed to keep exterior walls, roof, and cupola stabilized. While this operation was in progress, it was discovered that the cupola had been perching on top of the building since 1837, without ever being fastened to it. Although this was a good experience record — 132 years — it was decided not to tempt fate further. The cupola was attached. Next, securely based steel columns and girders were installed. Together with the exterior walls they support five reinforced concrete slabs, one for each floor and one for the ceiling of the fourth floor.

As for the exterior, the extensions added in 1889 were retained. The wood rafters were left intact, as was the roof. The exterior walls were found to be in somewhat better condition than many had feared they would be. Where it was necessary, sections of the walls were rebuilt. The newly installed grid of steel columns and girders, and the reinforced concrete floors, greatly strengthened the walls. All new window sashes were placed. For the convenience of those who would later be using the building, air conditioning and an elevator were installed.
As was the case in 1835-1836, so in 1967-1970 both college and architect wanted a building which would be functional while at the same time it would have areas of architectural strength. In the restoration special attention was given to Greek Revival reminders in three areas: a small, central rotunda on the second floor; a large room in the central part of the third floor, which was the location of the old college chapel; and a ground-floor entrance west of the north portico.

Between August 17 and 25, 1970 college administrative offices occupied the completed building, according to the following plan:
First floor: Registrar, Business Manager, Bursar
Second floor: Dean of Students, Dean of Men, Dean of Women,
Financial Aid and Career Counseling, Counseling
Third floor: President, Dean of the College
Fourth floor: Development, Alumni Relations, Public Relations

Pennsylvania Hall, first floor, fall 1970
For many years this area was a dark and unattractive part of the building, scarcely inviting to students.
Considerable unassigned space was available for future use. As administrative needs change, adjustments in the assignment of space can be made relatively easily because of the large number of movable partitions used.

The total cost of the restoration, including construction, architects' and engineers' fees, furnishings, walks, roads, grading, and seeding, was estimated at $1,275,000.

Dedication of the renovated structure was scheduled for October 24, 1970.

Thus at the opening of the 1970-1971 academic year, Pennsylvania Hall (Old Dorm) was once again in excellent condition, actually more secure from the elements of nature than it had ever been. Within its walls an integral part of the college had been brought together and was in a position to perform its tasks more effectively than had been possible before. Beyond its walls in all directions were the other buildings which have followed Pennsylvania Hall to the campus since 1837, and in which other integral parts of the college were engaged in the cooperative endeavor which higher education should be. With a brood of brick-and-mortar sons and daughters close about her, and a much larger brood of flesh-and-blood sons and daughters scattered around the world, Pennsylvania Hall was in a better position than at any time since her virtual monopoly was broken in 1889 to retake her place as the unchallenged symbol of Gettysburg College. She was now a symbol of which one could be proud.

The decisions which brought Pennsylvania Hall to this new milestone in her life, and the contributions which supported them and made them possible of fulfillment, were part and parcel of an educational endeavor which values beauty along with knowledge and stateliness along with power. The achievement of the renovation was a measure of the college's commitment to these ideals.

On August 8, 1867, on the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of Stevens Hall, Samuel Simon Schmucker, now retired and nearing three score years and ten, gave one of the addresses. In the course of his remarks he reviewed, as though it had been only yesterday, the events which led up to the founding of the Classical School, the Gymnasium, and the college. He talked about meager resources, careful plans, Thaddeus Stevens, and the Pennsylvania legislature. And then he pointed, with what must have been a deep sense of satisfaction and restrained pride in the eventual accomplishment, to "yonder beautiful and stately College edifice." So too now can we.
“The College edifice – well, you will all see it, as most of you know it familiarly, and I think... you will consent that it is in a good state of preservation.” President Milton Valentine, 1882
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

The first source to be considered in thinking or writing about Pennsylvania Hall is Pennsylvania Hall. There she stands, in the middle of the first campus, having both accommodated and resisted nature and men since the fall of 1837. While the first interior is entirely gone, there is still enough of the original about the building to repay observation and careful study.

Many records and accounts of the College Edifice have been preserved and are in the Gettysburg College Archives. Among these are the manuscript minutes of the trustees from July 4, 1832, of the faculty from October 29, 1832, and of the building committee from 1835 to 1838. Also valuable are the early reports of the faculty and president to the trustees, and the reports of the repairs committee. A number of college publications, such as the catalogue (1837--), Pennsylvania College Monthly (1877-1893), Mercury (1893-1912), and Gettysburgian (1897-), chronicle the history of Pennsylvania Hall as part of the history of the college. The Spectrum (1891--) is especially useful for the photographs it contains, and also for the occasional reminiscences by an alumnus, in which some reference to the first building is often made.

The two published histories of the college are E. S. Breidenbaugh, ed., The Pennsylvania College Book, 1832-1882 (Philadelphia, 1882), and Samuel Gring Hefelbower, The History of Gettysburg College, 1832-1932 (Gettysburg, 1932). In addition to being secondary accounts of the institution, both include some primary material.

Newspaper files, especially those of the local papers, which begin in 1800, can be used to good advantage in supplementing other sources of information.

Two works which are quite helpful in any effort to place Pennsylvania Hall and Gettysburg College in their state and national contexts are Saul Sack, History of Higher Education in Pennsylvania (2 vols.; Harrisburg, 1963) and Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York, 1962).
INDEX

Allegheny College .................................................................2, 13
Alumni association ................................................................53
American flag, flying the ......................................................73-6
Antietam ..............................................................................43
Anti-Masonic movement ......................................................12
Apple, John A. .................................................................89
Apple Hall ..........................................................................85
Architects ...........................................................................17
Architectural design ..........................................................19-20
Aughinbaugh, Peter ..........................................................27, 29, 36-7
Bank of Gettysburg ...........................................................5, 6
Battle of Gettysburg ..........................................................41-48
Battle of Gettysburg, 50th anniversary .............................66-7
Baugher, Henry L. ............................................................35, 43, 48, 74
Beachem, Charles W. .........................................................65
Beachem Memorial Portico ................................................65, 69
Beaver, James A. ..............................................................67
Bikle, Philip M. .................................................................44, 53, 60
Blood, H.B. .........................................................................48
Bream, Henry T., Physical Education Building ..................85
Breidenbaugh, Edward S. ..................................................38, 45, 95
Breidenbaugh Hall .............................................................65
Brua Chapel ........................................................................56, 77
Brumbaugh, G. Edwin .......................................................88-9
Buford, John ........................................................................46
Carver, Joe L. ......................................................................75
Christ Chapel ......................................................................85
Civil War Institute .............................................................87
College Edifice ....................................................................see Pennsylvania Hall
College bell .........................................................................58
“College Guards,” military company ..................................41
Colver, M. ...........................................................................44
Company A, 26th Regiment ..............................................43
Cooper, Thomas J. ...........................................................21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croll, Luther H.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin, Andrew G.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitory Hall</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eichholtz, Jacob</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmert, Willington Roe</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyster, William F.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortenbaugh, Robert F.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin College</td>
<td>2, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garber, Davis</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg Academy</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg Classical School</td>
<td>4, 6, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, campus</td>
<td>42, 54, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, centennial</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, development</td>
<td>80-1, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, enrollment</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, heating plant</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, incorporation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, post Civil War</td>
<td>49-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg College, statutes</td>
<td>30-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg Gymnasium</td>
<td>4-5, 6, 8, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert, David</td>
<td>15, 18-19, 21, 22, 23-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glatfelter Hall</td>
<td>56, 67, 77, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville, William A</td>
<td>77, 80, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, C.A.</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Henry W.A.</td>
<td>65, 74, 75, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson Hall</td>
<td>52, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding, Warren G.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hefelbower, Samuel Gring</td>
<td>51, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins, John</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter, Samuel</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs, Michael</td>
<td>43, 44, 45, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kuhns, John .........................................................................................................................39
Lafayette College .................................................................................................................2, 13
Latrobe, Benjamin ...............................................................................................................17
Lee, Robert E. ......................................................................................................................44-5, 46
Linnaean Hall ......................................................................................................................29, 31, 34, 40, 56, 87
Linwood residence .............................................................................................................5
Literary societies ................................................................................................................28, 40, 41, 53, 54, 63
Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg ...............................................................4
Madison College .................................................................................................................2
Masters’ Hall .......................................................................................................................85
Miller, Thomas C. ..............................................................................................................6-7
McCreary, John B., Gymnasium ......................................................................................52, 56
McCreary Hall ....................................................................................................................85
McKnight, Harvey W. .......................................................................................................50-1, 56
McKnight Hall ..................................................................................................................52, 58, 64, 77, 87, 88
McPherson, John B. .........................................................................................................15, 21
Muhlenberg College .........................................................................................................49
Musselman, Emma G., Hall ..............................................................................................85
Musselman Stadium ...........................................................................................................85
New Recitation Hall ..........................................................................................................56, 58
Observatory .......................................................................................................................52
“Old Dorm” ...................................................................................................................... see Pennsylvania Hall
Patrick Hall .......................................................................................................................85
Paul, Willard Stewart ........................................................................................................87
Paul Hall ............................................................................................................................85
Pennsylvania, legislature appropriation .........................................................................25
Pennsylvania College .......................................................................................................10-11
Pennsylvania Hall ............................................................................................................16, 26, 32, 44, 48, 50, 56, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70-1, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 83, 86, 88, 90-3, 94-5
Philomathean Society .........................................................................................................28, 40
Phrenakosmian Society .....................................................................................................28
Plank, Eddie, Memorial Gymnasium ...............................................................................65, 82
Poems ...............................................................................................................................79, 83
Revett, Nicholas ...............................................................................................................20
Rice Hall ............................................................................................................................85
Richard King Mellon Foundation ......................................................................................89
Roosevelt, Franklin D. ........................................................................................................... 73
Rudolph, Frederick .................................................................................................................. 95
Ruthrauff, Albert F. .................................................................................................................. 89
Sack, Saul .................................................................................................................................... 95
Saunders, William .................................................................................................................... 50
Schmucker, Samuel Simon ...................................................................................................... 3-7, 10, 13, 15, 21, 93
Sieber-Fisher Infirmary .......................................................................................................... 85
South College ............................................................................................................................. 58
Spectrum ..................................................................................................................................... 60, 77
Stahley, George D. ..................................................................................................................... 48, 55
Stevens, Thaddeus .................................................................................................................... 1, 11, 12-13, 14-15, 21, 40
Stevens Hall ................................................................................................................................ 52, 93
Strickland, William .................................................................................................................... 17-20
Stuart, James .............................................................................................................................. 20
Stuart, J.E.B. .................................................................................................................................. 43
Student housing .......................................................................................................................... 36
Student Union Building ............................................................................................................. 85
Susquehanna College ................................................................................................................... 49
Tener, John K. ................................................................................................................................ 67, 68
Thiel College .................................................................................................................................. 49
Thomas, Charles ........................................................................................................................... 48
Tilberg, Wilbur E. ....................................................................................................................... 76
Trautwine, John Cresson ............................................................................................................ 16, 18-23, 59
Trustees ........................................................................................................................................ 10, 14-15, 21, 33, 35
Typhoid epidemic ....................................................................................................................... 32
University of Pennsylvania ......................................................................................................... 2
Valentine, Milton H. ..................................................................................................................... 45, 46, 53, 56, 65, 69, 81, 86
Washington College .................................................................................................................... 2
Weidensall Hall ............................................................................................................................ 52, 65, 82
Wentz, Abdel R. ......................................................................................................................... 63
Western University of Pennsylvania ............................................................................................. 2
“White House” ............................................................................................................................ 36
Winemiller, Henry ......................................................................................................................... 22, 29
Wolf, George ............................................................................................................................... 1, 7, 13
Wrightsville and Gettysburg Railroad Company ........................................................................... 23
YMCA ........................................................................................................................................... 57, 62, 82
Originally published in 1970, *Yonder Beautiful and Stately College Edifice* relates the story of Gettysburg College’s most venerable building. It will awaken memories of all those who lived there and inform readers who know Pennsylvania Hall best as an administrative building.

Erected five years after the founding of Gettysburg College in 1832, Pennsylvania Hall was designed to serve virtually all the college’s needs. Students slept, ate, and studied there, faculty taught and advised under its roof, and the first two presidents lived there, as part of the college’s commitment to operating like a “well regulated family.”

Pennsylvania Hall changed with the times. Periodically renovated, it emerged by the turn of the twentieth century as the largest campus dormitory and something more—the place most associated with powerful imagery of the Battle of Gettysburg.

By the early 20th century, though dwarfed in size and overshadowed in function by Glatfelter Hall, Pennsylvania Hall retained its eminence in the hearts of alumni. For architecture buffs, Pennsylvania Hall represents a fine example of American Greek Revival style. For members of the college community, it was “almost the symbol” of Gettysburg College, a dignified and graceful centerpiece of the campus.

How Pennsylvania Hall’s form and function changed over time is the central theme of *Yonder Beautiful and Stately College Edifice*. Connecting the college’s history to national currents, Charles Glatfelter has produced a valuable treatise on the evolution of the small liberal arts college.