As long as colleges have existed they have been confronted with the ubiquitous problem of curbing the overly exuberant or incorrigible student. Conceptions as to what constitutes acceptable behavior have varied from time to time and have been modified as the mores of society have changed. A student misdemeanor in the nineteenth century could well be looked upon in the twentieth as a sign of healthy adolescent growth. But institutions, by and large, appear to require the unruffled calm which generally accompanies conformity. They tend to dissuade sharp expressions of difference, and they establish rules designed to produce preconceived notions of desirable conduct.

Scarcely ten years had passed after the opening of the College and Academy of Philadelphia when the trustees enacted regulations (1761) designed to proscribe physical activity and to assure correct student deportment. The rules, in addition to the usual prohibitions against the defacement of property, threatened sanctions against those who would create "indecent Noise." They prescribed in detail the hours of entry and departure, marked by the tolling of a bell, for the purpose of preserving "Order in the Schools, to discourage Slothe & to promote a manly Spirit of Industry." Being practical
men, however, and no doubt aware of the possibility that the manly spirit may be forgotten in the momentary pursuit of illicit attractions, the trustees decreed that "For each Violation of these Rules and Ordinances or any of them without a reasonable excuse the Offender shall be chastized, or incur a Pecuniary Mulct of two English half Pence."

Each institution of higher learning in Pennsylvania adopted regulations for the preservation of order and socially acceptable behavior. Quite frequently, students were required to sign statements promising to observe the laws of the college. Allegheny College, for example, exacted this pledge from each of its students: "We, whose names are subjoined, severally promise, that, while undergraduates of Allegheny College, we will obey the laws of this institution, refrain from all immoral and unbecoming speech and behaviour, treat with respect the Trustees and all other officers of the College, demean ourselves towards all our superiors, equals, and inferiors in a manner becoming the character of gentlemen and will pursue our studies with a regularity and diligence worthy of the approbation of our friends and instructors. In testimony of which, we have hereunto set our respective hands at the times of the annexed duties."

In an effort to guard against repetitions of delinquencies already committed, or anticipated future infractions, the colleges of Pennsylvania often enacted voluminous rules embracing a great many possible misdemeanors. Although by no means complete in its coverage, the statutes of Dickinson College (1830) may be regarded as typical of those generally adopted:

Of the deportment of the students, of misdemeanors and their punishment

Section 1. The students are to consider themselves and each other, as young gentlemen associated for purposes of mutual improvement, and are to behave themselves accordingly.

2. They are to treat with entire respect on all occasions, the Principal, Professors, and Tutors, obeying implicitly all their lawful commands, and in every respect demeaning themselves as those who know that their char-

1 Minutes of Trustees, I (Mar. 10, 1761), 131 ff.
2 Cf. Dickinson College, Minutes of Trustees, I (June 3, 1789), 189; Haverford College, Minutes of Managers, I (10 mo. 23, 1833), n. p.; Thiel College, Minutes of Trustees, I (Dec. 27, 1871), 25 ff.
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acter for correct behaviour, is not less important nor less at stake, than their character for intellectual acquirements.

3. The Faculty have power to inflict any punishment for offences short of dismission or expulsion; but when in their opinion the offence shall merit the punishment of dismission or expulsion, it shall be the duty of the Principal to report the case in writing to the President of the Board of Trustees, with the attendant facts and circumstances, proving the individual’s guilt; who shall immediately convoke the said Board and submit the matter for its decision. But the Board shall act exclusively on the written report of the Faculty, taking the facts therein set forth as conclusively established, and shall inflict such punishment as a majority of the Board may direct.

4. No right of appeal to the Board from the decisions of the Faculty, nor of petitioning in classes or combinations, as in any way implying co-ordinate authority among the students, shall be recognized either by the Faculty or by the Board.

5. If any student shall be guilty of profane cursing or swearing, of intoxication, of riot, of theft, of forgery, of fornication, of playing cards, dice, or any other games of chance, of visiting gambling and lewd houses, of fighting, striking, quarrelling, of breaking open the door of another, or privately picking his lock with any instrument, of turbulent words and behaviour, of wearing women’s apparel, of fraud, lying, defamation, or any crime for which an infamous punishment may be inflicted by the state, he shall, if convicted, be suspended, dismissed, or expelled.

6. If any student shall assault, wound or strike the Principal, a Professor or a Tutor, or shall maliciously or designedly break the windows or doors of their apartments or lecture rooms, or contumaciously resist their authority, and refuse to appear before them, he shall be suspended, dismissed or expelled.

7. If any student shall be guilty of an injury to a fellow student, or to any person, or of acting disorderly, and injuring the property of any person in the borough of Carlisle, on complaint and proof thereof being made to the Principal, he shall, with the advice of the Professors and Tutors, give judgment thereon, and order satisfaction to be made according to the nature of the offence or injury, which if he refuses to do, he shall be publicly admonished, and if after admonition he persist in such refusal, he shall be dismissed.

8. If any student shall fight, or propose to fight, a duel, or be in any wise concerned in promoting or abetting a duel, or in the giving or accepting of a challenge, or shall reproach, traduce, or treat disrespectfully, any student for having refused to accept a challenge, he shall be expelled.

9. If any student shall absent himself from any recitations of his class without sufficient reason, he shall be admonished or suspended as the Faculty may direct.

10. If any student shall visit a tavern, house of entertainment, or eating house, he shall be suspended or dismissed.
11. If any student shall bring into his room or have in his possession, any intoxicating liquor, he shall be suspended or dismissed.

12. If any student shall keep for his use or pleasure any riding beast, dog, gun, fire arms or ammunition, sword-dirk, sword-cane, or any deadly weapon whatever, or shall ride out unless the Principal may think his health or any special circumstances may require it, and grant him permission so to do, he shall be publicly admonished, suspended or dismissed.

13. If any student shall hire any riding beast or carriage from any person whatever, for the purpose of amusement, exercise or business, without explicit permission from the Principal, or shall, without such permission go to a greater distance than two miles from the College at any time whatever during the continuance of the session, he shall be publicly admonished, suspended or dismissed.

14. If any student shall, during the session, attend a ball, private dancing party, theatrical exhibition, dancing school, or any place or resort for purposes of amusement that shall be prohibited by the Faculty, he shall be suspended or dismissed.

15. If, in the opinion of the Faculty, the character of a student shall be so vicious as to render him an unworthy member of the College and a source of corruption to the other students, that is, whenever they shall be satisfied that he is guilty of frequent and unnecessary absence from prayers, public worship, or any college exercise as established by law, or of disorderly behaviour when present at any of them; or of neglecting his studies and interrupting the studies of others; or of unreasonable expensiveness in living or company keeping in his room or elsewhere, or of idleness, of going out of College limits without permission, or of absenting himself from his room after 10 o'clock at night, or being frequently absent during study hours, or of any other conduct prohibited in these statutes after two or three admonitions, and he does not forthwith reform, he shall be sent home and his parent or legal guardian be requested to remove him from College.

16. A student who shall have been expelled, or twice dismissed, shall not be re-admitted.

17. Every student during the vacations, shall be answerable for all vicious, scandalous and immoral conduct, in the same manner as during the sessions of College, and every student remaining in the place shall be under the control of the officers of College who may remain in it during the vacations.

18. No female shall be permitted on any pretence to go into the college building or campus, except on days of public speaking, excepting also strangers who wish to see the College, or persons of the neighborhood, accompanied by an officer of college, or some person appointed by him. Nor shall any militia trainings, or public sports, or diversions, or recreations, or entrance and strolling on the College campus, by persons from the town not having direct business with the College, be allowed by the faculty.
19. Every Student shall preserve not only his own room, but as far as possible every part of the building from all dirt and filth, and shall not indulge in any practice inconsistent with the regulations, nor shall any student throw out of his window, or against the sides of the building, any filth of any description, under such penalty as the Faculty shall judge the offence deserves.

20. Every case of offence, not specifically provided for in these statutes, is remitted to the best discretion of the Faculty, who shall for such offences inflict punishment as may be consistent with the general character of the government, and accordant with the nature and circumstances of the crime.

21. No student under penalty of public admonition or suspension, shall visit any shop or restauurateur where confectionary or other articles of diet or drink are sold, or purchase at such house, or shop, or from the proprietor of the same, any article whatever, unless the Faculty of the College shall have publicly signified to the students that such houses or shops may be resorted to for the purchase of the articles contemplated—which articles the faculty may specify, if they judge expedient.

22. If any person not belonging to the College, shall contemptuously treat or abuse the authority of the College, or shall instigate, advise or aid any student to a refractory and stubborn behaviour or carriage towards the laws and officers of the College, or shall draw away or seduce any of the students into vile principles or practices, the Principal may forbid the person so offending to enter into the campus, and also prohibit the students from holding any intercourse with him, which if any student shall have after such prohibition, and if he shall keep company with other persons of publicly bad character, he shall be publicly admonished, and if the practice be continued, suspended or dismissed.4

Whatever Dickinson College may have overlooked was incorporated in the regulations of other institutions. There were prohibitions against participation in politics and political celebrations.5 There were injunctions against smoking.6 Coeducational institutions enacted rules banning or regulating the commingling of the sexes.7 The dress of students was a matter of concern in some colleges.8 Even student mail was censored in a few institutions.9

4 Statutes (Apr. 16, 1830), 21-24.
5 Pennsylvania College, Minutes of Trustees, I (Sept. 18, 1833), 11; I (Sept. 20, 1837), 48.
7 Cf. Waynesburg College, Minutes of Trustees (Mar. 27, 1854), n. p.; Bucknell University, Minutes of Trustees, III (June 26, 1888), 118.
8 Cf. Haverford College, Minutes of Managers, III (11 mo. 6, 1857), 7-8; III (2 mo. 5, 1858), 11-14; Wilson College, Catalogue (1875-1876), 20.
9 Cf. Thiel College, Minutes of Trustees, I (Aug. 26, 1890), 274; St. Francis College, Catalogue (1891-1892), 5-6; St. Vincent College, Catalogue (1903-1904), 13.
Scarcely a facet of life was left untouched by regulations. As problems arose, rules were multiplied and the student’s area of movement circumscribed. Swarthmore College, for example, published one hundred regulations in 1883, governing the student in his studies, his social relations, and his deportment generally.\textsuperscript{10} Judging from the pyramiding of laws in this and other institutions, college administrators, particularly in the nineteenth century, appeared to have concluded that the frequency of student derelictions would be inversely proportional to the number of laws enacted to regulate their behavior. There is, however, no evidence that this was so. The ebullient spirit of youth may have been tempered, but it was certainly not suppressed by the myriad rules which surrounded it.

Alexander Graydon informs us that as an eighteenth-century student in the College of Philadelphia he was forced to engage in a pugilistic encounter, despite his aversion for it, “in order to establish my claim to the honor of being an academy boy.”\textsuperscript{11} Fights of a more serious nature occurred on occasion. The trustees of Dickinson College reluctantly expelled a student for dueling in 1812, and considered it “but an act of justice to the accused to declare, that his conduct in every other instance has been such as to merit their approbation, and must express their regret, that this sentence should be passed on a young man whose character has been so fair, and conduct so exemplary.”\textsuperscript{12} Three years later, they felt no such compunction in expelling three absconding students who were involved in a duel where a fourth was killed.\textsuperscript{13} In 1906, the faculty of Lincoln University ordered the complete disarming of students after incidents of shooting and stabbing had occurred, and obtained two baskets full of revolvers, knives, razors, stilettos, and other deadly weapons.\textsuperscript{14}

Major crimes against the person, however, were rare; student infractions, as a rule, were much less violent. Yet, hardly a statute enacted for their government did not suffer for want of observance.

\textsuperscript{10} Laws . . . Relating to Students (1883), i–20.
\textsuperscript{11} Alexander Graydon, Memoirs of a Life, Chiefly Passed in Pennsylvania within the Last Sixty Years (Harrisburg, 1811), 17 ff.
\textsuperscript{12} Minutes of Trustees, II (Feb. 22, 1812), 35.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibd., II (Dec. 18, 1815), 91–92.
\textsuperscript{14} Philadelphia Press, Dec. 13, 1906.
At Washington College, in 1816, the trustees learned "with much regret that some Tavern Keepers of this place are so far lost to a sense of both duty and interest as to permit some of the Students to behave with great impropriety in their Houses." The faculty of Dickinson College, in 1828, resolved "that those students who were detected violating College orders on the last evening of the last session, by being at taverns & eating houses without leave & by making a riotous noise in the streets, be suspended till Friday evening next, when they are to be admonished." Students were disciplined for leaving the campus without permission; for attending theatrical performances and circuses; for using profane language; for smoking; for intoxication; and for dancing.

At times, students rebelled against performing their assigned studies and against the discipline and authority of college professors and administrators. In 1813, the faculty of Dickinson College reported

Finding among the Students of the junior class, a combination to resist the performance of certain exercises in the greek language directed by Professor Shaw—that several of them had deliberately and in an improper manner quitted the Lecture room of Mr. Shaw, without leave, and in a body—and that they, with other students of the junior class, had entered into a written engagement to oppose those exercises, and to share the punishment that might be inflicted on them for this instance of disobedience and refractory conduct—they were called before the Faculty last week and interrogated upon the subject, when they presented a paper containing their engagement with each other to the purpose above mentioned.

---
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Nor was this an isolated instance. In 1839, the faculty complained that the students had "resolved not to attend to any College exercise, until the Faculty restored two of their Members whom they had occasion to dismiss." 24 Again, in 1853, the president informed the trustees that

In December last a tendency to combination suddenly developed itself by the refusal of the Sophomore and Freshman classes to perform certain requisitions of the Faculty. . . . Although the government of the College was sustained and the spirit of rebellion promptly suppressed, it brought to light the fact that among the students a spirit of loyalty to the classes is deemed of higher obligation than loyalty to the Faculty and Laws. 25

Other colleges had their troubles with incorrigible students. The faculty of Lafayette College (1838) were compelled to expel William Cox for "disorderly & improper conduct and for an assault & battery committed on the President." 26 In 1854, a professor at Westminster College complained that the students had burned him in effigy. 27 Members of the senior class of Allegheny College (1857) refused to comply with the regulations of the faculty respecting the commencement. 28 The faculty of Susquehanna University reported in 1860 that the students had "rebelled" against the policy of appointing tutors to oversee them in their rooms every evening. 29 Unfortunate experiences at previous commencements led the trustees of Muhlenberg College to resolve in 1871 to refuse graduation to any member of a graduating class who delivered a speech other than the one handed in to and approved by the faculty, or one into which objectionable matter had been subsequently introduced. 30

On occasion, the students vented their spleen directly on the authors of the disciplines they studied. At Washington and Jefferson College it was customary for an entire class to conduct a mock trial of the Greek poet Pindar, and to hang him in effigy. Formal programs were frequently printed and elaborate ceremonies devised for

24 Minutes of Trustees, III (July 11, 1839), 320–321.
25 Ibid., IV (July 13, 1853), 234–235.
26 Minutes of Trustees, I (Sept. 18, 1838), 83.
27 Minutes of Trustees, I (Dec. 26, 1854), 41–42.
28 Minutes of Trustees, II (Apr. 29, 1857), 279–280.
29 Minutes of Managers, I (June 27, 1860), 68.
30 Minutes of Trustees, I (June 28, 1871), 247.
the occasion. In such a manner did the class of 1868 wreak retribution upon the soul of the departed poet, closing their exercises with an ironic hymn:

While the Soul of the Departed is crossing the (Sticks) Styx the following requiem will be howled:

How has passed the gloomy winter?  
How has passed the reign of Pindar?  
While around us smiles the Spring,  
Pindar's death song here we sing. . . .³¹

In like manner the students of Haverford College cremated Paley and Wentworth.³² The fair sex, plagued more by the intricacies of mathematics than by the obscurities of the ancient languages, projected their woes on the demon "Trig." A student publication at Wilson College (1888) described the exercises in connection with the cremation of Trigonometry:

Clad in garbs of deepest mourning, each having a torch, his devoted disciples carried the remains to the spot where the funeral pile had been erected. The class formed a semi-circle around the body, and the exercises were begun with the following songs:

(Tune: Oh, My Darling Clementine.)

Fare thee well, thou grim old tyrant,  
We would bid a last adieu.  
Thou hast made us toil and labor  
Hard and long for answer true.  
Cho.—Oh, my darling, Oh, my darling,  
Oh, my darling, dear old Trig.  
We are done with thee forever,  
Never more o'er thee we'll dig. . . .³³

Not only were college administrators and unsuspecting authors the victims of nonconforming youth, but the lowly freshmen were frequently forced to suffer indignities at the hands of their more

³¹ "Execution of Pindar, Conducted by the Class of '68."
³² Haverford College, "Ye Funeral Rytes and Burial of Ye Mighte Paley, by Ye Classe of '80 (6 mo. 24, 1878), by the Class of 1880"; "Cremation of Wentworth by the Class of '86 (June 23, 1884), by the Class of '86."
³³ The Pharetra, I (February, 1888), 12 ff.
sophisticated elder classmen. Hazing was a perennial problem. In 1869, the superintendent of Haverford College reported:

I have had the evil called "rushing Freshmen" under care even more than before. I find the practice, still unprecedentedly persisted in, is confined mainly to four in the Sophomore class, who also have been ring-leaders in certain other outrages, and from whom the whole college is catching an infection which I fear will prove disastrous unless now removed in the removal of those four, three of whom particularly deserve it.  

The Board of Curators at the University at Lewisburg recommended in 1879 that the "Trustees and the Faculty . . . take all needful steps to prevent the barbarity known as 'hazing' and that this Board will sustain the Faculty in any step needful to secure this result." At Muhlenberg College, in 1886, the faculty resolved that "Whereas, the custom of initiating new students, heretofore practised in this institution is productive of disorder, and may result in bodily injury to the participants . . . that hereafter . . . hazing in every form including the so-called 'initiations' . . . be absolutely forbidden." Other colleges enacted similar prohibitions.

Eventually, the students themselves came to frown upon the practice. The faculty of Bryn Mawr College was informed by the president in 1898 that the Self-Government Association had suspended a student for one month for hazing. In 1899, the board of trustees of Pennsylvania State College was so impressed with action of the students in abolishing hazing that it passed resolutions of special recognition and approval. At Gettysburg College, in 1913, the faculty characterized the students' prohibiting of hazing in all its forms as "the greatest steps forward ever taken at this institution."

Thus, there were both infractions of the rules and attempts at correcting the fractious. The latter, particularly with the advent of self-government, was partially undertaken by the students them-

34 Minutes of Managers, III (10 mo. 11, 1869), n. p.
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36 Minutes of Faculty, IV (Dec. 1, 1886), 40.
37 Cf. Swarthmore College, Minutes of Faculty (6 mo. 11, 1894), 270-271; Susquehanna University, Minutes of Directors, II (June 16, 1903), 230; Lafayette College, Minutes of Trustees, III (May 2, 1912), 585.
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selves in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.41 More frequently, however, students were punished by those responsible for the government of higher education. The severity of the disciplining presumably varied with the nature of the crime committed, the ultimate penalty, expulsion, being reserved for the most heinous offense. Perhaps some idea may be obtained of the measures taken to suppress the infinite variety of peccadillos and more serious delinquencies of which students are capable, from a sampling of the experiences of the colleges in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

At Jefferson College, in 1832, a student was dismissed from the institution for “speaking scoffingly of religious exercises.”42 That same year, two students “were affectionately admonished” by the faculty of Pennsylvania College (Gettysburg College) for “some impropriety of conduct”; and one was dismissed in 1844 for burning the college privy.43 A sophomore at Marshall College was fined one dollar in 1843 for “throwing a pail of filth down stairs.”44 In 1862, two students were expelled from Franklin and Marshall College: one “for insulting the Board of Trustees in his Valedictory Address, and inciting disgraceful & riotous conduct which broke up the Commencement Exercises”; the other “for being most prominent in aiding & abetting the disorder.”45

Villanova College employed a most unusual form of punishment. Students were “jugged,” or imprisoned, in 1856 “for smoking in the Shoemaker Shop,” “for want of punctuality in attending washing in the morning,” “for neglecting to study their catechism & prayer,” “for disrespect to his prefect.”46 A similar punishment was meted out to one unfortunate “for sneaking out of bounds & larceny of some half dozen rotten eggs to the sore trouble of a poor hen.”47 Two students were “Caught dealing in an article contraband of War—

41 Cf. Bryn Mawr College, Minutes of Trustees, II (1 mo. 8, 1892), 91; Swarthmore College, Minutes of Faculty (2 mo. 7, 1898), 362; Lebanon Valley College, Minutes of Trustees (June 6, 1911), 40.
42 Minutes of Faculty (June 15, 1832), n. p.
43 Minutes of Faculty, I (Dec. 28, 1832), n. p.; II (Apr. 15, 1844), n. p.
44 Minutes of Faculty, II (Feb. 13, 1843), n. p.
45 Minutes of Trustees, I (July 28, 1862), 216.
46 Jug Book (Feb. 15, 1856), 1.
Captured by an enemy's Ship of the line, properly confiscated and the delinquents imprisoned for two days on fever diet—bread & water.”

Less drastic measures were taken by Swarthmore College (1880) in chastising four students who attempted to cut off the water supply in an effort to lengthen the forthcoming holidays. They were placed on probation and denied all leaves until Christmas vacation. In 1898, the University of Pittsburgh obtained from the undergraduates of the college, the engineering and the medical departments “a suitable expression of regret for the unseemly interruption to the address of President Raymond, of the University of West Virginia, which took place at the Commencement of the Department of Dentistry on April 1st.” The faculty of Wilson College (1912) attempted to cure students of the habit of cutting classes by requiring them to make up their work with written lessons, for which privilege they were asked to pay the sum of two dollars. As late as 1923, Swarthmore College suspended three young women of the senior class for one year because of their violation of the rule concerning smoking.

Since most activities were prohibited by college regulations, diversions were few and, as we have seen, frequently clandestine in nature. It was not unusual for authorities to deny requests for the holding of social functions which promised to be both chaperoned and decorous. The trustees of Dickinson College in 1838 refused to grant the students permission to give “a suitable festivity in honor of the annual Orator before the College Societies.” Wilson College, in 1888, declined the offer of the Dickinson College Glee Club to perform before her students. In 1889, the junior class of Lafayette College was denied “the use of the Gymnasium for the Junior Hop, or Ball, to be held on the evening of March 5.” It was not until 1919 that a committee of trustees of Allegheny College felt

---
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that dancing under proper regulations and under supervision of the faculty should be permitted, and that the Board of Trustees pass this as a resolution. That a resolution should be passed that permission for dates for parties for dancing should be arranged for with the faculty or with its proper representatives, and should be limited to fraternity houses or gymnasium or other halls selected by the faculty. That the students should not be permitted to go to dances in the city or outside cities during college periods without special permit of the faculty. 56

It was small wonder, then, that students complained of the dullness of college life, or blamed their frustrations on the seemingly callous adults. Reminiscing about her college days of 1857, an alumna of Beaver College declared:

Few and far between were the amusements that were allowed to distract our minds from books in these school days of long ago. Saturdays were hailed with delight. Then our walks were sometimes extended to the next village, but oftener we went along Main street on to the Minis grove, then round to the river bank, where, safe from criticism, we sometimes indulged in a game of blind-man-buff, or hindmost of three, and returning along byways, past the old jail, or crumbling academy, stray cows were often encountered where are now the parks. Sometimes, eluding the vigilance of the “advance guard” of teachers, we cast side glances at the young gentlemen upon the corners, or exchanged shy greetings with some future Judge or fair-haired Professor.

Occasionally we were invited to spend an evening in the Music Room, when Prof. Leonhart improvised rare concerts, accompanying our one piano with his violin. When things grew desperate, we criticised the teachers, or abused the boarding, in regular school girl fashion, and everything else failing, kept ourselves up on hard study and the stimulous [sic] of coming examinations. 57

An anonymous student newspaper (1857) bitterly attacked the village and citizens of Canonsburg, where Jefferson College was once located. In an article entitled “Canonsburg Unmasked,” the unhappy student charged:

Thy streets are the theatre whereon man meets man and there is no recognition; where citizen meets student, not as friend meets friend, but as foe meets foe. Scandal and slander are thy instruments of power, which

56 Minutes of Trustees (June 3, 1919), 94-95.
57 Lizzie Rutan, “First Quinquennium,” Exercises of Quarter-Centennial of Beaver College and Musical Institute (June 17, 1880), 11.
open ears greedily gather, and ready tongues exultingly convey to the head of the Pentetarchy. The harmless pleasures and jovial frolics of students, which thy hypocritical pretensions pollute with the name of depravity, are to thee most galling eyesores.  

At Haverford College, in 1859, James Tyson recorded in his diary: "The monotony of a college life renders it an unsuitable place for keeping a daily journal. The routine of daily study affords no subject for comment, and the student is confined almost wholly to remarks on the weather, which besides being in many respects an uninteresting subject is also an uninstructive theme. I was glad that the snow would permit me to take the daily amount of exercise by walking."  

But college life in the nineteenth century, though not so free and varied as it is today, was not entirely devoid of planned diversion. The dull care of which Tyson complained was relieved by boating excursions on the Schuylkill River, by the introduction of a new game called "Hares & Hounds," by the organization of a singing club called "Krambambule," and by the entertainment of students with a costumed minstrel show. At Muhlenberg College (1867) the faculty suspended recitations to afford the students an opportunity to attend an agricultural fair. The senior class of Pennsylvania College (1877) was handsomely entertained by a professor and his wife. "The generous preparations and kindly attentions on the part of the Professor and his wife, together with an equal number of ladies, made the occasion highly enjoyable to the boys of '77."  

In 1878, the students of Washington and Jefferson College renewed the custom of celebrating "Washington's birthday by a parade en masque." According to an account of the affair, "The order in the ranks was excellent and nothing occurred during the day to reflect discredit upon the participants, or to mar the general enjoyment of the occasion." Even dances were permitted by a few institutions. At a hop given by the students of Lehigh University (1881), which lasted until two o'clock in the morning, "all went merry as a marriage
bell.” There was editorial protest, however, that the expenses for the dance should have come from the athletic dues, rather than from a tax on the participating students.\textsuperscript{64}

As the nineteenth century progressed, student social affairs became more numerous. The girls of Wilson College in 1887 conducted a “strawride” which was “enlivened by song, laughter, and the music of guitar and banjo, not to speak of the oft repeated note on the tin horn.”\textsuperscript{65} The enlightenment of the last decade of the century was joyously welcomed by the fair sex of Lebanon Valley College (1892), when they were permitted to “repay the many courtesies of the gentlemen.” This memorable occasion was glowingly reported in the student publication:

The ladies of Lebanon Valley College availed themselves of this privilege on Wednesday evening, January 20. On the morning of that same day each gentleman boarding in the hall was confronted by a fair damsel, who acquainted him with the startling intelligence that the ladies boarding in the hall were going to have a sleighing party, and asked him to join the number. After some explanation that it was a sleighing party and not a slang party, as was at first understood by some of the gentlemen, the invitation was accepted by all. Directly after supper all were arranged in two sleighs, and a jollier crowd never left the town of Annville. After much cheering, and after the college “yell” had been given several times, the party was out of sight of college, faculty, and everything that would tend to draw their thoughts to studies and work. Within a short time the party reached Lebanon, where they spent a short time, then returned to Annville. Part of the time was spent in singing, and the remainder in having a general good time. On their arrival at Annville the gentlemen gave three cheers for the ladies, which was duly appreciated by them. They parted with merry good-nights, all feeling that the evening had been pleasantly spent. We are glad to say no one even contracted a cold, but we suppose it was due to the precaution taken by some of the number.\textsuperscript{66}

College life, however, centered not about these infrequent though often sought interludes, but in the organized student societies and clubs. The most widespread and the most influential of these were the literary societies. So far as the records reveal, every Pennsylvania college or university founded before 1875 had organized at least one

\textsuperscript{64} The Burr, I (October, 1881), 3, 10.
\textsuperscript{65} The Pharetra, I (November, 1887), 6.
\textsuperscript{66} The College Forum, V (February, 1892), 10–11.
literary society. Indeed, many made their appearance while the colleges were still in their infancy.

Intellectual and moral enlightenment were the primary purposes of these societies. "We . . . earnestly . . . [desire] to improve ourselves in some of the most important parts of Science," states the constitution of the Belles Lettres Society of Dickinson College in 1786. The constitution of the Franklin Literary Society of Jefferson College (1837) declared its object to be the promotion of "Literature, Friendship and Morality." Embodying in more comprehensive terms the objectives of literary societies generally, the Diagnothian Literary Society of Marshall College stated:

Its chief aim is to secure to the members their advancement in thorough knowledge, their improvement in composing and speaking, and the cultivation of friendship and morality. The character of the constitution harmonizes perfectly with the design of a complete academic course of study; thus, when such a spirit is fully realized in the members, an association of this kind assists materially in developing and refining the faculties of the mind.

In order to accomplish these aims, the constitution of the Philo Literary Society of Jefferson College (1808) decreed: "The exercises of the Society shall be Composition, speaking, orations, speaking extempore, reading and spelling and debating." The delivering of formal orations and debating were, in fact, the primary means of expression. Debates were conducted between members of the same society and between representatives of opposing societies. Questions of moment were seriously argued. In 1786, the Belles Lettres Society of Dickinson College disputed "Whether it is lawful for Americans to enslave for life, those who have never forfeited their Lives or Liberties to the States." The question was decided in the negative. Two years later the majority vote was cast for the affirmative side of the ques-

67 St. Vincent College called its organization, established in 1861, a debating society. Catalogue (1870–1871), 14.
69 Minutes, II (May 20, 1786), 3–4.
70 Constitution (1837), 1.
72 Constitution (July 23, 1808), 3.
tion, "Is it the design of nature that Woman should be entirely excluded from civil & ecclesiastical preferments." In 1837, the membership of the Franklin Literary Society of Jefferson College considered such questions as: "Would a national University be beneficial"; "Should religious tests be required of civil officers"; "Is love an involuntary passion"; "Would it be just for Legislatures of slave states to enact laws liberating the slaves without compensating the owners"; "Is man possessed of instinct"; "Would a community of property be more conducive to the happiness of a people than the present system"; "Should the Pres. be elected immediately by the people"; "Do labor saving machines ameliorate the condition of mankind"; and "Should the possession of land be limited by law."

At first, literary societies were relatively autonomous and free of administrative control or direction. The trustees of Jefferson College, for example, in 1822 declared that they had never passed laws respecting them; consequently, should the societies at any time violate their own laws and regulations, the members affected by such violations should have the right of appeal to the faculty, and the faculty in turn should be guided in their investigation of such appeals by the laws and regulations of the societies themselves. Five years later, loath to interfere in the difficulties which arose between the Franklin and Philo societies, the board again reiterated its former position by stating: "that inasmuch as this Board never have, by an official act made any rule, or provision, for a decision in the contest of the two literary societies... so they deem it expedient at present to decline the same; and they recommend it to them to come to a mutual agreement that no formal decision of this kind be hereafter made." Similarly, the trustees of Pennsylvania College decided in 1835 to pursue a policy of nonintervention respecting the difficulties arising between the two literary societies.

But this condition of freedom from restraint did not persist, despite the efforts of certain of the societies to maintain hegemony over their affairs. In 1834, the Franklin Literary Society of Lafayette

73 Minutes I (Aug. 12, 1786), 9; I (Nov. 22, 1788), 54.
74 Constitution and Records (1837), 40 ff.
75 Minutes of Trustees, I (Sept. 24, 1822), 104.
76 Ibid., I (Jan. 9, 1827), 113.
77 Minutes of Trustees, I (Apr. 23, 1855), 22.
College objected in vain to the rules adopted by the trustees for its government.\textsuperscript{78} At Jefferson College, in 1836, the board was finally constrained to intervene in the controversy between the Franklin and Philo societies by decreeing that no judges would be appointed for nor decisions be rendered on the outcome of the annual spring contest.\textsuperscript{79} The trustees of Washington College in 1840 were adamant in maintaining that the faculty had the undoubted right to set the times at which the meetings of the literary societies might be held. And under no circumstances would they reconsider this decision so long as the societies persisted in their determination never to meet again until they were permitted to hold their meetings at times selected by themselves.\textsuperscript{80} Later, in 1867, the laws of the combined college of Washington and Jefferson contained an entire chapter of regulations concerning the literary societies.\textsuperscript{81}

As the nineteenth century progressed, the supervision of literary societies became more pronounced. In 1851, the students of Allegheny College protested in “disrespectful . . . language” the decision of the trustees “That all appointments by the students of persons to deliver the Annual, or other addresses before the societies, shall be subject to the approval of the faculty of the College. . . . That the Board disapproves of the selection of a speaker to deliver the annual address before the Literary Societies at the coming commencement, & hereby, through the Faculty, instruct them to withdraw the invitations given.”\textsuperscript{82} In 1868, the Franklin Society of Muhlenberg College was required to submit its constitution to the faculty for approval.\textsuperscript{83} The faculty of Swarthmore College not only passed on the student composition of the Eunomian and Somerville societies, and determined the time and place of their meetings, but censored their libraries as well.\textsuperscript{84} At Thiel College, in 1886, the student publication took the faculty to task for ignoring the wishes of the students with regard to the time of holding society meetings:

\textsuperscript{78} Minutes of Trustees, I (Sept. 23, 1834), 62-63; I (Nov. 12, 1834), 63-66.
\textsuperscript{79} Minutes of Trustees, II (Sept. 28, 1836), 35.
\textsuperscript{80} Minutes of Trustees (Aug. 25, 1840), n. p.
\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Laws} (1867), 23-24.
\textsuperscript{82} Minutes of Trustees, II (May 10, 1851), 250; II (May 17, 1851), 251.
\textsuperscript{83} Minutes of Faculty, I (Feb. 17, 1868), n. p.
\textsuperscript{84} Minutes of Faculty (11 mo. 12, 1877), 17; (3 mo. 25, 1878), 24; (11 mo. 18, 1880), 82.
Ever since it was certainly known that the different societies were to have halls of their own, the students have been looking forward with bright anticipations to a time when they might have their society meetings at night. This wish finally took shape in the form of a mass meeting of the students on the twenty-second of Sept. at which a resolution was passed almost unanimously requesting the Faculty to permit the societies to meet Friday evenings, and to change the time of hearing the Saturday recitations from Saturday morning to Wednesday afternoon, when the societies have heretofore held their meetings. At the present writing no action on this resolution has been reported from the faculty. They will do well to carefully consider a petition passed by the students with such unanimity, and which the vast majority of the students are very anxious to have granted. The Saturday morning recitations have always been considered a nuisance.85

But if colleges controlled their literary societies, they supported them as well, and, in so doing, indicated the importance with which they were regarded. In sanctioning the formation of a literary society in 1813, the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania directed that a suitable room be appropriated for their use.86 The trustees of Allegheny College took similar action in 1834.87 Lacking a stove with which to heat their meeting room, the members of the Philomathean Society of the Western University of Pennsylvania obtained this essential piece of furniture from the trustees.88 In 1853, the trustees of Franklin and Marshall College agreed that since the "Literary Societies of Marshall College had sustained voluntary losses by deeding over their property to Marshall College in order to effect the merger of Franklin and Marshall, that they would contribute to each of them the sum of $1000 & land, and a further sum of $1000 lent to each of them without interest, provided they build halls and each raise the additional sum of $2000 for that purpose."89 The board of the Farmers High School (Pennsylvania State University) in 1859 appropriated $250 to each of the literary societies to be expended in the purchase of books and to enable them to commence the formation of libraries.90

85 The Thielensian, IV (October, 1886), 36-37.
86 Minutes of Trustees, VI (Nov. 23, 1813), 103.
87 Minutes of Trustees, II (Aug. 12, 1834), 123.
88 Minutes of Trustees (Jan. 4, 1847), 107.
89 Minutes of Trustees, I (Aug. 31, 1853), 103-104.
90 Minutes of Trustees, I (May 18, 1859), 33.
Literary societies in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were held in high esteem. They were viewed as valuable sources for the enrichment of the curriculum, rather than as organizations of an extracurricular nature. The catalogue of Pennsylvania College in 1837 stated: "Connected with the Institution are two literary Societies, which, besides the regular duties of the College of a similar character, furnish abundant opportunities to the Students for their improvement in composition and declamation. Each Society possesses a respectable library." Allegheny College, in the same year, characterized the societies as "of great utility to young men acquiring an education. They not only improve them in the arts of public speaking, but also familiarize them, in some measure, with the forms of transacting the business of deliberate bodies, and cultivate systematic business habits." Marshall College insisted in 1844 that no interest connected with the College was considered more important than the literary societies. Other institutions held similar views. In fact, a few colleges made attendance upon the meetings of societies compulsory.

The students, too, joined in extolling the virtues of these societies. Speaking of the Theta Alpha and Euepia literary societies at the University at Lewisburg in 1870, the student publication maintained that "These departments of our College life are well sustained and full of interest, and are to many students one of the most useful parts of their course." A like publication at Haverford College in 1880 declared:

Of the many sources from which the student draws in the attainment of an education, and in moulding himself into the full rounded man which he aspires to be, that of his literary society is by no means the least. The existence of so many institutions of this kind in our colleges is a witness of their value. The private room gives time for thought and study; and the recitation-room affords but little opportunity for learning to express our thoughts. It is in the society that we, even while students, partake of active

---

91 Catalogue (February, 1837), 11.
92 Catalogue (1837), 13-14.
93 Catalogue (1843-1844), 24.
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95 Cf. Muhlenberg College, Catalogue (1875-1876), 24; Waynesburg College, Minutes of Trustees (Oct. 1, 1878), n. p.
96 The College Herald, I (May, 1870), 4.
life. It is here, after a week of mental toil and fatigue, that the student can find new life and vigor; it is here that he wears off his rough edges and square corners, by giving scope to his fancy and play to his power of expression in competing with his fellows; it is here of all places that work is a pleasure, and never a task.\(^97\)

Attesting to the worth of the literary societies, the Pennsylvania College and University Council in 1896 supported the contention of F. A. P. Barnard that no part of his training at Yale College had been more beneficial than that which he derived from the practice of writing and speaking in the literary society to which he belonged. The Council urged the colleges to maintain their societies as essential molding factors in the education of students, and lamented the increasing tendency of the Greek letter fraternities to destroy and supplant them.\(^98\)

But the holding power of the literary societies was rapidly waning by the close of the nineteenth century. And few survived beyond the second decade of the twentieth century, despite administrative efforts to revive interest in them. The old societies at the Western University of Pennsylvania had evidently disappeared, for in 1904 the faculty called a meeting of students in an effort to organize a literary society.\(^99\) There is no evidence that the move was successful. In 1907, the president of Muhlenberg College complained: “Our Literary Societies are not what they should be. There is coming a new movement of inter-collegiate speaking and debating. Other Colleges have special instructors for this work. We have trainers for athletics. Is it right that as a literary college we do not produce the best results in writing and speaking? A man’s full time could be given to this work. The English department is doing what it can, but it can’t possibly do all that is necessary.”\(^100\)

At Westminster College, in 1914, the trustees adopted the following resolution:

Whereas, Interest in the Men’s Literary Societies has been declining for some years, resulting finally in discontinuing the meetings of the Societies; and

\(^97\) The Haverfordian, I (2 mo., 1880), iv.
\(^99\) Minutes of Faculty (Sept. 28, 1904), 77–78.
\(^100\) Minutes of Trustees, III (Jan. 22, 1907), 236.
Whereas, We believe that the work of these Societies is vital to the proper training of the students,

Therefore, Resolved, That membership in these Societies, with faithful performance of the work which belongs thereto, be made obligatory upon students of the Sub-Freshman, Freshman and Sophomore Classes, and be optional in the Junior and Senior Classes, and that the work of these Societies be correlated with the College work so far as possible, and that the details be referred to the Faculty for adjustment.\textsuperscript{101}

Despite these efforts, the day of the literary societies had clearly passed. The trustees of Thiel College were informed in 1917 that "The literary societies had sunk to a low ebb. During the Spring months a year ago both men's societies even suspended their meetings and at the opening of the Semester in September there was no society spirit visible."\textsuperscript{102} Swarthmore College indicated the possible demise of her societies by excluding any mention of them in the catalogues after 1920.\textsuperscript{103} Ursinus College maintained an illusion of existence to the very end. In 1929, the catalogue stated: "The two literary societies, the Zwinglian and the Shaff, each having held a place of honor and great usefulness in the College from the earliest days, have temporarily suspended activity, their functions having been assumed by other organizations." By 1931, however, even this ephemeral hope had been abandoned, as evidenced by the deletion of the adverb "temporarily."\textsuperscript{104}

There were many who held, along with the College and University Council, that the Greek letter fraternities were responsible for the destruction of the literary societies. Franklin and Marshall College in 1874 insisted:

No countenance is given to what are called College Fraternities. These, it is well known, are the bane of College Literary Societies properly so named, and have in fact put an end to them virtually in many of our American colleges, besides being seriously objectionable on other accounts. No student is admitted now into Franklin and Marshall College without signing an engagement that he will join no association while in the institution, secret or open, which is not approved by the Faculty.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{101} Minutes of Trustees, Vol. D (June 15, 1914), 43.
\textsuperscript{102} Minutes of Trustees, III (May 8, 1917), 49.
\textsuperscript{103} Catalogue (1920-1921).
\textsuperscript{104} Catalogue (1928-1929), 73; (1930-1931), 79.
\textsuperscript{105} Catalogue (1873-1874), 18.
It is small wonder, then, that the colleges were almost as unanimous in their condemnation of the fraternities as they were united in their praise of the literary societies.

Institution followed institution in banning fraternities. The trustees of Lafayette College in 1857 instructed the faculty to exact a pledge from each student declaring his intention to refrain from joining any secret society, and to withhold his graduation until such time as he had signed a paper declaring that he had not broken his pledge. Westminster College denied admission to individuals known to be members of secret organizations, and warned that those who joined such societies after admission would be dismissed. Nor was this an idle threat; four students were expelled in 1866 for violating the ban. In some instances, even faculty members were cautioned against associating themselves with fraternities. The laws of Washington and Jefferson College, for example, in 1867 specifically prohibited the faculty from any fraternity connection, and invested them with the responsibility for suppressing all such secret organizations. Muhlenberg College in 1872 admonished a professor for presiding over a banquet of “one of those Societies disapproved by the authorities of this Institution,” and indicated that it expected the professor to “abstain from giving further offense in this direction.”

Thus, the colleges of Pennsylvania tried to suppress the fraternities as they arose, and to discourage the formation of new ones. But these measures were almost universally taken in vain. Even while the trustees were passing resolutions prohibiting them, student publications were openly proclaiming their existence. A few were so bold as to hazard administrative wrath by publishing articles in defense of the fraternities. The student magazine at Pennsylvania College (1877) may be cited as an example of these:

There is an idea prevalent among all classes that College Fraternities are essentially evil both in principle and action. The “goat” and the shrieks of tortured victims under initiation, formerly thought to belong to the

106 Minutes of Trustees, II (July 27, 1857), 70.
107 Catalogue (1856–1857), 22; Minutes of Trustees, I (June 27, 1866), 127–128.
108 Laws (1867), 16.
109 Minutes of Trustees, I (June 27, 1872), 275.
Masonic Fraternity, have . . . been piously treasured as facts of great importance, and as disclosing the secret workings of that order. In the course of time as College Fraternities have fallen into disfavor with those who object to "secrecy," "midnight orgies" and so on, the stigma formerly belonging to the great Masonic organization has attached itself to these.

In order to a defence of College organizations of this character a refutation of a few of their enemies' arguments is necessary. They accuse Fraternities of being promoters of disorder and insubordination.

This, the writer declares, is not so. On the contrary, he maintains, "They . . . bind together in sincere affection persons of congenial temperaments, and . . . kindle that friendship above which persons cannot rise in the ordinary association of College, into a frame of noble affection." 111

Eventually, the colleges came to recognize the futility of attempting to outlaw the fraternities. In 1881, Pennsylvania College granted permission to the Epsilon Chapter of the Phi Kappa Psi fraternity to erect a chapter house on the campus grounds "upon condition that satisfactory guarantees be afforded to the Board that said chapter house will always be under such legal control and disciplinary or moral strength as will prevent it from being used in any way or manner or for any purposes which in the judgment of the Faculty would be in contravention of the statutes of the Institution. . . ." 112

The trustees of Pennsylvania State College removed the ban on fraternities in 1887 at the urging of the alumni association. 113 At first, in 1892, Lafayette College permitted individual fraternity chapters to erect chapter houses on college property; by 1900, this was expanded to a general policy embracing all fraternities. 114 Susquehanna University removed the prohibition against joining fraternities in 1903. 115 And Westminster College, which, in 1896, had "received with great gratification the announcement from the President of the College, that fraternities alleged to be secret have been disbanded," finally acknowledged that it had been deluding itself by adopting the following resolution:

That since the knowledge has come to the members of the Board of Trustees that certain secret clubs or societies exist in the student body

112 Minutes of Trustees, II (June 29, 1881), 246.
113 Minutes of Trustees, I (June 29, 1887), 303; I (Jan. 13, 1888), 309.
114 Minutes of Trustees, III (June 28, 1892), 207; III (June 19, 1900), 337-338.
115 Minutes of Directors, II (June 16, 1903), 226.
of Westminster College, that it is the sense of this Board that chapters of certain National college fraternities would be less detrimental to college life than local secret clubs or societies, that we therefore instruct the President of the College to enter into a conference with the proper students of the college with a view of permanently settling the fraternity matter satisfactorily to all concerned, and that he be instructed to make proper and satisfactory provision for the non-fraternity men.\textsuperscript{116}

Aside from the literary societies and the fraternities which achieved recognition much later, sanctioned student clubs and organizations were phenomena of the second half of the nineteenth century. True, the students of Jefferson College had formed their "Lyceum of Natural Science" in 1831.\textsuperscript{117} A "Musical Association" was in existence in 1834 at Pennsylvania College, for which the trustees appropriated $75 "to aid in purchasing musical instruments,"\textsuperscript{118} and in 1836 the students at the University of Pennsylvania had projected "an Association for the promotion of a Knowledge of Natural Sciences."\textsuperscript{119} But these were isolated instances of student organizations, rather than indicators of a general trend.

Clubs and societies devoted to student amusement and recreation began to emerge after 1850. Among the earliest were those concerned with musical entertainment. St. Joseph's College in 1854 had its Philomelian Society "composed of those students who are remarkable for possessing a fine voice, or who are learning to play on musical instruments."\textsuperscript{120} The students of the Farmers High School (Pennsylvania State University) received the blessings of the board of trustees in 1859 in their efforts to form "a musical band."\textsuperscript{121} There were "College Bands" and "Moonlight Rangers" at Washington and Jefferson College in 1867.\textsuperscript{122} The faculty of Muhlenberg College in 1869 approved the formation of a student "Glee-Club."\textsuperscript{123} These were the precursors of a large variety of student associations which have their counterpart in contemporary higher education. Washington and Jefferson College had two chess clubs in 1867.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{116} Minutes of Trustees, Vol. C (Sept. 17, 1896), 115; Vol. D (Mar. 19, 1918), 44.
\textsuperscript{117} Hazard's Register of Pennsylvania, VIII (Aug. 13, 1831), 109.
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\textsuperscript{123} Minutes of Faculty, I (Sept. 20, 1869), n. p.
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dramatic society was organized at Villanova College in 1870.\textsuperscript{125} There were clubs devoted to fishing (Icthyophagous Club) and smoking (Meerschaum Club) at Muhlenberg College in 1873.\textsuperscript{126} The student publication of Haverford College in 1879 declared: “A club association mania has seized the students. Besides the literary societies and class organizations we have the Y. M. C. A., base ball and cricket clubs, Carpenter Shop Association, Gymnasium Association, political clubs, archery clubs, foot-ball associations, tennis clubs, geological clubs, etc.”\textsuperscript{127}

The “club mania” continued to spread. Bryn Mawr College in 1886 organized a “Reform Club” devoted to discussions of “social movements.”\textsuperscript{128} The University of Pennsylvania announced the existence of a “Camera Club” in 1893, and the following year, as a result of a gift of $100,000 by Mr. and Mrs. Howard Houston, erected a hall for the general use of students, which is said to be the first collegiate student union in the United States.\textsuperscript{129} There was an “Electrical Club” at the University of Pittsburgh in 1902.\textsuperscript{130} The faculty of Wilson College in 1906 approved the charter of a social club, for the purpose of providing students with “a larger social life and an organized means of social usefulness.”\textsuperscript{131} A glance at the catalogues of the colleges of Pennsylvania will reveal the extent of the present movement to provide students with sources of entertainment and diversion, a movement which had such feeble beginnings in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{132}

Student life found further expression through the medium of publications. Like the clubs, student newspapers and magazines arose, for the most part, rather late in the nineteenth century. There were, of course, exceptions to this growth pattern. One of the earliest of
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these, a handwritten, anonymous broadside, appeared at Washington College in 1818. Another, designed to disturb trustee and faculty equanimity, made a similar single appearance at Jefferson College in 1825. In 1841, the unidentified editors "Jared & Franklin" of Marshall College issued a bound copybook in which was collected a series of short stories, poems, and articles written by students and reflecting their life at the institution. Intensive research has uncovered the existence, before 1850, of only three regularly printed publications enjoying official sanction, which may be classed as student journals. The Zelosophic Literary Society of the University of Pennsylvania released the first issue of its magazine in April, 1834; this was followed, nine years later, by the appearance of The University Magazine, jointly "Edited by a committee of the Philomathean and Zelosophic Societies of the University of Pennsylvania"; and by the first issue (1844) of The Literary Record and Journal of the Linnaean Association of Pennsylvania College, a society composed of students, professors, and alumni.

By and large, however, student publications began to enliven the college scene after the Civil War. Quite frequently they were the official organs of the literary societies. Unlike some of their predecessors, the single, scurrilous sheets clothed with anonymity, the new offerings aspired to modest literary competence, and exhibited a more decorous tone. Contrasting its aims with those of the papers it was replacing, the first issue of the magazine of the literary societies of Washington and Jefferson College stated in 1867:

We take pleasure in congratulating the friends of college interests on the downfall of those base and slanderous issues of former days; those clandestine sheets that ungenerously abused the glorious privileges of the press,

134 Jefferson College, "The Trumpet" (Feb. 5, 1825). Two other single sheets called "bogus papers" were issued before 1850: "The Seniors of Washington" (September, 1840), at Washington College, and "Scrutineer" (Dec. 2, 1843), at Jefferson College.
135 "The Rupjonjin" (1840-1841).
136 The Zelosophic Magazine, I, No. 1 (April, 1834); The University Magazine, I (January, 1843); The Literary Record and Journal, I (November, 1844).
and by anonymous publication—that most cowardly method of attack—
gave spread to their foul-mouthed calumnies. In their stead we have
endeavored, despite the danger of becoming commonplace, to give a true
and mostly formal exposition of college institutions and customs; plain and
unvarnished it may be, uncolored by fancy and unexaggerated by prejudice,
but still a correct bird’s-eye view of students and students’ pursuits.\(^\text{139}\)

At the same time, the recognized student publications were neither
docile nor wholly conforming. They were often critical, contentious,
and crusading. At Lafayette College, in 1870, a student poked fun at
and questioned the value of the study of natural history.\(^\text{140}\) In 1887,
an article in the student publication of Pennsylvania College took
issue with the trustees for opposing fraternities.\(^\text{141}\) The faculty of the
Western University of Pennsylvania in 1883 threatened the editors
of the Pennsylvania Western with close supervision unless all refer-
ences to “objectionable personalities” were omitted.\(^\text{142}\) A student
editorial at Swarthmore College in 1886 protested the administra-
tion’s prohibiting of “dramatic entertainments.”\(^\text{143}\) The executive
committee of the board of trustees of Pennsylvania State College
threatened in 1895 to withdraw pecuniary assistance from La Vie
unless the editors of the publication “hereafter . . . carefully ex-
clude all offensive allusions to any member of the college govern-
ment.”\(^\text{144}\) These are but a few of the examples which could be cited.

On the whole, student publications have exerted a positive and
salutary influence on college life. They have, in the words of the
editors of the student newspaper at Bucknell University, attempted
to “conserve the great interest of liberal education, and [to] be the
especial advocate of . . . College interests.”\(^\text{145}\) The support and en-
couragement which college administrators have afforded them, at-
tests, in part, to the success which student publications have enjoyed
in realizing these aims.

---
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In addition to the intellectual and social activities they afforded students, nineteenth-century colleges made meager and often reluctant provisions for offsetting the sedentary life of the classroom with some form of physical outlet. However, it was informal, spontaneous play, rather than consciously organized programs, that characterized college athletics in Pennsylvania prior to the Civil War. Though administrators recognized that students would seek means for physical expression, the prohibitions which they enacted against unrestrained activity served to circumscribe the number and kind of sports in which students could legitimately engage. The Reverend Richard Peters, for example, in his sermon delivered at the opening of the Philadelphia Academy (1751), spoke of the lots contiguous to the Academy building which would “furnish a large and unencumbered Area for the Children’s Exercise.” Yet, the trustees of the College and Academy in 1761 adopted rules which forbade wrestling and the playing of ball in the college yard or the adjacent streets.

Nevertheless, students did manage, albeit infrequently and in a limited manner, to devise forms of activity which would provide some outlet for their physical energies. In 1828, the students of Dickinson College induced the faculty to permit them to “have a ball-alley erected in the campus, in such situation as shall be pointed out to them.” However, they did not long enjoy the use of it. Two years later, the trustees instructed the executive committee to tear down the “Ball alley,” to sell the boards and divide the proceeds equally between the two literary societies.

A student at Haverford College described the meager resources for student recreation which the institution possessed in 1833 and 1834: “. . . the amusements of the Students out of doors were but few. The principle [sic] were the common play of ball, and as the cold weather advanced, sliding down a hill not far from the house became
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the favorite pastime. The winter being in the first part mild, the Students had not the pleasure of skating till 1834.”

At Pennsylvania College students were prohibited in 1837 from playing “at hand or foot ball in the College yard.” If a student violated this rule he could be fined fifty cents, and, if he persisted in his derelictions, could be suspended, sent home, or dismissed. This law was relaxed somewhat the following year when the trustees authorized the president to procure a handball for the use of the College. Three students at Dickinson College were dismissed in 1853 for being involved in a fight as a result of a football game.

“Athletics,” declared Thomas Anderson, in writing of his experiences at Washington and Jefferson College between 1865 and 1868, “did not cut so large a figure in College activities, as they do now; yet we had four Baseball Clubs, at Canonsburg. The students played for exercise and recreation, rather than for competition with other Clubs. I believe the College Nine of Canonsburg did play an occasional match game with the College Nine of Washington.”

After 1865, athletics, particularly intramural sports, began to receive an increasingly larger share of student interest. The students at Lehigh University, according to the 1866 catalogue, “have . . . formed a boating club, and have a fine flotilla of barges and boats upon the Lehigh.” A student at Villanova College in 1869 received “a tremendous crack on the nose while playing 3rd base” in an intramural baseball game.

Cricket had already become a well-established sport at Haverford College by 1869. Baseball and boating clubs were functioning at the University at Lewisburg in 1870. The national pastime was becoming so popular at Lafayette College that the literary societies in 1872 requested the trustees “to forbid base ball matches on Wednesday Afternoons,—on account of their
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interfering with the proper work of the Societies."

In 1877, a student publication at Pennsylvania College described a football game in ironically humorous terms.

Intercollegiate athletics met with a good deal of opposition from college authorities, and, consequently, did not enjoy wide acceptance until the fourth quarter of the nineteenth century. Although a Haverford College cricket team had engaged in a match with a team from the University of Pennsylvania as early as 1866, the trustees, in 1869, noting that the practice had grown up among the students of having match games of cricket on the College lawn with clubs from elsewhere, concluded that it would be best not to allow such practices thereafter. A student publication at Swarthmore College expressed disappointment in 1882 that the executive committee of the trustees had rejected a petition to permit the College nine to play intercollegiate baseball.

The trustees of Muhlenberg College in 1892 denied the students permission to organize and maintain a baseball club for the purpose of engaging in intercollegiate competition. In 1894, the directors of Susquehanna University resolved, "That it is the sense of this Board that they should enter their protest against Students leaving the University grounds to engage in Foot Ball, considering the game of such a character as injurious to body as well as to the morals of the young men who indulge in it." Bryn Mawr College in 1895 withheld permission from the students to play a game of basketball with Drexel Institute. In 1900, the trustees of Juniata College decided against the playing of match games of football with outside teams.

This resistance to intercollegiate competition appeared to be based upon two considerations: first, the expressed fear that general participation in athletics, with its anticipated benefits for the majority, would be superseded by the narrow cultivation of a few specialists;
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second, the belief that the college amateur would be supplanted by the paid professional, thereby perverting the primary purpose for which organized athletics had been established. With respect to the first argument, the 1894 catalogue of Washington and Jefferson College stated: “In athletics, encouragement is given to specialization only as it is the crown of all-around excellence, and in this, as in all the other work of the department, an effort is made to obtain the best results from the greatest number, rather than the cultivation of a few specialists to the exclusion of the majority.” The latter fear, characterized as a disaster which had already gripped the colleges, was contained in the report of the chancellor of the Western University of Pennsylvania to the trustees in 1897:

We have endeavored during the fall to cultivate a spirit of manly honesty in sports and to suppress “professionalism,” the bane of sports. I may say that we have succeeded in so far that only students in regular standing have been permitted to play in match games and no allowance whatever in fees or tuition has been given. The result has not been satisfactory from the fact that professionalism seems to be too deeply rooted in College circles and among the so-called amateur clubs. A large number of our own students have been, to use plain English, “hired” to play elsewhere, and have in fact told us that as the University does not offer any financial inducements, they must play where they are paid. I am continually approached by students who offer to matriculate here, and to play on our athletic teams, provided they may be given their tuition or other valuable considerations. In many cases these students are not equal to the work of the classes in which they seek to matriculate. I have consistently declined such offers and they have matriculated elsewhere in neighboring colleges or in those more remote. The inferences I am forced to draw in some cases conflict very decidedly with the protestations coming from certain quarters that nothing but pure sport is sanctioned. This is one of the disagreeable and difficult phases of college life experienced at the present time. It is bad enough to have our youth exposed to the peril of life and limb in the rough games which the spirit of the times seems to demand but it is worse to have the whole educational life honeycombed with the rottenness of deceit. If sport is to be fostered for its own sake, so be it: if our colleges are to have a score or more of men practically hired to compete on athletic fields in order to advertise the colleges, so be it. I have no doubt there are those who are sufficiently interested in the University to contribute money enough to hire athletic teams; but if this is to be the settled policy of American Colleges, I wish in the name of truth and candor, to know it.168

168 Catalogue (1893-1894), 40.
169 Minutes of Trustees (Dec. 21, 1897), 140.
Despite these prohibitions and objections, the onward march of intercollegiate competition appeared to be an inexorable one. The University of Pennsylvania, after 1875, was consistently engaging teams from other institutions in matches involving track and field events, rowing, football, baseball, cricket, tennis and other sports.\textsuperscript{170} Lehigh University first participated in intercollegiate football in 1884–1885.\textsuperscript{171} Students at Swarthmore College, in the face of faculty injunctions, took matters into their own hands and played unauthorized football matches with the Pennsylvania Military Academy in 1879, and with the University of Pennsylvania in 1885. By the latter date, the president of the College was prone to be lenient, and "recommended that in view of the good character of the students and other extenuating circumstances the case be dismissed with a reprimand."\textsuperscript{172} Intercollegiate competition in baseball and football was beginning to flower at Pennsylvania State University in 1887,\textsuperscript{173} and in 1891, the college nine at Villanova University was engaging teams from Haverford College and the West Chester State Normal School.\textsuperscript{174} In 1901, on the recommendation of the faculty, the trustees of Muhlenberg College finally lifted their ban on intercollegiate athletics.\textsuperscript{175} The faculty of Wilson College in 1906 granted the request of the "three upper classes . . . to form a Varsity [hockey] team and arrange for one match game upon the college campus with some visiting team, such game to be played on Monday, if possible and if not at such time as would not interfere with college work."\textsuperscript{176}

Furthermore, some colleges had had happy experiences with athletic competition. Geneva College, for example, maintained in 1898: "Athletic contests lead to work in the gymnasium, in that the hope of athletic victory is, with many men, the only motive for physical training. On this account such contests are to be encouraged. In view, too, of the present criticism of college athletics, it is cause for congratulation that for many years past the honor men of the graduating classes have almost without exception been prominent in
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athletic circles and members of the teams."\textsuperscript{177} Then, too, college administrators were beginning to succumb to the growing practice of subsidizing promising athletes. In 1896, the trustees of Westminster College granted "the request of the students for free tuition for four students in the interest of the Base-ball team and the football team."\textsuperscript{178} Even the chancellor of the Western University of Pennsylvania overcame his repugnance to "hiring" athletes and prevailed upon the trustees to allow the athletic committee to "have the discretionary power, in case a contestant is in need of financial assistance in order to complete his studies in the University, to grant him a certain measure of assistance from the fund at the disposal of the Committee for the purpose of paying his tuition in whole or in part. . . ."\textsuperscript{179} Increasingly, college administrators were coming to share the view of the president of Lebanon Valley College, who, in 1914, regarded athletics as an excellent means of advertising his institution:

The athletics this year have been most excellent and the results achieved have gone beyond our fondest dreams. . . .

Foot-ball, base-ball, basket-ball and track teams have covered themselves with glory and advertised the college as nothing has done for many years. While it is expensive it is still our most successful way of advertising and brings results.

Our athletes are not thugs, and bums, but gentlemen on the field and everywhere. Wherever they play they are commended for their manliness. This makes friends for the College and draws students.\textsuperscript{180}

Such was student life in the nineteenth century. Compared with the life of the contemporary student, which is enriched by aid from many sources, enlivened by social affairs and by clubs and organizations offering innumerable diversions, and stimulated by athletic activities which virtually cover the sports spectrum, it was rugged, almost Spartanlike in character. Opinion is divided as to which of the two students—the product of the past, or the creation of the present—is capable of making the greater contribution to the progress of society.
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