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ABSTRACT

The pavilion and hotel gardens at the University of Virginia were spaces of constant change in the 19th century. Thomas Jefferson believed gardens to be central to the plan of a Virginia university; he included them in his first plans for the Albemarle Academy in 1814. In his final plan for the University (exemplified by the Maverick Plan of 1825), Jefferson differentiated between gardens and yards – one the private space of the pavilion resident or hotelkeeper, the other a shared workspace – envisioning both as integral parts of an infrastructure for a self-sufficient university. Because he understood the gardens and yards private spaces and as locations for smokehouses, privies, chicken coops, and food cultivation, Jefferson planned only the serpentine walls enclosing the pavilion gardens; he left the interiors to be shaped by the inhabitants of the surrounding buildings.

In the decades after the University opened, the gardens and yards saw the construction of outbuildings for both housing and day-to-day activities; the intrusions of water pipes and unruly students; dilapidated structures and proud trees. They were the spaces where children played, slaves worked, and into which professors expanded their pavilions (both with and without the University’s official approval). Throughout, the gardens remained private spaces, leaving little trace in the official records about what happened in them. This paper and the following annotated bibliography are intended to guide future research on this elusive and often ephemeral aspect of the University of Virginia’s history. Although largely ignored in secondary scholarship, the gardens and yards were essential to the daily life and infrastructure of the University.
of Virginia as planned by Thomas Jefferson. My hope is that the following document will provide a starting point for the revision of narratives of the University’s history such as those offered in official literature and exhibits (i.e. the exhibition in the basement of the Rotunda) or in future student papers and professional scholarship.

**METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS**

I began the research for this project by systematically mining the Board of Visitor’s Minutes for any reference to the buildings or grounds of the University. By combing carefully through the index, following up on these references, and by reading the reports of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds (called various names throughout the 19th century) for each meeting, I was able to construct the database that serves as Appendix 1 later in this report. The information gleaned from the BOV provides a spine or outline for the narrative that follows, supplemented by the variety of sources discussed in the annotated bibliography.

Throughout my research, I found it difficult to focus entirely on the pavilion gardens specifically. Because the gardens (and also the “back yards”) were just one aspect of the Academical Village’s infrastructure, thinking of the gardens as part of larger system became central to my project. Especially in the early years of the University, the pavilion gardens and yards were as essential as the system that brought water from Observatory Hill; they provided space for necessary activities of daily life, from supplementary housing to food cultivation and preparation to animal husbandry. As the later 19th century saw technological development, a growing
University community, an increasing connection to a similarly expanding City of Charlottesville, and a decreasing dependence on servants, on grounds amenities such as the gardens and yards, stables and smokehouse lessened in their importance to the sustenance of the daily life of the University. My larger project, therefore, often diverges from the strict topic of the pavilion gardens to embrace the larger issues of the University grounds.

Unlike the public amenities and buildings located elsewhere on grounds, however, the gardens and yards are elusive places to research for a variety of reasons. They were officially considered the private space of the hotel or pavilion until the Garden Club of Virginia’s mid-20th-century restorations, making their repairs and improvements largely the responsibility of the tenant of the respective hotel or pavilion. Consequently, finding documentation of changes to or life in these spaces in the Proctor’s Papers and BOV Minutes – or other official records – can be challenging. Most often, only references to the addition of significant buildings such as brick kitchens or servants quarters are readily found.

Another reason why references to the gardens and yards are difficult to find in official University records is the closeness and relative isolation of the University community for most of the 19th century. There was no need for a hotelkeeper to write a letter to the Proctor asking for a new fence or to repair her smokehouse, for example, as the Proctor was on grounds daily and in constant contact with the residents of the University. If the hotelkeeper or pavilion resident needed something, they most likely just asked. For the researcher, however, this unfortunately leaves behind little
documentary record of what happened in the everyday spaces like the gardens and yards.

The secondary literature about the history of the University grounds reflects this scarcity and difficulty in finding documentation of the gardens and yards. Combined with a general disinterest (or dismissal) of the vernacular landscape until the past few decades of architectural history scholarship, the result is that very little has been published about the history of the grounds, gardens, and yards beyond those aspects that have survived to the present day or discussed by Thomas Jefferson himself. There were, therefore, few models for my research and even fewer for the narrative I propose below.

Based largely on trends I noticed through my examination of the Board of Visitor’s Minutes, the following narrative is intended to provide a framework for thinking about the function and role of the gardens and yards in the 19th century life of the University. For more particular examples, see the entries in the annotated bibliography. Although the breadth of my research – both in the BOV minutes and in other primary and secondary sources – spanned the grounds and gardens and yards of the University, this narrative is largely focused on the gardens and yards.
NARRATIVE

Thomas Jefferson first used the term “Academical Village” to describe a university in 1804. He drew his first plans for a campus of secondary education in 1814, for the still un-located “Albemarle Academy” (see fig. 1 in Appendix II). Included in this vision were most of the components that became central to Jefferson’s plans for the University of Virginia: pavilions for professors’ lodging and classrooms punctuating a colonnade lined by student dormitories, a central Lawn, and gardens. From the first designs for the University, therefore, Jefferson included the gardens as an essential concept. Just like a plantation, Jefferson’s university would be a self-sufficient community – a village. Rather than producing tobacco or wheat for economic gain, however, the university would foster knowledge and generate educated young men.

Once a site for Central College had been chosen, Jefferson’s design for the grounds included not only the Lawn, pavilions, gardens, and colonnades of his 1817 design, but also a central Rotunda and a second colonnade (or arcade) of dormitories parallel to that of the Lawn and punctuated with hotels, or boarding houses. Jefferson’s first design of March 1819 (fig. 2) placed the West Range directly behind the Lawn, with the hotels and Range dormitories backing up to the pavilions and Lawn dormitories. The gardens, meanwhile, were located along the western side of the West

---

Range, fronting the hotels. After considering the suggestions of Joseph Cabell, Jefferson amended the drawing by cutting out the West Range and replacing it with a new version, presumably in order to save precious graph paper and the time it would take to redraw the West Lawn and Rotunda (fig. 3). The revised design located walled gardens between the West Lawn and West Range, creating the configuration of the gardens as we see them today. Jefferson wrote of the change: “I think it a real improvement, and the greater, as by throwing the Hotels and additional dormitories on a back street, it forms in fact the commencement of a regular town, capable of being enlarged to any extent which future circumstance may call for.”

The new arrangement allowed for the “approach of carriages, wood-carts, etc to the back of the buildings” via alleys, yet the residents of the hotels and pavilions were still required to share the same garden space. In his final iteration of the drawing (again created by cutting out the West Range and inserting the revised portion, fig. 4), Jefferson split the shared gardens in half with a central wall to differentiate between the hotel and pavilion gardens. He also drew all of the garden walls as serpentine, reflecting his interest in the principles of the English picturesque landscape movement and garden walls he had seen on his travels to Europe.

---

2 See C. Allan Brown, “An Outline of the Early History of the University of Virginia Landscape, 1817-1875,” unpublished manuscript, currently housed in the Office of the Architect of the University of Virginia.

3 Thomas Jefferson to [General Breckenridge?], July 8, 1819, #1715, Jefferson Papers of the University of Virginia, Special Collections Library, The University of Virginia. In fact, Jefferson himself began an additional “street” when he located the Anatomical Theatre directly opposite Hotel A shortly before his death.

4 Jefferson to [Breckenridge?], July 8, 1819.


Jefferson’s complete and final plan for the University of Virginia was engraved and published in 1825. Known as the Maverick Plan (fig. 5), this drawing was accompanied by a broadside (presumably written by Jefferson himself7) explaining the plan and the functions of its various buildings. In this “explanation” of the Maverick Plan, the serpentine walled pavilion and hotel gardens are differentiated from yards:

[the Pavilions] of two stories each, for the residence of the Professors separately, with each a lecturing room, and generally four rooms of accommodation for the family – a back yard and garden. The offices are below…[the] Hotels have their offices below, with each a back-yard and garden, separated by cross streets of communication with the Pavilions.

The location of the “back yards” becomes clear with the broadside’s later reference to the University’s water supply infrastructure: “Within the back-yards are cisterns of fountain water, brought in pipes from a neighbouring [sic] mountain.”8 These cisterns are pictured in the spaces behind the dormitories (rather than within the garden precincts marked by the serpentine walls) on the Maverick plan, confirming that the “back yards” were the spaces directly behind the dormitories, hotels, and pavilions that are now used as parking lots. University landscape architect Mary Hughes further

---

8 The University of Virginia, “Explanations of the Ground Plan of the University of Virginia,” Broadside 1824 VS7, Special Collections Library, The University of Virginia.
notes that Jefferson used serpentine walls to delineate the garden spaces and straight walls to demarcate the yards.  

The practice of using the term “back yard” to describe “functional work spaces” and the word “garden” for a private space was common throughout the Chesapeake in the period. In fact, the term “yard” had particular connotations in the South in general: yards were the workspaces of African American slaves on plantations. Besides housing woodyards, cisterns, sheds, and other small buildings, the yards were where enslaved children played while their elders cleaned laundry, chopped wood, and prepared food; they were the places for daily work. Yards were essential to Jefferson’s understanding of a self-sufficient village.

Other than the graceful serpentine walls, Jefferson did not make any explicit provisions for the gardens and their contents. For such a careful designer, such an “oversight” is indicative of his understanding of the gardens and yards as private spaces that would be outfitted for the specific needs of the residents of the hotels and pavilions with outbuildings such as laundries, dairies, stables, kitchens, slave quarters, smokehouses, corncribs, woodyards, pig pens, and chicken coops. Jefferson recognized the necessity of outbuildings in a letter to the Proctor written in the fall of 1825: “a smokehouse is indispensable to a Virginia family. Therefore they must be

---

10 Hughes, “Preserving Jefferson’s Garden University,” 146.
built for such of the Professors as require them.” By the fall of 1826, the Board of Visitors promised to pay for the construction of “the necessary out houses” in the hotel and pavilion gardens and yards once funding became available. Following Jefferson’s lead, however, the BOV considered the gardens and yards private spaces for which the “tenants” were accountable:

The professors and hotel-keepers shall be responsible for the cleanliness of their tenements, and the grounds in their occupation respectively…The tenement of the hotel-keeper, within the true intent and meaning of this enactment, shall be held to embrace, not only the hotel and grounds in his immediate possession, but [also]…the back yards attached to such dormitories.

The University did build some privies in the gardens which were quickly established as the private facilities of hotel and pavilion residents. By 1830, the BOV explicitly noted that the cleaning of the hotel and pavilion privies were the responsibility of the occupants, not the Proctor, confirming that the outhouses located in the “grounds of the tenements” were private. Larger student facilities were built outside of the Academical Village precinct as well as in the alleys.

When Jefferson planned the University, he famously envisioned his faculty to be unmarried men. Not surprisingly, the private quarters confined to the yards, gardens, and upstairs rooms of the pavilions were not sufficient for the married professors who brought their families and slaves with them to Charlottesville.

---

12 Thomas Jefferson to Mr. Brockenbrough, November 12, 1825, #2258, Jefferson Papers of the University of Virginia, Special Collections Library, The University of Virginia.
13 Board of Visitor’s, The University of Virginia, Minutes, vol. 1 (October 7, 1826), 129.
14 BOV Minutes, vol. 1 (December 16, 1826), 152-153.
15 BOV Minutes, vol. 2 (July 21, 1830), 239.
16 See Brockenbrough to Cocke, April 24, 1822 and May 24, 1827, Proctor’s Papers, Special Collections Library, The University of Virginia.
Requests for additions to the pavilions and the erection of substantial outbuildings in
the gardens began immediately after the professors and hotelkeepers moved in; large
buildings were more likely to be constructed in the gardens than in the yards in order
to keep the yards open for circulation and deliveries and because many buildings were
actually attached to the back of the pavilions or hotels themselves. In 1827, Professors
Dunglison and Emmet requested slave quarters for Pavilions X and I, respectively;17 2-
room slave quarters called “offices” were approved for Pavilions III and V and Hotels A
and E in 1829 and for Pavilions IX and VI in 1831;18 additions for the accommodation of
slaves were also made to the basements of 4 pavilions by 1832;19 and kitchens were
erected in many of the hotel and pavilion gardens in the first decade after the
University opened.20

Although professors and hotelkeepers made frequent requests of the Board of
Visitors and its Executive Committee throughout the 19th century for the addition or
improvement of their “tenements” and outbuildings, the University did not maintain a
unified front as to their responsibility for constructing these buildings. Although the
BOV declared in 1828 “as soon as the funds of the University will permit…it shall be
cause to be erected additional offices for the accommodation of servants, in
connection with the Pavilions and hotels of the University, where they may be

17 BOV Minutes, vol. 1 (July 21, 1827), 195.
18 BOV Minutes, vol. 2 (July 20, 1829), 220 and vol. 2 (July 20, 1831), 278.
19 BOV Minutes, vol. 2, (July 17, 1832), 290.
20 Kitchens were instructed to be built in the garden of Pavilion X in 1836 (BOV Minutes, vol. 2 [August 13,
1836], 379) and Hotel D in 1829 (BOV Minutes, vol. 2 [July 20, 1879], 220). By 1830, Hotel A had a washhouse
and a kitchen. See Marie Frank, “It Took an Academical Village: Jefferson’s Hotels at the University of
desired," the money was rarely available for such amenities. Despite the fact that the BOV could not pay for such necessary improvements, however, they decried the construction of ad hoc additions to pavilions and unsightly outbuildings. In 1837, the Board made a resolution to refuse to pay for additions or alterations to pavilions and hotels built without prior approval, while in 1852 they decried all unauthorized “alterations or additions however trivial and however conducive to convenience” as potentially harmful to the preservation of the University. Presumably, the latter response was the result of the construction of wooden buildings that posed a threat of fire to the Academical Village or shoddy, unsightly workmanship at a time when the University grounds were undergoing considerable improvement (i.e. the construction of the Annex to the Rotunda).

Professors also frequently requested changes or repairs to their garden walls. The garden walls as we know them today were, of course, reconstructed by the Garden Club of Virginia in the 1950s-60s to reflect the idealized Maverick Plan. There has been considerable discussion in recent years (and especially in response to archaeological findings) that has led to the conclusion that the serpentine walls were never completely built according to Jefferson’s specifications as illustrated in the

---

21 BOV Minutes, vol. 1 (October 1, 1828), 204.
22 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (August 18 1837), 397.
23 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (June 28, 1852), 579.
24 For more on the discussion about rebuilding the walls according to the Maverick Plan, see Edwin Morris Betts and Sylvester H. O’Grince, “Historical Sketch of the Trees and Grounds of the University of Virginia,” unpublished manuscript, ca. 1960, the Office of the Architect of the University.
Regardless of whether or not all of the serpentine walls were actually built as planned, however, it is certain that the garden walls quickly fell into disrepair. In 1826, the Pavilion IV garden wall was the victim of an early example of what would become a long history of vandalism by University students; the walls of Pavilion II’s garden were reportedly “dilapidated” in 1831; and a portion of the Pavilion V garden wall fell down in 1837. Professors also built new walls to further privatize their back yards. Professor Bonnycastle in Pavilion VIII was given the go ahead to enclose a part of his yard south from his pavilion in the length of two dormitories, while plank enclosures were approved for the back yards of Pavilions II-V that same year.

Enclosures in the pavilion yards are visible in a map of the University from the 1870s (fig. 8, detail). In 1851, Professor James L. Cabell was given permission to take down the brick wall between his Pavilion II garden and that behind Hotel B to create one large space. Presumably leaving the Hotel B garden unused, the Washington Society and the Moot Court had occupied the building for at least 2 years prior to Cabell’s request. By 1840, meanwhile, tree roots were threatening garden walls throughout the University grounds. The BOV ordered the Proctor to remove any tree growing within 12 feet of any wall and to refrain from planting new trees within 15 feet of

26 BOV Minutes, vol. 1 (April 4, 1826), 112.
27 BOV Minutes, vol. 2 (August 12, 1836), 369.
28 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (August 18, 1837), 394.
29 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (July 7, 1840), 429.
30 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (July 7, 1840), 430.
31 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (June 27, 1851), 564 and vol. 3 (June 30, 1853), 611.
32 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (June 28, 1849), 546.
existing walls in the future. Maps from the mid and late 19th century (figs. 6, 8-10) demonstrate that the garden walls were repaired and rebuilt in an ad hoc manner, with little regard for Jefferson’s plan. Damaged or destroyed walls were often replaced with straight walls rather than serpentine; they would have proven less difficult to build, though they would have required more bricks. The anonymous map from 1870 demonstrates the ways in which straight and serpentine walls were used simultaneously (fig. 8).

Hotelkeepers, meanwhile, often fenced in the areas in front of their hotels, creating additional “yards.” An 1842 resolution of the BOV called for the lots “Facing the hotels” to be divided and the Proctor to “remove any fences now upon them.” As late as 1872, a stable and cornhouse were located in front of Mr. Jeffries’ boarding house.

Although the University could not always accommodate professors with the construction of new outbuildings or substantial brick additions to their pavilions, they did provide additional living space to professors in the student dormitories and additional garden space elsewhere on grounds. As soon as the University opened in 1825, the BOV resolved: “so much of the grounds of the University as can be conveniently applied to [gardens], should be laid off in lots [for] the uses of the Professors, the Proctor and keepers of the Hotels, rent free, but to be inclosed [sic] and

33 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (July 7, 1840), 431.
34 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (July 5, 1842), 453.
35 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (September 19, 1872), 988.
improved at their expense.” In 1830, the BOV asked for a plan for the “establishment of outer gardens and offices on the eastern and western sides of the University,” while kitchen gardens were well established next to the Anatomical Theatre by 1831 and south of the Lawn by 1833. As late as 1888, a hotelkeeper asked for a small portion of land somewhere on grounds to plant a more substantial plot than her hotel garden allowed.

In addition, the University offered student dormitory rooms on the Lawn to professors as additional living and office space throughout the 19th century. In 1830, Professor Bonnycastle in Pavilion VIII initiated the soon to be common practice of having a “door of communication…cut from his pavilion to the dormitory contiguous to it on the south side thereof.” Not all professors actually amended the party wall between their pavilion and the dormitory next door; many simply rented the adjacent room. Even hotelkeepers took over the Range dormitory rooms: Mr. Maupin in Hotel A occupied at least two dormitories to accommodate his family over the summer of 1853. This practice was amended at times when the University needed more space to accommodate students and presumably, the steady and guaranteed income of student rent. In 1854, the BOV asked faculty to restrict their use of student dormitory

---

36 BOV Minutes, vol. 1 (October 5, 1825), 96.  
37 BOV Minutes, vol. 2 (July 21, 1830), 244. This plan was still not completed by the next year: vol. 2 (July 20, 1831), 275.  
38 BOV Minutes, vol. 2 (July 20, 1831), 276.  
39 BOV Minutes, vol. 2 (July 19, 1833), 308.  
40 BOV Minutes, vol. 6 (July 11, 1888), 144.  
41 BOV Minutes, vol. 2 (July 21, 1830), 244. See also a request made by Professor Minor in Pavilion X in 1846: vol. 3 (June 28, 1846), 511.  
42 Professor Davis in Pavilion X was given permission to occupy an adjacent dormitory in 1837: BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (August 18, 1837), 388.  
43 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (June 30, 1853), 613.
rooms to 1 room only.\textsuperscript{44} This rule did not last long as professors continued to take over dormitories on both the Lawn and Ranges. In 1889, the BOV enacted a rule that only the dormitories on the East Range could be assigned to professors.\textsuperscript{45} It was hoped that housing the majority of students on the Lawn would make it easier to discipline them.\textsuperscript{46}

The condition of the alleys, gardens, yards, and their buildings – and the University grounds in general – were repeatedly reported to be in deplorable condition throughout the 19th century. The pavilion and hotel residents often neglected to clean their privies, leaving the Proctor to dispose of the waste and the occupant to pay a small fine. Animals were also a substantial nuisance and cause for health concern in the early 19th century. Although students were not allowed to bring dogs or horses with them to the University from the beginning,\textsuperscript{47} many professors kept animals both in their gardens and elsewhere on grounds. In fact, keeping chickens in the pavilion and hotel gardens persisted through the end of the century.\textsuperscript{48} Stock “of all sorts” was prohibited from the public areas of grounds by 1827,\textsuperscript{49} though pigs were not banned in private spaces such as the gardens and yards until 10 years

\textsuperscript{44} BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (June 28, 1854), 649.  
\textsuperscript{45} BOV Minutes, vol. 6 (June 28, 1890), 229. Although this rule was said to be “without exception,” Professor Minor was permitted to occupy a room on the East Lawn next to his Pavilion the next year: BOV Minutes, vol. 6 (June 30, 1891), 267.  
\textsuperscript{46} BOV Minutes, vol. 6 (June 25, 1889), 193.  
\textsuperscript{47} BOV Minutes, vol. 1 (October 4, 1824), 73.  
\textsuperscript{49} BOV Minutes, vol. 1 (July 18, 1827), 175.
later. The condition of fences during the Civil War led to cattle grazing on the Lawn in 1863 and a reminder in 1867 for the Proctor “to enforce the enactment prohibiting the keeping or introduction of cattle, horses or hogs within the walls of the University” demonstrates that the problem persisted.

Concern over animals and the cleanliness of drains and privies within the Academical Village became especially intense after a typhoid outbreak in 1858. That fall, the University officially realized a plan begun in 1856: they hired William A. Pratt to serve as the University’s first Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds. After almost a half-century of complete reliance on the Proctor and his assistants for the maintenance of the University, Pratt was the first person specially trained in design hired to oversee the grounds. This appointment and an interest in the overall organization and appearance of grounds was not new at the University, though it did reflect an interest in the picturesque movement and was perhaps also stimulated by the completion of Robert Mills’s Annex in 1852. Pratt made a series of suggestions for the beautification and organization of grounds, exemplified in Figure 7. His plan, written 2 years earlier, was accepted in 1858 and included new plantings, the removal of the privies and stables located to the south of the Lawn, the establishment of

---

50 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (August 18, 1837), 394.
51 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (July 4, 1863), 846 and vol. 4 (June 29, 1867), 884.
52 BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (March 12, 1858), 742.
53 In 1856, the Board of Visitors asked the Executive Committee to hire a “landscape gardener” to do a master plan, remove outbuildings, make plans for future housing, examine and evaluate the condition of the buildings, and create a master plan for the future beautification of the grounds: BOV Minutes, vol. 3 (June 28, 1856), 697.
54 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (September 4, 1858), 774.
55 Betts and O’Grince, “Historical Sketch of the Trees and Grounds,” 35
regular garden plots for the professors, and “the removal of the Professors Gardens and the enclosures.” Pratt also proposed a series of new buildings for the Academical Village, including a Gothic chapel for the South end of the Lawn that was never completed and a Gatehouse built in 1856.

The Civil War and serious financial problems prevented the full realization of Pratt’s plan. In fact, a lack of funds forced the merging of the position of Proctor with the newly established Superintendent post from 1863 until 1866. Because of lack of maintenance (not to mention the abuse of the buildings during the war), the University entered the 1870s in dire straights. After declaring in 1868 that all repairs and improvements to hotels, pavilions, and their grounds be paid for by the occupants because the University could not afford to do so, the Committee on Buildings and Grounds reported in June 1873 that “the buildings are suffering in many cases to decay, and in some to ruin whilst the grounds themselves present appearance that does not impress us and cannot impress the public favorably.” After efforts to remove stables and other outbuildings, improve drainage and the water supply, and repair buildings, the buildings and grounds were found to be in an improved condition the next year.

Although there were a number of requests by professors for the enlargement or improvement of their pavilions after the Civil War, there are very few inquiries made

---

57 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (September 4, 1858), 774.
59 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (June 29, 1869), 898.
60 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (June 28, 1873), 1022.
61 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (June 30, 1874), 1053.
for changes in the gardens or even discussion in the Board of Visitors’ minutes of the
garden and yard spaces at all. I can suggest three potential explanations for this: the
post-war emancipation of the Southern slave population, a gradual decrease in
dependence on the University’s general self-sufficiency, and economic conditions both
at the University and throughout the South. Firstly, emancipation dramatically
reorganized labor at the University – and throughout the South – after the war. Before
the Civil War, between 127 and 160 slaves lived on the grounds of the University of
Virginia. Catherine Neale has tracked the jobs and places of residence for these
African Americans at the University after the Civil War. She observes that a number of
blacks (many former slaves) were living on University property after the Civil War,
many continuing to do the same service jobs that blacks held during slavery.
Because the buildings in the hotel and pavilion gardens were private, however, one
may assume that these African Americans were no longer living in them. In addition,
because professors and hotelkeepers were no longer responsible for housing servants,
there was no need to build new slave quarters in their private precincts.

Secondly, the University slowed down considerably during Reconstruction.
Although it was able to maintain acceptable numbers through 1871 (216 students
enrolled in 1871), matriculation dropped to a low of 89 students the next year.

---

University of Virginia, 2006), 77.
64 See Philip Alexander Bruce, History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919: The Lengthened Shadow of One
Largely due to depressive economic conditions throughout the South, these low numbers persisted through the late 1880s. In terms of the gardens and grounds, this meant that not only was there little money to be spent on their improvement, but also that the support population that had occupied them (hotelkeepers, professors, servants), was no longer as extensive. The University required the students to hire their own servants for the first time in 1884, for example.

Finally, are the changing ways in which people at the University (and throughout the formerly rural South) lived. As the 19th century progressed, Charlottesville grew towards the University. It became increasingly unnecessary, therefore, for as much as to be grown or produced in the Academical Village. The gardens and yards were no longer the largely utilitarian and production-oriented spaces they had been. This is demonstrated in the number of requests for indoor bathrooms by pavilion residents in the late 19th century. Although the privy system was given an overhaul in 1866, Professor Noah K. Davis requested to have an indoor water closet installed in Pavilion VII just 10 years later. John B. Minor’s request for an indoor bathroom in 1894, almost 20 years later than Davis’s request, however, reveals that although the uses for the gardens were changing, they were doing so very slowly.

Anna Barringer’s account of living in a pavilion in the early 1890s demonstrates that the gardens were still crammed with activity through the end of the century. She

---

65 Bruce, History of the University of Virginia, 57-60
66 BOV Minutes, vol. 5 (July 1, 1884), 1370.
67 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (June 29, 1866), 866.
68 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (June 29, 1876), 1116.
69 BOV Minutes, vol. 6 (January 9, 1894), 417.
describes her family’s pavilion garden: “down two steps and across a wide brick walk, was the kitchen, a very large brick cottage, extra spacious for the original student eating house…The [garden] was constantly crowded…a coal bin, a wood pile, a chicken coop, and a hydrant.”70 Her description of the yards, meanwhile, indicates that they were no longer utilitarian spaces for the household:

While elders chatted, children played hide-and-seek in the alleys and [gardens], but never, never in the space behind the student rooms on the Ranges or in the space below the Lawn rooms. That was student territory and out of bounds even to your brothers, night or day during the session, and to me, as a girl, at any and all times.71

Barringer’s description of the alleys and former yards as student spaces not only confirms that the gardens continued to be private spaces, but also that the alleys and former yards were student – or public – spaces.

The decline in importance of the gardens and yards to the sustenance of the daily life of the University community and the general movement away from the self-sufficient village model of the early 19th century was signified most profoundly by the introduction of a service road between the East Lawn and Range in the mid-1890s, shortly before the fire of October 27, 1895 that destroyed the Rotunda and Annex. The suggestion to build a “public road through the grounds of the University” was made

70 Barringer, “Pleasant It Is,” 13 & 17.
as early as 1873. Only in the summer of 1895, however, was $6,000 appropriated for changing the “location of the present roadway along East Range” among other improvements. The road was constructed straight through the east gardens and connected to the public road that encircled the Academical Village south of the Lawn (fig. 11). The Academical Village was no longer a private enclave and the gardens were no longer as central to the University’s infrastructure. They could literally be bifurcated in order to create a new set of conveniences.

---

72 BOV Minutes, vol. 4 (June 30, 1873), 1031.
73 BOV Minutes, vol. 6 (July 2, 1895), 492.
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The preceding narrative is focused almost entirely on the utilitarian uses of the gardens and yards and does not acknowledge that because the gardens were private spaces, they most certainly were sometimes employed as pleasure grounds by the Professors. We know for example that Maximilian Schele de Vere, a professor of Modern Languages who lived in Pavilion IV from 1844 to 1895, planted gardens for pleasure in his walled space during his time at the University. While evidence of such gardens – and many other details about the gardens and yards – is almost impossible to find in the official primary documents of the University on which I focused my research, there are two other routes that I have left unexplored: the papers, diaries, and correspondence of individual professors and their families and archaeological investigation.

Mary Hughes argues (and C. Allan Brown’s work with John P. Emmet’s papers housed in the Huntington Library in California demonstrates) that research into the private papers of professors could potentially reveal a wealth of information about daily life in the private gardens.74 Because the number of professors who taught at the University in the 19th century and the fact that many of their paper collections are not kept at the University of Virginia, however, this could prove to be a daunting task.

Systematic and comprehensive archaeological investigation could also provide an unparalleled and as yet, largely untapped, resource for the history of the gardens and yards. The recent work of Rivanna Archaeological Services, for example, has been

---

74 Hughes, “Preserving Jefferson's Garden University.”
essential to a re-evaluation of the Maverick Plan and the conclusion that it is an 
idealized – rather than an as built – drawing.\textsuperscript{75} More comprehensive archaeology as 
well as inquiries into the evidence of plant matter could make the story of the gardens 
far more complex and complete.

In terms of further documentary research, more condensing of information is 
necessary. A central database of information regarding the gardens and grounds 
needs to be established that will allow scholars to enter any information they find on 
a space or period. Because the official records most often mention the gardens in 
short excerpts, such a “clearinghouse” of information would allow for growth and the 
creation of future narratives. Mapping of buildings and landscape features with 
locations already determined. meanwhile (such as that which has begun in the Office 
of the Architect for the University), should be continuously and constantly updated.

\textsuperscript{75} Rivanna Archaeological Services, LLC, “Archaeological Investigations in the West Gardens.”
ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: RG-1/1/2
Credit Line: Minutes of the Board of Visitors, The University of Virginia.

General Description:
The Board of Visitors is the main, decision-making body for the University of Virginia. Before the establishment of the position of the University President in 1904, the BOV made decisions that guided the curriculum, faculty, and staff; daily life of students and others living on grounds; and, most importantly for the current project, the improvement and maintenance of buildings and grounds. They also served as the liaison for the Virginia state legislature to the University community, ensuring that the University functioned according to its role as a state-funded institution. The BOV met only a few times a year (usually once in the spring or summer and once in the fall or winter) and the minutes are the record of these meetings.

The version of the minutes consulted here is the transcript of the hand-written minutes kept in the reading room of the Special Collections (therefore are not required to be called). Housed in a series of boxes organized by volume, the transcript of the BOV minutes consists of a series of loose-leaf pages with typed text divided into folders. The pages are numbered, usually in the upper right-hand corner, though the numbering of pages is inconsistent in some volumes. The transcript is accompanied by a series of bound indexes that are largely complete. The index is more consistently helpful with proper nouns, though it does chronicle the more day-to-day life of the University as well.

Organization:
Organized chronologically according to the date of meeting, the minutes record issues brought to the BOV through both reports from faculty or staff or from sub-committees; resolutions on issues requiring action and updates on issues resolved at previous meetings; all personnel decisions, from the appointment of hotel keepers, to the creation or dissolution of staff positions or the hiring of faculty; and evaluations or “check-ups” for the general quality of life at the University. The actual content of the minutes are relatively brief. The reports of the various committees are usually summarized and there is little indication of the substance of debates over issues; the issue is usually just summed up and the resolution reported. Reports, budgets, or transcriptions of letters/statements read at meetings are usually mentioned or summarized in the body of the minutes and then transcribed at the end of the section for that particular meeting.
**Suggestions for Use:**
The BOV minutes are helpful in understanding the major decisions made for the University and, therefore, the governing body’s priorities and the University’s financial position at certain points in time. The resolutions made at the semi-annual meetings, however, were not always carried out. Also, because the BOV met only a few times a year, issues raised were not always current; many had emerged months (or in some cases, years) previously and just had to wait until the next meeting of the board to be addressed. It is, therefore, sometimes difficult to gauge when something discussed by the board initially occurred or became an issue. Other sources, therefore, must supplement the BOV minutes in order to determine not only whether or not resolutions were carried out, but also the background for issues or problems brought to the BOV. This research strategy is especially important for resolutions that requested that the issue be passed on to another committee or member of the University staff. Throughout the 19th century, the members of the Executive Committee and the Proctor were generally the persons who most often carried out the BOV’s wishes for changes to or improvements on grounds. Once the position of the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds was created in 1858, this person also took on the responsibility of many of the BOV’s resolutions.

In a research project focused on the gardens or the grounds of the University, the minutes are also helpful in assessing the relationship between the BOV and improvements and construction on grounds. The Committee on Grounds and Buildings (the name changes throughout the 19th century but retains some sort of variation, i.e. “Committee of Inspection”) is one of the most steadfast connections between the BOV and the grounds. Consisting of a handful of BOV members, the committee would inspect the condition of the University grounds, buildings, and equipment for every meeting. These reports, summarized in the BOV minutes and often prompting resolutions, provide a regular overview of the state of the grounds and usually focus on maintenance and the general appearance of the University’s property. They are, however, not particularly thorough; the members of the committee typically had only a few days to observe the grounds. Most often, they express the committee’s disgust with the state of the grounds and buildings or reveal their surprise in finding things in relatively good condition.

The minutes are also a quick and easy way to assess the responsibility the BOV felt towards the grounds at a particular state in time, something which often corresponded with the University’s financial situation. In the early years of the minutes, for example, the word “tenement” is used to describe the rooms above a hotel or pavilion occupied by the professor and his family, along with the adjacent garden, “yard” and privy. Although the professors’ landlord, the University did not always consider itself responsible for improving these spaces when professors requested changes. The word “pavilion,” meanwhile, describes the downstairs of the pavilion used as a lecture hall or other public, classroom space. University servants
(slaves in this case) or those owned by the hotels were responsible for the upkeep of these rooms and the University paid for all improvements to these portions of the buildings (the addition of benches and platforms or the installation or replacement of equipment were the most common improvements). The distinction between the “pavilion” and “tenement” disappears by the late 1830s in the minutes, by which point it became increasingly clear that the University was no longer interested in or financially prepared to pay for changes to the professor’s living spaces; reimbursements for professor's pavilions were on a case-by-case basis and often took years. The BOV minutes are riddled throughout the 19th century with requests by professors and hotel keepers for reimbursement for this or that improvement; whether or not the BOV agreed to pay for changes to the professor’s private space within a pavilion usually depended on their financial state, rather than the appropriateness or necessity of the addition or improvement.

In times of growth and prosperity, however, the BOV became very interested in the appearance and condition of the buildings and grounds. In the 1850s, for example, the BOV hired William A. Pratt to create a comprehensive plan for the University. Pratt’s plan, adopted by the BOV but never carried out in full, suggested the construction of picturesque winding paths and the removal of many of the outbuildings in the gardens and alleyways. The BOV’s interest in improving the state and organization of the grounds in this period provides a sharp contrast to other moments in the 19th century, when finances were tight and priorities were elsewhere.

The BOV minutes also include reports on the University's annual budgets. This is especially helpful in determining the state of the University's financial affairs and their commitment to the improvement of buildings and grounds.

Consistent in the BOV minutes, however, is the relative elusiveness of information about the pavilion and hotel gardens. This is largely because the gardens were considered to be the private spaces of the professor and family who lived in the pavilion. Although one may find requests by professors for additions to their gardens such as kitchens or slave quarters, these are substantial (most likely brick) buildings; more ephemeral and inexpensive [wooden] structures such as sheds, smokehouses, dairies, etc. were built by the professors and hotel keepers as needed and without the approval of the BOV. Requests are made, however, for the repair or construction of garden walls, perhaps in part because damage to walls or their very necessity was due to the unruly behavior or vandalism of students, something which the University remained responsible for throughout the 19th century, although they devised a series of strategies for passing that expense on to the student population.
General Description:
These brief, published reports were made annually by the Board of Visitors to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund as dictated by the Virginia State Legislature. They are largely composed of the year’s fiscal review, though some years’ reports include a short narrative account of the state of the buildings and grounds or general state of the University. The reports summarize each of the accounts paid, the number of students matriculated, and list the names of the professors teaching at the University in any given year. Some years also include a reprint of the catalogue. In years in which major events happened at the University (i.e. the 1858-59 typhoid outbreak that killed several students and prompted the BOV to finally appoint a Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds), the report also includes an especially long and detailed account of the University.

Suggestions for Use:
These reports are easily accessible sources for a summary of information recorded in the Proctor’s ledgers and journals. For example, in the report for the year ending June 30, 1845, payments made for locks, bricklaying, locust posts, plank, ditch digging, repair of fireplaces, and other improvements are listed with the dollar amount and the person who was paid for the work. Some descriptions are actually quite specific. For example, George W. Spooner is listed as having been paid $200 in November of 1844 and $100 in February of 1845 for “an addition to kitchen at Hotel D,” while Mrs. Carter Gray (then the hotelkeeper of Hotel E) was paid $330 in January “for an addition to hotel E, by order of visitors.” In the 1858-59 school year, meanwhile, new Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds William A. Pratt was paid $240 for his “services as architect,” $236.95 for “alterations in lecture rooms and for fencing,” $534.76 on the infirmary account and $592.65 for “water pipe and gas pipe” for the infirmary; $4217.82 for the renovation of the University; $6000 for the water works; and $3000 for labor. Pratt also received numerous cash credits.
General Description:
The Executive Committee was composed of members of the Board of Visitors and was the group most often responsible for overseeing the realization of the BOV's resolutions concerning the improvement of the buildings and grounds of the University. The committee acted in close contact with the Proctor/Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds. These books cover the minutes for meetings only between 1859-1868 (vol. 1) and 1882-1898 (vol. 2), though the Executive Committee was in place early on in the University's administrative history. For example, the October 5, 1825 BOV minutes resolve “that the Proctor, under the direction of the Executive Committee do cause...[garden] lots to be laid off” for the professors, hotelkeepers, and the Proctor on the grounds of the University.

Despite the great number of issues referred to the Executive Committee by the BOV (and as recorded in resolutions recorded in the BOV minutes), the minutes of the committee are relatively brief. The committee met only once or twice a year in the periods covered by these minute books, presumably dependent upon the amount of business to be conducted and the meeting times of the BOV.

Organization:
Volume 1 begins with an index that is relatively explicit and lists events by page number, corresponding with the dates of meetings in chronological order. Within the text, notes in the sidebar of the ledger-sized books summarize the subject of the minutes. Volume 2, meanwhile, begins with a table of contents listed by date with short summaries of events. The pages of both books are numbered and the books themselves are relatively easy to navigate. Reports (such as by the Proctor or Superintendent on the state of buildings and grounds or status reports on various projects) are often listed in the body of the minutes, though the content of these reports is most often not discussed specifically nor are the reports themselves transcribed.

Suggestions for Use:
Much like the BOV minutes, the Executive Committee minutes are very sparse and consist mainly of resolutions rather than extensive descriptions of discussions or debates about particular issues. This and the fact that we do not have a complete set of minutes for the 19th century make them a rather disappointing source, especially considering the quantity and breadth of issues related to the committee by the BOV concerning the construction, demolition, and improvement of outbuildings, walls,
pavilions and their additions, and other subsidiary buildings around grounds. The Executive Committee minutes also share the limitation of the BOV minutes of recording the discussions of a group that only met a few times a year; it is, therefore, difficult to tell when certain issues first became of concern or whether or not resolutions were actually carried out on the ground. Because the Executive Committee did have far more direct contact with the Proctor/Superintendent and acted as the actual delegating body of the BOV, however, it is fair to assume that their resolutions were most often carried out (and perhaps with more certainty than the resolutions of the BOV concerning relatively minor changes and improvements to buildings and grounds).

There is information concerning the gardens and grounds to be gleaned from the minutes, however. Much like the BOV minutes, the Proctor or Superintendent is often ordered to make changes to pavilions at the request of professors. For example, at the September 23, 1859 meeting, the committee ordered a smokehouse to be built for Professor Coleman (Pavilion VI) and a door cut into the sidewall of his kitchen “onto the adjoining courtyard.” On July 8, 1859, a porch for Professor Schele de Vere (Pavilion IV) was approved and the University agreed to pay for the porch as long as it did not cost more than the one recently built for Professor Minor (Pavilion X). The Executive Committee oversaw improvements beyond the Lawn as well. On September 2, 1859, the committee ordered the Superintendent to build a fence “along grave-yard road in front of the Professor’s gardens.”
ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE PROCTOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

In the early years of the University, the Proctor acted as its overseer and as liason between the faculty and the bursar for the day-to-day life. He lived on grounds in housing built and maintained by the University. Bruce explains the responsibilities of the Proctor in the early years of the University:

Broadly described, the proctor was the master of police and inspector of buildings, lands and other property of the University. He was expected to visit all the dormitories at least once a week, and all the hotels at least once a month, and to draw up a report on their condition for the information of the chairman [of the faculty]…He was impowered[sic] to employ laborers to keep the entire area of the University in a sanitary state; to head off trespasses, intrusions, and rows upon the grounds; and the frustrate all other attempted violations of the statutes…It was his duty also to superintend all building operations that were in progress; to frame the contracts necessary for their right execution; to settle the accounts of the undertakers, and to deliver to them drafts on the bursar in payment of such balances as should be in their favor. It was his further duty to collect all moneys, -including the rents of the numerous dormitories and the several hotels, -that were owing to the University…

(vol. 2, pgs. 53-54)

 Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
 Call Number: RG-5/3
 Credit Line: Papers of the Proctor of the University of Virginia, 1819-1905.

General Description:
One of the richest and yet challenging sources for researching the history of the University of Virginia’s buildings and grounds, the Proctor’s papers are also one of the most extensive. They principally consist of 22 boxes consisting of approximately 4,000 items listed under the call number RG-5/3, though many other items are scattered throughout Special Collections (see list below). Because the Proctor acted as the primary target for the BOV and Executive Committee’s delegation for issues varying from the day-to-day maintenance of drains and privies throughout grounds to the monitoring of students’ attendance at breakfast to the supervision of all new construction and the handling of University financial accounts, the Proctor’s papers include an extraordinary range of items. Receipts, invoices, work orders, and correspondence (between the Proctor and everyone from vendors to professors seeking employment to parents asking for particular room assignments for their students) make up the bulk of the content.
Organization:
The earliest years of the University's operation under Proctor Arthur S. Brockenbrough (active 1819-1831) have been treated differently than the rest of the Proctor's papers in this record group. The bulk of items from the Brockenbrough years date from 1817-1828, contain ca. 883 items, and are organized into 57 boxes. Much of the early correspondence is between Brockenbrough and Thomas Jefferson, detailing the plans for the University and reports on the progression of construction. These letters (57 total) have been separated out from the Proctor’s papers and are located in the vault (and therefore must be called independently of the other boxes). The Brockenbrough years are also microfilmed and have been indexed (the guide may be accessed online).

The rest of the group consists of 15 boxes organized chronologically by year, with the bulk of the material relating to the earlier decades of the 19th century; material after 1840 is not as complete or extensive. Although the content of these boxes has not been indexed, a report in a binder for the record group located at the Special Collections reading desk does list the boxes and the corresponding years of their respective content.

The boxes themselves are most often divided into folders by year, with each year having its own “Bills and Accounts” and “Correspondence” folders. Items relating to individuals or particular issues are sometimes organized into their own folders. Correspondence is most often with BOV members or people outside of the University. The Bills and Accounts folders usually include handwritten receipts or letters written confirming deposits or payments.

Suggestions for Use:
Because the Proctor’s papers include so many items and are for the most part not indexed, it is best to approach the source by choosing the box/folders pertaining to the years in question and to then go through each item individually. Although this is a painstaking method, there is much information to be found about the improvements to grounds and buildings at the University. For example, a September 27, 1833 receipt found in box 10 acknowledges the payment of $3 to a William Kennedy for whitewashing the columns on the Lawn and supervising “University hands” and $7 for whitewashing and plastering Hotel D. This receipt is typical as it not only lists the date, amount paid, and the recipient, but also the service for which the individual was paid. Each small receipt (often no more than the size of an index card), therefore, contains a wealth of potentially useful information on determining when changes or improvements were made to the University. Along with the receipts, the correspondence reveals that the Proctor was in charge of purchasing everything for the University, from rubber to notebooks and algebra textbooks. Understanding where these items came from and the prices paid for them helps to tell the story of the University’s role in a larger network of Universities and small, Southern communities.
Because the correspondence of the Proctor’s papers is largely with the outside world, however, it is less likely to reveal details about the gardens or yards of the University. These were private spaces, occupied by people the Proctor saw everyday and who knew him by name. While parents of students or furniture salesmen wrote the Proctor formal letters found today in the Proctor’s papers, the average professor or hotel keeper was far more likely to have requested the Proctor’s assistance with a project in their garden or pavilion in person and left no record of the event or, if it were a small project, conducted it without the Proctor’s help entirely. Record of work that was contracted out, however, could be found in the receipts, though it is unlikely that the particular location (i.e. south garden wall of Hotel A) would be included in the receipt. They might be especially helpful, however, in checking up on resolutions made by the BOV or Executive Committee; the receipts could confirm that a decision made by one of these groups for a change or improvement to the buildings and grounds was actually carried out.

**Depository:** Special Collections, The University of Virginia

**Call Number:** RG-5/3/1.961

**Credit Line:** University of Virginia. Proctor. Journals of Business Transactions of Central College, 1817-1819, and Its Successor, The University of Virginia.

**General Description:**
The 5 volumes of these journals cover the following years: vol. 1, 1817-1822; vol. 2, 1819-1828; vol. 3, 1844; vol. 4, 1832-1844; and vol. 5, 1851. The first volume is an unparalleled resource for tracking the workmen and foremen hired to construct the University of Virginia. Much like the Proctor’s ledgers, they record accounts by name of the person paid, though they are far more specific about work done (i.e. specify the provision of lumber for a particular building or plastering in a certain hotel). Subsequent volumes list all monies paid or owed to the University as well as payments made by the University. They essentially list the same information as the Proctor’s ledgers, but are organized differently and are far more specific.

**Organization:**
Unlike the Proctor’s ledgers (which are organized by account), the Proctor’s journals are organized chronologically. The first volume is organized chronologically, with each account adding or subtracting from the running balance. Intermittently, resolutions of the Board of Visitors referring to the handling of certain accounts or for particular attributions of funds are transcribed. While the subsequent volumes are also organized chronologically, each item is accompanied by a work order number (or Proctor’s Reference Number). This number is used to cross-reference items in the Proctor’s ledgers.
Suggestions for Use:
Used with the Proctor’s ledgers, the journals would be extremely helpful in tracking improvements made to the grounds or individual buildings between 1817 and 1851. Because they are more specific than the Proctor’s ledgers, the journals can provide additional information for items listed in the ledgers. For example, while a ledger might simply list that a certain amount was paid to a certain laborer, the journal states that in June 1840, $12 was paid “to John Day for painting back porch of Dr. Blaettermann’s Pavilion” and that in October 1836, James Lobban was paid for “Brick work, Paving, and, and Digging Foundation to Professor Davis’ [sic] Kitchen” and for “7 days work in repairing dormitories fire places and firing [?] 550 bricks…” While the Proctor’s ledgers might be more helpful in gathering statistical information or in obtaining an overall view of an account or a certain period, the journals are far more specific about the items or labor paid for by the Proctor.

Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: RG-5/3/2.961
Credit Line: University of Virginia. Proctor. Ledgers maintained by the Proctor of the University of Virginia…1817-1832 and 1859-1905.

Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: RG-5/3/2.981
Credit Line: University of Virginia. Proctor. Ledgers maintained by the Patron of the University of Virginia…1833-1858.

General Description:
These large and heavy books are fascinating accounts of the day-to-day financial expenditures of the University of Virginia. Kept by the Proctor (or by the Patron who answered to the Proctor between 1833 and 1858), these ledgers record seemingly every dollar paid by or to the University in meticulously neat handwriting. Because these ledgers are organized the same way and were kept for the same purposes, I have grouped them together in the following discussion.

Organization:
Each school year has its own volume. Volumes either have indexes inserted into the front of the book or written in separate ledgers that are attached (often by a string tied around both volumes). The index of the later volumes (1870s) split the index into two sections: one for students and their accounts, the other for professors and various University accounts (i.e. the Experimental Farm).
The volumes themselves are also typically split into 2 sections: individual student accounts and all other accounts. The first section tracks all payments made by students to professors and the University for board, fees, clothing, fuel, candles, washing, ice, chaplain, gas, etc. Some volumes (including 1875-1876) have pre-printed pages for this section; items not included in the pre-printed list are written in at the bottom of the page. The second section lists boarding houses/hotels along with every student residence and a chronological list of all of the hotelkeepers’ fines and debts, the ins and outs of all of the University's accounts (i.e. ice house), and the professor’s payments to the University (i.e. for labor of the janitor, for borrowing horses) and the distribution of their salaries. The “Contingent Expenses” section lists everything the University purchased from the professors (i.e. paint brushes, stamps) and payments made to laborers (or slave owner for laborers).

**Suggestions for Use:**
These books are one of the most helpful sources for understanding the day-to-day material life of the University, especially when supplemented by the Proctor’s journals. One could use them to track everything from the University population’s use of ice to the types and amounts of fuel used for heating and lighting the buildings. In the case of the University’s ice account for 1861-65 for example, everything from the dates for when ice was brought out of the ice pond, the laborers who did the work, and how the ice was distributed is recorded. One could then track the use of ice by individuals from examining the accounts of particular students, hotels, or professors.

Besides confirming information about labor and materials for building projects listed in the BOV and Executive Committee minutes and perhaps even found in receipts in the Proctor’s papers, the ledgers also provide a wealth of information about the maintenance of the University, including the gardens and yards. One of the most helpful categories found throughout the ledgers is for payments of fines or for damages done to University property. Because technically all of the Academical Village was University property, the items listed are extensive. Extremely common in the student accounts sections of the ledgers are payments made for damage to “gl” or glass, furniture, rooms, and knobs. The hotelkeepers and professors also commonly had to pay fines or for the replacement of materials in their pavilions or hotels. In the 1875-76 school year, for example, the keeper of Hotel A had to pay a $4 fine for having a horse on the Lawn. In October 1836, Augustus L. Warner (Pavilion II) and Edwin Conway (Hotel A) paid $1.11 for the Proctor to clean their neglected privies. Professors were also consistently repaying the University for repairs to window glass.

For research on the gardens and grounds, more specific information may also be gleaned from the ledgers. The professors and hotelkeepers often paid the Proctor or hired University laborers to make small repairs or improvements to their buildings and other private spaces. These payments are sometimes recorded in fine detail. In 1836-37, for example, George Tucker (Pavilion IX) paid $1.25 for the re-hanging of the doors
to his office and smokehouse, while John A. G. Davis (Pavilion III) paid $3 for the repair of his yard wall. In some cases, debts owed to the professors or hotelkeepers by the University were paid by work that the Proctor or his laborers did in their private spaces. This is listed in the 1850-51 and 1844-46 volumes, for example, as “contra” and describes work such as the construction of fences and partition walls or general repairs.

The ledgers are also unparalleled in the ways in which they record the names of every person financially associated with the University. This is invaluable not only if one where to try to track the work of certain laborers or contractors, but also for finding the locations within the Academical Village in which particular students, hotel keepers, or professors lived. Although there are partial directories for students (see the student directories) and the locations of professors have been well documented (see Ammir Shahien, “Pavilion Residents at the University of Virginia…” below), there is no comprehensive list of the hotelkeepers and their respective hotels. Because the BOV and Executive Committee minutes and the Proctor’s papers often list hotels by the hotelkeeper and not by the letter identifying the hotel, the ledgers are an extremely important resource for locating events or improvements mentioned in other sources.

Although the ledgers are painstakingly organized, both chronologically and thematically, the most thorough and potentially fruitful method for using them to devise information about the gardens and grounds would be to go through the second sections line-by-line. Because the BOV and Executive Committee met so infrequently, it is nearly impossible to quickly check up on a certain issue or event; when things happened or were requested are most often not recorded in other sources, making it difficult to follow up on that information quickly in the ledgers.

Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: MSS 8904
Credit Line: Papers of the Proctor’s Office, The University of Virginia.

General Description:
This box is typical of some of the others listed below that include few items that range over a vast period pertaining to the Proctor. This collection consists of 1 box of items dating from 1822-1903, though most items date from the periods 1822-1825 and 1895-1903.

Organization:
The folders are mostly unlabelled, though some are dated. Items within the folders are not necessarily organized chronologically or thematically.
Suggestions for Use:
This box includes a few items that are of special interest for construction and improvements of the grounds of the University including handwritten receipts for labor during initial construction, hand drawn floor plans of Alderman Library, and correspondence between Brockenbrough and others regarding the initial building phase. Also of interest for research on the gardens and yards of the University is a certificate for a runaway slave belonging to Brockenbrough.

Other Items Pertaining to the Proctor Located in Special Collections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Call Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papers from the Office of the Proctor, 1811-1905 (bulk 1817-1925), including ca. 44 items.</td>
<td>MSS 38-174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and Candle Account Books of the Proctor, 1835-1869, 6 volumes.</td>
<td>MS 200-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills, Receipts, and Other Documents from the Office of Green Peyton [Proctor 1859-1875], 1873-1877, 17 items.</td>
<td>MSS 639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correspondence of Robert R. Prentis [Proctor 1853-1865], 1835-1862, 1 item.</td>
<td>MSS 877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt Book, “List of Subscribers to the University of Virginia,” kept by Brockenbrough, 1824-1827, 1 volume.</td>
<td>MSS 1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankbook of the University of Virginia Proctor kept by J. E. Johnson, 1866-67, 1 volume.</td>
<td>MSS 1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts of Green Peyton, 1879-1893, 60 items.</td>
<td>MSS 1557-q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia. Proctor. Monthly Report of the Proctor of the University of Virginia, 1836-1837.</td>
<td>MSS 11990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia. Proctor. Proctor's Supplemental Report to the Faculty. February 1837.</td>
<td>MSS 11992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports and Correspondence of the Proctor of the University of Virginia, 1833-1867, 9 items.</td>
<td>RG-5/3/1.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledgers Maintained by the Proctor of the University of Virginia in which records of unpaid student accounts were kept, 1865-1882, 2 items.</td>
<td>RG-5/3/3.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records of Cash Receipts and Disbursements, 1817-1905, 18 volumes.</td>
<td>RG-5/3/4.961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

As dictated by Jefferson, the faculty of the University carried out the resolutions of the Board of Visitors and made recommendations to them. As Bruce notes, “the Faculty was really in a better position to form a just conception of what the University’s welfare demanded than the Board, for its members were on the ground (vol. 2, pg. 47).” The faculty also met far more often than the 2-3 times that the BOV came together annually. The minutes of their meetings have been transcribed and are described below.

The Faculty Chairman, meanwhile, acted as a liaison between his colleagues and the BOV and between the BOV, faculty and the Proctor, Patron, Bursar, and Janitor. Bruce describes the Chairman’s duties:

He was the spokesman of the Faculty on both public and private occasions; he saw to the execution of all laws adopted for the government of the institution; overlooked the proctor, the hotel-keepers, and all other subordinate agents; suspended, for a limited time, all delinquent students, or inflicted on them the minor punishments; sent out the monthly reports to their parents, and finally, empowered them to change their boarding houses, or to use the public rooms. In relation to the Faculty itself, he was authorized to convene that body as often as the welfare of the University imperatively required; he presided at its meetings, with the right of voting once as a professor, and a second time, as the chairman, should there arise a tie; and he brought its attention all matters bearing on the fundamental government of the institution which required a decision. In its turn, the Faculty could call on him for information about any subject upon which they had a right to deliberate (vol. 2, pgs. 50-51).

Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: RG-19/1/1.461
Credit Line: Minutes of the Faculty of the University of Virginia.

General Description:
The Minutes of the Faculty of the University of Virginia record the discussions and resolutions of the faculty meetings, which were held far more frequently than those of the Board of Visitors or the Executive Committee and thus provide a more in-depth view of what day-to-day life was like at the University. In general, the minutes reflect the faculty’s limited direct responsibility for the buildings and grounds. They are principally concerned with the matriculation, behavior, and discipline of students; the relationship between the faculty and the Board of Visitors; the administration of rules
and regulations of the University; outfitting of classrooms; professors' schedules; and curriculum and administrative issues. Although the minute books are housed in Special Collections, bound transcriptions (used here) are housed in the reading room of the same library.

Organization:
The minutes are recorded in the chronological order of the meeting. Although the later bound and transcribed volumes are accompanied by indexes, the index for volumes 1-11 are found only on Microfilm reel 1 for the group's call number. This index is largely limited to individual names and is a reproduction of the handwritten original (and thus, its page numbers refer to the microfilmed – or original – pages). Volumes 12-16 each have their own indexes located on the microfilm copy. All of the indexes, however, are spotty.

Suggestions for Use:
The early minute books (through the 1840s) are the most detailed and explicit in describing not only the resolutions enacted by the faculty, but also the various points of view in debates over certain issues. They often transcribe (rather than summarize) the arguments or evidence presented in a certain case, i.e. a student's disciplinary hearing. In such cases, therefore, the minutes present an unparalleled opportunity to follow-up on an event or incident mentioned in the Chairman's journals or, for more substantial issues, the Board of Visitor's minutes. For example, the details of an 1856 beating of a slave girl owned by one of the boarding house keepers (Miss Terrell – her boarding house was located to the northeast of the Rotunda and is visible on fig. 6) are provided both from the point of view of the student and witnesses. The case is then supplemented by a description of the various views of the faculty, the letter they subsequently sent to the student announcing his dismissal, and the rebuttal submitted by this student on his own behalf. The minutes potentially demonstrate not only the administrative organization of the University, therefore, but also the interaction between students and other members of the University community.

Like the Chairman's journals, discussions relating to the grounds and buildings of the University are largely limited to infrequent requests for the Proctor to attend to particular issues (most often issues associated with academic buildings).
Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: RG-19/1/2.041
Credit Line: University of Virginia. Chairman of the Faculty. Journals of the Chairman of the Faculty.

General Description:
Along with the Proctor's papers, journals, and ledgers, these books are one of the most potentially fruitful sources for understanding the day-to-day life of the 19th-century University. As part of his duties, the Faculty Chairman was required to keep a journal in which he recorded issues requiring further attention with a frequency somewhere between once every 1-2 weeks. The items recorded in these journals were then discussed by the faculty during their meetings. The frequency and detail (not to mention a largely narrative format) make these journals compelling and rich sources. The University archives as volumes for the years 1827 through 1864 with some gaps: vol. 1, 1827-1830 July; vol. 2, 1830 July -1831 July; vol. 3, 1831 July -1832 July; vol. 4, 1832 July-1833 July; vol. 5, 1833 August-1835 June; vol. 6, 1835 July – 1837 June; vol. 7, 1837 June-1838 June; vol. 8, 1838 July-1839 June; vol. 9, 1845 July -1846 June; vol. 10, 1851-1854; vol. 11, 1855-1858 July; vol. 12, 1858 October -1861 June; and vol. 13, 1861 October 7-1864 June 6.

Organization:
The journals are organized chronologically, both in content and in volume number. The same book would be passed from Chairman to Chairman, year to year, until room ran out in the particular book or the term ended. Each new school year is marked by a heading that features the inclusive dates and the Chairman's name for that term. The volumes are largely un-indexed, though volumes 1 and 3 have brief indexes (mostly concerning specific names of those mentioned in the journals) in the front of the books. Some Chairmen entered short headings in the left margin describing the issue or activity written in narrative.

Suggestions for Use:
While the Proctor's papers, journals, and ledgers will be most helpful to the researcher of the gardens and grounds of the University in terms of changes and improvements, the Chairman of the Faculty Journals are unparalleled in the wealth of detailed information they offer about what happened in the buildings and grounds of the University. The volumes' content is focused on the people who inhabited the University – students, professors, hotelkeepers, staff, and slaves – and the ways in which they interacted with one another. The journals reveal the tension between the Proctor and the Chairman of the Faculty; the particulars of the matriculation and misconduct of students both on and off grounds (i.e. operating gambling houses, visiting taverns, sleeping late, shooting at one another with pistols); the conditions of the hotels, the subsequent excuses offered by the proprietors for their negligence, and
the quarells that often erupted between students and hotelkeepers; the behavior and quality of work of servants and slaves; scuffles and arguments between students, faculty and the families of the faculty; and the particulars of curriculum and class meetings.

Discussion of the buildings and grounds specifically occurred most often when the Chairman recorded his conversations with the Proctor or when the Proctor had neglected his duties regarding their upkeep. For example, on May 22, 1833, the Chairman wrote in his journal: “I saw the Proctor upon the subject of the hogs which roam about the University. The dilapidations to be perceived in the walls, pavements…and the leaks in the roofs of several of the pavilions and other buildings.” The Chairman and Proctor were often at odds with one another over the way in which the Proctor carried out (or did not carry out) his duties as instructed by the Faculty and the BOV.

The journals also record the students’ conduct in relationship to the buildings and grounds. On April 5-6, 1836, for example, the Chairman recorded an incident in which a group of students “had illuminated the eastern lawn by candles stuck against the walls of the dormitories and pavilions.” Because “the walls [were] blackened and disfigured by this mode of illumination,” the Chairman extinguished the candles. After a second attempt was made the following evening, the Chairman “adopted a mode which did no injury to the buildings, and it being accompanied by no disorder…did not farther interfere.” Earlier in the same year, the Chairman remarked upon a mysterious group of students who had lit multiple, dangerous bonfires on the Lawn as well as intentionally broken the windows of hotels and pavilions.
OTHER ARCHIVAL SOURCES

**Depository:** Special Collections, The University of Virginia (reproductions), Frances Loeb Library, Harvard University (original)

**Call Number:** RG-31/1/2:2.814

**Credit Line:** Manning, Warren H. “Master Site Plans for the University of Virginia, 1908-1914.”

**General Description:**
Distinguished American landscape architect Warren Manning was hired by the University in 1906 to design a new master plan for the quickly expanding grounds. He produced 2 plans for the grounds and teamed up with William Lambeth on the first published book on Thomas Jefferson as an architect, *Thomas Jefferson as an Architect and Designer of Landscape*, in 1913. He also designed the “Italian Garden,” a large garden that encompassed the gardens behind Pavilions VI and VIII (shown on the “Study for Development,” fig. 11, and largely destroyed during the restorations of the 1950s). This collection contains copies of the “General Plan,” “Study for Development,” “Plan of Existing Conditions,” and “Report to Accompany a Plan for the University of Virginia,” the originals of all of which are housed in the Harvard University Library.

**Organization:**
In the “Report to Accompany a Plan,” Manning describes the existing condition of the Academical Village in 1908, interprets Jefferson’s plan for the University and intentions for the gardens, and makes suggestions to both adapt the Academical Village to contemporary needs and to bring the landscape back to what Jefferson had intended.

**Suggestions for Use:**
Manning’s “Report to Accompany a Plan” is helpful to the researcher of the gardens and grounds for a number of reasons, the overarching interest being Manning’s perceptive interpretation of Jefferson’s intentions for circulation, grading, orientation, divisions of public/private space, viewsheds, and the ways in which the arrangement of the buildings could serve the daily life of the University. Manning distinguishes between 2 sides to the University: living (Lawn) and entrance (courtyards and alleys), understanding the living space as being private. Manning finds considerable “beauty” in the gardens, though he claims that this is the “result of accident.” He says of the uniqueness of the pavilion gardens:

One of the most attractive features of the original plan and an indication of the refinements of the day which we have yet to attain, was the provision for gardens at each residence hall….I would have your University the Garden University of America, for these gardens would be one of its greatest distinctions, and their whole development would indicate a refinement of taste that would give greater emphasis to the high ideas already established by the University and be in marked
contrast to the absolute bareness or the meager display of garish flower beds in most other American institutions.

In keeping for his reverence for Jefferson’s original plan for the University – and especially the gardens – Manning’s master plan includes the construction of roads, walks, and quadrangles that will best present the University upon approach and shape views from various buildings; thinning and maintaining trees so as to maximize views; instituting a uniform and easy-to-care-for material for walks; and returning the gardens to their state as “old-fashioned gardens of Jefferson’s day” by removing the service road to the east side of the East Range. Manning also suggests that before any further changes are made, efforts be focused on creating “complete detailed plans of underground pipes, buildings, and other constructions of which an accurate knowledge is essential if the greatest economy in construction and maintenance is to be secured.” It is unclear whether or not this aspect of his plan was ever carried out, though such a source would surely prove to be invaluable for understanding early 20th century conditions in the gardens.

The “Plan of Existing Conditions,” meanwhile, roughly documents the state of the gardens and grounds in May 1909. Manning depicts the service road on the east side of the Academical Village, as well as a path on the west side, directly behind the West Range. The scale is approximate, making the size or extent of this road difficult to determine. Manning also does not draw the walls of the gardens, preventing any precision in an analysis of the location of these roads/paths.

---

**Depository:** Special Collections, The University of Virginia  
**Call Number:** MSS 13517  
**Credit Line:** Tucker, Eleanor Lile. “Memories of a Happy Life at the Dear Old U. VA.” Cleveland, Ohio, 1968. Unpublished manuscript.

**General Description:**  
This manuscript is an autobiographical narrative by Eleanor Lile Tucker, a descendant of John B. Minor, a professor who played a central role in saving the University from fire during Union invasion during the Civil War and who resided in Pavilion X from 1845 to his death in 1895. Tucker moved to the University area in the late 19th century when her father, William B. Lile, to take over his great uncle Minor’s post as professor of law. Tucker and her family initially lived with her cousin, Kate Minor, in the Parsonage at the end of Dawson’s Row, then moved into a rented house on 14th Street before moving into Pavilion X after John B. Minor died. She remained at Pavilion X until her 1915 marriage to University Reverend Beverly D. Tucker, Jr., when she moved to a “house” on the East Range behind Pavilion VI (presumably Hotel D). Tucker provides an anecdotal history of the pavilions and their residents during her life at the University.
Suggestions for Use:
Tucker's narrative and others like it are invaluable sources for the kinds of personal, anecdotal stories that are often not recorded elsewhere. Her account provides a lively picture of what living on the Lawn was like in the late 19th century, a perspective that is harder to reconstruct from sources such as the Proctor's ledgers and the minutes of various committees. This is especially true in terms of understanding how families lived in the Academical Village. For example, she described what it was like living on the Lawn as a child, playing with the children of other faculty members: “We children skated and bicycled up and down the Lawn, under the arcades in snow and rain, played a modified game of baseball with trees as bases.” Tucker's narrative also reveals the tightness and small scale of the University community. For example, professors’ children often married into other professors' families because the population was so limited.

Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: Broadside 1824 .V57
Credit Line: The University of Virginia. Explanations of the Ground Plan of the University of Virginia.

General Description:
Printed to accompany the Maverick Plan and perhaps with text written by Jefferson himself (see handwritten note accompanying the plan), this one-page flyer describes the buildings of the Academical Village and their functions. Betts says that this plan was printed to accompany the 1825 Maverick Plan and “the two were sold together for fifty cents to students and other interested people (Betts, Groundplans and Prints, pg. 87).”

Suggestions for Use:
The description of the pavilions differentiates between the back yards and the gardens, a demarcation that is often lost in later descriptions and analyses: “of two stories each, for the residence of the Professors separately, with each a lecturing room, and generally four rooms of accommodation for the family – a back yard and garden. The offices are below.” The hotels are described similarly: “These Hotels have their offices below, with each a back-yard and garden, separated by cross streets of communication with the Pavilions.” Specific reference is also made to the University’s water supply infrastructure: “Within the back-yards are cisterns of fountain water, brought in pipes from a neighbouring [sic] mountain.” These cisterns were pictured in the spaces behind the dormitories (rather than within the garden precincts marked by the serpentine walls) on the 1825 version of the Maverick plan, confirming that this explanation was both meant to accompany the 1825 version and that the “back yards"
to which the explanation refers were the spaces directly behind the dormitories, hotels, and pavilions now used as parking lots.
NON-ARCHIVAL PRIMARY SOURCES


General Description:
Barringer moved to the University with her family as a small girl in 1889, first living at No. 1 West Range (then Elsom’s boarding house) and then moving to a pavilion (Pavilion IX?) in 1890.

Organization:
The first installment of the memoir (vol. 24), is loosely chronological, including an account of Barringer’s first impressions upon arriving at the University and accounts of the death of John B. Minor; the fire of 1895; the blizzard of 1899; and the smallpox epidemic of 1900. The second installment (vol. 27-28), meanwhile, is far longer and greater in scope. Largely organized thematically, it is more descriptive of life in Charlottesville and of individuals at the University and also includes historic photographs (i.e. images of three African American employees of the University). Barringer is far more self-aware in the second volume as well, often comparing the way things were in her day to how they are in the 1960s.

Suggestions for Use:
Like Tucker’s memoir, Barringer’s descriptions of life at the University are invaluable in understanding the ways in which families lived in the Academical Village in the late 19th century. She gives detailed descriptions of the places where she and the other children who lived on the Lawn would play, for example:

While elders chatted, children played hide-and-seek in the alleys and back yards, but never, never in the space behind the student rooms on the Ranges or in the space below the Lawn rooms. That was student territory and out of bounds even to your brothers, night or day during the session, and to me, as a girl, at any and all times (vol. 24, pg. 9).

It is useful to keep in mind that in such first-person narratives, the authors often have their own terminology for spaces or buildings. For example, in this case, Barringer refers to the pavilion gardens as “back yards.”

Barringer also describes the grounds and buildings of the University in some detail. She describes the scene in her family’s pavilion garden: “From this porch, down two steps and across a wide brick walk, was the kitchen, a very large brick cottage, extra spacious for the original student eating house….The back yard was constantly crowded…a coal bin, a wood pile, a chicken coop, and a hydrant (vol. 24, pgs. 13 and 17).”
**Citation:** Southall, James P. *In the Days of My Youth: When I Was a Student in the University of Virginia, 1888-1893.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1947.

**General Description:**
Much like Tucker and Barringer’s essays, this chronologically organized memoir presents an opportunity to understand the daily life of the University in the 19th century. Born in 1871, Southall grew up in Richmond and was a student at the University from 1888 to 1890 and both a student and instructor from 1891 through 1893.

**Suggestions for Use:**
Although riddled with nostalgia, this autobiography provides an instructive and detailed view of what life was like for a student at the University in the late 19th century. Southall describes day-to-day, administrative activities, such as how one matriculated at the University: first he and his father consulted the Chairman of the Faculty and then “the next step was to see the Proctor and conclude the business of matriculation by paying required fees and making arrangements for my board and lodging (pg. 33).” Though tedious at times, Southall provides considerable detail, vividly describing the “characters” of his story, the arrangement of his first dormitory assignment on Monroe Hill, and the daily responsibilities of the “coloured [sic] janitor who waited on me,” for example. Southall’s descriptions are most helpful in creating a picture of the daily interaction between faculty, students and staff of the University and they provide colorful images of those whom Southall encountered. There is, however, little description of the buildings and grounds of the University, other than what was absolutely necessary to create a backdrop for Southhall’s anecdotes.

**Other Memoirs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
General Description:
These are the catalogues distributed to the University community each school year. Although the particulars of the content changed from year to year, the catalogues consistently provide the names of students and summaries of University services.

Organization:
The first catalogues (beginning with the University’s 1825 opening) list students, their hometowns, the “schools” they are attending within the University; the professors and their appointments; the schools included within the University and the number of students enrolled in each; the members of the Board of Visitors; a breakdown of where students are from and the total number of students attending the University. Beginning in 1835, the catalogues also begin to list the regulations and terms for matriculation, courses, etc. They include descriptions of each professor’s classes and the textbooks required, along with a breakdown of expenses. This basic format is retained until ca. 1850, when the catalogues begin to list the hotelkeepers and the location of each student’s room (i.e. Lawn, Range, boarding house). This practice does not continue, though the names of boarding house and hotelkeepers continue to be listed along with the proctor, chaplain, and other University staff until 1870. Descriptions and lists of regulations gradually become more comprehensive. A University calendar – laying out the schedule of classes and activities and a weekly schedule of lectures – begins to be included in 1874-75, along with a list of and information for alumni. By 1891-92, a “historical note” is printed on the back page. A map of the principal buildings of the University is included by 1895 (fig. 10).

Suggestions for Use:
Although the catalogues do not consistently list the names and corresponding living quarters for students (something which may be found in the Proctor’s Ledgers), they are an invaluable source for quick confirmation of the names of University students, faculty, and staff for any given years. They are also helpful as a quick go-to for statistical information about the University for any given year.

Call Number: LD 5667
Citation: University of Virginia. Catalogues. Sessions 1825-1896.
General Description:
Edited and written by students and published by the University, these un-indexed journals often feature updates on the state of buildings, grounds, and administrative decisions at the University, as well as make suggestions for future improvement.

Suggestions for Use:
This publication is helpful for understanding the University from a student perspective at a given time. While many of the official records of the University provide only a view of student life in terms of the various regulation infractions for which they were found out and their ensuing punishments, these journals suggest a more complicated and engaged student population. A December 1872 article laments the loss of a large chestnut tree on Carr's Hill: “Not a student who has boarded on the Hill who does not remember this old tree, and has not some incident of his college life connected with it… (vol. 11, no. 3, pgs. 153-4).”

A section dubbed “Collegiana” from the 1870s (a similar format is found in the “Editor's Table” section of the late 1850s and early 1860s) is especially explicit in its descriptions of existing conditions. Students expressed their appreciation for improvements made to the Lawn in 1871:

[with] unseemly paths made across it during the Winter…fast disappearing…we hope that by the Final Celebration to see it clothed with an emerald carpet to be pressed by fairy feet, that shake not the dew from the trembling blade as they pass. We congratulate future loafers, upon the flourishing condition of the young trees planted on the Lawn and in other parts of the College during the past winter….They should have been planted twenty years ago, instead of the locusts that now disfigure the Lawn; but better late than never (vol. 9, no. 8, pg. 454).

Such accounts provide a glimpse into the appreciation that students had for the 19th-century Academical Village, in sharp contrast to the constant official reports that tout their bad behavior.
THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA: HISTORY

Citation: Barringer, Paul B. *The University of Virginia: Its History, Influence, Equipment and Characteristics*. 2 volumes. New York: Lewis, 1904.

General Description:
This large-format, 2-volume book was written by Paul B. Barringer, the Chairman of the Faculty at the time of publication, and former University professor James Mercer Garnett. The bulk of the book is an encyclopedia-like directory of former University founders, benefactors, faculty, officers, and alumni, with many entries accompanied by photographs or reproductions of paintings of the various personages. The book also includes a lengthy history of the University, focusing on administrative developments and major building campaigns. Principal sources are letters (especially between Jefferson and others); the minutes of the Board of Visitors and other official groups; and secondary sources on the history of the University published elsewhere, often by the very same men profiled later in the volume. Sources are often quoted at length and cited in the body of the text.

Organization:
While the second volume consists entirely of descriptions of University officers and alumni, the first volume contains a range of items, with its bulk devoted to a history of the University. The history portion of the first volume is focused on Jefferson’s ideas for education, the founding of the University, and the early administrative history, with more concise narratives of the later 19th century focused mainly on major building campaigns and shifts in the curriculum and organization of administration. Following the history is a number of addenda, including reproductions of a few of Jefferson’s letters regarding the founding of the University and copies of his elevations for the pavilions; reprints of articles or addresses by University professors (i.e. Dr. Noah K. Davis’s history of “The School of Athens” painting destroyed in the Annex fire of 1895); an account of the developments of the University library; a list of publications of University faculty; and a bibliography of the history of the University of Virginia to date, principally including publications and addresses by various professors. The first volume has a detailed table of contents.

Suggestions for Use:
Published in 1904, this book would be most helpful as a quick resource for the identification of names of people mentioned in Board of Visitors or Faculty minutes, etc. Descriptions vary from ½ page to a full page and provide outlines of the person’s life and associations; academic or business achievements; and affiliation with the University.
The book also includes a number of photographs of the University I have not seen printed elsewhere, including views of the back of Dawson’s Row and of “Cemetery Walk,” and of the south elevation of the Rotunda with unfinished and un-carved column capitals. There are, however, no images of the gardens specifically.


**General Description:**
This is the most comprehensive and often cited of all sources on the history of the University. Although footnotes are explanatory rather than citation-based, the first volume includes a list of “authorities” for volumes 1 and 2 and volume 3 has a list for the remaining books. This list of references consists largely of primary sources, though most applicable secondary sources available in the late 1910s are also included (i.e. Barringer, Patton, Kimball, Lambeth and Manning, and various biographies of Jefferson). Primary sources include newspapers, correspondence, and official records like the Proctor’s Papers and minute books.

**Organization:**
Bruce divides the history of the University into a series of periods, intermittently interrupted by more thematic discussions. Each volume has a detailed table of contents. The contents of the individual volumes are as follows: vol. 1, the conception and construction of the University; vol. 2, 1825-1842; vol. 3, 1842-1895; vol. 4, 1865-1895 continued and 1895-1904; and vol. 5, 1904-1919. Periods were largely determined by major shifts in administration (i.e. the appointment of President Alderman) or historical events (i.e. the Civil War, the 1895 fire).

**Suggestions for Use:**
These volumes are indispensable to the researcher of any aspect of the history of the University. Besides serving as the historical context for almost all histories of the buildings and grounds, they offer explanations of shifts in the University’s administration, organization, and duties of various faculty and staff positions; biographical profiles, descriptions, anecdotes of historical figures; and narrative accounts not only of major events in the University’s history, but also daily life. Take, for example, Bruce’s description of the early hotelkeepers:

[they] were, with one exception, men who keenly relished their toddies and loved to shuffle a pack of cards, either in their own apartments or in the dormitories. At the spring term of the Circuit Court of Albemarle, in 1826, several of them were actually indicted by the grand jury for
gaming. It was the loose practice of the times, from which they can be no more absolved than the students themselves (vol. 2, pg. 221). Although there are a number of descriptions of incidents happening in or around the gardens and yards, a lack of index can make these hard to find. Bruce's method of only occasionally citing particular primary sources, meanwhile, make such information even more difficult to track or substantiate. These volumes are most helpful, therefore, as references for general trends or climates of certain moments in the University's history.

Citation: Crenshaw, Lewis D., Sallie J. Doswell, and John S. Patton. Jefferson's University: Glimpses of the Past and Present of the University of Virginia. Charlottesville, VA: The Michie Company, Printers, 1915.

General Description:
This short book by Patton (University librarian), Sallie J. Doswell (a local history enthusiast and boarding house keeper) and Lewis D. Crenshaw (the Director of UVA's European Bureau, established soon after this book was published to serve the needs of alumni abroad), is part history book, part alumni catalogue, part guidebook, and part hagiographic boosterism. Largely anecdotal with quotes pulled most likely from the same sources Patton had used in his 1906 book, the narrative does not approach the early history of the early and subsequent history of the University systematically, but it is an excellent source for photographs and descriptions of important University personages, buildings, interiors, and grounds at the time of publication.

Organization:
The book is largely organized chronologically, with historical narrative interrupted by various items more common to guidebooks than history texts, including: descriptions and histories of individual buildings or places on grounds; a list of artwork, its artists and donors, found throughout grounds; cheers and songs part of the student tradition; and a drawing of the Lawn and Pavilions with the names of the professors who have resided there and the classical source of the buildings' architectural details. Like Patton's earlier book, later chapters are focused on the histories of individual themes at the University (i.e. societies and publications). There are no footnotes, nor is there a bibliography. There is no table of contents and only a brief index.

Suggestions for Use:
The book is considerably invested in the history of the University's buildings, and especially the construction process and the cost and funding sources for projects. Much like Patton's earlier book's anecdotes, however, the sources for most stories told in this book are not cited. Some claims are clearly unsubstantiated. For example: "As planned, the Lawn was to be devoid of trees, so that nothing would interfere with the
severely class accessories, but at present two rows of handsome maples border each side (pg. 25).” The book also frequently does not differentiate between buildings that no longer existed at the time of publication and those that still stood. This is a hint at the largely nostalgic tone of the book that prohibits its use as a reliable secondary source on the gardens and grounds, but suggests its richness in an examination as a primary source in a study of the University in the early 20th century.

_Citation:_ Neale, Catherine S. “Slaves, Freedpeople, and the University of Virginia.” Undergraduate Thesis, The University of Virginia, 2006.

_General Description:_
Neale’s thesis is a carefully researched account of slavery at the University in the 19th century, from the construction of the Academical Village, to post-emancipation race relations. Dependent almost entirely upon primary sources in Special Collections, the story Neale tells is a complicated and engages the methodologies of social history.

_Organization:_
A loosely chronologically-organized narrative, Neale’s thesis is divided into 3 main chapters: “Slaves and the Infrastructure of the University,” explaining the ways in which the antebellum University was dependent upon slave labor both in its construction and daily-to-day operation; “Slaves in the Daily Lives of Students,” describing the responsibilities slaves had for tending to the students and the often violent ways in which they interacted; and “Slaves Become Freedpeople and the University’s Response,” chronicling the post-emancipation African American population at the University, the ways in which the University shifted its organization in order to account for the loss of slave labor, and interactions between African American communities in and out of the University precincts. The thesis concludes with a series of appendices that involve population statistics throughout the 19th century; statistics on the “types” of slaves at the University; transcriptions of a notorious incident with a professor’s slave; and lists of the early hotelkeepers, administrators and faculty, and pavilion residents.

_Suggestions for Use:_
Besides offering a wealth of details about individual incidents regarding slaves, their interactions with students and professors, and their role in the larger University community, this thesis provides an indispensable framework for historical trends and developments regarding slave life in the antebellum period. The complete footnotes and bibliography make it easy to follow-up on Neale’s claims or individual historic incidents. The paper is also a fantastic example of the kind of successful narratives made possible by a considerable dependence on the Proctor’s Papers.
General Description:
First published in 1900 and written by the librarian for the University, this book is focused on the major events in the creation and subsequent shaping of the University (i.e. the creation of the honor system, major building campaigns), its financial history, the history of various student grounds, and the biographies of professors and others who had central roles in the history of the University. He begins by positioning the University and the idea of secondary public education in post-Revolutionary America.

Patton's methodology seems to be a combination of a systematic examination of a limited number of primary sources and tidbits and anecdotes he had encountered over his years at the University. His sources seem to be largely letters and the minutes of the BOV and faculty committees, etc. and are rarely cited in the text. Other sources are simply cited as “contemporary account[s].”

He does attempt at an architectural history of the University, acknowledging Jefferson's indebtedness to Palladio (years before others were to do so), recognizing the initial project's budget constraints, and approving of the McKim, Mead and White addition still underway in 1906. Reflecting the distaste for Victorian period architecture, Patton critically writes: “The Jeffersonian group of buildings plainly indicated the order for all subsequent structures, but absolute disregard of congruity and harmony characterized every building erected for nearly seventy years after the founder's death (pg. 192).” He cites Brooks Hall as the ultimate example of this demise in the quality of the University's architecture.

Organization:
The book is organized chronologically until the fire of 1895 and the subsequent restoration. Later chapters are more thematic (i.e. alumni, athletics, literary societies). A final chapter lays out the potential future of the University. The table of contents is detailed and extended, making it a far more useful navigating tool than the brief index. The book has few footnotes and no bibliography.

Suggestions for Use:
Patton's book is filled with anecdotes that pertain to the daily life of the University and improvements and changes to the buildings and grounds. For example, he writes that when the University opened, 3 of the first 5 professors came with their wives, toppling Jefferson's assumption that his teachers would be single. Patton recounts: “It was not long before these young maidens had banished the classes from their homes, and converted the large lecture-halls into drawing-rooms (pg. 92).” Patton then claims that in the first winter after the University opened it was “unpleasantly new and smelling of..."
paint, and its chief building, the Rotunda, still unfinished. The grounds, recently
graded and parts of them doubtless still undergoing change, were raw, treeless, and
uninviting… (pg. 94).” While such descriptions and claims are helpful and surely
interesting, their lack of documentation is problematic.

**Depository:** Special Collections, The University of Virginia

**Call Number:** MSS 13201

**Citation:** Schulman, Gayle M. “Slaves at The University of Virginia.” Paper
draft, September 2004.

**General Description:**
This 33-page [draft] paper by a local (Charlottesville-Albemarle) historian is one of the
few attempts at a history of slavery at the University of Virginia, from the construction
of slave quarters and outbuildings immediately after the University opened to post-
emancipation achievements of particular slaves who had formerly lived and worked at
the University. Schulman is especially adept at picking out and illustrating the lives of
particular slaves and their relationships to their masters and the rest of the University
community; she tracks the purchase of particular individuals as well as their
subsequent lives at the University and possible sale. Focusing largely on the slaves
owned by University professors, Schulman’s papers is one of the few histories of the
University that actively incorporates letters and other items found in the collections of
individual professors. The well-researched and footnoted paper also references the
minutes of the Board of Visitors and Faculty, the Proctor’s Papers, as well as both
memoirs found in the University archives and published. She also skillfully
incorporates information from a wide variety of secondary sources, including Bruce,
Grizzard, Frank, Historic Structure Reports, and various histories of slavery in the United
States.

**Organization:**
A chronologically-organized narrative, this paper is divided into sections: “Slave
workers from the beginning,” describing the role of African American slaves in the
construction of the University; “Early years at the new university,” outlining the arrival
of the first professors at the University, the slaves they brought with them, and the
types of buildings the University constructed in order to accommodate them;
“Students and Slaves,” highlighting some of the incidents between students and slaves
and providing an overview of the ways in which the two groups interacted on
grounds; “The ‘Peculiar Institution’ in the Established University,” which puts slavery at
the University into the context of slavery throughout the South in this period;
“Punishment, Family Disruption, and the Rules of ‘Freedom,’” “Literacy and Education;”
“Health Problems as the University Grows,” describing the sickness and death of slaves
in the late antebellum period; “Conflict and War;” and a conclusion that discusses the
post-emancipation paths of some of the African Americans who had formerly lived at the University as slaves.

**Suggestions for Use:**
Along with Neale’s thesis, this paper provides not only names and stories of individual slaves, but also a context for slavery at the University in the antebellum period. Sculman’s paper also provides a rare example of how individual professors’ papers could be used in a reconstruction of 19th century University history.

---

**General Description:**
Shahien’s report is focused on the social and biographical history of the residents of the pavilions. It consists largely of transcribed or reprinted accounts and compiled biographies, rather than original analysis. The report’s bibliography focuses on University publications, published accounts of life at the University, previously printed biographical sketches of University faculty, student directories, and the University yearbook, *Corks and Curls*.

**Organization:**
The report is guided by a table of contents and divided into the following sections: a catalogue of pavilion residents from the University’ 1825 opening through 2006; short and anecdotal histories of the pavilions; biographical sketches of selected pavilion residents; reprinted accounts and descriptions of pavilion life (including that of Eleanor Lile Tucker) and transcriptions of interviews with contemporary pavilion residents; and short thematic descriptions of various aspects of University life.

**Suggestions for Use:**
This report offers a significant contribution with its list of pavilion residents, complete with the years in which each professor or staff member resided in the pavilion and the school in which they taught or position that they held while living in the pavilion. Because many of the primary sources used in research on the history of the University (and especially the Board of Visitor’s Minutes) refer to pavilions by the name of the professor then residing there (rather than the pavilion number), this list is an invaluable reference. Shahien does not, however, explicitly reveal his method for compiling this list.
THOMAS JEFFERSON: ARCHITECT

Citation: Kimball, Fiske. “The Genesis of Jefferson’s Plan for the University of Virginia.” *Architecture* 48, no. 6 (December 1923): 397-399.

**General Description:**
In this short article, Kimball argues with the “recurrent skepticism on the part of architects that Jefferson himself could have composed [the design of the University of Virginia].” He directly engages and refutes the claim that Jefferson stole his idea for the Lawn, pavilions, and colonnades from an 1805 Grands Prix design by Guennepin, arguing instead that both designs merely reflect the “pervading classical style of the time” and that Jefferson was perhaps more influenced by the Marly-le-Roi which he saw in Paris in 1786. This article publishes reproductions of Jefferson’s 1814 scheme for Central College, the Maverick Plan, Latrobe’s letter proposing the Rotunda, and Jefferson’s final scheme for the University of 1819 featuring the serpentine walls.

**Suggestions for Use:**
This article shows Kimball’s untiring defense of Jefferson at work; he refused to have Jefferson belittled as an amateur architect merely copying others’ designs, and yet he acknowledged that Jefferson’s design sensibility and his solutions for individual projects did not materialize out of thin air.

---


**General Description:**
This large folio beautifully reproduces many of Thomas Jefferson’s architectural drawings and includes Kimball’s periodization of Jefferson’s architectural development. Kimball saw the value of Jefferson’s drawings not only in terms of what they revealed about the man himself, but also that they “offer the fullest evidence we have concerning the design of buildings in colonial times and in the years of our national life (pg. 13).” As the first historian to write an architectural history of Colonial America, it is not surprising that Kimball consistently attempts to position Jefferson’s work within the architectural climate of the period. In contrast with Manning and Lambeth’s publication of just a few years prior, Kimball details with footnotes and an authoritative tone the circumstances of Jefferson’s commissions and design choices, including the Virginia State Capitol. In fact, Kimball explicitly criticizes the previous publication in a footnote: “Unfortunately, being written without reference to the manuscript documents, it is unhistorical in many of its assumptions and suggestions, both concerning the plan [for Monticello] in Jefferson’s day and concerning the motives which conditioned it (pg. 69).”
Organization:
The book begins with a description of the content and provenance of the Jefferson papers by Worthington Chauncey Ford before launching into Kimball’s narrative. Kimball divides Jefferson’s “development as an architect” by his political appointments (i.e. the years he was in Europe, served as president of the United States), follows with a discussion of the influences on Jefferson’s architecture, and ends with an essay on and list of Jefferson’s books on architecture. The plates of drawings, meanwhile, are prefaced by a list that includes analysis, discussions of provenance, descriptions of technique, and transcriptions of documents that pertain to the particular drawings.

Suggestions for Use:
The prominent position Kimball establishes for Jefferson in the narrative of early American architectural history is essential to any discussion of a Jefferson-designed project. In terms of a study of the history of the grounds and buildings of the University in particular, Kimball’s book directly engages the discussions Jefferson had with Thornton and Latrobe during the planning process (including attributing the suggestion for the Rotunda to Latrobe), the ways in which the selection of the site dictated subsequent changes to the design, and the criticisms of Dunglison, Cabell, and others in the years soon after the University opened. Kimball’s work set the tone for subsequent generations of historians and many of his evaluations and attributions remain constant. This book, therefore, is key to an understanding of the historiography of Jefferson’s architecture.

Note:

Citation:  

General Description:
The first book dedicated to Thomas Jefferson as an architect and landscape architect, this book reflects the beginnings of a renewed interest in Jefferson in the early 20th century. As is typical in such early histories, Jefferson is touted as a genius and innovator who “conceiv[ed] of a new architecture (pg. 21).” It often asserts a defensive tone and is full of inaccuracies (i.e. “Monticello was the only complete piece of domestic architecture by Jefferson [pg. 22] ”). Typical of the period, it often presents
Jefferson's finished projects as having been completely designed and built by the man himself. The book is well illustrated with photographs and includes reproductions of some of Jefferson's drawings and sheets of building specifications.

Organization:
The book is divided into two sections, with Lambeth as the author of “Thomas Jefferson as an Architect” and Manning of the shorter section, “Thomas Jefferson as a Designer of Landscapes.” After beginning with an argument against claims for William Thornton's influence on Jefferson's architecture, Lambeth's section is roughly divided into a study of Jefferson's domestic work and his design of the buildings at the University of Virginia. Lambeth does not attribute the Virginia State House to Jefferson, though he does gesture to the idea that he designed the early buildings in Washington, stating that “It is certain that George Washington and his commissioners consulted Jefferson on the plans of the White House and the Capitol Building – that his knowledge and tastes were influential in the making of Virginia’s State House (pg. 31).” His discussion of the University of Virginia attempts to create a narrative for the development of Jefferson's design and the process of construction and features transcriptions of a number of Jefferson's letters. He is careful to point out Palladio as an inspiration for Jefferson's architecture.

Manning, meanwhile, begins with a description of Jefferson's surveying knowledge and interest in city planning, followed by discussions of the planning of the site, circulation routes, lawns, and views of Monticello and the University. Manning discusses Jefferson's layout for the buildings and their relationships to one another; the importance of the gardens to the overall plan; the lack of evidence that he made specific plans for the planting of trees; and his unrealized plans for an arboretum.

Suggestions for Use:
Although the inaccurate content, the hagiographic tone, and lack of attribution for sources that largely make this book an out-dated reference for research on the gardens and grounds, it is important to consider in terms of the role it has played in the historiography of both Jefferson's architecture/landscape architecture and the history of the University. For example, both Lambeth and Manning stress the evolution of Jefferson's plan for the gardens, beginning with his placement of the West Range directly behind the West Lawn. Manning writes,

This last arrangement permitted a direct access by stairs to the gardens from the professors' homes in the second story of the pavilions which were included in one plan and partly built...The service road and yard, used in common by two pavilions, were shut off from the gardens by serpentine walls. Thus you will see he provided a secluded outdoor compartment for professors' families that corresponded to his Monticello south lawn (pg. 116).
Although he cites Cabell’s approval in this decision, Manning does not ascribe Cabell agency in the switch. Such points in the narrative were instrumental in shaping subsequent scholarship, which often uncritically accepted and repeated much of the book’s content.


General Description: Written by Nichols, one of Fiske Kimball’s successors both on the University of Virginia’s Architecture faculty and on the board of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation, and Griswold, a landscape architect then engaged in research on the 18th century gardens at Colonial Williamsburg, this book was the first serious attempt to consider Jefferson as a landscape architect since Manning and Lambeth’s publication more than fifty years prior. The objective of the book is to position Jefferson’s landscape architecture in his historic moment; they aim to trace Jefferson’s influences and the ways in which he adapted ideas to the particulars of his projects. It follows up on Kimball’s and Nichols’s own studies of Jefferson’s architecture to chronicle Jefferson’s work and ideas as a landscape architect, a role in the design process considered quite differently in the 19th century.

Organization: The book is organized chronologically, beginning with Jefferson’s training in land surveying by his father and ending with his design for the University of Virginia. Chapters are both thematic (“Influence of Landscape Garden Literature,” “Horticultural Influence”) and project-based (“Monticello and Other Plantations,” “The University of Virginia”). Many images are incorporated throughout the text, including reproductions of drawings and pages from Jefferson’s Garden Book; drawings and plans Jefferson completed for various projects; historic and contemporary photographs of Jefferson-designed landscapes and gardens; and plans, photographs, and drawings of the various designs that Griswold and Nichols posit as influencing Jefferson’s landscape design. The book has limited footnotes and a bibliography of secondary sources and reprinted primary sources. Betts’s publications on Jefferson’s gardens, Kimball’s analysis of Jefferson’s design and inspirations, Patton and Bruce’s histories of the University, and Jefferson’s letters and other writings are some of the listed texts that are most relied upon.

Suggestions for Use: This book provides a foundation for understanding Jefferson’s planning and landscape concepts. Nichols and Griswold position Jefferson’s design for the University of Virginia as “the culmination of his extraordinary life experience,” making the rest of
the content a prelude to the planning of the University. The bulk of the chapter on the University focuses on Jefferson’s planning and the origins and inspirations for his design. Intermingled with the account of the development of Jefferson’s design are descriptions and analysis of Jefferson’s theories on education and the comments of others central to the planning and construction of the University (i.e. Cabell, William Thornton). Nichols and Griswold claim that the botanical garden was built (and later destroyed with the construction of Cabell Hall) as Jefferson’s “final contribution to the planning of the University of Virginia (pg. 169),” though there is no evidence that the botanical garden was ever completed as planned by Jefferson.

Discussion on the gardens themselves is relatively limited and focuses on the gardens constructed by the Garden Club of Virginia. Nichols and Griswold tow the party line of the Colonial Revival, claiming: “No plans for the interiors of the gardens were left by Thomas Jefferson; but his other designs, letter, and lists of plants were sufficient evidence of the style of gardens he would have created…All of the architectural details…were prepared by the landscape architect [Alden Hopkins] as if Jefferson himself had been carrying out his intended design (pg. 172).”

The book’s hagiographic tone is best exemplified by the opening line of the Epilogue: “Not since Hadrian of Rome has anyone combined administrative talent with aesthetic genius more successfully than Thomas Jefferson of Monticello (pg. 177).” Although such a tone does not disqualify this book from being useful to the researcher of Jefferson’s gardens, it should be approached with caution. It is a lively narrative that skillfully culls information and quotations from a variety of sources, though the most reliable information on the gardens and grounds of the University comes from Betts’s studies or are oft-repeated quotes from Jefferson’s letters and other primary documents central to the early history of the University.
THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA: ARCHITECTURE AND LANDSCAPE

**Depositary:** Alderman Library, Reference Room, The University of Virginia

**Credit Line:** University of Virginia History Clipping Files.

**General Description:**
These clipping files were selected from the vast collection of files on a wide variety of topics housed in a filing cabinet in the reference room of Alderman Library. Folders, such as those discussed here, are focused on specific places on grounds, or on professors, University issues, or specific events or incidents. These files have been created and updated by the library staff and consist mostly of articles from local (*Cavalier Daily*, other University publications, or Charlottesville-Albemarle area) or regional publications; photocopies of narratives or descriptions from secondary sources; handwritten notes by library staff; and correspondence between library staff and various people from outside the University regarding inquiries made about various aspects of University history. Most clippings date from the 1950s through the late 1980s.

**On Specific Selected Files:**
- **Gardens:** This file includes mostly articles and ephemera from a wide range of sources focused on the restoration of the gardens by the Garden Club of Virginia. It includes photographs of construction and conditions during construction and of the Garden Club ladies and copies of old pamphlets and other University publications about the gardens.
- **McGuffey Ash:** Focusing on a large, old, and beloved tree in the garden of Pavilion IX, the clippings and other items in this folder chronicle the life of the tree and the University community’s affection for it. A number of articles from the mid-1960s call it the “oldest tree on grounds,” while a *Richmond News Leader* article from 1965 (5/6/1965) recounts that the tree had been planted by Pavilion IX’s first resident, George Tucker, 20 years before William McGuffey moved into the pavilion, dating the tree to the year after the University opened (1826). Articles from the 1990s detail the discussions surrounding the removal of the dying tree. A 1990 *Cavalier Daily* article (1/22/1990) claims that the tree was the “largest ash in the state” and that the late 19th century Pavilion IX resident, the wife of Professor William E. Peters, saved the tree when it was threatened by the construction of a sewage ditch. This folder also includes a typed list of trees, shrubs, and woody vines growing on grounds, a copy of which is found in the “Trees” folder as well. Although the document is not dated, it is most likely from the 1940s/50s as the notation “made by Dr. Betts” is written in pencil.
- **Pavilions:** This folder contains a number of articles from the *Cavalier Daily* and other local publications discussing the history and residents of the pavilions. These articles were often written to correspond with the opening of the buildings for Garden Week, to feature new professor/residents, or to discuss newly completed
restorations. Also included is a series of feature articles on the pavilions published by the *Cavalier Daily* in the 1980s. Also included are press releases from the UVA Information Service through the 1990s about changes planned for buildings.

• Cracker Box: This meager folder features a few items on the Cracker Box, the small, 2-story, brick kitchen and slave’s quarters behind hotel F. A handwritten note made by Mable Talley dated October 1, 1962 attempts a chronology of the building: it was not used for many years in the mid-20th century, then occupied by a Mr. Titus in 1958, then renovated and occupied again in 1961 by 2 architecture students. Titus supposedly had photographs of the building as it was being renovated. Talley also notes that the building had a “reputation” years ago, remarking that a “lady” lived there. Also included in the file is a handwritten list of years and occupants of the Cracker Box from 1919-1925, presumably culled from Student Directories.

*Suggestions for Use:*
These files would be most helpful in a study of the restoration and life of the gardens and yards in the 20th century. Many of the articles and other secondary sources, however, do include anecdotes about the history of these spaces in the 19th century, though they rarely cite the sources for these stories.

*Depository:*
Special Collections, The University of Virginia

*Call Number:*
MSS 7230

*Credit Line:*
Documents Relating to the East Garden Walls, compiled by Anne Freudenberg, for the UVA Garden Restoration Committee and the Garden Club of Virginia’s Restoration Committee, 1961.

*General Description:*
This is a microfilm of a series of documents in Special Collections gathered by University librarian Anne Fruedenberg in the 1950s as part of the research done for the restoration of the pavilion gardens by the Garden Club of Virginia. Almost all documents relate to the garden walls rather than what occurred within the gardens themselves, as the Garden Club’s objective was to recreate the walls as depicted on the Maverick Plan. Consisting mostly of reproductions or transcriptions of items in the University archives, many pages feature Freudenberg’s analysis or notes written in pencil.

*Organization:*
The collection is divided into 3 sections: ground plans, “Documents Pertaining to the Gardens and the Related Structures, 1819-30,” and “References to the Gardens and Related Structures in the BOV (1818-1855) and Faculty Minutes (1825-1845).” The first section includes copies of the drawings Jefferson completed of the gardens, the
publication of the Maverick plan, and Edwin Morris Betts’s interpretations of both. The
1819-30 documents consist of copies of select Jefferson letters laying out the plan for
constructing the walls; copies of expense accounts for bricks and other building
materials for the walls and pavilions; reports and correspondence (mainly between
Jefferson and Brockenbrough) regarding the completion of the garden walls, privies,
and smokehouses; balance sheets for pavilions with the cost of the walls; and copies
of items published by Betts and Warren Manning pertaining to the walls. The final
section is a list of excerpts (much like that found in Brown's unfinished manuscript and
my own appendix) of all of the references to gardens and buildings in the gardens
found in the BOV and faculty minutes for particular periods.

Suggestions for Use:
This collection offers little in terms of new information or analysis; all items are copies
of things found elsewhere in Special Collections. The nature of the items selected and
their specific content, however, substantiates the recent conclusion that the Garden
Club of Virginia was intent on confirming the Maverick plan in their reconstruction of
the serpentine walls, rather than attempting to reconstruct them as they were actually
built. This is especially apparent in Freudenberg’s notes. The general restriction of
items to those pertaining to the walls rather than the buildings or activities that
happened within the gardens further confirms that the gardens created by the Garden
Club were not intended to recall what actually was there in the early 19th century, but
rather a Colonial Revival vision of the spaces and their historical uses.

Citation: History and Cultural Landscape Survey Binders, the Office of the
Architect for the University.

General Description:
Since the mid-1990s, the Office of the Architect for the University has hired summer
interns to research the history of the University landscape, most focusing on the 20th
century. An overwhelming majority of the content pertains to the University’s
buildings and grounds beyond the Lawn and its principal buildings (Rotunda,
pavilions, dormitories). The binders are full of handwritten notes pertaining to items
in Special Collections or secondary sources about the history of the gardens and
grounds. Some include extensive bibliographies or references to other studies and
sources, while others include narratives or chronologies for certain areas (i.e. the
Engineering or Medical School campuses) or large swathes of grounds (i.e. west
grounds). Many binders include reproductions of items found in University archives or
elsewhere, such as letters from Jefferson regarding the construction of the garden
walls and historic maps to a transcript of Manning’s 1908 report.

Organization:
The binders are for the most part organized by the year of the intern’s work, though some are compilations of work done on a particular decade or period of the University’s history. These binders are loosely divided into sections of notes, copies, bibliographies, etc. The “Figure Ground Diagrams” binder is organized into sections of historic maps, aerial photographs, and compilation maps (by decade) of the grounds of the University.

Another set of binders pertains to specific aspects of the University grounds, i.e. the Pavilion Gardens and Alleys, Walks, and Roads. The Pavilion Gardens binder includes a series of copies of Jefferson letters; excerpts from the BOV minutes; copies of Betts’s material pertaining to the gardens; a collection of articles from a wide range of local and state-wide newspapers about the Garden Club’s restoration plans and various other features about the gardens over the years (mostly dating after the 1940s); and sections for each pavilion containing reproductions of photographs of the gardens housed in Special Collections and from other sources, copies of restoration plans, and photocopies of various secondary literature on the individual gardens. The Alleys, Walks, and Roads binder, meanwhile, is divided in a similar way and has similar content, though it is related to the circulation systems of the University rather than the pavilions. It includes sections on each of the major historic roads near the University (i.e. Lynchburg Road) and on each of the individual alleys. The sections on historic roads outside of the Academical Village include copies of plats and deeds from the Albemarle County Courthouse tracing the ownership of the properties and the history of their transfer to the University. This binder also includes copies of selected secondary literature relating to macadam (the material used to pave the alleys and roads of the University in the 1820s) and the development of the streetcar line in Charlottesville in the late 19th century.

Suggestions for Use:
Although the vast majority of the content of the binders in the Office of the Architect for the University are copies of items found elsewhere in Special Collections and Facilities Management (in the case of the drawings of the restoration or recent changes to the gardens and alleys), or that are widely available through major libraries (i.e. newspapers and secondary literature), the range and quantity collected is remarkable. These binders could be tremendously helpful to a research project on the gardens and landscape of the University, especially in the planning stages. The notes of the various interns, however, reveal intense primary research that is constantly being incorporated into narratives produced by later interns in the office and will eventually lead to an unparalleled and comprehensive examination of the history of the grounds. The maps made by the office and found primarily in the “Figure Ground Diagrams” binder have already begun to compile information found throughout the years of research. Culling from information gleaned from historic maps to descriptions, these sets of maps show the University’s major buildings and roads approximately every 10-15 years beginning in 1817; the development of water sources
and water infrastructure (including wells) for grounds by decade beginning in the 1820s; and overlay various historic maps with topographic maps while indicating the construction of new auxiliary structures (i.e. stables, privies) and roadways every 15-20 years beginning in 1825. These are extremely helpful in understanding the ad hoc expansion of the University and will continually be refined as new information arises.

_Citation:_ Betts, Edwin Morris. *Groundplans and Prints of the University of Virginia, 1822-1826.* Lancaster, PA: Lancaster Press, 1946.

_Citation II:_ Betts, Edwin Morris. “Groundplans and Prints of the University of Virginia, 1822-1826.” _Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society_ 90, no. 2 (May 1946): 81-90.

_General Description:_
This brief document is a history of the prints of Jefferson’s plans of the University of Virginia commissioned by Jefferson himself, beginning in 1821 and resulting in the famous Maverick plans. Betts includes transcriptions of the letters between Jefferson and William J. Coffee (who facilitated the production of the Maverick plan and others) and the engraver Peter Maverick, as well as excerpts from the Board of Visitors Minutes authorizing payment for the prints. Also included are accounts of the Goodacre engraving of the University and that completed by a Mr. Williams and printed with the Böyë map of the state of Virginia.

_Suggestions for Use:_
More of a chronology of these early images of the University than an analysis, this is the only document I have found that chronicles the creation of the Maverick plans, including Jefferson’s correspondence.

_Depository:_ Office of the Architect of the University

_General Description:_
A professor of botany and historian of Jefferson's gardens (both at the University and at Monticello), Edwin Morris Betts’s manuscript chronicles the history of the grounds of the University, paying special attention to the planting and survival of trees. This well-illustrated manuscript is annotated throughout with handwritten additions and corrections. Primary sources are usually cited and often extensively quoted or included in the form of transcriptions or reproductions.
**Organization:**
This manuscript begins with a preface that provides short biographies of the University's Superintendents of Buildings and Grounds since Pratt; a list of all of the Superintendents (1858-1962) is located later in the manuscript. Betts divides the history of the University grounds into 7 periods, chronicling the expansion of University property, and major building and planting campaigns. This historical narrative (including liberal transcriptions of primary correspondence and documentary evidence) is followed by a section on “Trees of Special Interest,” highlighting the histories and conditions of some of the University’s most distinctive arboreal features. He then provides short histories of the pavilion gardens and the Schele de Vere Garden (Pavilion IV), followed by descriptions of the [proposed] restorations by the Garden Club of Virginia, copies of historic maps, and descriptions of plantings elsewhere on University property.

**Suggestions for Use:**
Betts’s historical narrative tracks the history of major changes to the University grounds: the calls for improvement by the Board of Visitors, the planting of groves of trees, and the creation of gardens or other cultivation spaces. Betts does not, however, differentiate between primary sources that call for improvements and those that actually prove that changes were made on the ground. This is one of the pitfalls of depending entirely on the BOV minutes, as mentioned previously. Betts’s lively history does offer, however, the only complete story of the gardens and grounds in the 19th century, making it an invaluable source both for particulars of content (especially in terms of plant matter) and narrative. Betts’s short description of the pavilion gardens, meanwhile, is limited to a discussion of the serpentine walls. His discussion of the Schele de Vere Garden (Pavilion IV) is focused almost entirely on plant matter.

The manuscript does provide a rare description of the debate over the use of the Maverick Plan in the restoration of the gardens by the Garden Club of Virginia. The narrative states that after Alden Hopkins presented his initial plans in 1949 (which supposedly followed the Maverick but also included “privies, as well as other outhouses,” [pg. 110]), 3 decisions were made by the Garden Club’s Restoration Committee and a University Committee that included Betts:

1. How many “outhouses” do we construct? The Garden Club decided only to rebuild a few of the privies on their original foundations.
2. Do we follow the Maverick Plan?
3. The gardens would be maintained by the University.

The discussion of the second point is the most illuminating. The manuscript states:

Several members of the two committees felt that Peter Maverick’s plans (there were two) were only approximations of the garden details as requested by Mr. Jefferson, and that they were used primarily to show
prospective students a plan of the University and were not to be taken as an accurate working drawing. Because of his early studies of the archaeological excavations showed a number of discrepancies in the Maverick Plan, Mr. Hopkins was in agreement with this group and he also felt that the straight rear walls of all five gardens would look unattractive if placed in a single line. On the other hand, Dr. Betts felt that some plan should be followed; and, since this was one that dated back to 1825, it should be the one. After heatedly arguing the pros and cons of this, the joint committee finally agreed with Dr. Betts and incorporated in the minutes of the meeting that the Maverick Plan would be followed (pg. 111)

In a footnote, Betts goes on to explain that later excavations proved that the rear walls (on the West side) did not conform with the Maverick Plan and instead connected with Jefferson Hall. The explanation is offered: “Probably Mr. Jefferson was not aware of these changes in the wall alignment, which could have been made ‘in the field’ without his knowledge. He was very old then…” (pg. 111).

The manuscript is also accompanied by a number of maps and very poorly reproduced photographs, including some of the restorations in progress, presumably taken by Betts. The series of maps identifies a number of trees on grounds and approximates the existing condition of the grounds’ walks and roads.

Note: An undated, shorter version of this manuscript is microfilmed in Special Collections (Microfilm #6437). RG-20/3/3.761 housed in Special Collections meanwhile, is an incomplete copy of the manuscript, as it does not include the sections on the pavilion gardens or any of the manuscript’s accompanying images.

Depository: Special Collections, The University of Virginia
Call Number: MSS 1453
Credit Line: Betts, Edwin Morris. “List of His Collection of Prints, Maps and Surveys of the University of Virginia and Monticello.”

General Description:
This document lists 114 prints, maps, and photographs (presumably) of the University grounds and buildings and of Monticello made by Betts for an exhibition at The University of Virginia Museum of Fine Arts, April 13th to May 1st, 1938.

Organization:
The images are numbered and listed in chronological order respectively, with all of the University of Virginia images listed first and followed by the images of Monticello. Most images are given a title and those with published provenance (i.e Harper’s Monthly
Suggestions for Use:
While many of the images on this list are readily known and published today, some are not. For instance, Betts lists an 1825 map of the University grounds he titles “Old Map of the University Grounds,” accompanied with the description: “Note the Professors’ Gardens, which extended from Rotunda to Frys Spring Road intersection, and also on the present golf course site. These were removed in 1858 by W. A. Pratt, the first Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds. The black area is the ‘Pleasure Ground.’” I am not aware of this map and the title provided by Betts (like many others on the list) seems to be one he wrote himself. While problematic, however, this list could potentially be central to finding images of the University that have since receded from the public memory or are not explicitly searchable in the University databases (Virgo). One could perhaps find more information on these images through research on the exhibition, materials about which (i.e. catalogue, notes, press) could presumably be located.

Citation: Brown, C. Allan. “An Outline of the Early History of the University of Virginia Landscape, 1817-1875.” Unpublished Manuscript. Currently housed in the Office of the Architect of the University of Virginia.

General Description:
This document is the result of an unfinished study of the University grounds in the 19th century. Rather than focusing on Jefferson’s architecture as nearly all other histories of the University do, this document focuses on Jefferson’s plan for the University grounds and the ways in which it was adapted for daily use and necessity in the decades after his death. It is well researched and footnoted, as well as actively engaged with contemporary scholarship on Jefferson and the University.

Organization:
This unpublished manuscript consists of two main parts: an unfinished narrative and a “Chronological Compilation of Documentary References Relevant to the Developmental History of the University of Virginia Landscape, 1817-1875.” The narrative is thoroughly researched and footnoted and engages contemporary scholarship on Jefferson and the history of the University. It does not extend, however, beyond Jefferson’s initial planning of the University. The “Chronological Compilation,” meanwhile is a chronological list of quotes from letters (primarily between Jefferson, William Thornton, Madison, Cocke, and Cabell) and excerpts from the minutes of the Faculty, the minutes of the Board of Visitors, the Proctor’s papers,
the Virginia University Magazine and the University Literary Magazine. The quotes and excerpts include any reference Brown found pertaining to the landscape, trees and plantings, subsidiary buildings (i.e. kitchens, smokehouses, etc.), waterworks and infrastructure, and walks.

Suggestions for Use:
Although unfinished, this document provides a wealth of information potentially helpful for the researcher of the University's gardens and grounds. The partial narrative is critical and well documented in its careful analysis of Jefferson's design process for the placement of the gardens, yards, and alleys. Through letters and the Board of Visitor's minutes, Brown reconstructs the dialogue between Breckenridge, Jefferson, Cabell, and Cocke regarding the placement of the gardens and stresses the oft-forgotten distinction between the backyards (the courtyard spaces at the heads of the alleyways) and the gardens enclosed by the serpentine walls. The “Chronological Compilation,” meanwhile provides a list of events, changes, or improvements to the University grounds that future researches could use as leads for research.


General Description:
In his book, Creese focuses on a series of intentionally designed landscapes – those “almost too large to comprehend or handle” and smaller spaces – and analyzes the intersections between the designer and the found condition, the structures and the land, and the experience of the visitor. His first chapter, entitled “Jefferson’s Charlottesville,” Relying principally on Jefferson’s writings (especially Notes on the State of Virginia) and secondary scholarship (i.e. Manning, Kimball, Nichols), Creese actively engages the debates in architectural history scholarship about the origins of Jefferson’s designs for The University of Virginia and Monticello.

Suggestions for Use:
This book offers a solid summary of the various arguments for the inspiration for Jefferson’s plan for the University (i.e. Kimball, O’Neal, and others). Well-footnoted and critical in his discussion of secondary sources, Crease lays out Jefferson’s possible inspirations. He does, however, repeat some of the inaccuracies of his predecessors, including Nichols and Grisworld’s claim that Jefferson’s botanical garden was realized at the south end of the Lawn until it was displaced by McKim, Mead and White’s addition.

Creese’s almost lyrical descriptions of the ways in which the buildings and grounds interact both with each other and with the larger landscape (physical and
philosophical) are potentially useful as alternative ways of looking at the Academical Village. He identifies the plan’s commitment to the pavilion gardens as being part of Jefferson’s distaste for urban life and universities housed under one roof, as well as his intention to create a healthful place for learning. Crease states: “Jefferson’s objection to the customary brick pile as the shelter for a university arose from his desire to furnish quantities of sunshine and fresh air. This motivation also played a part in the addition of gardens behind the pavilions...the feeling seems to be as antimedieval as it is antiurban [sic] (pg. 21)” Following Leo Marx, Creese likens the Lawn’s framing of the wilderness by its open south end with Jefferson’s understanding of the essential conditions of the cultural-political-physical American landscape.

---

**Citation:** Frank, Marie. “It Took an Academical Village: Jefferson’s Hotels at the University of Virginia.” *The Magazine of Albemarle County History* 59 (2001): 30-68.

**General Description:**
One of the very few attempts to examine the gardens and yards of the University, Marie Frank’s article is a well-researched, critical source based on primary sources. Frank latches onto the word “Village” to describe the Academical Village, understanding Jefferson’s design and the University as experienced in the 19th century as a community complete with an “infrastructure of buildings, services, and staff needed to maintain the University (pg. 32).” The article argues that while the Maverick Plan illustrates Jefferson’s commitment to classicism, other primary sources reveal that Jefferson knew of and anticipated additions to his plan in the form of necessaries and outbuildings; he counted on the classicism of the Maverick Plan guided these buildings often ignored in modern scholarship. Her sources are largely primary and archival, including: Jefferson, Cabell, and Cocke’s letters; Faculty Minutes; Board of Visitors Minutes; and the Proctor’s Papers. Secondary sources are limited, though Bruce and Wilson are cited repeatedly. The paper is well footnoted.

Frank focuses in on the hotels in order to both provide a limitation to maintain her study’s viability and because she argues that the hotels “highlights the high degree of self-sufficiency attained by the University in its early years (pg. 35).”

**Suggestions for Use:**
Frank’s article is a reliable secondary source for an understanding of the ways in which animals, cultivation spaces, and necessary outbuildings were both understood by Jefferson as an integral part of University life and how they functioned in the daily life of the University. Besides the discussion of specific outbuildings or types of outbuildings peppered throughout the article, the piece successfully presents the mess, noise, and smell of the gardens and yards of the University.
Frank also attempts to positively position some of the gardens and yards located outside of the immediate Academical Village precinct, though the work undertaken by the interns in the Office of the Architect for the University have had far more success in this arena. She also operates under the assumption that the Maverick plan is an as-built drawing and is, therefore, unengaged with any discussion about the original location of or subsequent changes to the serpentine walls.

Following the article are a series of appendixes, including a list of events, changes, or passing mentions of each hotel in the Faculty Minutes, Proctor’s Journals (Ledgers), Board of Visitors Minutes, Proctor’s Papers, and in Bruce; and bills of fare for the hotels transcribed from the Faculty Minutes from 1835, 1842, and 1851. The article also includes a drawing of the Maverick plan with an overlay of all of the documented outbuildings. This image was created for this article and is dependent upon Frank’s research and is, therefore, not found in any other publication.


General Description: This project takes advantage of the wealth of documentary evidence about the construction of the University of Virginia and is probably the single most complete secondary resource for research on buildings in the years 1817-1828. Besides offering a historical narrative divided into periods, the document includes transcriptions (often annotated) of many documents and a list of the 1,750 documents regarding the construction of the University. All is offered in a searchable electronic database, making it not only a great resource, but also easy to use and quick to reference.

Organization: The narrative is divided into a series of 11 periods chronicling the planning and construction of the University of Virginia. These chapters, divided into sub-sections and based almost entirely on primary sources, have hyperlinked footnotes. Following the narrative are a number of appendices, including transcriptions, a glossary, and bibliography. The list of documents is accompanied by a discussion of the author’s methodology. Also on the website are links to a number of shorter essays by Grizzard on various aspects of the early history of the University.

**General Description:**
Intended to serve more as a guidebook than a historical narrative, Hogan’s book provides factual information such as dates of construction or the origins of design details for various buildings and also offers anecdotes about the buildings, grounds, and objects of the Academical Village. The book is not footnoted, though it does include a bibliography consisting largely of secondary sources. William B. O’Neal, Kimball, and Nichols are heavily relied upon. Only the early years of the Proctor’s Papers and Board of Visitor’s Minutes are listed.

**Organization:**
As a guidebook, this small volume is divided into sections pertaining to the Rotunda, East and West Lawn, and East and West Gardens and Ranges. Included within each section are both contemporary photographs and reproductions of historic drawings and prints. Each building on the Lawn has its own section, as do dormitory or Range rooms of note (i.e. the Poe Room, Woodrow Wilson’s Room). Each garden has its own section.

**Suggestions for Use:**
Meant more for the casual visitor than the researcher, this book nevertheless offers a concise explanation of the layout of the gardens and acknowledges that the gardens are not “restorations” as Jefferson left no plans for the gardens. The accounts of the individual gardens are largely descriptive of the plant matter and artifacts (i.e. the Merton College pinnacle in Pavilion VI’s garden) and the Hopkins designs. Though passing mentions are made of 19th century professors’ additions to the gardens (i.e. Schele de Vere’s boxwoods in Pavilion IV’s garden), there is no discussion of the ways in which these spaces were actually used in the 19th century or of the alleys and yards.

---

Citation: Hughes, Mary and Jennifer Steen. “UVA’s Lost Pleasure Ground.” *Virginia: The University of Virginia Alumni News* 86, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 26-29.

**General Description:**
This short feature piece explores the history of The Dell area, from Jefferson’s intentions for the meadow Creek watershed to contemporary use. Sources are based largely on recollections from oral histories and are focused on the early 20th century.
**Suggestions for Use:**
The only secondary source dealing exclusively with this aspect of grounds, this article would prove helpful to a discussion of the University landscape beyond the Academical Village.

---

**Citation:**

**General Description:**
In this short article published in conference proceedings, University of Virginia Landscape Architect Mary Hughes suggests three phases for the history of the gardens at the University and argues that any preservation efforts must embrace this multi-layered history.

**Organization:**
Hughes defines the first, 19th-century period of the gardens’ history by the persistence of the gardens in the development of Jefferson’s plans for the University; the differentiation between gardens and yards; the private nature of the pavilion gardens; and the subsequent construction and adaptation of the garden spaces for a variety of uses. The second period begins with the appointment of the University’s first president in 1904 and follows with the reorganization of the gardens and grounds exemplified by the master planning of Boston landscape architect Warren H. Manning. Hughes’s third period is identified by the Garden Club of Virginia’s mid-20th-century restoration of the pavilion and hotel gardens.

**Suggestions for Use:**
Hughes’s article is the only published source to acknowledge Jefferson’s differentiation between the gardens and yards in his plan for the University; this discussion is essential to a full understanding of the original intentions for these spaces and the ways in which they were used in the 19th century. Her suggestion that further research on the 19th-century gardens look to the diaries and papers of the pavilions’ inhabitants is also astute. Because she recognizes the completely private nature of the gardens in the 19th century, Hughes argues that this is the logical place to find information on the ways in which these spaces were actually used.

General Description:
Lasala’s thesis attempts to realize William B. O’Neal’s intention to collect the primary documents pertaining to each building designed by Thomas Jefferson for the University of Virginia (O’Neal published only Jefferson’s Buildings at the University of Virginia: The Rotunda [Charlottesville: The University of Virginia Press, 1960]). Through an analysis of the drawings and specifications Jefferson made during the design process, Lasala examines Jefferson’s drafting and design methods, suggesting the logistics of both Jefferson’s process and the requirements of the project itself.

Organization:
Lasala’s thesis consists primarily of three parts: a narrative, an “Analysis of Jefferson’s Specifications for the University of Virginia Buildings,” and an Appendix that catalogues and illustrates all drawings of the University made before 1826. The narrative portion engages secondary scholarship on Jefferson’s architecture (i.e. Kimball, O’Neal), Jefferson’s design inspiration (principally Palladio and Vitruvius), and determines modules and other design methods Jefferson employed in his designs for the University. The second section systematically analyzes Jefferson’s Specification Book for the University of Virginia and concludes that, through the analysis, “no single design method has emerged (pg. 57).” The first two sections of the thesis are accompanied by a bibliography of the author’s primary sources and secondary sources relating to Jefferson’s architecture, as well as figures of the Specification Book and some of the pattern books to which Jefferson turned for inspiration during the design process. The third section, or appendix, is a catalogue of more than 100 drawings of the University – its grounds and its buildings – principally by Jefferson, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, William Thornton, and John Neilson dating before 1826. The appendix’s introduction summarizes Jefferson’s drafting method, surmises about which drawings were used for construction, and makes comparisons between the drawings of Jefferson and Neilson. Lasala also offers a numbering system for the drawings, which is far more logical than that created by Frederick Nichols. He provides a cross listing with Nichols’s list as well as those completed by Kimball and in the 1898 inventory. Each catalog entry is accompanied by an image of the drawing and historical description (often supplemented by excerpts from letters or the Board of Visitors Minutes) and analysis. For drawings included with letters (i.e. the exchanges with architect William Thornton), Lasala also provides a transcription of the correspondence.
**Suggestions for Use:**
This thesis’s appendix is its most helpful aspect. It is the only source that I have found to bring together all of the drawings of the University completed before Jefferson’s death or that systematically analyzes Jefferson’s design process (including drawing technique) for the project. Lasala’s descriptive analysis of the buildings is astute and knowledgeable, making this an especially helpful source if the drawings themselves are inaccessible to the researcher. The catalogue also includes descriptions of drawings now lost, which could prove helpful if one were to find references in primary sources to drawings that are particularly difficult to find; it could turn out that they just no longer exist.

**Depository:** Special Collections, The University of Virginia
**Call Number:** LD5680 .P3 P3 1988

**General Description:**
The first of a series of historic structure reports completed by the consulting architecture firm Mendel, Mesick, Cohn, Waite, Hall, Architects, this slim volume and the ones that followed it (including a not-so-slim analysis of the Rotunda) combine architectural history and analysis in order to provide a detailed and careful study of the pavilions in the Academical Village. Intended to guide restoration and future changes or improvements to the buildings, the reports document both existing and historic conditions. The history section does have footnotes, though it lacks a bibliography. Principal primary sources consulted are the Jefferson papers (primarily correspondence), Board of Visitor’s minutes, correspondence found in the early Proctor’s Papers, and notes found in early Proctor’s Ledgers. Bruce is the only secondary source consistently relied upon. The introduction to the report acknowledges that systematic examination of the Board of Visitor’s Minutes and Proctor’s Papers should be undertaken in the next phase of research.

**Organization:**
This illustrated report consists of a concise description of the Academical Village and the relationship between various buildings and their functions; an architectural history of the building accompanied by projected drawings of the building and its details as they appeared upon completion; an architectural description of existing conditions complete with sections, plans, elevations, molding profiles, and photographs undertaken by the consultants; and final sections that detail problems of repair and recommendations for restoration. The history section is organized chronologically, quotes extensively from primary sources that describe the construction of Pavilion I,
and includes historic images that feature the building (primarily drawings and prints). This section is especially careful to attribute the work on the pavilion to particular workmen and the bulk of the work is focused on the initial construction of the building. Because these reports are intended to guide restoration, the history of the buildings after their initial completion is more limited and focused on major additions, the introduction of new inhabitants, and occasional mentions of outbuildings.

*Suggestions for Use:*
For the researcher of the pavilion gardens, these reports are only marginally helpful. Because the study is intended to guide changes to the actual brick and mortar of the building, little is focused on its social history. Although the consultant team included a landscape historian, virtually no attention is given to the history of the pavilion’s gardens. Because the Proctor’s Papers, Board of Visitor’s Minutes, and other primary sources were not approached systematically for the years after the completion of the buildings, it is fair to surmise that the references to outbuildings were found through the indexes or by accident.

Other historic structure reports by Mendel, Mesick, Cohen, Waite, Hall, Architects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion II, <em>The University of Virginia: Historic Structure Report.</em></th>
<th>Call Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Citation:* Rivanna Archaeological Services, LLC. “Archaeological Investigations in the West Gardens: Thomas Jefferson’s Academical Village.” October 2005.

*General Description:* The University has taken the opportunity to hire archaeological consultants in recent years, both when infrastructure maintenance requires investigation and when it does not. The reports, written and directed by Benjamin P. Ford, Ph.D., offer a remarkable
wealth of primary information and rich conclusions that bring together not only the findings of the dig, but also well-documented archival research and analysis of historic documents.

The objective of this well-illustrated report was to follow-up on the brief archaeological research conducted in 1949 in the West Gardens during the planning of the garden restorations. No digging was conducted in Pavilion I, though work was done in areas behind the gardens of Pavilion III, V, VII, and IX. The meticulously reported archaeological findings are supplemented by extensive and well-footnoted documentary research. The Proctor’s Journals are used extensively, as is Grizzard’s work on the construction of the University, Frank’s work on the Hotels, and Barringer’s recollections.

**Organization:**
After a chronological narrative history of the west gardens including a number of early images and maps, the archaeological results are presented and summarized. Appendices include a transcript of a letter found in Special Collections by Alden Hopkins describing the results of his archaeological investigations to the Garden Club of Virginia.

**Suggestions for Use:**
This report confirmed that the Maverick Plan was an idealized plan rather than an as built drawing. Besides the extensively documented archaeological findings, the report discusses the relationship between the findings and historic documents and assumptions. These reports are essential to future examination of the gardens. They also provide well-researched historical narratives for areas not often (or never) chronicled in secondary sources.

Other Reports by Ben Ford or Rivanna Archaeological Services, LLC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“‘In Each Alley…:’ Archaeological Investigations Associated with the Central Grounds Waterline Replacement Project.”</td>
<td>February 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Archaeological Investigations in Pavilion III Garden, University of Virginia.”</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Archaeological Mitigation of the Academical Village Lawn, University of Virginia, Irrigation Installation Project.”</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Archaeological Mitigation Adjacent to the Cryptoporticus, University of Virginia, Rotunda Access Project.”</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Archaeological Investigations at the North Rotunda Terrace, University of Virginia.”</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Archaeological Investigations at the North Rotunda Terrace, University of Virginia.”</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Archaeological Excavations on Historic East Street, East Range, University of Virginia.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citation: Wills, Garry. Mr. Jefferson’s University. Washington, DC: the National Geographic Society, 2002.

General Description:
Written from the perspective of an historian, Wills’s book is a rare attempt to tell the story of the founding of the Academical Village from the perspective of Jefferson, his cohorts and detractors. Printed in a diminutive, hand-held format, the lyrical narrative is intended to be read by the layman rather than the professional historian; footnotes are infrequent and primary sources are cited in the text. The book gives a unique perspective not only on the Academical Village itself, but also its place in American history as a university, a work of art, and as a product of Jefferson, whom Wills calls “the only president of the United States who was also a great artist (pg. 5).” Focused on the development of Jefferson’s plan for the University of Virginia and the subsequent construction, the sources are largely limited to Jefferson’s correspondence. Cited secondary sources include Lasala, Bruce, and William B. O’Neal’s work.

Organization:
After opening with an extensive and personal explanation and description of the Academical Village, Wills narrates Jefferson’s conception of the University from Central College in the mid-1810s and tracks the history of the construction through Jefferson’s death in 1826.

Suggestions for Use:
This book is more of a good read than a critical resource for the researcher of the gardens and grounds of the University. It does, however, offer a unique perspective on the planning and construction of the Academical Village focused on Jefferson and the other men who made it happen, rather than the buildings themselves. Wills’s discussion of the gardens does little to differentiate between the gardens as we see them today and how Jefferson envisioned them in the late 1810s, though they do provide useful interpretations. He writes:

The beauty of the university’s variety is illustrated by the famous serpentine walls around the gardens. On the university’s ground plan, as it was engraved by Peter Maverick, these look uniform and repetitive. But in fact the walls must span dips and rises in the ground, which means they are of constantly varying height. Above most people’s eye level, they sink in places to allow differing degrees of vision into the gardens. They create a semi-privacy which does not interrupt the continuity of the whole endeavor (pg. 85).
Wills is also one of the few historians of the Academical Village who explicitly acknowledges Jefferson’s dependence on the plantation model for the University: “It may seem perverse to say that a domestic building was the model for a public institution. But a plantation of any size in Virginia was a kind of ‘agricultural village,’ analogous to the multiple-but-related activities of Jefferson’s ‘academical village’ (pg. 71).”


General Description:
Edited by Richard Guy Wilson, one of the few architectural historians to focus on Jefferson in recent years, this book was written to coincide with an exhibition celebrating Jefferson’s 250th birthday. Consisting of three essays, this book covers the history of the planning, construction, subsequent life, and restoration of the Academical Village. All three essays include footnotes and are largely based on primary sources or personal experience.

Organization:
The three essays in this book are: “Education and Architecture: The Evolution of the University of Virginia’s Academical Village” by Patricia C. Sherwood and Joseph Michael Lasala, exploring the design and construction process up until Jefferson’s 1826 death; “Jefferson’s Lawn: Perceptions, Interpretations, Meanings” by Richard Guy Wilson, picking up in 1826 and continuing through late 20th-century restorations explains the ways in which Jefferson’s design has been amended and interpreted, and the reasons behind his design decisions; and “The Academical Village Today” by late architect for the University, James Murray Howard, exploring the restorations since the 1970s and their methodologies.

Suggestions for Use:
I constantly reference this book when writing and researching about the University as it offers concise explanations not only for the design and construction process of the University, but also individual drawings and views. While Lasala and Sherwood’s essay would perhaps be the most helpful for the researcher of the gardens because of its well-documented discussion of Jefferson’s collaborative design process, Wilson’s essay presents a narrative for the ways in which the University community interpreted and added onto the Academical Village in the decades after Jefferson’s death.

**General Description:**
This is one of the most reliable references for short histories of the buildings of the University, concise narratives of on the development of its grounds, and trends in its architecture. Relying heavily on both published and archival primary sources, this book also includes an extensive bibliography of secondary sources on the history of the University's architecture and landscape.

**Organization:**
Wilson and Butler lay out a comprehensive narrative history in the book's introduction, dividing it into periods relating in large part to larger trends in the development of American architecture and planning. Following are concise historical narratives on the various sections of grounds (i.e. “Central Grounds,” “The Academical Village”) and entries on individual buildings that include the name of the architect, construction dates, and contemporary photographs, and occasional reproductions of historic drawings or views.

**Suggestions for Use:**
This book is mostly helpful as a reference book. Its historical narratives on the development of the grounds and architectural character of the University are also useful as background or a framework. The 2 entries on the west and east gardens, respectively, were written by Mary Hughes and discuss the gardens as rich palimpsests, the Colonial Revival history as important as Jefferson's initial design or their use in the 19th century. Her short histories are careful to acknowledge the designers and historians who have shaped the gardens since Jefferson, including Warren H. Manning, Edwin Morris Betts, Alden Hopkins and Donald H. Parker.
I created this database by combing the indexes for the Board of Visitors Minutes and reading most of the annual reports made by the various inspection committees between 1817, when construction began at the University, and 1895, the year of the fire and the destruction of the east garden walls for the development of a public road. I then followed any reference to the gardens and yards, grounds, pavilions, and subsidiary buildings elsewhere on grounds in the transcript of the minutes located in the Special Collections Library reading room. All page numbers, therefore, refer to the transcript. The items are listed in chronological order (the date referring to the date of the meeting) and often include quotations. Spelling or syntax errors should be checked against the original document.

The items are listed under the following headings:
Animals
Building Program
Canada
Dormitories
Faculty
Gardens and Yards
General Improvements
Grounds
Grounds Staff
Hotels and Boarding Houses
Infrastructure
Pavilions
Servants
Students
Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Further Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLUME I: 1817-1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>May 5, 1817</td>
<td>The site owned by John Perry has been decided as the location for the university by the Visitors of the Central College (they had visited the various sites on April 8th). The act establishing the college passed, allowing it to encompass the Albemarle Academy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>May 5, 1817</td>
<td>Pavilions now under construction will be built, along with others for the professors, &quot;the 3rd until otherwise wanted for a boarding house, to be kept by some French family of good character, wherein it is proposed that the boarders shall be permitted to speak French only, with a view to their becoming familiarised to conversation in that language...The board is of opinion that the ground for these building should be previously reduced to a plain or to terrasses as it shall be found to admit with due regards to expense, that the pavilions be correct in their architecture and execution, and that where the family of a Professor requires it, 2 additional rooms shall be added for their accommodation.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>October 7, 1817</td>
<td>all monies not employed in administrative issues for the university should be going towards construction - it is imperative that workmen are secured before the season begins. In 1819, &quot;engagements may be entered into for building in the approaching season two more pavilions for the Professors, one Hotel for dieting the students, and as many additional Dormitories for their lodging, with the necessary appendages as the said funds shall be competent to accomplish: that we approve of the propositions for covering with tin sheets the pavilions and hotels hereafter to be covered, and for bringing water to them by wooden pipes from the neighboring highlands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>February 26, 1819</td>
<td>Professors will be provided with living spaces in the pavilions for free, along with their salaries and fees from students who are enrolled in their classes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>March 29, 1819</td>
<td>Instead of another hotel (as directed by B.O.V. on 29th and approved 29th), an additional pavilion will be built, along with 2 more pavilions and dormitories in the future. This will make 10 pavilions total, 5 hotels, and the number of dormitories depending on how many students &quot;shall apply for admission into the University, with their Appendages, will be necessary for the proper accomodation of the whole number of Professors contemplated by the legislature...&quot; Stone will have to be procured from elsewhere for the capitals - local stone is too poor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>October 4, 1819</td>
<td>&quot;actual expenditures of the institution from the beginning, of those yet to be incurred to its completion, &amp; of the funds received &amp; still receivable, as nearly as can be at present stated….the following are nearly finished, &amp; are estimated at the rates others have cost, or at prices actually contracted for...&quot; Backyards and Gardens: $1,500.00...making the whole cost of the 4. rows to buildings and accommodation $176,942.68.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens and Yards</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>October 2, 1820</td>
<td>2 hotels are completed &quot;and the others will all be completed in the ensuing summer.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>October 2, 1820</td>
<td>6 pavilions are completed, with 82 student rooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>October 2, 1820</td>
<td>6 pavilions are completed, with 82 student rooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>October 2, 1820</td>
<td>6 hotels are completed &quot;for dieting the Students, with a single room in each for a Refectary, and two rooms, a garden and offices for the tenant.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>October 7, 1822</td>
<td>10 pavilions have been completed (&quot;Containing each a lecturing room, with generally four other apartments for the accommodation of a Professor &amp; his family, and with a garden and the requisite family offices&quot;).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>October 7, 1822</td>
<td>(for student rooms are completed, along with arcades. All openings are ready to be occupied &quot;except that there is still some plastering to be done...the gardens (page 42 begins) grounds and garden walls to be completed...The remaining building, necessary to complete the whole establishment, &amp; called for by the Report of 1818, which was to contain rooms for religious worship, for public examinations, for a library, &amp; for other associated purposes is not yet begun for want of funds.&quot; The B.O.V wanted to complete all construction before opening because it will cost so much to run the thing that there won't be enough money to finish building it. &quot;but the present state of the funds renders the prospect of finishing this last building indefinitely distant! the interest of the sums advanced to the institution now absorbs nearly half it's income.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Program</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>October 7, 1822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Program</th>
<th>October 6, 1823</th>
<th>the garden walls and grounds, plastering, and foreign columns discussed in the 10/7/22 meeting have all been finished/acquired and the university will be ready to open in 1824 assuming that the professors are hired. The Rotunda walls are completed, but they are waiting to put the roof on until the mortar sets.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>December 23, 1822</td>
<td>garden walls and pavements still are not completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>April 7, 1824</td>
<td>The professor shall be permitted to occupy, rent-free, a pavilion each, with the grounds appropriated to it in addition to their salary and tuition fees. &quot;The professors shall not permit no waste to be committed in their tenements, and shall maintain the Internal of their pavilions, and also the windows, doors, and locks external during their occupation, in as good repair &amp; condition as they have received them.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>October 4, 1824</td>
<td>Resolved that the faculty can appoint a Janitor to come to all meetings of the faculty and the BOV &quot;and shall perform menial offices for them.&quot; He will be paid $150 by UVA and given a &quot;lodging room.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>October 4, 1824</td>
<td>Hotelkeepers cannot collect more than $100/student for the 10.5 month session &quot;nor shall suffer ardent spirits or wine mixed or unmixed, to be drank within his tenement, on pain of an immediate determination of his lease, and removal by the Faculty...&quot; Basically sets rule that students are not ever allowed to drink. Students can eat in any Hotel or wherever they want (except for the &quot;tenements&quot;) with capacity for the Hotels set at 50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, Animals, Servants</td>
<td>October 4, 1824</td>
<td>Students are not allowed to keep liquors, weapons, gunpowders, servants, horses, or dogs within the precinct of the school. Can't drink or smoke or carry a weapon or anything that looks like a weapon in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>October 4, 1824</td>
<td>UVA will provide workshops and tools for students to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>October 5, 1824</td>
<td>Hotel leaves are for one year and are written by the Proctor &quot;and that he cause to be inserted therein such covenants as he shall deem necessary as to the preservation of the houses, inclosures, and appurtenances of the tenements.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>October 3, 1825</td>
<td>to be added to leases for next year's hotelkeepers that they are not allowed to &quot;furnish...entertainment&quot; for students or others or to use his lodging quarters within the hotel as a boarding house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>October 3, 1825</td>
<td>Janitor is to be paid $200 next year and will act as a witness for any legal matters that arise to which he has been a witness. UVA will continue to house and feed him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens and Yards</td>
<td>October 5, 1825</td>
<td>the board being of opinion that so much of the grounds of the University as can be conveniently applied to that purpose, should be laid off in lots of the uses of the Professors, the Proctor and keepers of the Hotels, rent free, but to be inclosed and improved at their expense, therefore Resolved that the Proctor, under the direction of the Executive Committee do cause such lots to be laid off, and assigned to the several pavilions &amp; Hotels and to the Proctor's house.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, Gardens and Yards</td>
<td>April 4, 1826</td>
<td>&quot;It is especially enjoined on the Proctor to make vigilant enquiry into the violence lately offered to the house of Professor Emmet, and the wall of Professor Blaettermann's garden, and to endeavor to bring the offenders before the civil authorities.&quot; Emmet was living in Pavilion I and Blaettermann in Pavilion IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>April 4, 1826</td>
<td>It is the proctor’s duty to make sure that the university’s drains are clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>April 4, 1826</td>
<td>Hotelkeepers are apparently letting students get away with unruly conduct - resolved that they shall be expected to uphold the rules of the university like a faculty member would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>April 4, 1826</td>
<td>Executive Committee is responsible for providing lighting of the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>October 3, 1826</td>
<td>the Executive Committee will direct the Proctor to plant trees &quot;about the buildings.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelkeepers</td>
<td>October 6, 1826</td>
<td>hotelkeepers cannot entertain expelled students for 5 years after expulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>October 7, 1826</td>
<td>No students will be allowed to live off-grounds after this session and the proctor will from here on out decide the students’ room and hotel assignments, with consideration of the students wishes. They will not be able to change their assignments once made by the Proctor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>October 7, 1826</td>
<td>The keepers of hotels shall not furnish luxurious fare to their boarders: but the fare shall be plentiful, good and wholesome vitals, neatly served and well dressed; and, in all its details, conformable to such rules as the faculty may prescribe pursuant to this enactment...The hotel keepers shall furnish the students not only with diet, but with bedding and furniture for their dormitories, fuel, candles, and washing: also proper attendance of servants for domestic and menial duties: also the details of all which shall be regulated by the faculty.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>October 7, 1826</td>
<td>&quot;For the faculty must refer to the executive committee for any changes to their &quot;tenements&quot; to which the committee will respond that &quot;the funds of the institution are in a condition which does not allow any application to that object at present: that the committee, as soon as the funds will permit, will cause the necessary out houses to be erected, &amp; will consider the propriety of making the proposed alterations in their attics and cellars.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>October 7, 1826</td>
<td>The Executive Committee will decide whether stables should be built for the hotels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rotunda, Pavilions, Building Program | October 1826 | The portico of the Rotunda has been finished, though the steps have not yet been laid with marble. One of the large oval rooms, the entrance, and one of the small rooms have been completed and 1/4 of the Anatomical Hall. "Some small additions are also necessary for the better accommodation of the Professors in their Pavilions, and of the students in their Dormitories, and for a few other minor objects."
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotels</th>
<th>146</th>
<th>December 16, 1826</th>
<th>&quot;Every hotel-keeper shall be charged with the cleanliness, police and good order of the hotel &amp; grounds in his occupation, the dormitories assigned thereto and their appurtenances.&quot; Cannot serve boozes to student, but he and his family/guests may drink moderately within the building.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>December 16, 1826</td>
<td>Proctor acts as the chief of police, the building superintendent, and the overseer of all monies and inspections at UVA. &quot;He shall employ the laborers of the University in preserving the cleanliness of all the grounds &amp; tenements not in the occupation of the professors &amp; hotel-keepers, in keeping the drains &amp; gutters clean &amp; in repair, in causing suitable depositories to be prepared for the reception of the sweepings &amp; offal from the tenements of the professors and hotel-keepers, and in daily removing such sweepings and offal, when so deposited.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions, Hotels</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>December 16, 1826</td>
<td>&quot;The professors and hotel-keepers shall be responsible for the cleanliness of their tenements, and the grounds in their occupation respectively; and shall cause the sweepings and offal from them to be daily deposited in the receptacles prepared for that purpose, at such hour in the day as shall be appointed by the proctor.&quot; They have to pay a fine if they do not comply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>December 16, 1826</td>
<td>&quot;The tenement of the hotel-keeper, within the true intent &amp; meaning of this enactment, shall be held to embrace, not only the hotel and grounds in his immediate possession, but all such dormitories as shall be assigned to him, for the accommodation of his boarders, the back yards attached to such dormitories, and the arcades in front thereof and in front of his hotel.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>December 16, 1826</td>
<td>the proctor is paid $500/year and receives a house free of rent as long as he keeps the &quot;buildings, grounds &amp; inclosures&quot; in good repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>December 16, 1826</td>
<td>students cannot visit &quot;any tavern or confectionary&quot; without the permission of a member of the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>July 18, 1827</td>
<td>The proctor will have a &quot;neat iron railing&quot; installed adjacent and to either side of the portico of the Rotunda &quot;for the purpose of walking over the gymnasium.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>July 18, 1827</td>
<td>&quot;It shall be the duty of the Executive Committee to cause the grounds lying within the limits aforesaid, to be inclosed, by causing the stone fence to be repaired &amp; made an effectual fence, as far as it extends along the public road, &amp; by causing a strong &amp; close post &amp; rail fence to be placed along the residue of those limits. As soon as the grounds shall be enclosed, the Executive committee shall cause them to be laid out into suitable walks, and planted with appropriate trees, in clumps, avenues, or otherwise, as to them may appear most expedient &amp; proper.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>July 18, 1827</td>
<td>&quot;stock of all sorts shall be excluded from the Public walks, from the enclosure north of the Rotunda, &amp; from the area between the pavilions; and the execution to this order is hereby given in special charge to the Proctor.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>July 18, 1827</td>
<td>Dunglison was living in Pavilion X and Emmet in Pavilion I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>July 21, 1827</td>
<td>BOV gives permission for the executive committee to erect a building &quot;for the accommodation of Servants&quot; for Dunglison's pavilion costing $150. Emmet will also get $150 to build a servant space for his pavilion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>July 21, 1828</td>
<td>the cistern should be located near the Proctor's house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>July 21, 1828</td>
<td>&quot;In order for the Proctor to distribute the wood to the students, a &quot;fit woodyard may be provided at the expense of the University, under the direction of the executive committee.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>July 21, 1828</td>
<td>&quot;Every hotel-keeper shall be charged with the cleanliness, police and good order of the hotel &amp; grounds in his occupation, the dormitories assigned thereto and their appurtenances.&quot; Cannot serve boozes to student, but he and his family/guests may drink moderately within the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>July 21, 1828</td>
<td>students who destroy the furniture in the hotels will have to pay for it themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>July 21, 1828</td>
<td>&quot;In order for the Proctor to distribute the wood to the students, a &quot;fit woodyard may be provided at the expense of the University, under the direction of the executive committee.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>July 21, 1828</td>
<td>hotel-keepers will be fined if students' rooms are not in proper order (the proctor will inspect rooms at least once a week).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>October 1, 1828</td>
<td>the janitor's residence &quot;should be convenient to the residence of the Chairman&quot; and is the responsibility of the Proctor, under the direction of the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>October 4, 1828</td>
<td>&quot;Resolved. That as soon as the funds of the University will permit, it shall be the duty of the Proctor, under the directions of the Executive Committee, to cause to be erected additional offices for the accommodation of servants, in connection with the Pavilions and hotels of the University, where they may be desired; not exceeding two apartments to each hotel or pavilion; provided that in no case, shall the expense exceed $100. &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLUME II: 1829-1836</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dormitories</strong></td>
<td>216 July 16, 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotels</strong></td>
<td>216 July 16, 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavilions</strong></td>
<td>220 July 20, 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</strong></td>
<td>220 July 20, 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jefferson</strong></td>
<td>220 July 20, 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Servants</strong></td>
<td>220 July 20, 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rotunda</strong></td>
<td>230 July 21, 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavilions</strong></td>
<td>238 July 21, 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grounds Staff</strong></td>
<td>239 July 21, 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</strong></td>
<td>241 July 21, 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavilions</strong></td>
<td>244 July 21, 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gardens and Yards</strong></td>
<td>244 July 21, 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Improvements</strong></td>
<td>245 July 21, 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gardens and Yards</strong></td>
<td>246 July 21, 1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gardens and Yards, Rotunda</strong></td>
<td>258 July 15, 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grounds Staff</strong></td>
<td>272 July 19, 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavilions</strong></td>
<td>275 July 20, 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavilions</strong></td>
<td>275 July 20, 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavilions</strong></td>
<td>275 July 20, 1831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavilions</strong></td>
<td>275 July 20, 1831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolved, That the Executive Committee cause to be erected in the rear of Professor Tucker's and professor Harrison's pavilions, which are now used for the purposes of the University, but which are also used by the faculty for their personal convenience.</td>
<td>July 20, 1831</td>
<td>Tucker was living in Pavilion IX and Harrison in Pavilion VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions, Hotels</td>
<td>July 20, 1831</td>
<td>Brockenhurst has been given permission to operate a book store in one of the tenements (as determined by the Executive Committee) to sell text books to the students as requested by the Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>July 16, 1832</td>
<td>When a hotel servant is deemed disorderly or disorderly by the faculty, the Hotel keeper must dismiss them or face a fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 17, 1832</td>
<td>Emmet will have an addition to the basement story of his pavilion to the rear of the building in order to house &quot;Domestics&quot; - like that of the pavilions occupied by Tucker, Bonnycastle, and Harrison. A Stair from the 2nd &quot;Garret story&quot; of his pavilion be built just like that on Dunglison's Pavilion and Dungan's. Be reimbursed for the money spent on this improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>July 18, 1832</td>
<td>Davis and Patterson bought a slave (Lewis Commodore) for the University's use and is trying to sell it to UVA (there is a letter stating such). The Proctor will pay $500 for the man and the University will own him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 18, 1832</td>
<td>Davis wants something done to his stables - referred to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>July 18, 1832</td>
<td>Mrs. Gray wants repairs done to her hotel - referred to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>July 19, 1833</td>
<td>Rose will exchange hotel occupation with William Wertenbaker and the cellar room in this hotel will be fitted into a dining room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>July 19, 1833</td>
<td>Proctor is to see that the Executive Committee have the wood pipes connected to the water works repaired, cistern near Tucker's pavilion completed, connet iron pipes to gutters of nearby buildings to create an auxiliary water supply for cistern; next the Lawn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 19, 1833</td>
<td>Davis and Patterson's pavilions to get wells in the back court of and in a situation convenient to the pavilions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens and Yards</td>
<td>July 19, 1833</td>
<td>&quot;That the kitchen gardens within the limits of the enclosed walks on the south of the University be removed.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>July 19, 1833</td>
<td>Librarian wants reimbursement for &quot;certain temporary shops&quot; built on the grounds by his late father - referred to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>July 19, 1833</td>
<td>The Executive Committee is requested to inspect and take care of the &quot;state of the grounds and plantations of trees&quot; and improve them as they see fit and as funds allow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>September 2, 1833</td>
<td>Mrs. Gray's garden request and the application to remove Davis's garden wall are referred to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>July 18, 1834</td>
<td>Requests for improvement to Hotel A referred to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>July 18, 1834</td>
<td>Proctor in charge of trees along the walks of the University's pleasure grounds and to renew &quot;when necessary...those missing in the rows on the Lawn replaced in the proper season.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>July 19, 1834</td>
<td>&quot;Build a house&quot; glass looking to be installed over the students' rooms on the arcades (as suggested by Executive Committee) is approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 19, 1834</td>
<td>The late professor of Anatomy Dr. Thomas Johnson can use Pavilion II as a residence for himself and his family until August 20th. He wants reimbursements for changes he made to the Anatomical Theatre and to his house and lot at Pav. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>July 19, 1834</td>
<td>&quot;The proctor under the directions of the professor of Natural Philosophy cause two walls to be erected near the Observatory for meridian lines.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>July 6, 1835</td>
<td>Mr. Pencile asks for a university gymnasium to be built, but the request is denied at this time because of lack of funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>July 6, 1835</td>
<td>Mr. Pencile is given the upper rooms in the S. E. Hotel for his family's accommodation as long as the Faculty approves it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>July 6, 1835</td>
<td>The room on the ground floor of the Rotunda now occupied by a slave is to be vacated and either put to another purpose or locked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>August 12, 1836</td>
<td>Dr. Warner's garden wall is dilapidated and the matter is referred to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>August 12, 1836</td>
<td>William Dunkum wants to lease the land &quot;devised&quot; to the University by Martin Dawson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>August 12, 1836</td>
<td>Proctor can execute an addition to Janitor's house under the direction of the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 12, 1836</td>
<td>Because Emmet moved out of Pavilion I and it is now vacant, things are dilapidated and this is his responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>August 13, 1836</td>
<td>Mr. Pendleton's horse has been used by the University since 1832 and a reimbursement is granted, even though none has been requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>August 13, 1836</td>
<td>Kitchen to be erected by Proctor under the Executive Committee to the rear of Pavilion 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 13, 1836</td>
<td>Many of the window shutters of the pavilions are in very poor condition. The proctor will have the work done and then charge the professor who occupies the pavilion - see &quot;printed enactments&quot; ch. 1, sec. 14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## VOLUME III: 1837-1855

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pavilion</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Students living on grounds are not allowed to ride horses or drive carriages within grounds unless they have permission from the chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Davis was living in Pavilion X. Permission granted to Davis to occupy one of the dorm rooms adjoining his pavilion and he will pay the usual rent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>New gate made in the &quot;backyard&quot; of Pavilion III; Executive Committee ordered to have the roof fixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Ceilings of Pavilion V to be dried out, &quot;fallen wall in back yard of said pavilion...&quot; to be rebuilt and roof leak fixed and roof covered in slate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Ceilings located at the Rotunda are causing &quot;material injury to the walls of the building&quot; and should be removed. Executive Committee also ordered to enlarge the cisterns and fix the pumps to channel water from roofs and for fire preparedness. Should be on western side of Lawn, 2 on eastern, and 1 at Rotunda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>The practice of keeping and raising hogs within the precincts be entirely prohibited; and that anyone living within the precincts and violating this prohibition shall be liable to a fine of not less than one nor more than ten dollars for each hog and pig kept within the precincts more than 24 hours to be assessed by the Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Blaetermann was living in Pavilion III. Request is also made by Professor Bonnycastle for improvements to his own pavilion. He wants a terrace repaired in the back of his pavilion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Bonnycastle was living in Pavilion VIII. Blaetermann was also Ordered to have the roof fixed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>The Medical Prof's are given permission to use the brick house as a dispensary - currently used to house the Laborers of the University, near the house where the Janitor lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>Bonnycastle was living in Pavilion VIII. The Proctor will fix the roof of Prof. Bonnycastle's Pavilion and &quot;that the Shop in the rear of his pavilion, the press for models &amp; Black board in the lecture room referred to in his communication of this date be constructed if in the opinion of the Executive Committee the funds of the University will justify the Expenditure.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>&quot;Resolved that the expense of repairs to Pavilions rendered necessary by the excesses of the Students during the last Session shall be defrayed from the funds of the University.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>&quot;Resolved that it is inexpedient to allow the claims of Professors for repairs or alterations upon their tenements made without authority from the Board, and that in future this rule will be rigidly adhered to.&quot; Profs. Blaeterman and Magill (recently deceased) made some changes to the interiors of their pavilions before this was resolved, but it seems that they'll let this slide as the repairs were those that they would have recommended anyway - refer matter to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>Mr. Alston requested to keep a horse within the precincts and this has been referred to the Faculty and is okay as long as the horse is for Alston's own health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Professor Tucker made an addition to his pavilion, which the Board will probably not pay for because of the former resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>August 18, 1837</td>
<td>Tucker was living in Pavilion IX.Resolved that the expense of repairs to Pavilions rendered necessary by the excesses of the Students during the last Session shall be defrayed from the funds of the University.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>The Proctor will fix the roof of Prof. Bonnycastle’s Pavilion and “that the Shop in the rear of his pavilion, the press for models &amp; Black board in the lecture room referred to in his communication of this date be constructed if in the opinion of the Executive Committee the funds of the University will justify the Expenditure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>Bonnycastle was living in Pavilion VIII. The Proctor will fix the roof of Prof. Bonnycastle’s Pavilion and “that the Shop in the rear of his pavilion, the press for models &amp; Black board in the lecture room referred to in his communication of this date be constructed if in the opinion of the Executive Committee the funds of the University will justify the Expenditure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 5, 1838</td>
<td>&quot;Resolved that the expense of repairs to Pavilions rendered necessary by the excesses of the Students during the last Session shall be defrayed from the funds of the University.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 4, 1839</td>
<td>Cabell was living in Pavilion II. The changes to James L. Cabell’s pavilion interior are permitted, though they will be paid for by Cabell and reimbursement by the University will be delayed until they can decide whether or not the alterations were merited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 6, 1840</td>
<td>Cabell was living in Pavilion II and Tucker in X. The Proctor will refund Professors Tucker and Cabell (with interest) for &quot;improvements and additions&quot; they made to their pavilions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
<td>Tucker was living in Pavilion X. Prof. Blaeterman is to be given $256.42 for &quot;alterations and additions&quot; to his pavilion made in 1835, as dictated by July 3rd, 1837 statement by G. W. Spooner and accounted for by James Libbey's account of November 1, 1835.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
<td>Blaetermann had been living in Pavilion IV. It had moved out in 1838. Lecture rooms are in the basement of the Rotunda are being fitted into the Gymnasium - under the control of the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
<td>The skyline in the Rotunda needs to be altered according to the plan of General Cocke at the same time as the alterations to the gymnasium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
<td>The Professor of Natural Philosophy is asked to find a press to keep Mr. Jefferson's donations in so that they may be &quot;properly preserved&quot; and also to repair things that need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens and Yards, Pavilions</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>July 7, 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>July 5, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>July 5, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>July 5, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotunda</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>July 5, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>July 5, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>July 5, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>July 5, 1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>July 5, 1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounds Staff</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>July 5, 1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>July 5, 1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>July 5, 1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens and Yards</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>July 5, 1842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage System</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>July 5, 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>July 5, 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>July 5, 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>July 4, 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilions</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>July 4, 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>September 10, 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>July 4, 1845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix I
Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 480 | July 29, 1845 | The Proctor will clean the privies, set up a system that will monitor and clean them daily, that the contents be removed "to some fixed Dept, there to be mixed with lime or charcoal in suitable proportion to neutralize the offensiveness of the mass, and to dispose of the whole from time to time as it may be applied for by the neighbouring Farmers or Gardeners" and that he report on this annually to the BOV.

Infrastructure | 487 | October 30, 1845 | "the practice of illuminations" is seen to have considerable potential damage and is "forbidden within the precincts of the University."

Grounds Staff | 499 | June 27, 1846 | the duties of the Overseer and Janitor (including or only?)" attention to the Ice House" go to John Smith the machinist.

Servants | 499 | June 27, 1846 | Lewis Commodore used to be drunk on occasion, but has since been on good behavior. Because of this, during school vacations "Lewish shall not be required to work out in the grounds with the other laborers of the University, but be confined only to the performance of such a reduced portion of the duties of his station as the absence of the Students & professors will permit, so long as the said Lewis Commodore faithfully maintains his pledge of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks."

Hotels | 501 | June 27, 1846 | Hotel F (along with its "grounds appropriate") are assigned to the new Proctor & Patron of the University, Wm. L. Kemper. The Executive Committee will see that it is fitted up to his needs. The Washington Society that was housed there will be redirected to another space by the faculty.

Grounds Staff | 510 | June 28, 1846 | The Proctor is asked to "dispose of any stock belonging to the University, except such horses as may be required for it's use."

Animals | 512 | June 29, 1846 | Maj. Broadus has built a stone fence - the Proctor and the Executive Committee need to figure out how to pay him back.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 504 | June 29, 1846 | The University is retrofitting the proctor's house for student housing so as to lower the price of housing for the students. Lease should set for one year with a "contractor" who will keep the land the way it is and clear land and gather wood on adjacent Dawson Farm.

Grounds Staff | 515 | June 29, 1846 | Steward is in charge of the firewood.

Pavilions | 511 | June 28, 1846 | Minor wants to make a door to connect his pavilion to the dormitory next door - matter referred to Executive Committee Minor was living in Pavilion X.

General Improvements | 512 | June 28, 1846 | School "will not be liable for the washing for the State Students" and "the Steward be allowed $150 for washing for the State Students during the past session."

Grounds Staff | 515 | June 28, 1846 | As the sense of the Board of Visitors that the appropriation of Dormitories rented by Professors to other uses than for studies, Libraries or for lodging students, who may board with such professors, is inconsistent with the interests of the University and inadmissible."

Dormitories | 514 | June 29, 1847 | The Steward is basically running a boarding house on Dawson's Farm.

Grounds Staff | 515 | June 28, 1846 | The University is retrofitting the proctor's house for student housing so as to lower the price of housing for the students. Lease should set for one year with a "contractor" who will keep the land the way it is and clear land and gather wood on adjacent Dawson Farm.

Report of the state of the grounds is disappointing: they discovered the most marked evidence of wanton injury and dilapidation, to many of the Dormitories upon both the back ranges, & especially to the walls, doors, & windows of the same." Venetian doors are usually in bad shape, presumably because of student destruction. Need to reinforce the behavioral rules for the students in order to ensure that the University is preserved properly.

General Improvements | 523 | June 28, 1847 | Proctor asked to repair and repaint doors and windows found in poor condition in the Dormitories "and staining and white washing the inside walls, & arches of the same."

Animals | 525 | June 28, 1848 | "Resolved that the Proctor be instructed to cause the ends of the terraces to be closed by lattice work, or other sufficient barrier, so as to prevent animals from coming or being brought upon any part of the Terrace."

Dormitories | 528 | June 28, 1848 | The Steward is basically running a boarding house on Dawson's Farm under the direction of the Proctor, who will make all decisions to improve the thing for the University ... he was a supplement to the Hotel keepers.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 528 | June 28, 1849 | Proctor will erect a building next to the Steward's House to accommodate students. Apparently contractor (presumably in charge of Dawson's Row) is in charge of even more students.

Students | 531 | June 27, 1849 | The students have requested (through Mr. Johnathan Washington, Jr.) to illuminate the Lawn on June 27-28 and this is granted as long as the Proctor does not see any danger to the buildings in this.

Grounds Staff | 532 | June 28, 1849 | The Steward is basically running a boarding house on Dawson's Farm under the direction of the Proctor, who will make all decisions to improve the thing for the University ... he was a supplement to the Hotel keepers.

Animals | 534 | June 28, 1849 | any manure "made upon the premises of the University, should stay there for the use of the Professors, Hotel Keepers, Steward, and Proctors' gardens.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 540 | June 28, 1849 | construction of 12 new student houses and the steward's dining room, etc. enlargements total: $6,420 09

Building Program | 545 | June 28, 1849 | "Resolved that the Executive Committee be requested to present at the next regular meeting of the Board a plan for such an addition to the buildings of the University as may afford another Pavilion, a new edifice for lecture rooms & public examinations, and additional dormitories for students."

Hotels | 546 | June 28, 1849 | two rooms (other than those used by the Washington Society) in Hotel A are to be used for the Moot Court.

Gardens and Yards | 546 | June 28, 1849 | Proctor to make an addition/alteration to the "outhouse" in Dr. Harrison's yard "as to give him an additional room"

Students | 547 | June 28, 1849 | Grant permission for the Proctor to house students in his house next session, but not more than he has in his room now.

Appendix I
Pavilions 547 June 28, 1849  "That the proctor shall erect or provide rooms in lieu of rooms now attached as offices to the pavilion No. 7 under the advisement of the Executive Committee."

Building Program 550 October 9, 1849 The Faculty tell the BOV that there is an "urgent want" for addition lecture halls, especially if the University continues to grow. 5 departments have to share 2 lecture halls.

Infrastructure 555 June 28, 1850 new cisterns requested so as to ensure sufficient supply of water in case of fire (to be collected from the roofs of the buildings)

Building Program 556 June 29, 1850 larger lecture rooms needed as class size has increased

Building Program 557 June 29, 1850 Proctor told to contract burning 900,000 bricks for potential future building projects.

Grounds Staff 557 June 29, 1850 Maj. Broadus was the Steward and has died, therefore "the Hotel for boarding State Students kept at the charge & on the account of the institution." Hotel keeper will be hired to run the house.

Building Program 559 September 25, 1850 Board agrees that new buildings are necessary as the existing buildings are insufficient for the growing population of the school. The Rotunda has been used for large lectures and exhibitions - uses which it was not designed to house and therefore which can no longer be done safely. Stevenson and Col. Randolph are appointed the Building Committee and can choose an architect and decide what the buildings should include and look like.

Gardens and Yards 560 September 25, 1850 Profs. Courtneay & Dr. Harrison have requested additional buildings behind their pavilions for housing their families and the BOV finds this reasonable, turns matter over to Proctor and Executive Committee. Courtenay was living in Pavilion I and Harrison in Pavilion V.

Infrastructure 564 June 27, 1851 3 new cisterns requested of the Proctor

Hotels 564 June 27, 1851 "the Proctor continue the arrangement made for the State Students on June 29, 1850, for the ensuing year, and that he be particularly desired, to make the farm and garden attached to the premises, tributary as far as practicable to support the Hotel."

Gardens and Yards 564 June 27, 1851 Cabell is given permission to "open a communication between his garden" and the lot of the building which now houses the moot court and the societies (Hotel A). This was granted, but UVA would not pay for it.

Building Program 566 June 28, 1851 run down of how the budget will be limited so as to make enough funds available for the building program and the usual necessities of the University. Obviously already decided that the Rotunda will be added onto. The Proctor may hire a clerk to help him with all this and a loan of $25K from the legislature is recommended. The new building is supposed to cost $30K.

Grounds Staff 569 June 28, 1851 The Proctor can have the privies cleaned, but will always do it at the expense of the Hotel-Keeper or Professor.

Students 570 June 28, 1851 Students are required to pay a $10 deposit to the University for potential damage to buildings, furniture, and other property.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 571 June 30, 1851 The BOV gives permission for a house to be built on grounds for the Chaplain as paid for by a volunteer [other than UVA]. It would be the property of the University and be under their control once completed. The Chaplain is chosen by the Professors biennially and paid by students and professors.

Dormitories 578 June 28, 1852 Whereas it appears to the satisfaction of the Board that the passage between the Pavilions occupied by Dr. Cabell & Dr. Schele is not now needed as a thoroughfare and that the Space thus lost may be advantageously appropriated as the site of a dormitory, it is hereby

Resolved that the Proctor be instructed to close this passage & to convert it into a dormitory with a door of communication between it & the dormitory occupied by Dr. Volger the Assistant Teacher in the School of Modern Languages for whose use it has been assigned."

Cabell was living in Pavilion II and Schele de Vere in Pavilion IV.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 578 June 28, 1852 Mr. D’Alfonce is the Teacher of Gymnastics and has requested a gym to be built

Pavilions 579 June 28, 1852 Harrison has been making an addition to his Pavilion and wants to be refunded. Is now referred to the Committee of Inspection. Harrison was living in Pavilion V.

Building Program 579 June 28, 1852  "The Hector & Villiers are aware that alterations and additions have from time to time been made in the buildings of the University without previous authority, and regarding such alterations or additions however trivial and however conducive to convenience, as of mischievous tendency, take occasion to express in this form their disapproval of such unauthorized acts, and to urge on the Faculty, Executive Committee and Officers of the University in future to observe the vigilant care to prevent any alteration to the buildings of the University, without proper authority being previously obtained, and entertaining these views, to make known that no bill for any such unauthorized alteration can be allowed to be paid out of the funds of the University."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 580 June 28, 1852 Jas. R. Watson asked to be reimbursed for building on his lot - was turned down.

General Improvements 581 June 28, 1852 Faculty asks for railings around Chapel and Lecture Room of Natural Philosophy.

Infrastructure 588 June 28, 1852 three cisterns have been added in the past year, to join the existing three. A drought has prompted the Proctor to consider building additional cisterns "and that the plan of the Hydraulic Ram proposed by the Faculty as a means of furnishing the necessary supply of water be referred to the Executive Committee."

Building Program 589 June 28, 1852 Mills’s report on the new building was read. Addison Maupin asked to build a “small brick cottage” behind the house he occupies. Matter referred to the Executive Committee to grant/not grant.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 590 June 28, 1852 Faculty given permission to accept private donation for a Temperance Hall to be built on grounds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 20, 1852</td>
<td>Prof. Minor made suggestions for the &quot;introduction of Gas into the University.&quot; Matter referred to Faculty and Executive Committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1853</td>
<td>$11,301.25 left to pay the contractor's bills on the new building. $3,000 to complete the building and grade the grounds around it. $2,000 goes to repairs of existing buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1854</td>
<td>description of the spaces within the Annex. Many buildings were found in great disarray by Committee of Inspection: doors are cut or ripped from hinges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1853</td>
<td>&quot;The glass in many of the windows of the offices attached to the Hotels are broken out and defaced - The plastering beneath the terraces in many places have fallen down from leaks in the covering, which is rotting down and which require immediate and suitable repairs...We also found in front of many of the dormitories a part of the brick under pinning broken down for the purpose of ventilation; instead of having it done in the rear of the buildings. We also found the stone steps of the Rotunda in a state requiring attention and repair - in the present state of the steps the bases of the columns are in danger.&quot; Request to hire more/more efficient guards to watch the buildings and prevent the students from destroying them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1853</td>
<td>(The Committee of Inspection) found the public water closets filthy &amp; a perfect nuisance &amp; endangering the health of the students. Cabell was living in Pavilions II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1853</td>
<td>Professor Cabell has been granted permission to take down the brick wall behind his pavilion &quot;so as to include the ground appropriated as a garden to the building in rear of said Pavilion used by the Moot Court.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1853</td>
<td>Mr. Maupin may used the dormitories next to his hotel for accommodating his family and the Executive Committee will supervise the construction of a building for his servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 1853</td>
<td>Executive Committee requested to draw up a report with cost estimates for repairing the terraces and the best way to get water from the Springs (especially in case of fire).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 1853</td>
<td>Permission granted to Chairman of the Faculty to get an estimate from Messrs Stratton &amp; Brother for introducing gas lights to the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 1853</td>
<td>Proctor (under Executive Committee) ordered to bid out construction of an addition to Pavilion VIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 1853</td>
<td>&quot;The recommendation of the Faculty that an additional Ice Pond be constructed is approved, and it is ordered, that the Proctor cause an additional Ice Pond to be made on the University grounds at such point as may be selected by him under direction of the Executive Committee for the use of the public ice houses.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1855</td>
<td>Recommended that another person be hired to taken on the supervision of the buildings and their maintenance as the Proctor has too many other duties. Suggests a superintendent of buildings and grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26, 1854</td>
<td>&quot;The Rector laid before the Board an Estimate of George Nichols (Builder of New York) of the labor and materials necessary to the repairs of the Terrace roofs to the University...&quot; resolved for Proctor to pay Nichols (for estimate only)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1854</td>
<td>Proctor suggests that coal will be a cheaper way to heat the university now that the RR in Cville has improved and coal can be brought in. &quot;It is submitted that a discretion shall be allowed the Proctor to substitute coal grates, for wood fires in case he shall find that the reduction of the cost of fuel will decidedly compensate for the change of fire-place construction.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1854</td>
<td>Proctor has no privacy on his lot and his family and he are bothered constantly. The BOV &quot;recommended that he be allowed Dormitory No. 56 adjoining his house.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1854</td>
<td>Committee of Inspection found the lecture rooms filthy, but didn’t blame the servants because they already had so many duties to keep them busy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1854</td>
<td>A drawing was submitted by the Proctor showing who was using which dormitory rooms. &quot;Resolved that the subject of the appropriations of Dormitories by the Professors and Officers of the University be referred to the Executive Committee, and that they report as early as they can consider the subject, with instructions to resume all dormitories for the use of the students which are not now necessarily occupied by the Professors and Officers.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1854</td>
<td>$25K was granted by the state legislature for the repair of the terraces. Alexander Jackson Davis was solicited for the repairs, a Mr. Nichols came in his stead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1854</td>
<td>&quot;Resolved that the small room between dormitories No 4 &amp; 6 be appropriated to the use of the Secretary of the BOV to be used as an office wherein to preserve the papers and records of the Board of Visitors.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>June 28, 1854</td>
<td>$25K resolved to be split between improvement of water supply and repair of terraces, though this is not enough. The terraces will cost $14,204.90 and the water works $23,352.13, without the cost of taking the water directly to the pavilions and dormitories (an expense found unnecessary). Therefore resolve not to spend more than $10K on terrace repair and no more than $25K on water supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>June 28, 1854</td>
<td>Faculty are asked to relinquish (except where &quot;serious inconvenience may occur&quot;) the dormitories for the students to use. The BOV moves to make the rule that no professor can occupy more than one dormitory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, Grounds Staff</td>
<td>June 27, 1856</td>
<td>The Executive Committee gives their report on the fixing of the terraces and the water works: bids have been put out and examined for the terraces. The water works will cost more than the $25K appropriated and the owner of the Springs (&quot;or one of them at least, and that he's most important&quot;) who supplies the water refuses to sell it (?!) to the University. George W. Spooner hired for terraces and will finish by December 1855.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>June 28, 1854</td>
<td>The Observatory is to be fixed up for student housing by the Proctor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavilion II</td>
<td>June 28, 1855</td>
<td>Because Mr. Davis and his family are so uncomfortable, the Proctor will contract the addition of 3 rooms to &quot;the rear of his House&quot; to cost less than $2000 and to approved by the Executive Committee. Davis was living in Pavilion VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>June 28, 1855</td>
<td>The Executive Committee gives their report on the fixing of the terraces and the water works: bids have been put out and examined for the terraces. The water works will cost more than the $25K appropriated and the owner of the Springs (&quot;or one of them at least, and that he's most important&quot;) who supplies the water refuses to sell it (?!) to the University. George W. Spooner hired for terraces and will finish by December 1855.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servants</td>
<td>June 28, 1855</td>
<td>3 servants were hired in the past year to service the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>June 28, 1855</td>
<td>Discussion of proposed gates on roads around/leading to the University: &quot;it is not proper that the roads leading around the University and passing in front of the Dormitories and Hotels, should be used as public roads by persons from one part of the County to another.&quot; Gates recommended for such roads and kept locked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities</td>
<td>June 28, 1855</td>
<td>Gymnasium discussed as if it is a separate building; the gates will be erected on either side of it - on Lynchburg road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>June 29, 1855</td>
<td>As usual, the Committee of Inspection found the buildings in terrible shape: &quot;great delapidation and injury in many of the buildings and especially in the dormitories and the ceiling of the terraces...&quot; Grounds have also been neglected: confirms that Proctor can't handle all of his duties and bolsters suggestions that another post be filled to take care of the buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Improvements</td>
<td>June 29, 1855</td>
<td>&quot;They find the public water closets in a very filthy state and a perfect nuisance endangering the health of the students, and even of those who reside within the limits of the University.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix I**

**VOLUME IV: May 1856 - June 1877**

- That the Chairman and Faculty be specially recommended to cause the dormitories, alleys, and prives, etc to be kept by the proper persons with strict cleanliness, and to exert themselves to secure such fidelity on the part of the Proctor and Hotel Keepers; that an ample supply of good and wholesome fare be served up in each Hotel, to the students in a cleanly and gentlemanly style, and that the Chairman report all delinquencies and complaints in this regard to the BOV.
- Hotelkeeper Maupin asked to move off grounds with his family. The BOV granted his request, as long as he continues to carry out his duties as hotelkeeper.
- Hotel
- Pavilion II.
- General Improvements
- Hotel, Grounds Staff
- Building Program
- General Improvements
- General Improvements, Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities
- Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities
- Hotel
- Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities
- Pavilion II.

*Appendix II*

- Authority granted for the Executive Committee to put together a contract with the Charlottesville and University Gas Company to outfit the University.
Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 714 February 14, 1857 discussion of boarding house for 50 students to be built west of Mrs. Ross & McCyoys as well as a boarding house for 60 students on UVA land east of RR, and another for 100 students with large dining room. Discussion of enlarging some of the dining rooms in the hotels to serve 100+ students.

Infrastructure 719 February 26, 1857 request to continue Eliot's survey of water works and begin contracts for construction.

Hotels 720 February 26, 1857 Faculty will require of the hotelkeepers to keep in each dormitory; 2 tables, 4 chairs, one slop bucket, clean sheets, pillow cases for each student once a week, clean towels every day.

Students 726 June 29, 1857 Number of billiard saloons have been constructed near the University and are causing much distraction for the students. Billiard tables are banned from within the University precincts.

Pavilions 736 June 30, 1857 $400 appropriated for the repairs of the kitchen attached to Minor's pavilion, and another $200 for the repair of the porch attached to the back of the same building. Minor was living in Pavilion X.

Dormitories 736 June 30, 1857 New dormitories are necessary immediately, as well as housing for professors.

Pavilions 737 June 30, 1857 Davis's pavilion to get an addition. Davis was living in Pavilion VII.

General Improvements, Animals 742 March 12, 1858 There is some kind of epidemic and all students are removed from the ranges for the rest of the term. Other precautions enacted: grounds drained, basements of Range rooms drained/examined, no cattle, pigs or horses to be kept within the precinct, all cellars cleaned.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 759 September 2, 1858 Mr. Maupin (hotel keeper) requested reimbursement for buildings. BOV will not give him money for anything except for that which pertains to removing a stable.

Building Program 760 September 2, 1858 Executive Committee approved to build a new Hotel at the South end of the Eastern Range.

Hotels 761 September 2, 1858 The new dining hall built in Hotel occupied by the Proctor makes it necessary to build Proctor another house. He will take over Mrs. McCoy's former Hotel. Changes made in Col. Ward's Hotel have made it unlivable, he is therefore moved to Mr. Brock's former Hotel.

Pavilions 761 September 2, 1858 McGuffey's basement is in trouble - referred to Mr. Pratt. McGuffey was living in Pavilion IX.

Hotels 762 September 2, 1858 Students of the "new Hotel" will be required to bring their own furniture and be in charge of their own laundry.

Hotels 764 September 3, 1858 Executive Committee asked to improve Mr. Ward's Hotel kitchen as they see fit.

Infrastructure 764 September 3, 1858 Eliot instructed to go ahead as soon as possible with new water system.

Dormitories 764 September 3, 1858 Professor Gildersleeve's request for a dormitory for his office is denied. Two dormitory rooms on Range suggested to be combined for the use of the Columbia Society.

Hotels 768 September 3, 1858 50 sets of bedroom furniture to be delivered to UVA by NY firm Messrs. Hutcherson and Wickersham as of 8/15/58 letter.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 769 September 4, 1858 Mr. J. E. D'Alfonce requested to build vapor baths on University grounds. Resolved: UVA will have control over the baths, they can only be used by UVA folks, after 20 years they will be owned by the University. Matter handed over to Executive Committee.

Gardens and Yards 772 September 4, 1858 Privy on Prof Howard's lot to be moved to a better spot.

Dormitories 773 September 4, 1858 Each room is to be examined for fitness for student habitation. If deemed not habitable the student shall not live there.

Grounds Staff 774 September 4, 1858 Mr. Pratt appointed superintendent.

General Improvements, Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 774 September 4, 1858 Pratt's plan accepted (from 1856): "the ground colored green, with an extension of the same in a belt 150 to 300 feet wide along the red line running on the west side from the Lynchburg road to the Staunton road, shall be suitably graded in grass (?), and planted in trees and shrubs, and roads and walks laid off therein as proposed, the privies and stables and other unsightly buildings to the south shall be removed to suitable places beyond the proposed park grounds, and gardens and lots for the professors laid off. But the road marked "east Precinct" shall not be moved (?) until further order...Reasonable time shall be given for the removal of the Professors Gardens and the enclosures shall be removed, at the expense of the University."

General Improvements 777 March 18, 1859 referred to the Executive Committee to repair the road that approaches UVA from the west.

Hotels, General Improvements 782 March 19, 1859 Dawson's farm will be sold for $19K and with that money new student housing will be built to accommodate 50 students, along with a building attached to Mrs. Ross's Hotel like that which has been added to Dr. Hamner's Hotel.

Hotels 785 June 27, 1859 Hammer wants to cut doors into his dining room - referred to Executive Committee.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 785 June 27, 1859 Approval for those who want to build private housing for students on University Land - must comply with the usual rules of doing so.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 796 June 30, 1859 the vapor baths were completed.

Infrastructure 799 February 8, 1860 the ice pond overflowed onto Mrs. Mary J. Smith's land.

Servants 805 July 3, 1860 all work on the university farm shall cease as shall the hiring of "surplus labor of servants."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 805 July 3, 1860 "Resolved that in future no wood of any description or for any purpose shall be taken from the lands of the University" without permission - strictly enforced.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 808 July 4, 1860 permission granted to faculty to erect a building to be used "as a place of religious worship" by private subscription, with the site having to be approved by the Executive Committee and the whole thing to be owned by the University.
Grounds 809 July 4, 1860 RTW Duke requested to investigate the University’s boundaries and any conflicts with neighboring property owners.

Pavilions 811 July 4, 1860 “Resolved that the dormitory next Prof Coleman’s office be assigned to the Instructor in Latin, and instead of it the dormitory next Prof Coleman’s Pavilion on the South be assigned to him for the use of his family and that the student thus displaced be allowed the room vacated by the Instructor in Mathematics.” (begin pg. 812) Prof. Coleman will have a $500 addition built to his pavilion, to be reimbursed by the University.

Infrastructure 812 July 5, 1860 water works to extend to the university infirmary.

Infrastructure 812 July 5, 1860 D’Alfonse allowed to use the water in the cistern next to the gymnasium rather than the water works.

General Improvements 814 March 6, 1861 Spooner made claim for cost of repairing the terraces.

Faculty 817 May 27, 1861 A council was appointed by the VA Governor to advise UVA on their role in the CW. He requested that they create a department for the “preparation of munitions of war” that will be supervised by the profs. They resolved to create the School of Military Science and Civil Engineering to include classes on tactics, etc. Resolution adopted.

Grounds 818 May 27, 1861 Executive Committee granted permission to rent out the hotels for non-university purposes?

Hotels 825 July 2, 1861 fuel for the university to be found by the Proctor on grounds. He is given permission to sell as much wood as necessary to professors and others.

Grounds 833 September 11, 1862 Resolved that “the use of the Buildings & Grounds of the University as Barracks or Hospitals is disapproved by the Board & ought not to be allowed in the future.”

Hotels 836 October 9, 1861 Col. Ward no longer has to take boarders into his hotel and this issue and the “compensation for the enclosure he has put around his garden” shall be referred to the Board.

Grounds 836 July 25, 1862 buildings and grounds cannot be used by Confederates without permission. University can rent buildings to Confederates, but also require compensation for the buildings and grounds damaged when the CSA used them for a hospital. [beginning p. 837] "Resolved that the interest of the state in the education of its citizens demands that the University be kept open in war as in peace.”

Hotels, Gardens and Yards 838 July 25, 1862 Col. Ward owed money for rent, but this is excused “in consideration of the enclosure put up around his garden at his own expense having been used by the Superintendent of P. B. for the benefit of the University, & of his hotel having been closed with the consent of the Committee before Xmas without his having any boarders.”

General Improvements 843 July 4, 1863 Executive Committee can use money from wood sold between 1863-64 to repair buildings.

Grounds Staff 844 July 4, 1863 The Executive Committee is granted the right to inquire about getting POWs? ("soldiers sentenced to hard labor") to work on the grounds of the University. $3000 appropriated to them to fix buildings that have long fallen into disrepair.

Grounds 846 July 4, 1863 Buildings in general are in poor repair because of lack of maintenance. The Dawson Buildings are in trouble: soldiers had been occupying them, one has a big leak in the roof, and the gutters are ruined on more than one. Dorms were left open and occupied by soldiers, floors covered in straw made possibility of fire likely, windows removed.

Animals 846 July 4, 1863 Many fences destroyed and cattle "allowed to graze on the lawns.”

Grounds 846 July 4, 1863 trees and shrubbery have not been attended to and are in poor shape.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 849 August 2, 1864 "Resolved That the Executive Committee may authorize the Proctor to provide a Mess Hall if they deem it advisable.”

Students 850 August 2, 1864 Students can pay their school fees in "agricultural products" as long as the professor is willing.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 851 July 5, 1865 "Resolved That the Chairman of the Faculty be instructed to have all buildings now occupied by persons not connected with the University vacated at the earliest possible moment - and Ordered that for the future no building of the University shall be occupied by persons not connected directly with the Institute.”

Grounds 852 July 6, 1865 The roofs of many buildings are in really bad shape: Dawson’s Row, skylight in Rotunda, Pavilions, Mess Halls, Dorms.

Hotels 856 August 16, 1865 the new dining rooms of 2 southernmost hotels already have ruined roofs. Old roofs to be completely removed and re-built of tin.

Dormitories 860 June 28, 1866 the professors want to use more and more dorm rooms for their private offices or libraries, but the university cannot afford not to rent these to students.

Pavilions 860 June 28, 1866 Prof. M. Schele De Vere granted permission to enclose part of his porch to use it for “domestic purposes.” Venables wants to enlarge his house and university will reimburse him up to $800. Schele de Vere was living in Pavilion IV.

Grounds Staff 861 June 28, 1866 Offices of Proctor, Superintendent of Public Grounds and Buildings to be combined and they have the right to hire a “practical gardener” with the approval of the Executive Committee.

General Improvements 862 June 28, 1866 all doors of the public rooms to be changed so that they open "on the outside.”

Hotels 862 June 28, 1866 “the building required for the new Hotel [requested to be] properly cleansed and thoroughly repaired at once.”

Animals 865 June 29, 1866 Dr. Maupin will continue to be compensated for his wagon and horses.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 865 June 29, 1866 2 of the Dawson buildings require new roofs.
Infrastructure, Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 866 June 29, 1866 Privies are a mess as there is a "very imperfect" drainage system that prevents them from being flushed out. They are really "obnoxious" and using too much lime is just as insufferable as letting them go. Worried that they will cause an epidemic.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 867 August 15, 1866 $1250 appropriated for repairs to Monroe House where Venable lives.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 868 August 15, 1866 The privies near Venable’s House are to be removed because they are a "nuisance."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 870 August 15, 1866 Issue of reopening baths (as suggested by Charles E. Bailey) sent to Executive Committee.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 871 August 15, 1866 Issue of establishing a laundry sent to Executive Committee.

Hotel A 872 September 8, 1866 Hotel A referred to as "small hotel" with $200/yr rent, Hotel B and E referred to as referred to as "large hotel" with $400/yr rent.

Grounds 876 June 26, 1867 "Resolved. That the extension of the boundary by the side of Prof. Holmes’ house, made by the Proctor be approved."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 876 June 26, 1867 Washington Society given permission to use Chapel as long as they allow it to stay open during appropriate hours for prayer and worship, furnish the room themselves and suitably for the chapel services.

Pavilions 878 June 27, 1867 Mr. Ford (or Miss Ross) to have a new porch.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 880 June 28, 1867 J. E. D’Alfonse has permission to remove the baths that he constructed on the grounds.

Infrastructure 880 June 28, 1867 Superintendent to make estimate for cost of Dam “in the Ravine of the Observatory mountain at the highest advisable level.”

Animals 881 June 29, 1867 "Resolved that the Proctor be instructed to enforce an enactment prohibiting the keeping or introduction of cattle, horses or hogs within the walls of the University.”

General Improvements 883 June 29, 1867 John Saunders (Proctor and Super of Buildings and Grounds) to be given commission for staging.

Pavilions 883 June 29, 1867 $250 allocated to build a portico onto Prof. Maupin’s pavilion. Maupin was living in Pavilion VIII.

Grounds 884 June 29, 1867 "Resolved that the Proctor be instructed to have further negotiations with Ambrose on the subject of "Canada" and report the result of said negotiation to the Executive Committee at their next meeting for final decision.”

Gardens and Yards 884 June 29, 1867 "Resolved that the little yard in the rear of Mr. Jeffries’ boarding house be paved, and that the small porch in that locality and the steps leading to the cellar be repaired and that the proctor is hereby directed to carry into effect this resolution if in his opinion they are all deemed necessary.”

Infrastructure 889 September 5, 1867 report made by Superintendent on the possibility of a dam on O-Hill passed on to Executive Committee.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 891 November 3, 1867 "Resolved that the Faculty be authorized to contract with any person or persons to erect a washing and bathing establishment below the University Pond or some more eligible point” with the usual regulations.

Faculty 892 November 3, 1867 There are currently 3 (and will be more) professors without housing on grounds, therefore they be given permission to build houses on the precincts as approved by Proctor and Executive Committee, with the prof. putting up half the money up front (to receive a bond for that amount).

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 896 June 27, 1868 Proctor asked to find out the “status of the old Temperence Hall” to see if the university could rent parts of it.

Building Program 897 June 27, 1868 Proctor may stop the passage under the new building at will. To be examined the possibility of making the “space under the Rear Portico of the New Building” into an “aparatus room for Prof. Smith,” by removing the partition that separates the mathematical section room.

Hotels 897 June 27, 1868 Henry Massie, Keeper of Hotel A sent a letter - discussed. The Board decided that the decoration of a public hall would be bad for the walls, therefore should not be done?

Pavilions, Hotels 898 June 27, 1868 repairs and improvements to hotels and pavilions are to be paid for by the occupants because the university is too poor to pay for it themselves.

General Improvements 899 June 27, 1868 Dawson House E needs new floor on 2nd story and all of them need repairs to steps. "A wooden structure near Massie’s Hotel used as a wood house and for other purposes should be removed without delay” and put somewhere else at the expense of the university. Roof of Rotunda is really leaky, balustrades to either side of the Rotunda need repairs. All of the roofs of the pavilions, hotels, and dorms leak. Gutters are a mess and the Rotunda water tanks are doing a number on the building and should be removed. The walls of the Annex “seem to be giving way.”

Hotels 900 June 29, 1868 Mr. Jeffries’s hotel is a total mess and he asks for money to have it cleaned denied. The dining room walls are so filthy that the room is called “unfit for decent people to eat in.”

Infrastructure 901 June 29, 1868 $4500 appropriated to introduce a water supply from O-Hill Reservoir with conduit pipes. The money collected from the sale of the old pipes will be put forth to this purpose as well.

Faculty 901 June 29, 1868 $15000 to be allocated to build 2 new professors houses.

Faculty 902 June 30, 1868 it is required by law that professors, officers, and tutors of the university live within or near the precincts of the university.

Infrastructure 910 June 30, 1869 Green Peyton built the new water works.

Pavilions, General Improvements 911 June 30, 1869 The stairs leading to the lecture room of Prof. Harrison’s pavilion need repairs and the roof of the Rotunda is in trouble, but the buildings and grounds are for the most part in improved condition. “Some of the brick inclosures require repairs, but this can be easily effected by the energy and attention of the Proctor.” Harrison was living in Pavilion III.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 922 September 17, 1869 "Ordered that the portion of land belonging to the University lying West of the Professors’ gardens adjoining the lands of Jesse L. Maury be set apart and used for Experimental Agriculture farm."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1870</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>The buildings are in good order in view of the condition of the finances as circumstances would admit of. The Rotunda’s “decayed cornice” was removed and replaced, along with new paint. Lawn buildings need paint and this should be done soon, especially in the case of the dorm cornice. The Experimental Farm has had a slow beginning, but has been fenced in and a few things are begun (including Sea Island Cotton experiment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1870</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>Leander J. McCormick, Esq. gave a mower to the Agricultural Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30, 1870</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>$350 to be spend to increase height of reservoir wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 1871</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>$134.70 requested for repairs to parsonage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 27, 1871</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>practice had been to hire “boys” as servants for the boarding houses but they are “lawless and irritating” in their conduct and the university should therefore limit the hiring of servants to grown men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1871</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>Harrison was living in Pavilion III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29, 1871</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>Proctor needs to be more vigilant about enforcing the no trespassing rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1872</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>“they have found much dilapidation in the buildings and great disfigurement in the grounds.” Dawson’s Row and terrace roofing are in trouble. <em>The grounds are checked with paths that are unsightly and entirely unnecessary,</em> even though they recognize the need for short cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 1872</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>“The attention of the Committee has been directed to some shanties just over the road from the Infirmary* and adjacent to a settlement known as ‘Canada,’ and as they are not necessary and are conspicuously detractive from the completeness of the lawn to which they are attached it is deemed best that they should be removed and it is therefore proposed that the Proctor be required to take them away as soon as possible put the ground in grass.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1872</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>in order to pay for the cost of lighting public rooms and library, fee raised to $20 for their use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1872</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>cost for building stable, tool house, and purchase of mules: $600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 1872</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>Stable and cornhouse of Mr. Jeffries resolved at last meeting to be removed now suspended, but these buildings will be removed before 1873-74 session begins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 1872</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>$100 be appropriated for repairs to Pav VII, as well as $75 for “the purpose of removing the partitions in the rear passages changing the present rear door into a window and the window in the rear of the dining room into an outer door, with steps into the yard.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 19, 1872</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>No student can live off grounds as long as there are available rooms on grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21, 1872</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>Unplastered room in Venables’ pavilion to be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 21, 1872</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Superintendent reiterates necessity of removing the stables and other buildings “in front of Mr. Jeffries boarding house, and converting the ground into a lawn.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 28, 1873</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>overseer not to be paid more than $500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| June 28, 1873 | 1019 | “Resolved that the Board have received with much gratification the information through the Committee on Public Buildings (begin pg. 1020) &c., that the paths which so seriously disfigure the Lawn have been overcome.”  
*The Proctor to continue to prevent these paths.*                                                                                          |
| June 28, 1873 | 1019 | “the cowhouses and stables on the road to the Cemetery be removed and that the Executive Committee be directed to indicate the site where other such buildings may be erected by the Professors desiring them upon such terms as may be agreed upon between said Executive Committee and professors.* |
| June 28, 1873 | 1019 | the water tanks “over the library” need to be inspected as it is potentially leaking onto the books.                                                                                                          |
| June 28, 1873 | 1019 | In accordance with the report of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings it is ordered that the Proctor proceed to remove the small building at the Eastern Entrance of the Grounds now occupied as a shoe shop, and that such removal be made before the 1st of October next.* |
| June 28, 1873 | 1019 | the buildings are running in many cases to decay, and in some to ruin whilst the grounds themselves present appearance that does not impress us and cannot impress the public favorably.” Terrace needs to be repaired/water proofed, especially since they are places for standing water on top of the brick work that could propagate typhoid. Dawson’s Row is a total mess: dummy windows were never finished, steps are rotten. Water tanks “upon the Rotunda building immediately above the Library” are leaking and causing damage to the books. Paths broken through the grounds are an “eye sore.” |
| June 28, 1873 | 1022 | Suggest that the buildings and rooms of the university would be better cared for if the students themselves were responsible for them - suggested by Faculty. |
| June 28, 1873 | 1025 | Range of stables, cow houses “&c” behind Dawson’s Row “lying immediately on the graved walk to the University Cemetery” are in terrible shape, some to the point of being falling down and useless. Recommended that they be torn down and the brick used for something else at the University. The shed houses opposite of the infirmary were supposed to be removed by 1873-74 session but still have not been |

Appendix I
General Improvements 1025 June 28, 1873 numerous lightening rods need to be replaced repaired.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 1027 June 28, 1873 "Your Committee have observed in the public service to the grounds from Charlottesville side and immediately at the Post Office & directly visible from the R Rd. a small wooden structure which detracts from the appearance of that portion of the grounds and would doubtless impress unfavorably a stranger visiting the University. It seems now to be used as a shoe shop. It is thought best to remove the shop at once and your Committee so recommend."

Trees 1027 June 28, 1873 the "Alantton Tree" is "objectionable" and scattered throughout the grounds, should be removed.

Infrastructure 1029 June 30, 1873 the tanks on the Rotunda are a problem because they are over flowing...

General Improvements 1031 June 30, 1873 suggestion to put a "public road through the grounds of the University."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 1032 June 30, 1873 order to remove the stables changed so as to retain the Cemetery "provided that the parties now using them shall repair and improve them so as to make them presentable, until they can provide other accommodations."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 1036 July 1, 1873 buildings and plans have generally been improved - everything practicable seems to have been done to make the best show in and about the University." Col. Peter's Pavilion porch has deteriorated significantly and Minor's basement is damp. Minor is given the dormitory next to his pavilion since he obviously needs more room for himself and his family - is to be used as his ofifice and not to be used for his boarding a student (which they BOV permits). The infirmary floor is largely rotten and should be replaced and the basement need to be improved. Suggest that because No. 6 on the Lawn is no longer used to house the records of the BOV, that it be returned to student use and that the board's records be kept in the Library.

General Improvements 1053 June 30, 1874 Buildings and grounds under good conditions considering the circumstances.

Grounds 1071 June 30, 1875 the Miller Board wants the land now adjacent to the sewage dump and not used currently as gardens for professors to be appropriated for the Experimental Farm (not including the mountain), including about 40 acres.

Gardens 1072 June 30, 1875 Sanitary system now leads outside of the University grounds to dump "to render impossible any infection of the air or water in and about the University and such other provisions made for the proper action of these sewers as will insure their cleanliness and efficiency"

Infrastructure 1072 June 30, 1875 Faculty proposes using the Southeastern most hotel (Jeffries) for the "messing system" - granted to do so under the faculty's control as long as the university can procure some revenue from it.

Hotels 1074 June 30, 1875 Prof. Minor was living in Pavilion X.

Executive Committee 1078 July 1, 1875 The Executive Committee can order the flushing of the sewers when they deem necessary.

General Improvements 1095 June 26, 1876 Dr. Davis has several requests for his house: convert blank front door into window, bring privy into his house. Though the BOV understands the necessity of said improvements, they can only afford to pay $50 for the removal for the privy. Venable, meanwhile, is communing and no longer needs a pavilion.

Pavilions 1111 June 29, 1876 Prof. Minor has asked that he either be allowed to enlarge his current pavilion or be moved into pavilion 1 - the board will enlarge the pavilion for him as they can afford it "and they also recommend that the portion between his present office and the adjoining dormitory be removed and the floor lowered so as to enlarge his office and thus give him the two dormitories asked for." He can take on the dormitory adjacent to the dormitory he presently occupies until his pavilion is completed.

Pavilions 1117 June 29, 1876 Prof. Price's request for building porches onto his house is referred to the Committee on Grounds and Buildings.

Grounds 1118 June 29, 1876 Grounds are generally in a good condition, though buildings will need repairs in next 2-3 years.

Pavilions 1121 June 26, 1877 The Museum of Natural History building is complete, but needs to be completed "in the style of the original design."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 1123 June 25, 1877 Board of Health reported that drains are necessary for the Lawn, pavilion cellars, and dorms. Board of Health to direct all future opening or creation of sewers.

Infrastructure 1125 June 25, 1877 $300 appropriated for Proctor to flush sewers connected to houses and dorms and to drain the Lawn.

Grounds, General Improvements 1128 June 25, 1877 grounds are in good shape. Pavements under arcades are in much better shape than last year. Colonade terraces are in poor shape and do not create the cover that is intended to keep the space beneath dry. Recommend "pavement metal floors." Painting necessary on the outside of all the buildings.

Gardens and Yards, General Improvements 1136 June 27, 1877 Recommend that the inside enclosures so far as they are not necessary to protect the privacy of the Pavilions shall gradually and with a little expense as possible be removed." Once these fences are removed, the "old carriage approach rendered necessary by the Museum Building would be much more acceptable" - the fences are on either side of this road.

Hotels 1137 June 27, 1877 BOV appropriates $150 for enlarging mess halls.
Appendix I
Subsidiary Buildings and
Amenities 1367 June 30, 1884 Site suggested for the Chapel: "north of the Garth boarding-house, and near the pond in the lawn" - is most agreeable to the citizens and university community as it can be easily accessed and won't negatively impact the university's existing buildings. Recommend that this be watched carefully and that the issue be examined by a supplemental report.

Pavilions 1367 June 30, 1884 Pavilion 9 repairs to be directed by Proctor.

Rotunda 1369 July 1, 1884 the chapel and reading rooms are in very bad shape (roofs and walls). Roof needs to be replaced with new shingles and other repairs jerry-rigged so building can survive through tough financial times and be fixed later when the university can afford it.

Servants 1370 July 1, 1884 students have to hire their own servants and provide their own furniture in university housing. The university will assign the rooms - that is the fullest extent of their involvement with the housing of students/use of the rooms.

Infrastructure 1375 September 12, 1884 $1019.26 to be spent to complete system of pumping water from icepond to tanks on top of Rotunda.

Infrastructure 1378 January 16, 1885 Reservoir to be built on the land of Henry N. Carey, et. Al. as approved by the Act of the General Assembly of VA (approved March 19, 1884) with pipes going along streets as assigned by Bowditch and approved by Executive Committee. Contract between university and city for the water works begins on page #1380.

VOLUME VI: June 1885 - July 1895

Students 6 June 29, 1885 students living off grounds had to put down a deposit.

General Improvements 9 July 2, 1885 the University will not pay out of its general funds for improvements to the Observatory except for improvements to the road leading to it.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 12 July 3, 1885 building at the southern end of the eastern range known as the Gymnasium now designated for the use of the Gymnastic Club.

Students 12 July 3, 1885 committee formed to push law in state legislature to ban bars from being a certain distance from the University.

Dormitories 13 July 3, 1885 new floor to be put into Dormitory 54 used currently by Prof. Dunnington.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 20 May 4, 1886 Proctor instructed to install hatrack and urinal in Infirmary Building.

General Improvements 20 May 4, 1886 road that runs from "old Turn Pike" across C&O be widened to 10 ft. on western (university) side and 5 feet on other (Mrs. Davis) side with shade trees on western side planted by Proctor.

Pavilions 22 May 6, 1886 there was a fire in Prof. Page's Pavilion.

Infrastructure 46 June 30, 1886 better water supply to Dawson's Row and Carr's Hill recommended because of risk of fire. Fire plugs should be built within 300 feet of every building.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 47 June 30, 1886 Carr's Hill dorms are in such bad shape that they are largely uninhabitable.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 47 June 30, 1886 recommendation of removal of blacksmith's shop at fork of Lynchburg and Staunton Roads because it is "unsightly" on the approach to the University.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 48 June 30, 1886 need new icehouse as old one was destroyed last season. Can be constructed for less than $500 made in profits from ice.

Infrastructure 52 July 1, 1886 "the lawn being a flat smooth [sic] plateau with no water conduits there is of necessity constant soil saturation & the basements of nearly all of the Professor's pavilions are damp." Recommend French drains to carry rainwater from roofs of pavilions, hotels, and dormitories, to be laid on east and west side of lawn.

Infrastructure 52 July 1, 1886 recommendation made that "water closets or other suitable means of disposing of excreta be erected for the use of all residents of the University."

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 53 July 1, 1886 Board of Visitors 55 July 1, 1886 the BOV members had to take an anti-dueling oath along with their oath of office.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 78 June 27, 1887 ladies representing the "New Chapel" are to be sold the "old Bell" so that proceeds can be put towards the purchase of a new bell.

Servants 80 June 27, 1887 Proctor is to supervise all servants working on grounds and to issue them a badge to wear indicating them as servants.

Rotunda 80 June 27, 1887 Proctor instructed to install a bronze tablet on the floor of the Rotunda on which to inscribe all major donations to the University Library. Bracket also instructed to be installed in order to hold the bust of late Prof. William B. Rogers.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 82 June 28, 1887 approve request by Faculty to build a lecture hall for the Prof. of Anatomy.

Board of Visitors 83 June 28, 1887 BOV will occupy rooms 50 & 52 on West Range with the Miller Board.

Jefferson 83 June 28, 1887 Proctor instructed to build an enclosure around the newly erected monument to TJ.

General Improvements 84 June 28, 1887 Proctor suggested change to east entrance of grounds and the BOV asks for a written plan in order to consider it.

Dormitories 88 June 28, 1887 Dunnington applied to use Dormitories 50 & 52 on East Range.

Dormitories 90 June 30, 1887 Dunnington's request approved in order for him to house guests over part of the upcoming vacation.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 91 June 30, 1887 2 wooden kitchens outside of Carr's Hill dormitories approved.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities, Gardens and Yards 106 August 11, 1887 Dunnington requested to build a wooden story on top of one of the "backbuildings of his lot" but the board declined his request because they could not afford "the erection of frame buildings in such close proximity to the University buildings."
Servants 106 August 11, 1887 students can change their room, but they must maintain the same servant.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 116 January 10, 1888 Charlottesville and University of Virginia Electric Light and Gas Company allowed to build wires at UVA at their own expense through grounds and the Faculty arranges for the actual use of the power, as long as it doesn't cost more than gas.

Infrastructure 116 January 10, 1888 debate as to whether or not dormitories should be occupied for the summer session. Recommended against because it could bring in diseases "from without" and because it will provide little time to properly clean the buildings and their amenities before the next session starts. But it is also recommended that only the Dawson's Row and Carr's Hill dorms be allowed to be occupied, coupled with a room-to-room inspection.

Dormitories 121 June 25, 1888

General Improvements 127 June 25, 1888 public requests a road to be able to access the university through the baseball grounds.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 129 June 26, 1888 dining room for Carr's Hill recommended and $1500 appropriated for it.

Infrastructure 129 June 26, 1888 lights are being rated for by the Faculty and Proctor asked to look into the insurance policies covering all aspects of the University.

Infrastructure 130 June 26, 1888 approval of enlargement of Old Reservoir from Dawson's How "to the building in rear of the Rotunda."

Grounds Staff 131 June 26, 1888 the Janitor is currently running the steam engine that supplies power to Physical Laboratory, even though he is not an engineer.

Gardens and Yards 144 July 11, 1888 Mrs. Burdine (boarding house keeper) wants to establish a garden somewhere on grounds and the Board will find a place for her that is appropriate.

General Improvements 144 July 11, 1888 Peyton suggests that the East Range Road be extended to Lynchburg Road for temporary public use.

Students 158 November 22, 1888 the Faculty can refuse students to live in off-grounds boarding houses they find objectionable because of health/safety or moral grounds.

Rotunda 158 November 22, 1888 Proctor instructed to build a "moveable wooden stairway, from the Northern portico to the ground floor below or to the lawn" before the next commencement ceremony.

Dormitories 162 November 24, 1888 BOV will distribute through the students.”

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 162 November 24, 1888 Proctor instructed to do repairs to Parsonage.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 166 February 8, 1889 recommendation to enlarge Dissecting Hall approved.

Dormitories 193 June 25, 1889 resolved that it would be easier to discipline and more comfortable if the dormitories on the Lawn were only occupied by students and Professors sent to occupy East Range. Faculty is to be consulted on the subject.

Pavilions 195 June 25, 1889 Proctor to reimburse professors for insertion of a door in a Pavilion attic and for repair of drainage.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 197 June 25, 1889 there has been talk of the bell being retained as a "relic," but the BOV has already given it over to the Ladies of the Chapel Aid Society to be recast, so they no longer have any jurisdiction over it.

Pavilions 198 June 25, 1889 BOV will distribute professor's pavilion assignments based on seniority.

Dormitories 198 June 25, 1889 R. H. Dabney allowed to continue using No. 38 East Lawn for his office and study.

General Improvements 210 April 24, 1890 $4000 needed for repairs to pavements.

Hotels 211 April 24, 1890 Dunnington can rent out the house at the end of the East Range as long as it's to a University official.

General Improvements 216 April 25, 1890 Proctor to spend up to $4500 for "renewing with artificial stone, the pavements on the lawn which are estimated at 2000 yards."

General Improvements 219 April 25, 1890 49th Valentine and SP Maury requested to extend their streetcar lines through grounds, but the board claims to have no authority to grant such a thing.

Infrastructure 219 April 25, 1890 Lankford & Pitcher requested to be able to extend their telephone line through University grounds - granted.

Dormitories 229 June 28, 1890 accepted that the dorms on the East Range be assigned to assst. profs or instructors and that rooms on Lawn be only open to students as dormitories. There can be no exceptions to this rule. Decided not to put letter boxes into dormitories.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 229 June 28, 1890 "That it is inadvisable to spend any money in inclosing the piece of land near the coal yard and east of the C. & O. R. R.

Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities 237 August 8, 1890 Proctor instructed to find a place to build a shelter for the fire-engine, ladder, and other stuff and to replace the current shelter "which has been appropriated to use in connection with Prof Thornton's shops."

General Improvements 241 August 8, 1890 Health Committee recommends that "small pond behind chapel" be drained and filled in - passed by BOV.

Grounds 241 August 8, 1890 Sanitary Conditions reported to be good.

Students 241 August 8, 1890 recommended by Committee on Health that all off-grounds boarding houses be required to have a University-issued license - passed by BOV.

Dormitories 245 March 20, 1891 University pays L. M. Burkeley for "losses sustained by him by the fire which occurred in the dormitory occupied by him on the 23d of Nov. 1890."

Animals 245 March 20, 1891 University was leasing land to Mrs. M. C. Burville for grazing.

Dormitories 267 June 30, 1891 Prof Minor granted permission to adopt the room on the East Lawn next to his pavilion for his use as a library. Proctor instructed to lower floor in room to accommodate the proff's books. Barringer given permission to use 2 rooms on East Range as his office "for the purpose of his eye work among the students."

Minor lived in Pavilion X.

Appendix I
| Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 337 | December 8, 1892 | recommend the construction of the new icepond. |
| Building Program | 306 | June 28, 1892 | Super of Bldg and Grounds asked to collect information from architects about the necessities for a modern gymnasium. |
| Amenities | 399 | July 12, 1893 | $3000 appropriated for the Executive Committee to repair the pavements throughout the grounds. |
| General Improvements | 321 | June 28, 1892 | $3000 appropriated for use in “repairing the old Lynchburg road through the grounds of the University, the same to be expanded under the direction of the Board of Visitors.” |
| Dormitories | 395 | July 20, 1893 | the Mess Hall on Dawson’s Row to be converted into a dorm with 7 rooms. |
| General Improvements | 400 | July 20, 1893 | $25 appropriated for use in “repairing the old Lynchburg road through the grounds of the University, the same to be expanded under the direction of the Rector.” |
| Pavilions | 291 | October 30, 1891 | W. H. Echols appointed Superintendent of Grounds & Buildings "and as such shall have charge of the construction and repairs of all buildings, and the improvement and repairs to all roads, walks, and public grounds, including, fencing, fertilizing, cutting grass, planting and trimming trees, protecting said grounds from depredations by vagrants, sportsmen, or other persons, and improper characters of all sorts. He shall further to these ends have control of the expenditure of appropriations for repairs (begin p. 259) and improvements which he shall discharge, by certificate to the Proctor for payments upon such form of voucher, as the Proctor shall prescribe." |
| Grounds Staff | 299 | June 27, 1892 | Pavilions 270 July 1, 1891 | request by James M. Garnett for Pavilion 3 be referred to Proctor who is expected to discuss the proposed improvements and its necessity for the health of the pavilion’s occupants with the Board of Health. |
| Grounds Staff | 425 | March 30, 1895 | General Improvements | 421 | March 30, 1895 | Piedmont Construction and Improvement Company be allowed to build and operate electric street car line on grounds - parallel to Lynchburg Road. |
| Grounds Staff | 423 | March 30, 1895 | Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 420 | March 30, 1895 | the parsonage to be managed like the pavilions by the Super and the chaplain cannot make any changes to the building without his approval. |
| Pavilions | 417 | January 9, 1894 | John B. Minor wants a water closet installed in his pavilion. | Minor lived in Pavilion X. |
| Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 435 | June 11, 1894 | BOV rejects Mrs. Harris’s application to build a new building on grounds. |
| General Improvements | 436 | June 11, 1894 | one person is to be employed by the Super of Bldg and Grounds to supervise all of the dorms (except those on Carr’s Hill) and to supervise, hire, and pay the servants, and furnish the rooms. |
| Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 438 | June 11, 1894 | request to enlarge kitchen at Carr’s Hill is postponed indefinitely. |
| Infrastructure | 453 | June 12, 1894 | water is being wasted in enormous quantities on grounds. |
| General Improvements | 475 | March 30, 1895 | Subsidiary Buildings and Amenities | 480 | March 30, 1895 | UVA employed a janitor and plumber and paid them a monthly salary. |
| Dormitories | 491 | July 2, 1895 | it is "inexpedient" to erect new dormitories. |
| General Improvements | 492 | July 2, 1895 | $6000 from Fayweather Fund appropriated for changing "location of the present roadway along East Range, and for paving East and West ranges, and the approaches therefrom to the Lawn." |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General improvements</th>
<th>$5,180</th>
<th>August 15, 1895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

$2750 more appropriated for changes to the East Range Road. $600 included "for the use of West Range an alley similar to that just opened for the use of East Range". Discussion as to whether to close the road in front of the West Range.
Fig. 1  Thomas Jefferson. Preliminary Ground Plan, August 1814. Jefferson Papers, Special Collections Library, University of Virginia.
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Fig. 2  Thomas Jefferson. Study for Lawn with Pavilions and Rotunda, March 1819. Jefferson Papers, Special Collections Library, University of Virginia. Accompanied by diagram of the cutaway drawing indicating the insert.
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Fig. 3  Thomas Jefferson. Revised Study for Lawn with Pavilions and Rotunda, April 1819. Jefferson Papers, Special Collections Library, University of Virginia. Accompanied by diagram of the cutaway drawing indicating the insert.
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Image altered by Lauren Hackney.

Fig. 4  Thomas Jefferson. Revised Study for Lawn with Pavilions and Rotunda, July 1819. Jefferson Papers, Special Collections Library, University of Virginia. Accompanied by diagram of the cutaway drawing indicating the insert.
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Image altered by Lauren Hackney.
Fig. 5 University of Virginia, 1822. Revised edition 1825. John Nielson, draughtsman, Peter Maverick, engraver. Edwin M. Betts Collection, Special Collections Library, University of Virginia.
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Fig. 6 Surveyed and drawn by S. A. Richardson under the direction of Charles Ellet, Jr. A Map of the University of Virginia and its Vicinity, 1856. RG 31/1/2:2.532, Special Collections Library, University of Virginia.

Fig. 7 William Pratt. Plan of University Cleared Land, 1858. RG 31/1/2:2.532, Special Collections Library, University of Virginia.

Fig. 8 Anonymous. Map of Utilities at the University of Virginia, 1870s. RG 31/1/2:2.791 (OS Tray 32), Special Collections Library, University of Virginia.

Fig. 9 Sanborn Insurance Co., University of Virginia, 1891. Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps.
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Fig. 10 University of Virginia, 1895.
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Fig. 11 G. R. Jackson and W. J. Laird. Detail, Map Showing Topography and Detail of the University of Virginia, showing arrangement of East Pavilion and Hotel Gardens, May 1909. NS 1, OS Folder 6169 (UVA Botanical Garden Maps and Plans, 1917-1959), Special Collections Library, University of Virginia.
Figure 7 (detail)
Figure 10
Thomas Jefferson first used the term “Academical Village” to describe a university in 1804. He drew his first plans for the nascent University of Virginia in 1814 (above). Included in this vision were most of the components that became central to Jefferson’s plans for the University of Virginia: “Pavilions” for professors’ lodging and classrooms punctuating a colonnade lined by student dormitories, a central “Lawn,” and gardens. From the first designs for the University, therefore, Jefferson included gardens as an essential concept. Just like a plantation, Jefferson’s university would be a self-sufficient community—a village.

Jefferson’s subsequent plans for the University of Virginia added the Rotunda - or library - and the east and west “Ranges” - arcades of student dormitories set parallel with the Lawn colonnades - punctuated with “Hotels.” The Hotels were boarding houses where the students ate all of their meals. Jefferson published his plan in 1825 (pamphlet cover).

Jefferson also included private gardens enclosed in serpentine walls for the hotels and pavilions and “yards” - utilitarian spaces behind the dormitories. Other than the walls (based on ones he had seen in Europe), Jefferson did not design what would go into the gardens. He left this to their inhabitants. Recent archaeological investigation has suggested that the walls were never actually built as printed on the 1825 plan. The famous “Maverick Plan,” therefore, is an idealized view rather than a record of conditions as built.

The garden walls were rearranged and often repaired with straight walls in the years after the University opened in 1825, as seen here in a map from the 1870s.
These small brick buildings were built by the Garden Club of Virginia in the 1950s-60s to approximate what privies might have looked like. The privies in the hotel and pavilion gardens - often described as “filthy” in the 19th century - were the private necessaries of the residents of the pavilion or hotel. The students had larger facilities elsewhere on grounds.

Between 1830 and 1860, anywhere from 109 to 185 enslaved African Americans lived on the University grounds as property of the professors, hotelkeepers, or the University itself. Many professors built substantial brick buildings in their gardens to house these slaves. Slaves also lived in kitchen buildings or in the basements of the hotels and pavilions. Called “the Mews,” this building is one of the few surviving slave quarters. It also housed a kitchen.

The alleys were built so that carriages and carts could access the Pavilions and Hotels. They were the private entrances to these residences.

The gardens and yards were the responsibility of the respective hotel or pavilion. With their serpentine walls, the gardens were especially private spaces for the hotel keepers or professors and their families. While the gardens were most often where substantial kitchens or slave quarters were built, food grown, and animals raised, the yards behind the dormitories were work spaces with woodyards, smokehouses, and other small buildings. The gardens and yards were essential to the daily life of the University in the 19th century.

The Cracker Box is the only Hotel outbuilding to survive. Notice the big chimney: this was a kitchen. The slave cook and her children would most likely have occupied the second floor and the kitchen was on the first, with quick access to the Hotel dining room. Before the Civil War, hotelkeepers were required to own or rent slaves to tend to the students.

This print of the University from the mid-1850s shows the east gardens and their various outbuildings.

This print of the University from the 1850s shows the various outbuildings of the west gardens.