Introduction

Almost from the very beginning, Brown University and the city of Providence were woven together on a common ground. In 1770, the Corporation charged the selection committee with seeking a site for Rhode Island College in Providence as follows:

“That it should be built in such a place and part of the town so it will at once be most commodious for the college and beneficial for the Public. These are the only objects, in our opinion, that should demand the attention of the committee.”

That the siting of the college would be “beneficial for the Public” was not an obvious requirement. Other colleges of the time were settling in rural sites that provided scholarly solitude, or forming urban enclaves to protect their students from the temptations of the city and protect the citizens from the antics of the students.

In the 235 years since Brown relocated to Providence and erected University Hall at the crest of College Hill, it has grown to include 235 buildings, and over 6,000,000 square feet of academic and related space. Only 31 of these buildings were constructed by Brown for their own use, before 1955. Only 60 buildings were built by Brown, or others, after 1955. The remaining 144 structures were built before 1955, by others, for other uses. Included in this total, for example, are over one hundred houses. Looking at this in another way, 75% of the buildings now occupied by Brown were built before 1955, and only 18% of these were built by the University for their own use.

These statistics quantify the qualities of campus space and institutional life that we see when we visit Brown. The historic greens, framed by early buildings, are the heart of the institution, but the majority of the experience of the campus is that the University and the city are woven together on a common ground.

The character of the campus is therefore largely historic, and entirely urban. The pattern of growth is characterized by adaptive reuse, more than by new, purpose-built construction. The perception of place is bound into the perception of Providence. The campus has evolved through adaptive reuse.

The constraints and opportunities of adaptive reuse are enhanced by another aspect of the place; the buildings built by Brown for itself are not monumental in scale, there are no stars, and there are no extraordinary buildings that stand out from their neighbors. The positive aspect of this lack of stellar excellence is that the campus is remarkably cohesive, a dense fabric in which each building contributes to the whole. The balance of cohesive fabric and quiet diversity is at the heart of the experience of this historic place. The ways in which buildings have been transformed, repeatedly, through the years, are a textbook of strategies; saving the best of the past, improving and adapting to meet current needs. Fifty of the houses are currently in use as departmental offices, administrative offices, and interdisciplinary centers. Their domestic origins color the atmosphere of their present use, and contribute to overall atmosphere of the campus.

Most of the Brown campus, with the exception of the athletics complex, is included within the College Hill National Historic District. Three other contiguous National Historic Districts and two Providence Historic Districts include other portions of the Providence East Side, and some additional buildings owned by Brown. The College Hill National Historic District extends from the Providence and Seekonk Rivers north to Keene Street and east to Hope Street.

The College Hill Historic District is significant as the site of the original settlement of Providence Plantation, and as a record of the growth of Providence from a colonial town to a modern city. Brown University and the Rhode Island School of Design form one aspect of that development, and one aspect of the historic district.

Most of the buildings built by Brown for its own use form the core of the Brown campus, surrounding the three greens on the block bounded by Brown, Waterman, Thayer, and George Streets. Several others define the limits of the old Pembroke Campus, now incorporated into the University grounds. Still others constitute major residential areas for undergraduate students, mostly to the south of the historic green.

The historic houses within the College Hill and Stimson Avenue Districts have been studied and documented as part of the documentation of these districts. The record of their ownership has been researched by the Providence Preservation Society. The Providence Historic District Commission, in 1994 and 1997 issued their Standards and Guidelines for the Armory, Broadway, College Hill, Northern Elmwood, Southern Elmwood and Stimson Avenue Historic Districts. This document provides clear direction and guidelines for the continuing care of these and other historic houses.

This study focuses on unique elements of the historic campus, the greens and the thirty-one buildings built by Brown, as the historic heritage of the university. These spaces and buildings have not been previously identified or studied as a unique group, yet they are the surviving physical record of the intentions of the University in building for its own use. We have researched the history of these buildings and the roles they played in the history of the university. Houses of special significance and size, and other historic structures not built by Brown which have been inhabited by Brown academic functions are noted as well, with emphasis on the university chapters of their “life story”.

The character of the Brown campus and the character of College Hill are mutually dependent. Campus walks are city streets. The tapestry of the campus includes the life of the city. It is our hope, in concluding this study, to focus atten-
tion on those places and spaces that are uniquely Brown, and to put them in the context of the life of the wider city.

**Preservation Priorities**
The identification of the historic core of the university is the first step in preservation. The group of 31 buildings included here are all essential elements in the physical history of the campus. Some of these buildings have been recently renovated. Others are underutilized, with some aspects of building fabric no longer adequate to meet modern needs. It is our hope that these buildings will be thought of first when opportunities arise for redevelopment, adaptive reuse, or reconstruction, and that the historic fabric of these buildings will be given careful consideration in any planned projects.
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Preservation Guidelines

All of the buildings included here have been renovated, repaired, changed, transformed for new uses, yet they are all clearly identifiable as survivors of Brown’s historic past. In everyday use, all of these buildings will continue to be repaired and refurnished, and incremental changes will continue as new functional requirements are met. The purpose of the following guidelines is to identify the historic elements in these buildings so that these elements can be treated with care and respect, so that the sense of the past will not be lost through inadvertence or lack of attention. The identification of elements is the first step in preservation. The next steps after identification cannot be formulaic. Careful consideration on a case-by-case basis must be given to each proposed change and must be related to the specific actions anticipated. These might be maintenance procedures, replacement and repair of worn or no longer usable systems and finishes, or transformations of the buildings to accommodate new programs.

The Brown University Department of Facilities Management has defined Project Delivery Process Guidelines. Every project under consideration is reviewed, first by the University Architectural Staff, and then by the Director of Design and Construction, Director of Planning, and Architect Advisor to the Board. The purpose of this review process is to assign a level of importance and a level of care. Projects of historic significance, projects involving design of public spaces, public art, memorials and site furnishings are identified so that they will receive special attention in selection of appropriate design consultants, constructors, and craftsmen.

General Guidelines for Working in Historic Buildings

- Do not replace old with new without first seeking advice.
- Do not remove old original fabric.
- Do not cover up old with new.
- Do not repair without first seeking advice.
- Do not install mechanical, electrical or other devices on any surface without first seeking advice.
- Do not paint or refinish any surface without first seeking advice.

Masonry Walls

Brick, limestone, and granite are the most frequently used materials in Brown’s historic buildings. The masonry walls are probably the most important elements in defining the character of these buildings. The color and texture of brick, the patterns of brick bond, and the color and detailing of mortar joints are of particular importance. Over time, damage to the walls may occur as mortar washes out or as spalling or cracking of masonry occurs. Bluestone and sandstone are particularly susceptible to de-lamination and chipping. Damage is also frequently caused by installation of wiring, cable, signs, and other appurtenances. Cementitious coatings are sometimes applied to repair or improve the appearance of masonry walls. In some cases, these coatings are part of the historic record - for example, when stucco is applied to hide brick and make it look like stone. In other cases, coatings have been applied to prevent leaks, with little regard for choice of color or texture.

Cleaning

Cleaning and removal of paints and stains should be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Chemicals, wire brushes, and sand blasting can remove outer layers of masonry, revealing softer more fragile inner layers, and increasing the risk of further damage or destruction. For this reason, cleaning procedures should include slow acting water drips and milder chemicals, rather than processes which might remove original surfaces. All cleaning should be tested first in small areas which are not visible, and all cleaning should be done by contractors experienced in the trade.

Repointing and Sealing

It is essential to repoint using mortar materials and colors which exactly replicate the original, and with tools which replicate the rake of the original joint. Similar materials will have the same permeability as the original, and will weather and hold their color in the same ways. Existing mortars should be analyzed with a wet chemical or instrument test to determine components and to determine composition so that new mortars can be matched. Care should be given to replicating shadow lines, depth and tooling of original mortar joints, and other character-giving detail. Before repointing, carefully inspect the wall to determine if deteriorated pointing is the result of leaking roofs or gutters, rising damp, or extreme weather exposure, and repair those problems first. Caulking or face grouting should be avoided. Neither application is a long term solution to the problem of deteriorated masonry joints.

Replacing and Repairing Masonry

Minimal repair is a goal. Small chips and cracks which reveal the age of the structure should not be repaired, unless they allow water to enter the wall. Consolidation techniques have been developed to match repairs to existing surfaces. However, the lifespan of these repairs cannot be determined. In cases where the structural or weatherproofing integrity of the wall is of concern, new stone or brick should be introduced to replace deteriorated or missing elements. When masonry is beyond repair, replacements should match the original as closely as possible, with brick and stone coursing matching adjacent joints. It is sometimes possible to relocate original masonry units from areas which are out of view, to assure a perfect match. Sealants applied to the surface of the masonry should be avoided, as they hasten further decay by trapping moisture within the units. Consolidation techniques for building up new layers of masonry are currently much in use, but their long term durability cannot be determined. Cast stone and fiber reinforced concrete are sometimes recommended as replacements. However, these materials frequently change in color over time. A preferable method for repair is the introduction of new masonry of the same type where old masonry is severely damaged.
Surface Mounting Wire and Accessories

No surface mounting of wiring should be permitted. No new holes in stonework should be allowed for any reason. Elements that must be affixed to walls should be affixed with mounting hardware penetrating mortar joints. All signs should be mounted in ways that do not create permanent holes in stone masonry. Wiring should be routed through the interior of the building and brought to the exterior at locations that do not penetrate masonry.

Doors

Most of the original exterior doors to Brown buildings are wood. Hardware has been changed and replaced numerous times, and signs have been affixed to many doors. Continuing vigilance is necessary to prevent accumulation of signs, unnecessary or obsolete security systems, and other obtrusive accessories.

Replacing Doors

New doors should match existing materials, profiles, design and dimensions as closely as possible. Attempt to use metal where metal doors originally existed and wood where wood doors originally existed.

Hardware and Accessories

Every effort should be made to select hardware and security systems that complement the originals and that do not obscure or damage the doors.

Windows

Windows, like masonry details, are essential character-giving elements. The slightest change of dimension, color, and design can have a radical effect on the appearance of a building. In the recent past, storm windows and replacement windows have diminished the qualities of the historic campus. It is now possible to fabricate windows that retain historic character and also incorporate modern energy saving details, including double glazing.

Retaining historic windows where possible is desirable. Repairing wood and metal, retaining original glass, adding weatherstripping, installing interior storm windows, and repainting with original colors are of course the best preservation techniques. Wherever possible, window air conditioners and metal storm windows should be removed and inappropriate security grilles replaced.

New windows should match originals in material, detail, profile, and color. It is now possible to obtain double-glazed wood windows with custom profiles and real muntins that exactly replicate original dimensions. Aluminum, standard, and stock windows that do not match original profiles should not be used. Windows that are not exactly matched to masonry opening sizes should not be used.

Roofs

Many of the historic buildings at Brown have tile, slate, or metal roofs, with tall gables visible from the campus. It is important to regularly inspect these roofs to ensure that drainage systems, flashings, and drains are in good repair. Roofs should be repaired with original materials or closely matched materials where possible. The size and spacing of slate shingles and the dimensions and locations of seams in metal roofs are all significant aspects of historic character and should be retained.

Rooftop installations of mechanical equipment, piping, antennas, should be avoided wherever possible. For flat-roofed buildings, care should be taken to locate equipment where it is not visible from the ground.

Building Accessories

Original lighting fixtures and wrought iron gates and fences should be retained and restored wherever possible. New substitutions, modern lighting fixtures in historic styles, or modern materials should not be substituted for authentic old elements.

Interior Finishes

Very few of the original interiors of the buildings have survived. As academic priorities have changed, the buildings have been renovated and reorganized many times to accommodate new programs. We have identified a few interiors that are notable for their proportions or special features. There are four “rotunda” spaces at Brown, including the miniature domes in The Cabinet and Marston Hall, the ornate cupola over the Robinson Library, and the flat dish rotunda created in 1931 in University Hall. For these and other spaces, we include some guidelines. Original finishes should be preserved and cleaned wherever possible. In rooms of significance, no painting should be planned without first testing to determine the original paint colors. No surface mounted wiring should be installed, and all mechanical and electrical equipment should be concealed within wall cavities wherever possible, with openings coordinated to avoid major elements in the rooms. Woodwork and stonework should be cleaned and refinished with minimal transformation of original colors and surfaces. Original lighting fixtures should be saved and relamped wherever possible. Character-giving elements should be surveyed and identified before any work is done, so that special care can be given to their preservation.

Additional Information

The best source for up-to-date information on restoration techniques is the series of booklets published by the Department of the Interior as National Park Service Preservation Briefs. The following issues will be of particular interest:

- The Cleaning and Waterproof Coating of Masonry Buildings
- Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Brick Buildings
- Conserving Energy in Historic Buildings
- The Repair of Historic Wooden Windows
The Front Green
The first buildings of the University were built in a row, along the ridge of the eight acre property on College Hill, beginning with University Hall, in 1770. By 1840 the Old Front Row included University Hall, Hope College, Manning Hall, and Rhode Island Hall. The row of buildings looked out across the broad lawn of the Front Green, facing toward the city of Providence, below. This arrangement was quite similar to the initial plan of Princeton University, and the Brick Row of Yale, and was a simple expression of the campus in the city. With the completion of Rhode Island Hall, gravel walks were laid out, elm trees were planted, and a fence was built, defining the edges of the front green.

The Middle Green
With the construction of Rogers Hall (now Salomon Center) in 1862, and Robinson Hall in 1878, two different patterns emerged. Rogers, to the east of the original row, was the anchor for a new row of buildings framing a new green, while Robinson, located across Waterman Street, marked the first step beyond the emerging campus precinct, into the surrounding city. The old “back campus” was renamed the Middle Campus, and during the next thirty years Slater, Sayles, and Wilson were added, filling gaps in the two lines of buildings facing the green. By the 1870’s, a picket fence enclosed the north and south ends of the middle green, further defining the campus space. Brown Street was a gravel path along the edge of the green, with narrow gates providing access on George and Waterman. By 1880, the middle green was landscaped, with trees and winding walks, and steps were added to the rear doors of the original Old Front Row, to face onto this new green.

The Campus Fence
The campus beautification effort of the beginning of the twentieth century included landscaping of the greens, the design of the new Lincoln Field plan, and the replacement of the old wood picket fences with a more impressive design. The Van Wickle Gates were dedicated in 1901, as the initial phase of construction of the new campus fence. The seals of the State of Rhode island and the City of Providence and mounted on the piers, and the Brown University seal is over the center gate. The gate is the centerpiece of a fence of uniform design, consisting of stone and brick piers with iron fencing between them. The fence is divided into sections of twenty one feet, and each section bears the dates of the class which contributed to the cost of that section. Memorial gates, for John Nicholas Brown, and William Goddard, and gates commemorating Robinson Hall, the Class of 1872, and the Psi Upsilon Fraternity complete the design, which forms the boundary of the Front Green and Middle Green. “The object of a fence is not to shut out our friends, but to protect them and ourselves whenever we together celebrate any of the festivals of the academic year. But the real object lies far deeper; it is by these distinctive memorials of classes and individuals to preserve and nourish those memories and associations which are our richest endorsement, and those fervent loyalties out of which all our future is to spring”. (Faunce 1904)

Lincoln Field
To the east, towards Thayer Street, the streets at the capusedge were lined with private houses. The university owned the inner lot behind these houses. At the time it was low, swampy cow pasture. A committee was created by the Corporation in 1877 to deal with the east campus site, which was 31 to 32 feet lower than the level of middle campus, but no work had yet been done. President Robinson noted: “While the humour of grading the middle campus it occurred to some of us that, by the requisite grading and filling up of an unsightly swamp-like hole, the eastern slope and terminus of the college land of Thayer Street could be transformed into much needed ballgrounds” (Bronson, p. 395). The work was completed
under the supervision of one of the faculty, S.S. Greene.

It was named Lincoln Field, in honor of Professor John Larkin Lincoln. In 1894 a cinder track was built around the field. In 1899, the athletic fields were moved to Andrews Field, and in 1901 Frederick Law Olmsted was commissioned to prepare a survey and plan for Lincoln Field.

The Olmsted Plan for Lincoln field envisioned a green space ringed with buildings. The drop in grade elevation from west to east was designed as an amphitheater, with curved stepped seating facing a flat presentation area to the east, and flights of steps along the paths at the north and south edges. The central axis of the green was bisected with a new walkway leading directly north, in the direction of the Pembroke campus. This proposed walk terminated in the green, with St Stephen’s Church blocking a possible extension to the south. The amphitheater and green were surrounded by an even row of rectangular buildings, some marked for academic uses.

The amphitheater was never constructed. Its' horseshoe shape is visible in the berm that negotiates the grade change today. The construction of the Lincoln Field building, Hegeman, and Littlefield conformed to the edges of the green defined in the plan. A 1920 plan by Paul Cret, finally realized in 1938 with the construction of the Metcalf Research Building, completed the northeast corner of the green, tying together Arnold and Metcalf Chemistry into a complex of buildings facing onto Thayer, Waterman, and the green.

The statue of Marcus Aurelius was unveiled in 1908. It is a copy of the statue on the Capitoline Hill in Rome, with a pedestal designed by Michelangelo. It was given to Brown in honor of Moses Brown Ives Goddard, and represented both aesthetic value and relevant aspects of the philosophy of Marcus Aurelius.

In 1921, the Soldiers Memorial Gate at Thayer Street was dedicated. It was designed by architect Charles Coolidge (of Shepley Richardson?) to commemorate Brown students and alumni who lost their lives in World War 1.
The earliest notes on the need for an overall plan for the campus were written by President Faunce in 1900: "For an old and established university or college to leave its old quarters and, knowing just what it needs, to proceed to organize a new working plan - whether it adopt the single-building scheme adhered to by Columbia or the quadrangle idea used by Trinity and the University of Pennsylvania; or for a new institution like the University of California or that of Chicago, to lay out a new scheme foreseen from the start - is, given architectural skill adequate to the management of the problem, an easy task. But for a college bound by inadequate territory and hampered by the lack of foresight of its early rulers, the handling of a new scheme is very difficult, and doubly so when lack of funds prevents any very definite forecast as to the number or the character of the buildings which are to be put upon the grounds. It was in somewhat this condition that Brown found itself in 1901 when the new buildings, in the special sense, began to be given to it.

"A glance at the plan of 1900 will show the conditions of the problem which were hard and fast - that is, the state of the grounds. How far could they be made to yield sites with due regard both to the old buildings and to the composition of the whole? How far could axial arrangement, vista and climax be regarded at this late day? Such, stated in architectural terms, was the problem which the college had to face, as the Administration Building, the Engineering Building, Caswell, the Brown Library, and Rockefeller Hall were in rapid succession to be located upon the grounds" [Isham].

This excerpt from a leading architectural journal was a reflection on the state of Brown's campus at the turn of the century. When President Faunce took office in 1899, he clearly felt that Brown needed a defined plan for growth, and instigated a colossal expansion of the campus facilities.

In 1900, Faunce reported on this issue to the Corporation: "Since the building of the gymnasium and Maxcy Hall, it has become evident that Lincoln Field may soon be the most beautiful part of our campus, and the approach from Manning Street may vie with College Hill. We should now engage competent advice as to the grading of Lincoln Field and the location of future buildings upon it. With a definite scheme for the development of that region, we can work toward its realization as means are provided."

In 1901:

"Our present buildings were obviously erected without any reference to a general scheme of development, and represent every period in architectural history - the Greek temple reappearing in Manning Hall, the Norman arch in Sayles Memorial Hall, the Gothic window in our Library, and the finest type of the old Colonial style in Hope College. This heterogeneity, which we share with most New England colleges, is certainly picturesque, and the ensemble, softened by time, is not unpleasing. But it is now time for some definite plan of architectural development. As preliminary to this Mr. F. L. Olmsted Jr. has, during the past year, made a careful survey of Lincoln Field and prepared plans for its grading and the location of future buildings."

By 1904, there were six building projects underway or just completed on the campus. They were: John Carter Brown Library, Caswell Hall, Rockefeller Hall, Engineering Building, Carrie Tower, Hoyt Colgate Swimming Pool.

"The material transformation of our campus now in progress is obvious to all. Without sacrificing one of our old buildings, without removing one of our ancient landmarks, we are developing swiftly the campus of the 'Greater Brown.' Realizing the importance of having competent advice at every step, we have frequently consulted Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted and Professor William R. Ware. We might conceivably have engaged a single firm of architects to plan all our new buildings, and so entrust our architectural future entirely to them. But for various reasons this proved impracticable. The result of having many buildings planned by a single brain would surely be harmonious, but it might also prove monotonous. We have adopted the alternative plan, of having various architects, all working in conference with one consulting architect and with one landscape gardener. No important step has been taken without consulting either Mr. Olmsted or Professor Ware. We trust the result will show a dominant motive in the choice of materials and the general design, together with the variety which befits structures intended for widely different uses. Ornate buildings are not essential in an institution devoted to plain living and high thinking; but the simplest building may show correct design, good workmanship and good taste" [Faunce, 1903].

This initial planning effort was a first step in cultivating a more deliberate approach to physical development, and other steps soon followed. In June of 1904, a position was created for a Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings, which gave the campus grounds a perpetual custodian.

In 1920, the Corporation created a committee on the comprehensive planning and development of University property. "We need now a policy to guide our physical development for the next half century. We cannot live from hand to mouth, purchasing a piece of ground because it is in the market, or locating a building or selecting a style of architecture because of the wishes of friends or donors. We must have a comprehensive plan, not indeed as a straight-jacket, but as a ‘pattern in the mount.’"

"Years ago Mr. Olmsted laid out for us Lincoln Field, submitting drawings for every building that could be erected there in all the future. Long ago, we decided that our architecture must henceforth conform in general to the Georgian or ‘colonial’ style, which not only reminds us of the age in which the University was founded, but is far better adapted
than the Gothic to give the generous lighting needed in modern libraries and laboratories. We have also established the office of supervising architect - at the present time held by Mr. Charles L. Klauder, of Philadelphia - and no building can be erected in the future until the supervising architect has approved the plans and the relation of the new structure to the old environment" [Faunce, 1920].

The tradition of retaining a consulting architect was also solidified in this era, and those firms typically contributed built work to the campus as well. Klauder’s firm acted as architects of Metcalf Chemical Laboratory in 1923, Littlefield Hall in 1926, and the Metcalf Research Building in 1938. Paul Cret drew up a general plan for expansion in 1922, and in 1925 designed the Brown Stadium [Mitchell, p. 113].

Outside of this administrative shift, general perceptions of the campus continued to evolve as well. President Faunce once again described the maturation of the campus in his report to the Corporation in 1926, near the end of his tenure.

“...The campus, ploughed up for the last two years in order to save the elms and improve the lawns, will soon be restored to its old-time beauty. Many of us can remember when the front campus was the Brown University campus. There all the Class Day exercises were formerly held, while the middle campus was devoted to what few outdoor sports then existed, and Lincoln Field was covered with weeds, and wildflowers. Then the second row of buildings was erected, and the middle campus became the scene of Class Day festivities and all academic celebrations, and Lincoln Field was the only baseball field, the grand-stand occupying the site of the Metcalf Chemical Laboratory.

“...Now the University is extending rapidly to the north and the south. On the south we have acquired excellent fields for tennis and for baseball at the junction of Thayer and Power Streets. On the north about forty years ago we built the Ladd Astronomical Observatory, and a little later Pembroke Hall, the nucleus of our rapidly growing Women's College. Now our holdings north of the campus have been greatly increased by the opening of Aldrich Field, devoted to baseball, and Brown Field [Brown Stadium], devoted to football, and the new Gymnasium soon to be erected adjacent to both fields. These two fields will comprise some thirty acres devoted wholly to outdoor sports. Thus the lands and buildings of Brown University already extend for over a mile through the most beautiful and valuable part of the residential section of Providence. Such a location enables us to combine many of the advantages of the rural college and the urban university. Forests and meadows and streams, as well as the ocean shore, are not far away from any students, while the musical, literary, and economic advantages of city life are offered to them each winter.”

The next major event to affect the shape of Brown’s campus was the hurricane that hit Providence in 1938. Fortunately, the statue of Caesar Augustus, which lost its arm, suffered the only loss of life or limb.

“So far as the appearance of the campus is concerned, the effects of the storm are most to be noticed on the front campus. There nine trees were torn down and sixteen damaged, some of them very severely. The general pattern of our front campus was established almost exactly one hundred years ago when Rhode Island Hall was built. That move restored University Hall to the center of the axis and determined the general pattern of the campus. Now therefore, for the first time in one hundred years, we have the opportunity and an obligation to remake a pattern. It comes at an appropriate time, for we are about to restore University Hall, and in conjunction with that we ought to design the new planting not only for that building but also for the entire front campus, in order to provide it with the most appropriate setting. If we are going to set out trees,
To read the history of University Hall is to glimpse the development of Providence itself. Many events in the political and technological metamorphosis of this American city, from the American Revolution to the Industrial Revolution, were witnessed by this venerable building. University Hall’s beginning is intertwined with the inception of the College, and the earliest Corporation papers describe both of their creations almost as a single event. The first reference to a college building was made September 5, 1768, at the second meeting of the Corporation. Some members, including Stephen Hopkins, Nicholas Brown, and then president of the College, James Manning, were appointed to a committee to locate a site for the first “College Edifice.” The Corporation established the Building Committee on February 9, 1770, only one day after Providence, RI, was chosen over Warren, RI, as the location of the College. It was then decided in a vote that,

“The College edifice be built according to the following plan, viz: That the house be one hundred and fifty feet long and forty-six feet wide, with a projection of ten feet on each side, (ten by thirty,) and that it be four stories high” [Guild, p. 231].

The lot selected for the building was originally about eight acres and included a portion of the “home-lot” of Chad Brown, whom the late Moses Brown designated as “the first Baptist Elder in Rhode Island.” It was for this reason purchased through the agency of the Brown family, in order that the College might stand on the “original house-lot or home-share, so called,” of their pious ancestor [Guild, p. 232].

It appears that Chad Brown owned two-thirds of the original College grounds. The “highway” leading from Benefit Street to the lot is now College Street. Mr. Edwards describes the location as “remarkably airy, healthful, and pleasant; being the summit of a hill pretty easy of ascent, and commanding a prospect of the town of Providence below, of the Narragansett Bay and the islands, and of an extensive country, variegated with hills and dales, woods and plains,” etc. “Surely,” he adds, “this spot was made for a seat of the Muses” [Guild, p. 233].

The Brown family was instrumental in bringing Rhode Island’s first College to Providence, and Nicholas Brown, son of the powerful merchant family, was on the original board of the Corporation. He also served as the builder of the structure. Nicholas Brown & Co., acting with the Building Committee, broke ground on March 27, 1770. The building was modeled after Nassau Hall at Princeton University, both buildings may have been designed by the same architect-builder, Robert Smith. Although Smith is not named in the Corporation papers, he is generally cited as the architect of the building [Tatman]. There is a corroborating reference in the original account of Nicholas Brown & Co. detailing costs dispersed by the Building Committee. A line item in this inventory describes an expense of 1 pound 4 pence on April 7, 1770, “to postage of a letter from the Architect of Philadelphia”, which was where Smith lived and practiced.

The building was not completed in one continuous period, however, and only the first and second stories were finished by the winter of 1771. This period of the project was financed by a substantial number of contributors [Guild, p. 238]. Nicholas Brown & Co. presented a final account to the Corporation on March 11, 1771. The building committee thus reported:

“We think it our duty to inform all the benefactors to this Institution, that the materials for said College, appear to us to have been purchased, collected, and put together with good judgment, prudence and economy; and that this Committee for their great application, disinterestedness and activity, are justly entitled to the thanks of every one who wishes well to so arduous and important an undertaking.”
Just as the College Edifice’s construction was interrupted, so was its use. Instruction at the College continued successfully until December 1776, when the building was temporarily appropriated by the American Army for use as barracks during the Revolutionary War. More than three years later, the troops quit the College Edifice, and on the 10th of May, 1780, President Manning rededicated the structure to the business of education. Unfortunately, the building was usurped again on June 25 of that same year as a hospital for French troops. The College continued without a home until May 27, 1782, and, although the structure sustained considerable damage during the War (for which a bill was presented to the central government), the College Edifice was finally returned to the College. The building was finished in two more stages of construction: the third floor of the structure was finished in 1785, and the fourth and last in 1788.

Rhode Island College sustained itself during this time but lacked operating funds. In response, the Corporation offered up the right to name the college to any friend of the College who made a $5,000 gift to the institution. This happened in 1803, soon after Asa Messer took office as the third president. The following year, Nicholas Brown offered $5,000 to endow a chair in oratory, and hence the name of the institution was officially changed to Brown University. Apart from the first President’s house, Brown’s campus consisted entirely of the College Edifice for 50 years. In these early years, the original building served as the place for students to live, study, eat, and worship.

In 1823, the Corporation renamed the College Edifice “University Hall” (at the same meeting at which they named the newly erected second building of the campus, Hope College). When the third structure, Manning Hall, was completed in 1834, University Hall was renovated a second time; the windows were replaced and a coat of stucco was applied to the exterior in the same fashion as its new neighbor to its north.

It was doubtless that, because the new building had a cement covering, University Hall, standing next to it, would receive a similar covering at this time. The report of a committee, on June 14, 1834, states: “The Building seems to have arrived at that State of decay that very considerable repair is necessary to prevent it from going to entire destruction - the window frames must be taken out, in order to prevent the water from getting in, over them. The bricks should be painted or covered with cement - the mortar has come out from between the bricks, & many of the bricks are much decayed” [Bronson, p. 222].

At this point the university chapel was relocated from University Hall to the upper floor of Manning. College business continued until 1842, when University Hall was again supplanted by the military. It was taken for use by the state militia, which came to Providence to quell the Dorr Rebellion, a tumultuous movement, led by Thomas Wilson Dorr, to secure broader voting rights for the people of Rhode Island. When Rhode Island Colony was settled in 1636, the original charter awarded the right to vote only to landowners. With the onset of the Industrial Revolution, farmers moved into jobs in factories, and a large landless (and voiceless) class developed. By 1829, more than half of the state’s free white males were ineligible to vote. A People’s Convention was held in November of 1841, and attendees drafted a new constitution that abolished property restrictions on suffrage. It was not recognized by the state, however, and the division among the classes grew. At the onset, Brown University stayed officially neutral in the struggle, although a prominent professor, William G. Goddard, wrote numerous essays in the daily press expounding the principles of rational liberty. President Wayland described his efforts: “when at last the crisis arrived - with an eloquence that fired the soul of every true hearted man, he urged us all to unite in defence of that heritage of civil and religious liberty which God had bestowed upon our fathers” [Bronson, p. 253]. Dr. Wayland expressed his own opinion in a sermon the first Sunday following the first crisis of the rebellion. “My own opinion,” he said, “as many of you know, has always been in favor of the extension of suffrage”; he affirmed, too, that the representation of the towns “had become palpably unequal,” and that there was “good reason for a revision of this whole subject.” But although he sympathized with the aims of the popular party, he disserted utterly from their methods” [Bronson, pp. 253-254].

The Executive Committee requested that a part of University Hall be offered to help quarter the 2,000 troops in Providence under the orders of Governor King. Classes were suspended for that season. The Dorr family supported Brown before and after the uprising. Thomas Dorr’s father, Sullivan Dorr, contributed at least twice to the University, $50 in 1825 and $100 in 1831, both times to support the library. Thomas’ uncle, Crawford Allen, subscribed $1,000 to support President Wayland’s new system for instruction and the new curriculum in 1850 [Guild]. Both men were prominent Providence industrialists and fought against the suffragists, led by their son and nephew. Although Thomas Dorr was ultimately defeated, the Rhode Island Legislature, responding to the popularity of the cause, passed reforms in 1842 awarding landless white males the right to vote if they could pay a $1 poll tax.

University Hall underwent several more renovations. In 1850, the original chapel was converted into recitation rooms, and the dining hall was remodeled. In 1860, partitions were constructed on the upper three floors, dividing the central corridor which had, until then, run the entire length of the building. In the early 1880s, a debate erupted over how to deal with the then run-down University Hall. Although there were some who wanted to raze it and construct a new building, it was decided to keep it and sub-
The grounds were improved as well, with grading changes to the north and south of University Hall. The Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings wrote in 1905, "The opening of a passage between Slater and University Hall has added to the values of the buildings, and opened up a vista where before the ugly fence hid the dumping-ground and catch-all for rubbish."

Technological advances in America were soon reflected on Brown’s campus. In 1905, Faunce reported:

"Early in the year a station of the United States Weather Bureau was installed in the upper story of University Hall, and its bulletins have been furnished regularly to the University and the city. While the work has no direct relation to our instruction, it is always of value to students to see scientific investigations carefully and successfully conducted."

The telephone was introduced to Providence when the first telephone call in Rhode Island was made between Alexander Graham Bell in Boston and Zachariah Allen at his home at 1 Megee Street (now the Faculty Club). The first lines in the state were installed between Boston and Providence in 1878. By 1906, the campus had telephone service as well, as noted in the Superintendent’s report for that year. Modernization continued in 1912, when bath-rooms were installed at University Hall and in the other dormitory, Hope College. Faunce remarked in his 1912 President’s Reports, "It is no longer reasonable to expect rent rooms with the bathing facilities of the last generation." The recitation rooms were wired for electricity in 1915.

Soon after, Brown University was again affected by war. Faunce wrote:

"Since the beginning of the Great War, the attention of the University has been steadily fixed on the ideal of public service, and since America entered that war, all our thought has been centered in the national need and our own responsibility. When war was actually declared, the minds of our students were thrown into a ferment and the campus was seething with eager and intense desire for action. . . . Students were hurriedly enlisting without regard to natural fitness and with no knowledge of the work into which they were going. . . . To steady our students and direct their fine loyalty into the channels where it would be most effective was a task of no small magnitude.

“We were greatly helped in this task by letters from General Leonard Wood, written to two American Universities, urging students to remain at their studies until the government should call them, meanwhile taking military training on the campus and so preparing themselves for positions of importance in the army still to be created" [Faunce, 1917]. Brown men favored naval over military service, and with approval and cooperation from the U.S. government, a Naval Training Unit was created at Brown to help prepare men for service while they remained at the University. Commandant Rear Admiral John R. Edwards came to Brown to oversee the project, and his office was opened in University Hall in 1918. "A University which stands at the head of Narragansett Bay, which graduated the first Admiral of the American Navy, Essek Hopkins, and whose whole history is inwrought with tales of the ocean, has a duty to train men who will understand sea-power and how to use it to advance the ideals of the nation" [Faunce, 1919]. On October 1, 1918, 405 (of 935 total) students were sworn into the military, and 213 of those joined the Naval Unit. Many buildings in addition to University Hall were used to serve this cause, including Hope College, Manning Hall, Rhode Island Hall, Slater Hall, Maxcy Hall, Rockefeller Hall, and Caswell Hall.

The curriculum was refocused on "the objective of national service." Faunce wrote in 1918, "Mathematics is obviously essential to artillery service; chemistry leads straight into gas defense; French must be acquired by every future offi-
cer. . . . History we have taught this last year mainly to give background and perspective to the present war. . . . Even Greek and Roman civilization, when interpreted by Murray or Ferrero, glows with new light upon our present problems. In the greatest of all wars there is the greatest demand for men of large horizon, penetration insight, clear thinking and sound judgment."

Faunce described the role of the faculty during this time. "The devotion of the Faculty to their novel tasks was admirable. The artificial barriers between departments vanished; the philosopher taught Mathematics, the Latinist taught American History or French, and every teacher without regard to his title did the thing that most needed doing" [Faunce, 1919].

By the end of the year the war efforts at Brown were completed, at least for the time being. "As soon as military control of the curriculum ceased at the end of December 1918, the University swung back to its ordinary and normal life. The students were overjoyed at the release from tasks cheerfully endured but never relished. Instead of inhibiting the spirit of militarism they had acquired for it a strong dis-taste, and they at once set to work to restore the campus life to all its pre-war activities" [Faunce, 1919].

University Hall continued to be used for various purposes, mainly dormitory accommodations, and no major changes were made to it until the end of the 1930s, when the new President, Henry Wriston, focused attention on it again. He wrote in his 1937 President’s Reports:

"The retirement and death of Dr. Barbour, the retirement of Vice-President Mead and Mr. Burlingame involved a very precipitous and a very important problem of administrative reorganization. With so many new officers having to work together, it is particularly important that they should work in continuous and immediate contact and with the freest opportunity for consultation with each other. The Administration Building does not house any of the fiscal and business officers, or those having to do with buildings and equipment, or the officers having to do with alumni contacts and public relations. It can not be enlarged without great cost.

"Meanwhile our greatest architectural treasure, University Hall, has been relegated to non-distinctive uses and is in urgent need of repair. It is a beautiful building, it has had a very distinguished history; it has all the value that comes only with antiquity; and it has all the charm which those things lend. It seems almost unbelievable that in 1883 there was serious agitation to have the building torn down; however, $50,000 were spent on repairs. Now after fifty-four years, the building has reached such a state of neglect and disrepair that some drastic steps need to be taken.

"I suggest that we should recognize it for what it is, our most significant structural tie with the past, and that the entire building should be thoroughly rebuilt and refurnished as was Wren Hall and the Chapel at William and Mary; two of the other colonial college buildings still standing, and as was Massachusetts Hall at Harvard. We should then house all the administrative officers there and provide suitable rooms for the meetings of the Corporation and the Faculty. Such parts of the building as are not necessary for administrative purposes could be made into offices for professors. Its use as a dormitory, which subjects it to heavy wear and tear, to which it is no longer well adapted, and which increased the fire hazard, should be discontinued. This is a project which may have a particular appeal to someone who treasures the past for its great gifts to the present."

An anonymous gift of $100,000 was presented for the renovation and accepted by the Corporation January 14, 1938. This coincided with the completion of a document entitled "Report on Proposed Reconstruction of University Hall, Brown University" by Perry, Shaw & Hepburn, Architects dated January 11, 1938. It described the need for structural rehabilitation, and offered the choices of "second class construction" or "fireproof construction". The benefits of fireproof construction were listed as "permanence of general structure; no maintenance on frame work required, Increase in clear story heights, better sound insulation, possibility of cracking of plaster reduced to minimum." The only noted advantage of the "second class construction" was the cost savings. They ultimately chose the fireproof construction:

"...it will take from $50,000 to $60,000 more than the $100,000 gift to put the building in second-class condition by stripping the walls of plaster, replacing the wooden laths with metal laths, rewiring and reheating, and otherwise making the building as sound as possible. There is one rather important item to consider in this connection: the floors as they are now constructed are very thick and the ceiling heights are very low. On the first floor the ceilings are 8’10". The others are less than 8’, and on the top floor they are only 7’4". By changing to fireproof construction, we can gain four or five inches in height in most of the rooms because the cement and steel floors will be thinner. They are also more nearly sound-proof. However, the essential point is that the more expensive type of construction will give to the rooms more air, more dignity, and very much better proportions" [Wriston, 1938].

On January 10, 1939, the Advisory and Executive Committee officially named the newly-restored University Hall as the headquarters for the offices of administration. University Hall still functions as the chief administrative building.
A committee was formed September 6, 1821, to determine the location, size, and appearance of a new college edifice needed to support a much expanded student body, which was currently sustained solely within University Hall, built 50 years prior. The Corporation purchased a 123' wide lot from Nathan Waterman extending 400' east from Prospect Street. "On this lot an elegant brick building . . . has been erected by Nicholas Brown Esq. . . . in length 120 feet, width 40 feet, four stories high, and containing 48 rooms" [Guild, p. 262]. Nicholas Brown was the sole financier, and the structure was built by Daniel Hale (master mason) and Samuel Staples (master builder) [Guild, p. 262]. In a letter to the Corporation dated January 13, 1823, Nicholas Brown announced the building's completion and suggested that it be named "Hope College", in honor of his only surviving sister, Hope Ives. It was designed as a dormitory in the colonial style. It was renovated for the first time 70 years after it was built, in the summer of 1891.

". . . Hope College, which was much out of repair - the north wall racked, timbers rotting, and the whole interior worn and dingy - was thoroughly renovated under the vigilant eye of Marshall Woods, chairman of the real estate committee, at a cost of $35,000; a cellar was dug, weak parts were strengthened, and the interior was completely refinished in far better style than before. At the same time the heating station, begun in 1890 to heat Sayles Hall and Wilson Hall, was extended so as to heat all the buildings on the campus" [Bronson, p. 459].

In 1918, Brown was absorbed in the Great War and campus-based Army and Navy Training Units were established. Many buildings, including Hope, were used to support the national cause through local efforts. During this period, Hope College was used to house those Brown students who were now also Navy students. The building was not focused on again until President Wriston took office in 1937. His presidential report announced his intentions to restore some of Brown's oldest and most venerable buildings to their former glory while giving them a vital modern purpose. In addition to University Hall, he recommended the restoration of Hope College.

"There is one of our dormitories in particular which should have attention. We took over from the English university the habit of speaking of the residence halls as colleges, a custom to which Yale has now returned. In Hope College we have one of the few student residential buildings in America which has always been called a college. Unhappily, because it is old, we have allowed it to get into bad condition and have made it the place where rooms are cheapest. Sometimes it is complained that the students do not treat it with the same respect with which we treat it. I suggest that we should make Hope College a manifestation of what a college residence should be. It should be entirely reconditioned and attractively furnished. Only juniors and seniors of honor grade should be eligible for admission. The names of distinguished persons who have lived there should be engraved on plates on the several doors, and the rooms of graduates who show promise after ten years should be given notice on plates beside the doors. Space should be spared on the first floor for rooms for one or two younger members of the Faculty who have talents in stimulating and leading discussion. In short, Hope College might well become the place where the leaders among the undergraduates live together and exemplify urbane living upon a significant intellectual level.

"We have here one of the oldest college dormitories, one richest in tradition, and one occupied by exceedingly distinguished persons. Instead of neglecting that tradition, we should make it work for us from day to day, capitalizing it for educational purposes, and enriching the life of the University thereby. This is a project which ought to appeal to someone not merely because the building is architecturally fine but because, while it preserves the past, it
makes the future more secure*

[Wriston, 1937].

The building was again used to house the military during WWII when an Army unit was housed here and in Slater Hall during the 1942-43 academic year. Hope was renovated again in the early 1950s. The work included installing new bathrooms and a sprinkler system. It was renovated again between 1957-59 by the architects Perry, Shaw, Hepburn & Dean. The building still serves as a dormitory today.
Manning Hall was built to accommodate the expanding university library and to provide a chapel, which until then had existed in the original College Edifice. President Wayland believed education should be grounded in a strong foundation of reading, and in 1840, as part of an effort to raise academic standards, a $25,000 permanent library fund was established. The new building was intended to house the library collection, which was begun in 1767, in the main room. The upper floor was designed as the new college chapel. Manning Hall was dedicated on February 4, 1835; the $18,500 cost of construction was funded entirely by Nicholas Brown, and named, at his request, in honor of the institution’s first president, James Manning (who presided during Mr. Brown’s time as a student there). The building is an exact replica, at almost twice the scale, of the temple of Diana-Propylaea at Eleusis. President Wayland described the building as follows:

“This College edifice, the third which has been erected, is built of stone. Including the portico, it is about ninety feet in length, by forty-two in width. Its height, from the top of the basement is forty feet. The Library occupies the whole of the first floor, and is a beautiful room. In the center, it is ornamented with a double row of fluted columns. The Library is sixty-four feet by thirty-eight, and is thirteen feet high. The Chapel is on the second floor. It exhibits the most graceful proportions. Its length and breadth are the same as those of the Library. Its height, however, is not less than twenty-five feet. The front of the edifice is ornamented with four fluted columns, resting on a platform projecting thirteen feet from the walls. Manning Hall is situated between University Hall and Hope College, equidistant from each. It is of the Doric order, and is said to be one of the finest specimens to be found in the country. Mr. Russell Warren was the architect; Mr. Daniel Hale, the master mason; and Messrs. Tallman and Bucklin, the master builders” [Guild, p. 268].

University Hall’s exterior brick was plastered over at this time in order to repair serious decay and loss of mortar, as described in a report to the Corporation dated June 14, 1834 [Bronson, p. 222]. A renovation to the chapel was conducted in 1857 at the expense of the Messrs. Brown and Ives. “The walls were painted, the ceiling was frescoed, and the windows were removed to give place to new ones, with ornamental sashes, and flock and stained glass. On the east wall, directly over the pulpit, an elegant and costly mural tablet was erected in honor of Nicholas Brown, by his nephews, Moses B. and Robert H. Ives” [Guild, p. 268].

When the new Library building (now Robinson Hall) was completed in 1878, the collection was relocated there and Manning’s lower chamber was converted into a recitation room. The room was turned into the president’s lecture room in 1883. Chapel services were moved to Sayles Hall in 1894, which removed most religious services from the chapel in the upper hall of Manning. For some time the space served, among other purposes, as a drafting and drawing room. Electric lighting was installed in Manning as well as Sayles Hall in 1906, which was meant to “not only improve the lighting, but remove considerable of a fire menace” [Superintendent, 1906].

At the onset of the First World War, a flurry of activity consumed the campus. During this time, Manning Hall was established as Army Headquarters. The University returned to the normal course of education by the spring semester of 1919. At some point the Department of Classics and its museum collection moved into the lower hall. “The Museum of Classical Archaeology in Manning Hall has been made available for a recitation room by the rearrangement of the larger casts and the removal of some of the smaller ones to the upper floor” [Superintendent, 1922]. They remained until 1928: “The Department of Classics has been moved from lower Manning to the third floor of
University Hall. The lower floor of Manning Hall has now been restored to its original condition as one large room, affording space for large classes such as history and psychology groups" [Superintendent, 1928].

Another renovation was conducted in 1945. A letter from the Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings dated August 17, 1945, states: "The demolition work in Manning Hall is progressing rapidly. The first floor ceiling will be down by tomorrow, and early next week the staircases will be out. I talked with Mr. Shaw [of Perry, Shaw & Hepburn, the architects of the reconstruction] this morning, and he tells me that the plans are completed and the specifications should be ready in a very short time." According to a report from January 23 of that year the scope of the project included general repairs to the exterior, and a rearrangement of the interior partitions. A letter from the Architect to President Wriston on August 2nd describes the need of creating a secondary fire stair for the second floor assembly space, which was placed in the southeast corner of the building. There was some amount of mechanical and electrical work, and new lighting and acoustic ceiling tile were installed in both rooms as well.

Upper Manning was rededicated as a chapel in 1959 after a $49,000 grant from the James Foundation was given for its renovation. The chapel is used today by a variety of student religious groups in spite of its formal Protestant configuration.

The lower level of Manning Chapel was renovated in 2004 to accommodate a satellite museum for the Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology.
This building was built in response to President Wayland’s efforts to realign Brown’s educational philosophy with the current era of progress associated with the Industrial Revolution. His call to broaden the curriculum to include such topics as chemistry and physiology created the need for appropriate facilities. A committee was formed for this purpose on September 8, 1836, specifically “to devise a means for erecting a building for lecture rooms, and rooms for the reception of geological and physiological specimens” [Guild, p. 271]. Within two years, only $2,500 had been pledged by various persons, when a letter from Nicholas Brown was received in which he transferred to the Institution “two lots of land on Waterman Street, as a site for the President’s house, and the lot of land called the Hopkins estate, on George Street, as a site for the College edifice.” Brown also pledged $7,000 for the “suitable man-sion-house for the President,” and $3,000 toward the cost of the second building [Guild, p. 273]. The citizens of Providence contributed the balance of the required funding. In honor of this, the name ‘Rhode Island Hall’ was given to the new building, and the second floor exhibition space was open to the public Saturday afternoons. The dedication was held September 4, 1840.

“The building is of stone covered with cement, seventy feet long by forty-two feet wide, with a projection in front of twelve feet by twenty-six. The first floor is divided into two lecture rooms, one for the Professor of Chemistry, the other for the Professor of Natural Philosophy. The second story is thrown into an ample and beautiful hall, of chaste proportions, for the cabinet of Mineralogy, Geology, and other similar collections of the University” [Guild, p. 274].

Guild also describes a large basement containing a chemical laboratory and other rooms dedicated to chemical analysis. The building is in the same Greek Revival style of Manning Hall, which was built by the same architect, Tallman & Bucklin, seven years prior.

A pattern was established at Brown that involved the shuffling of users and programs from building to building as the institution expanded. While it provided flexibility in the face of limited funds in an ever-changing environment, it often resulted in the dismantling of Brown’s buildings, renovation by renovation. Rhode Island Hall was certainly an example of this erosion over time. The differing science components occupying the building began to expand, each demanding more room. A chemical laboratory was built in the spring of 1851, and natural history expanded within the building during the 1871-72 academic year, when several large cases were placed in Rhode Island Hall under the direction of Mr. Jenks. Ultimately named the curator of the museum, he was instrumental in changing the shape of Rhode Island Hall. Partly in response to his urging, an addition was built on the eastern end of the building, designed by the architects Stone & Carpenter. It was the first construction instigated by the new President, Ezekiel Robinson.

“How urgent was the need is shown by Dr. Robinson in his autobiography: ‘The professor of Physics had no labora-tory; the damp, dark basement rooms of Rhode Island Hall…could be occupied by him only at the risk of his health and life.’ The work, which cost nearly $9,000, was completed shortly before the end of 1874, and the added rooms afforded excellent quarters for the department of physics, besides providing a well-lighted portrait gallery and more space for the ever-growing natural history museum” [Bronson, p. 389].

It was described as a “stone building…two stories high and 40’ square, covered with stucco in conformity to the style and mass of the present building” [Caswell]. The first floor of the addition was filled with new glass cases to display objects illustrating several branches of physical and mechanical philosophy; a new portrait gallery was created on the second floor to hold the paintings which had until
then been scattered about Rhode Island Hall. The two existing classrooms were renovated as well, and supplementary space for preparatory work by professors for their lectures was created on the first floor of the addition. The basement of the addition contained a "much needed apartment for the weekly instruction given by Professor Jenks to a volunteer class in Taxidermy" [Robinson, p. 1875]. After Sayles Hall was built, "The portraits were transferred to its auditorium, which formed a noble gallery, and a large room in Rhode Island Hall thus became available for the growing work in natural science" [Bronson, p. 394]. Jenks still continued the campaign for his collection of artifacts.

"While the transformation of Hope College was in progress Professor Jenks was engaged, at his own expense, according to a proposal which he made to the Corporation a year ago, in fitting up the new Museum of Anthropology. He has put the east wing, second story, of Rhode Island Hall in fine condition for this new use, erecting beautiful and commodious cases, wherein our rapidly growing stores of anthropological material can be synoptically arranged and the study of them greatly facilitated. The old Museum of Natural History now exists in two parts, the Jenks Museum of Zoology and the Museum of Anthropology, either of which is more valuable for educational purposes than the whole was before" [Andrews, 1892].

The importance of the collection dwindled over time, and after Jenks passed away in 1894, no more money was allotted for its upkeep. One professor, Albert Mead, asked for $1,000 for its continued maintenance, although he himself declared that "the reasonableness of spending money for the dusting and rearranging of the strangling sightseers is, we readily admit, not obvious" [Mitchell, p. 398]. The newly appointed President Faunce addressed the Corporation in 1900 regarding the insufficiencies of the campus. He described the need for a new chemical laboratory, a chapel, space for religious societies, completion of the swimming pool at Lyman Gymnasium, a larger library, and, foremost, a new biological library:

"Our University is now in imperative need of some new buildings, unless our work is to be crippled. To a stranger visiting our campus one of the most obvious needs is a new biological laboratory. No other building that we possess is so ill suited to its work as is Rhode Island Hall. No other building is so crowded, from attic to cellar, with apparatus, specimens and workers. The conditions would be ludicrous, if they were not pathetic" [Faunce, 1900].

To address the problem, a small, three-story addition was added at the south side in 1904 to supplement the biology laboratories on the first floor of Rhode Island Hall, which had slowly been taking over space in the building. The addition housed live animals, an aquarium, and a skeleton prep room. More space was made for Biology in 1905 when a fire erupted in Rhode Island Hall, resulting in a "spring cleaning" of the museum collection; some was lost, more thrown away, and the most important items cleaned and kept. The collection was finally completely removed in 1915 when Arnold Laboratory was built for the Biology Department, and Rhode Island Hall was renovated for other departments [Mitchell, p. 398]. The basement and second floors were given to the Geology Department, which relocated from Sayles, and the first floor was occupied by the Philosophy Department, which had been scattered around campus.

Rhode Island Hall got its next new user during the first World War, which affected great change on Brown's campus. Many buildings were dedicated to war efforts, including Rhode Island Hall, where Army headquarters were established. This was part of a U.S. government program to prepare young men for war while they remained at their own colleges until they were needed on the frontlines. The building was not put in the spotlight again until 1938, when the new President, Henry Wriston, focused attention on its physical condition:

"The use of Maxcy Hall for dormitory purposes naturally made the search for recitation rooms and offices even more intense than usual. Among other buildings carefully surveyed was Rhode Island Hall. Next year will be its centenary. I hope the members of the Corporation will inspect it, and they will certainly agree that its interior looks its hundred years - and more! It is wastefully laid out; it has been grossly neglected, it has been heavily overused, and nothing fundamental has been done to it for a long time. The stairway is extremely dangerous, the layout is complicated, and in many respects it is poorly adapted to its present uses. If we are going to follow our tradition of using buildings in perpetuity, as I hope we are, something must be done to Rhode Island Hall in the immediate future, - and there is no time more appropriate than its centenary" [Wriston, October, 1938].

In 1982, the Geology Department was removed to its current location in the Geology-Chemistry Research Building and Rhode Island Hall was renovated into classrooms and office space.
In 1850, President Wayland led the University to adopt a New System, which involved a changed curriculum and degree requirements. Additions to the course list were made in chemistry and science applied to the arts, which were especially relevant in relation to Providence’s strong textile and jewelry industries. Interest in the arena of science continued in the term of the next President, Barnas Sears, who presided at Brown during the lean years of the Civil War. The only building completed during this time was a new chemical laboratory. Nathaniel P. Hill, professor of Chemistry, spearheaded fundraising efforts. The site was determined by a committee to the Executive Board in 1862 to be "the open lot East of the present college grounds, and East of, and near to, the proposed line of Brown Street" [Bronson, p. 335]. The laboratory was designed in the Italian Gothic, a change from any previous buildings on the campus. A detailed description of the materials of the structure indicate that:

"The walls are of brick, built hollow, faced the outside with Danvers pressed bricks, and rendered on the inside with plaster. The roofs are covered with Vermont slates, laid in alternate bands of purple and green. The underpinning of the entire structure consists of red granite from the Westerly quarries, capped with olive-colored freestone. The window openings have segment or semi-circular heads, with olive and brown freestone voussoirs, the extrados of which are cut to form a pointed arch. The principle entrance doorway is decorated with olive-colored freestone. The band course beneath the main cornice and window sills, are of the same material, from the Albert Quarry, so called, in Nova Scotia" [Guild, p. 281].

Concurrent with the construction of the new lab, work was done to improve the grounds of the campus, including new paths of cinders and gravel - one from Waterman to George Street, another between the new laboratory and the library (now Robinson Hall).

The building has seen many additions and renovations through its life. In 1900, the Executive Committee proposed to the Corporation a plan to add a story at the rear of the building to accommodate the departments of Civil and Mechanical Engineering, including a new drawing room. When this was completed, the name of the building was changed from "The Chemical Laboratory Building" to "Rogers Hall", in honor of William Sanford Rogers, donor of $50,000 in 1872 to the Newport Rogers Professorship of Chemistry [Andrews, 1900]. A shop was constructed in 1908 behind the addition, filling up space between Rogers Hall and Lyman. The Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings described the addition as "one story high, about 20 x 30 feet, and has an open story underneath for storage of cart, sweeper etc." The new shop connected to the wood shop of the Engineering Department. In 1922 a new heating station was installed between Rogers and Lyman. The plant included a 164-foot stack and replaced the older boiler rooms at the same location. When the Metcalf Chemical Laboratory was finished in 1923 and the Chemistry Department vacated the majority of Rogers Hall, Political Science took over the space.

The building was finally retired as a chemical lab in 1938.

"Until last month Rogers Hall was, as you have heard so often, the chemistry laboratory longest in continuous use in any American collegiate institution. With the moving of the research division of chemistry to the new Metcalf Research Laboratory, we must decide what to do with Rogers Hall. The machine shops of the Chemistry Department and of the Engineering Division have been moved to their respective buildings, though the University carpenter shop still occupies the lower floor. The upper floor has been remodeled as inexpensively as possible and redecorated and relighted. In order to provide fire protection, the entire building has been sprinklered. These changes are the best that could be made, but I would not conceal from you that
they are palliatives and not the fundamental changes which are highly desirable, if not necessary." [Wriston, October 1938]

In 1986, the back part of the building was demolished and replaced with a structure that houses a large lecture hall and classrooms. The building was again renamed and is now called The Richard and Edna Salomon Center for Teaching.
Under President Robinson, Brown became a true University with a full range of degree plans, including a Ph.D. program. With this broad expansion of the curriculum, especially in the realm of the applied sciences, came the need for a larger physical campus. There had long been a call for a "fire-proof library", and in the academic year of 1869-1870, John Carter Brown, son of the late Nicholas Brown, donated $15,000 towards that end. Upon his death in 1874, he bequeathed a site at the Northeast corner of Prospect and Waterman streets (which he had purchased for that purpose) as well as $50,000 for the construction of the new library. The Library Building Committee reported to the Corporation on June 22, 1876, that construction plans had been almost completed in September of 1875, and the basement and foundations were completed by the winter, when construction was "stopped by frost." Plans were perfected over the winter. The report contains a detailed list of contracts to the various craftsmen and contractors, including money for granite, marble, cast iron work, galvanized ironwork, heating apparatus, and architectural fees. It was noted that the requirement of a fire-proof structure involved a certain expense, but that the "greatest extravagance is the roof, which with its iron framework and gutters, its slate and copper covering, and its necessary internal ornament costs about $14,000." They estimated completion by the following spring of 1877.

The new Library was dedicated February 16, 1878 and held all the books previously located in Manning Hall. The building was made of "brick, with stone trimmings; the roof was of iron, covered with slates; no wood was used except for shelves and other finishings" [Bronson, p. 390]. The Venetian Gothic cruciform-shaped building was centered on a sky lit octagonal reading room. A room was fitted out to hold the Herbarium in the basement but was determined to be too damp to support the plant life. The plants were relocated to a room in the southeast of Manning Hall to prevent their loss.

After the turn of the century, it became obvious that the library was no longer capable of handling the University collection. The basement was filled with thousands of volumes, and departmental libraries were sent out to be housed with their departments. Also, the basic concept of what a library was intended to provide was changing. Ultimately, it was decided that a new library building would be constructed. As The John Hay Library was being developed, there was much discussion as to what to do with the existing library building, which was almost adjacent to the site for the new library. President Faunce favored retaining the building for purely academic purposes in accordance with the donor’s wishes; his suggestion was as a home for the humanities departments. The joint committee on the library recommended converting into a seminary building, using the rotunda to house general reference books. It was proposed that communication between this branch and the new main library in John Hay "be facilitated by a tunnel with a mechanical carrier. This would place the whole library at the disposal of the departments without crowding the shelves of the seminary rooms or depleting the main library. It is worth noting that the two buildings will not be farther apart than the opposite ends of some of the great libraries in which a similar carrier system is now in use" [Report of the Joint Committee of the Library, 1907].

By 1909, the tunnel was constructed, and it was determined that the library would become home to all the departmental libraries and seminaries. "Plans have already been made for the rearrangement of the present building and the assignment of its space to department libraries. The John Hay Library will therefore mean not so much a substitute for our present library facilities as a great extension of them; indeed, the tunnel and its book-carrier will make the two buildings, so far as communication is concerned, virtually one" [Faunce, 1910]. The John Hay library
was completed in 1910.

As time progressed, however, their plans did not come to fruition.

"It is a constant regret that the old library building is now deserted and locked up. We have a fully developed plan to utilize the building for the housing of our department libraries, and for the use of our ‘seminaries’ and small classes. But the necessary renovation would cost at least $15,000 - a sum not yet forthcoming. It is greatly to be hoped that some friend of the University will come to our relief" [Faunce, 1911].

"Two years ago the Faculty outlined an excellent plan for housing in the building the various departments that may be classed as ‘humanities.’ But the plan called for a complete remodeling of the building at an expense of perhaps $15,000. Since no one has come forward to assume such an expense, it is impossible to carry out the plan. By a gift of $15,000 any public-spirited alumnus or citizen could virtually present the University with a building worth $150,000" [Faunce, 1912].

At the same time this plea was made, however, the building was reopened to the Economics Department, which took over the first floor; their 10,000 volume library came with them, removed from the basement of Sayles Hall. In 1922, they appropriated the second floor as well, and more space again in 1928. The Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings noted that year that the general condition of the building was poor. "It has been necessary to make rather extensive repairs to the roof and copings of the Old Library building. The entire building is in poor condition and to put the exterior in really first-class condition means repointing all stone and brick work, replacing deck roofs, and more extensive repairs than can be undertaken at present." The building was slowly reopened, with space parceled out a bit at a time, until the grand plans for a departmental library building were officially abandoned and it became the Economics Building. It was closed during WWII and reopened after a renovation into classrooms and office space in 1946; the building was then renamed Robinson Hall for Brown’s seventh president, who oversaw its original construction.

Robinson Hall still houses the Economics Department. It underwent a restoration in 1989.
Slater Hall was built as the University’s second dormitory, funded by a donation of $25,000 that was given by Horatio Nelson Slater to Brown on the condition that Ezekiel Robinson accept the presidency of the University. A site at the “south end of middle campus” [Bronson, p. 392] was chosen and work was begun in the fall of 1877. In 1878, President Robinson reported to the Corporation that progress on the building had been slowed.

“Unexpected obstacles were encountered, first, in deciding on a location, and afterwards in agreeing on the position and size of the building. To the location first selected by a majority of the committee, and on which a cellar was dug, at the south end of the Campus on George Street, and a foundation laid, and for which a plan with specifications for a building was obtained, a wide-spread and heated opposition was developed; the newspapers were resorted to and public sentiment was rapidly created against the action of the committee. Anonymous writers harangued the committee and the College in language which they would hardly have ventured to assume over their own signatures” [Robinson, 1878].

Several wealthy Providence citizens protested that their view of the College grounds would be blocked by the position of the new building, and after a continued debate, the first site was summarily abandoned by the committee and a second one, the open space between University and Rhode Island Halls, was settled upon [Bronson, p. 392]. The Treasurer reported in the same year that the cost of changing the site amounted to $4,069.43. The dormitory, although smaller than originally designed, was completed in the fall of the following year and was named for its donor, Horatio N. Slater. It was French-Romanesque in style and was received with popular acclaim. Its architect was commissioned to do a nearly identical building at the University of Maine. During WWII, Slater Hall was used to house the military; the dormitory, along with Hope College, hosted an Army unit during the 1942-43 academic year. Slater Hall still serves as a dormitory today.
President Robinson presented a letter from W.F. Sayles to the Corporation in 1878 in which he offered a gift to erect a building in memory of his son. William Clark Sayles was a Brown student who died February 13, 1876. His father offered $50,000 for a building containing a hall and classrooms. Robinson declared that: "The building is to be forever sacred to the uses of all good learning, of sound morality and of pure religion, and thus to commemorate the virtues of one who, though dying young, had lived long enough to appreciate the value of learning and to know the worth of morality and religion."

Foundations were begun by June 1879 and the building was dedicated June 4, 1881. It provided the University with a grand hall for commencement dinner, recitation rooms, and rooms for the economics department in the basement. The Romanesque structure was originally designed to be brick, but the ultimate choice of rusticated stone may reflect the influence of H.H. Richardson's recently completed Trinity Church in Boston. Specifically, it was built with "red face granite of Westerly, trimmed with brown Long Meadow sandstone" [letter to President Wriston, September 28, 1944]. The Hall was described in an architectural publication of its day as being a "very dignified building with an excellent color scheme" [Isham].

Another improvement to the campus at this time was the landscaping of the grounds of middle campus (now the Main Green). President Robinson duly attributed this work to Mr. Sayles, who presumably wanted a fitting view of his son's memorial within a beautiful landscape.

"To the lasting credit of Mr. Sayles be it said that, when the site for the Hall was selected, he foresaw the necessity of regrading the middle campus on which it was to front, and in his own mind he determined it should be done. Till then it had presented to the eye on its northern side, toward Waterman Street, an ungrassed and unsightly bank, and over the whole area its uneven surface reminded one of the recent days which it had been used as a cow-pasture. On the completion of the building, Mr. Sayles insisted that the campus should then be graded and put in order. The result was one of the most beautiful spots in the city of Providence" [Robinson, 1881].

The front campus was also regraded and seeded with grass at this time, which left only the grounds in the east campus unfinished. They too were regraded, and converted into playing fields.

Sayles Hall has served in many capacities throughout the years. It served as a dinner spot for alumni and as an off-season training space for the baseball team. Space on the top floor was used for drawing by the Engineering Department until a larger space was renovated for this purpose in University Hall. In 1892, Sayles was connected to a new Heating Plant, which also serviced Wilson and University Halls. The main hall began hosting chapel services in 1894. The Geology Department moved into the basement of Sayles when the Economics Department vacated its 10,000 volume library from the basement in 1912 and relocated to the old library.

Several improvements were made to the building over time. A Hutchings-Votey organ, given in 1903 by Lucian Sharpe, 1893, in memory of his parents, was installed in a new gallery designed especially by Stone, Carpenter, & Willson. It is the largest remaining organ of its type. The year 1906 saw electric lighting installed in Sayles as well as Manning Hall. The twelve large windows in the main hall of the building were replaced in 1944. Thomas Mott Shaw of Perry, Shaw & Hepburn Architects oversaw the work. A letter from the architect dated October 4, 1944 described the effort: "We enclose sketches of another idea for the Sayles Hall windows. We think the design is an improvement of the first attempt, being more in keeping with the Richardson Chapel style." In 1945, "The Little Chapel" was created in a small room adjacent to the main hall that had at one time
been used for undergraduate prayer groups. This room contained a Book of Remembrance that held the names of Brown men who perished in WWII, and in 1946 a stained glass window was installed and dedicated to the Military Chaplains [Mitchell, p. 488]. The room fell out of use, and the window was eventually moved to the John Hay Library.

Letters regarding the installation of pre-cast concrete walls and toilets in the basement of Sayles were exchanged between President Wriston and Gilbane Building Company in February 1949, although there was no confirmation in the correspondence that the work was completed as described. In 1951, Egyptology and the Department of the History of Mathematics moved from the basement of Sayles to their new home at 2 Prospect Street (now Wilbour Hall). Their space was reallocated to the Air Force.

In the 1970’s, the basement was occupied by the Political Science Department. A recently completed renovation has restored classrooms on first, second and third floors. In 2001, the building was restored by architects Durkee Brown.

The auditorium was recently renovated and is still a much used and valued meeting space on the campus.
"In a city and state so largely devoted to manufacturing as are Providence and Rhode Island, and to kinds of manufacturing in which competition is every year calling to its aid the latest results of science, it is evident that the demands on the one and only University of the state for instruction in applied science must constantly increase. Nor is the demand merely for the instruction of those who are to be actively engaged in the oversight of great establishments. The sons of manufacturers, on whom great responsibilities are afterwards to rest, and whose interests prompt to a more accurate knowledge of the relations of science to the industrial arts then the ordinary College curriculum offers, are every year becoming more and more interested in questions of applied science. While we would diminish not a whit of our present attention to literature and abstract science, it would seem only reasonable that our provisions for instruction in applied science should be largely increased." This passage from President Robinson’s report to the Corporation in 1882 clearly defines the direction that the University would take towards a focus on the sciences. This attitude was manifested in the construction of Wilson Hall and the Ladd Observatory in 1891, for which Robinson secured all the financing.

In 1883, George Francis Wilson bequeathed $100,000 to Brown. Partnered with Harvard professor Eben S. Horsford, Wilson operated Rumford Chemical Works, one of the most successful chemical plants in country. Through this company, which was originally located in East Providence, the professor developed chemicals and Wilson manufactured them for sale. His gift to the University was intended to foster the study of science, specifically chemistry.

Robinson reported to the Corporation in 1887 that the bequest was ready to be paid to the University. An architect had been working on the plans for the Physical Laboratory under the direction of Physics Professor Blake, and a location for the building was under discussion. The desired spot was just south of Sayles Hall, but it was thought to be too narrow. “It has been suggested that possibly the owners of abutting lots of George street might be induced to part with a sufficient number of feet from the rear of their lots to furnish the requisite width. The appointment of a committee on the question of site will probably be found to be necessary” [Robinson, 1887].

A gift of the needed land followed the next year. Mr. William Goddard gave land on George Street “at the southeast corner of our middle campus”, and a strip of land came from Rowland Hazard of St. Stephen’s parsonage which provided the needed width of the site for the new laboratory. Hazard also offered to sell the two houses on lots abutting Brown property to the east of the parsonage. Wilson Hall was under construction by the next year and was intended for “special instructions in physics and mechanics.” The Romanesque building is reminiscent of Richardson’s Sever Hall at Harvard. It was dedicated in June, 1891. Also that year, a Heating Station was completed which serviced Wilson, Sayles, and University Halls. It was the largest plant of its kind in New England. By 1893, President Andrews reported that: “our engine and our electrical plant . . . are able, without sensible drain upon the steam which we generate for heating, to manufacture light enough for the Gymnasium, Library, and Sayles Hall."

When the engineers, who occupied the top of Wilson, were given their own building in 1903 (Lincoln Field Building), the Mathematics Department and its library moved into the newly vacated space. The Mathematics library was relocated to Metcalf Research Laboratory in 1938 and subsequently the entire department moved to the old Delta Kappa Epsilon House. This left Wilson Hall entirely devoted to Physics, until the department moved to the new Barus and Holley building in 1965. At that time, Wilson was remodeled into a classroom and meeting room building.
Almira T. Metcalf donated 13 acres of cultivated farmland to the University in 1884, part of which she wished to be used as a site for an astronomical observatory. On the remainder of the land, she wished the University to create a botanical garden, in honor of her late husband, Whiting Metcalf. In a report to the Corporation in 1885, President Robinson described that the plot had been determined to be an unsuitable site for an observatory by "the gentlemen who had offered to erect and equip an observatory if a suitable location could be provided for it; the grounds may not, therefore, be used as proposed for the Observatory." No obvious progress was made on the observatory until 1889, when Governor Herbert W. Ladd offered President Robinson $20,000 towards construction. The Governor's investment was intended in part to benefit all of Providence's citizens and corporations, as one the observatory's planned functions was to track and provide standard time for the city. Discussions regarding a proper site were underway at this time, and although previously discredited, the Metcalf site was still under consideration.

Finally, the site was chosen to be on land donated by Frank W. and Knight D. Cheney, silk manufacturers from South Manchester, Connecticut. Brown was at this time under the leadership of a new President, Elisha Andrews. In the President's report to the Corporation in 1890, he declared that the chosen site was "absolutely the best site in the city of Providence." The Observatory Committee reported that plans had been completed for the building by Winter, 1889, and ground was broken in May of 1890.

"It happened that at this time the city widened Olney Street near the Observatory site and was very willing to supply without expense a large amount of dirt and also of loam. This made it feasible to raise the building several feet higher than was at first intended and to grade the grounds. . . . In October 1891 the munificent gift [from Governor Ladd] was complete and on the 21st was presented to the University by public dedicatory exercises" [Final Report of the Observatory Committee, 1892].

In the same report, President Andrews, the head of the Committee, also reported on various construction problems, including issues with the heating apparatus and the roof, which "has at no time been water tight and its slope on the west balcony is defective, causing the water to drop on the front steps instead of flowing away to the outlet. With this exception the building is in good order." The landscaping around the building was completed in the summer of 1891, and a frame building was constructed at the northeast corner of the site to hold a transit instrument designed by the donor of funds for the structure, Hezekiah Conant, Esq., of Pawtucket.

Upon completion, the building served three purposes: instruction of astronomy, astronomical research, and collection of time signals that were distributed throughout the state.

The Observatory was also used during WWII to test the Civil Defense air raid signals. Information on weather was also collected. Control of the Observatory went to the Physics Department in 1970. Ladd is still used by the department, although more modern facilities have supplanted its technology.
President Robinson transformed Brown into a true university through a greatly expanded curriculum (including the first PhD program), a larger faculty, new buildings, and a healthy reserve of funds. The prosperity of the era in Rhode Island was not isolated to the wealthy but permeated the middle class as well. College education became increasingly appealing to this growing sector, as "the intellectual life in America was rising to a higher plane." [Bronson, p. 431]. Brown saw a large increase in enrollment. Over the eight years of President Andrews' tenure, the undergraduate population tripled, and by 1895 the graduate program had grown from three to 117 students. To support this large influx of students, Andrews recruited large numbers of valuable new faculty, many specialists in their respective fields, and academic departments increased from 17 to 25. The hours of instruction went from 135 a week to 458 2/3. [Bronson, pp. 428-30]. It was not just this gilded era that must be credited for Brown's Renaissance, but Andrews himself. "He was a great natural leader and inspirer of young men, arousing both their intellectual interests and their personal loyalty in remarkable degree, and hence he was a great teacher and a great college president." [Bronson, p. 431].

This widespread expansion at Brown brought with it a growing interest in athletic clubs, begun under President Sears in the 1850s with baseball and crew. There are references to the University's need of a gymnasium in the President's Reports since at least 1869. Almost twenty years after that date, Daniel Wanton Lyman of North Providence bequeathed $50,000 dollars "to build a building for any needed use...to be known as the Lyman memorial" [Robinson, 1887]. President Robinson described two possible programs for the building. The two overriding needs at the time where an observatory, which had been promised to the Professor of Astronomy as a condition of him accepting a professorship, and a gymnasium, which many alumni felt was the most pressing need.

"The provision which has been made by us for the gymnastic training of our students under the best of supervision and instruction in the city, at the distance of six minutes walk from our buildings, is thought to be inadequate. A gymnasium on our own grounds, it is said, would be more frequented and be of incomparably greater service than any provision that can possibly be made in the city outside our own walls." [Robinson, 1887].

Almost half of Lyman's gift had been collected by 1889 and the Corporation appropriated it to the construction of a gymnasium. To this end, Lyman Gymnasium was built to supplement the adjacent Lincoln Fields, which were laid out in 1881 as athletic fields for the University. The building, designed by Architects Stone, Carpenter & Wilson, contained a bowling alley, batting cages, a running track, and wrestling room. Although the original plans made provisions for a swimming pool, President Faunce noted in 1900 that it had still not been completed. "We have simply a hole in the ground, where we ought to have a pool that would minister to the pleasure, health and manhood of hundreds of students. Five thousand dollars expending in turning the present yawning cavern into a limpid lake would probably do more for the physical and moral health of our students than any other possible expenditure of the same amount."

By 1902, plans for the pool by the original architect of the building were almost completed. Although the cost was now estimated at double the original figure, Colgate Hoyt, the donor, still paid for the project in its entirety. At the start of construction, the University "failed to find water by the artesian well, but have resolved to build the pool..." [Faunce, 1902]. Finally, Hoyt Colgate swimming pool was opened March 2, 1903. "As the city water, while pure enough for drinking purposes, shows a dark brown color in large masses, we have purchased and installed a large mechanical filter, by means of which the pool..."
seventy-five feet, and holding 70,000 gallons - can be filled in about eighteen hours with water of crystalline purity" [Faunce, 1903].

The loggia on the east of the building was enclosed in 1908 to provide more clerical offices for the director of athletics. In 1915, it was reported: "The swimming season was a dismal failure, owing to the indifference of the members of the team and their failure to maintain their scholastic standing. Unless a decided improvement and increase of interest is shown this coming year, it might be proper for us to consider the discontinuance of swimming as an inter-collegiate sport" [Report of the Professor of Physical Training and Supervisor of Athletics, 1915].

Swimming remained a requirement of all students, who were given a test each year. Although the University had intended to construct a larger pool at the new Marvel Gymnasium, that aspect of the new athletic facility was never completed. Colgate Hoyt pool continued as the sole facility many more years, but was generally considered at this point to be too small and antiquated for Brown's needs.

Hard times continued in 1938. "The hurricane blew the copper and glass roof off the swimming pool. It has been temporarily replaced with a wood and tar-paper roof, but this brings again to our minds the fact that our swimming pool is outgrown, that the advantage we accrued in being among the first to have one has been turned into the disadvantage of having an inadequate one. It is doubtful whether a roof like the old one can now be reinstalled" [Wriston, October 8, 1938]. The next year, Wriston declared, "Our swimming pool was one of the first among the New England colleges and has been enormously successful from many points of view, but it is in bad condition and is of a shape that cannot be remodeled successfully."

There are letters from February, 1947, approving a renovation of the swimming pool, but the details are unknown [Letter from Superintendent Davenport to Gilbane Building Company, June 4, 1947]. A renovation is again discussed in letters from the summer of 1951, but they do not indicate whether any work was actually undertaken. Ultimately, the pool remained until the building was renovated again, more than 30 years later.

The gymnasium saw changes beyond the fate of its swimming pool. A boxing room was installed in Rogers Hall in 1924, along with a passage over a newly constructed central heating plant that connected Rogers and Lyman. The name was changed to Lyman Hall in 1946 when all athletics where officially centered in Marvel Gymnasium and the Department of Naval Science relocated from Macy Hall. ROTC occupied the building until 1972 when Sasaki, Dawson, Demay Associates made recommendations for programmatic changes. Plans were drawn up by Leslie Armstrong, Pembroke '62, in 1978. The building was renovated into a theater arts facility, The Isabelle Russek Leeds Theatre, a gift of Mrs. Leeds and her family, and the pool was converted into the Ashamu Dance Studio, a gift of Chief and Mrs. E.O. Ashamu of Nigeria. Both of the donors had daughters who were Brown alumni.
This dormitory was built to help accommodate the large increase in admissions that Brown saw during President Andrews’ term. President Andrews conveyed to the Corporation in 1894 the “insufficiency of our premises in general.” He described overcrowding of class and lecture rooms and a serious lack of dormitory space. At the same meeting, the Corporation voted to erect a new building to respond to these issues. To immediately ease the housing burden, houses at 27 and 29 Benevolent Street (where Keeney and Wriston Quadrangles now sit) were rented to accommodate students and quickly filled to capacity. The new dormitory was sited partially on the existing Lincoln Field, which served as athletic fields at the time.

“The real estate of the University has been increased the past year by the purchase of two small lots which was rendered necessary by the construction of the new dormitory, and by the taking of a house and lot on George Street which belonged to the estate of the late John Wilson Smith, as a portion of his bequest; the three lots together containing 5,565 square feet. The entire real estate of the University now amounts to 1,309,116 square feet” [Treasurer, 1895].

The dormitory was under construction the same year and President Andrews described the building to the Corporation:

“This building is well advanced and will be finished by September. It stands directly east of Wilson Hall, and is eighty-four feet long by fifty wide. It will contain, in its second, third and fourth stories, thirty-six dormitory rooms, each for two students, thus making residences for seventy-two men. . . . The basement of the new building is to be arranged as a Botanical Laboratory and will excellently serve that purpose for many years. . . . The first story will for the present be fitted up for recitations, affording great relief in that way. However, the structure of this building is such that whenever plentiful recitation facilities are provided elsewhere, these recitation rooms can with little expense be made into dormitories.”

Maxcy Hall was named for Brown’s second president at its completion in September, 1895. On February 9, 1899, a fire broke out which did serious damage to the Hall, although there was no personal injury. The President reported that there was damage to the departmental libraries, although the Herbarium and Botanical Laboratory escaped unscathed. The students put out by the fire were housed in the old Presidential mansion on the northwest corner of College and Prospect Streets until the repairs were completed.

In spite of President Faunce’s intentions to eventually segregate academic and residential uses, Maxcy continually lost dormitory space to academic purposes. In 1907, the second floor dormitory rooms were remodeled into four recitation rooms when the Engineering Building’s classrooms were remodeled into drawing rooms and laboratories to support an increase in that type of work within the department of Civil Engineering. Botany expanded within the building in 1912.

“One of the most interesting places on the campus during the past year has been the laboratory of Forest Pathology in Maxcy Hall, established by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with our Department of Botany. In December, 1912, Brown University entered into an agreement (effective of January 1, 1913) with the authorities in Washington, whereby space in Maxcy Hall was furnished by the University for a branch laboratory for forest pathology in return for which the Botanical Department of the University might call on the resident college pathologist for a certain number of lectures, or their equivalent, each year, and also might have the use of certain pieces of government apparatus, which were not duplicated by the University. . . . To this laboratory are now referred from Washington all
inquiries regarding diseases of ornamental and shade trees and shrubs, tree surgery, etc., from all parts of the United States and even from Canada" [Faunce, 1916].

The need for dormitory space resulted in more changes at Maxcy in 1938.

"The mixture of botany, class-rooms, and dormitory has never been wholly satisfactory, and it now seems possible, since the Chemistry Department is leaving Rogers Hall, to do enough to the second floor of that building to take care of the Botany Department, and thus turn Maxcy over to undergraduates. This will have great advantages from many points of view. It is desirable not to scatter our men students around the community because of their youthful and occasionally boisterous activities, which I trust some of you recall from your own college days, for one of the most dignified of this body told me, only a few days ago, that one time when he wanted to kindle a fire he tore the lath of his room in University Hall. It is desirable to keep such young and vigorous animals on the campus because the older generation, except the Corporation, has not such good memories and is likely to think that modern youth is more destructive than its parents and grandparents, though some of you have the most acute reason to understand that the contrary is true" [Wriston, 1938].

Maxcy was reconfigured for undergraduate housing on all floors, and the graduate students who had occupied space there were moved to Ames House.

"In order to make it entirely safe, two fire escapes were constructed at the north and south ends, and a fire-stair has replaced the old common stair in the center. There were no bathroom facilities on the first floor or the second; those on the third and fourth floor were in bad condition. Therefore, new uniform bathrooms have been provided from top to bottom. . . . We have done nothing to the basement, but it could readily be fixed up as a good lounging room which would provide certain recreational facilities and give to the dormitory a distinctive characteristic that no other on our campus now has. Nothing could be done that would make Maxcy Hall beautiful, but we must remind ourselves that though it cost only $43,744 to build, that much cubic space could not be constructed today for much less than a quarter of a million dollars" [Wriston, 1938].

Maxcy was used to house a Naval Unit during WWII; 664 officers were placed in several dormitories at Brown including Caswell, Hegeman, and Littlefield Halls, as well as Sharpe House. The building was used as a dormitory until 1959, when it was converted to office space for use by the Department of Sociology.
The Corporation was first asked to admit women to Brown in 1885, and President Robinson recommended the creation of a separate women’s college. The next year, Robinson proposed a one-year experiment where “young women be admitted by us on the same conditions as young men; that instruction be given them separately, during their first year in college, in the afternoon, and in the recitation rooms of Sayles Hall, which during the afternoon shall be given up to their exclusive use…” He also noted that women “will be expected to frequent the college buildings and grounds only at hours when college exercises, or use of the library and cabinets, shall require their presence.” The plan was approved, but then postponed for further consideration [Bronson, p. 452]. Ultimately, women were not admitted into Brown until 1891, under the impetus of President Andrews. In his report to the Corporation in 1893, he describes his intent for the Women’s College. “No mere ‘annex’ is desired or intended. The College must be part and parcel of the University, giving women students the full university status.”

In 1896, the Corporation officially created the Women’s College. The women were to have an identical curriculum as the men, but in spite of Andrews’ idea of their full incorporation into the existing university, they were not allowed into the classrooms on the campus. The Women’s College students were taught in the University Grammar School, President Andrews’ office, and a school at 235 Benefit Street [Bronson, p. 454]. The Normal School Building on Benefit was later demolished and replaced by the Rhode Island College of Pharmacy in 1924. President Andrews reported to the Corporation in 1896 that the committee of society women headed by Sarah E. Doyle (and supported by Andrews), incorporated the previous year, had devised a plan to build two halls for the Women’s College, a classroom building and a dormitory. The site was a lot owned by the Corporation, "a few rods north of the university grounds" [Bronson, p. 457]. The 250’x120’ lot was situated between Meeting and Cushing streets. The committee’s plan was to build the recitation hall first. By 1896, construction was ready to commence, as the funding was in place, and the plans by Architects Stone, Carpenter & Willson were almost complete. In his report to the Corporation in 1896, he described the proposed hall as "red brick, with stone and terra cotta trimmings, after the English University style of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. An oriel window in front will surmount the main entrance. There will be three stories, besides a dry and commodious basement…" The first and second floors were to have recitation rooms, administrative offices, a library, a large reading room, and a "ladies' retiring room, to be fitted up with sofas, easy chairs, [and] all necessary conveniences for temporary rest." The third floor would be "one large hall 76 by 44 feet, with open-timbered roof, large fireplaces, and a platform." He noted also that the stairs would have a rise of only 6 inches, "so that ascent will be easy." The Corporation approved the architectural plans in April of that same year [Mitchell, p. 426]. Pembroke Hall was dedicated November 22, 1897. It was named to commemorate a college attended by Roger Williams called Pembroke College. It was founded in 1347 by Maria de St. Pol, widow of the Earl of Pembroke. The building was intended to support all of the academic, social, religious, and athletic needs of the Women’s College. The building quickly became used to its full potential and then some. The presumption that all aspects of the women’s education could be served well by one facility was lightly mocked in an article in Sepiad, a student literary and news periodical of the women students, in 1903.

*The gymnasium of the Women’s College is a long, wide room, well lighted by many windows. The walls are delicately tinted; and at each end of the hall stands a fine old fire-place. A handsome reproduction of Raphael’s
Madonna hangs upon the south wall, and forms a most appropriate decoration. . . . The chapel of the Women's College is a long, wide room, well lighted by many windows. The walls are delicately tinted; and at each end of the hall stands a fine old fire-place. Cases of dumb-bells and Indian clubs accentuate the contrast between the strenuous world without and this quiet spot, and form a most appropriate decoration. . . . The reception hall of the Women's College is a long, wide room, well lighted by many windows. The walls are delicately tinted; and at each end of the hall stands a fine old fire-place. A handsomely carved reading-desk stands at one side of the hall, and forms a most appropriate decoration" [Mitchell, p. 426].

By 1907, Pembroke Hall was overcrowded and a new building was constructed. Sayles Hall was intended to absorb athletic and social functions and leave the first building completely devoted to academic purposes. The campus continued to be developed the next year: a retaining wall was built between the college property and Pembroke Hall's western neighbors. The Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings reported, "A solid masonry wall averaging twelve feet high was been erected, and aside from taking care of landslide from the west, we have gained considerable in the width of the approach to the green and Sayles Gymnasium" [Superintendent, 1908].

In 1928 the Executive Committee of the Women's College voted that "the name of this College be changed to Pembroke College in Brown University, and that the Corporation be asked to act on this recommendation at its next October meeting" [Letter to the Corporation by Margaret S. Moriss, Dean of the Women's College].

Alumnae Hall was constructed in 1927 and Pembroke Hall was converted for purely academic use; the top floor, previously used for chapel services, was turned into a library. "The possession of an auditorium and cafeteria in Alumnae Hall has made possible the reconstruction of Pembroke Hall in a way that has added greatly to its usefulness. The Library has been moved to the third floor where the handicap of additional steps has been more than offset by the advantage of having the library in a single room, well lighted and with adequate seating facilities. That, and other changes in Pembroke Hall, have made possible the addition of four classrooms and two new offices" [Dean of the Women's College, 1928]. There was a renovation of the interior partitions in 1949 to better accommodate the Dean's office as described in letters between that office, President Wriston, and the architect, Perry, Shaw & Hepburn.

Pembroke College was not fully absorbed by Brown until the 1970s, by which time Pembroke Hall had been turned into administrative space for the College. Currently the building houses offices, including those of Career Services, with the library space on the top floor largely underutilized.
Pembroke Hall, photographs and rendering, c. 1930-1950
The first building in Lincoln Field was a structure for the Engineering Departments, placed according to the Olmsted plan. The site had been converted from unusable marsh to ball fields at the end of the 1870s, shortly after the grading efforts on the middle campus associated with the completion of Sayles Hall. The Engineering Building was to be located at the former center field of those first athletic fields. In 1897 Brown purchased Andrews field (at Camp Street and Rochambeau Avenue) upon the division of the John Wilson Smith estate; this land replaced Lincoln Field as the primary athletic fields for the University. Lincoln Field continued to be used for informal sports until the site was needed for the new Engineering Building.

"One ninth of our students are now in the engineering courses, and the numbers could at once be tripled if we could provide the room and apparatus. . . . We have moved them from building to building, housed them in basements and attics, and treated them as novices whose academic fitness must be proved by their survival of all discouragements. . . . Providence, of all cities in the country, is the one best suited for instruction in engineering" [Faunce, 1902].

President Faunce felt the need was so great that he suggested the equipment or a portion of the building be paid for through the endowment if donors were not found. In 1903, Faunce reported that a new engineering building sited at the south end of Lincoln Field was approaching completion. The first floor was planned to house heavy machinery, with recitation rooms on the second and a drawing hall on the top floor, top lit by saw tooth skylights. The following year the building was "but one-half its destined size, and is already fully utilized. The Civil Engineering Department has been removed from its present quarters to the new building, and thus Mechanical and Civil Engineering are brought under one roof" [Faunce, 1904].

It was commented in an architectural publication of the day that the architects, Clarke & Howe, were successful in their "ability to combine the requirements of a factory with the dignity and proportion necessary for a collegiate edifice" [Isham, p. 175].

In 1907, an increase in Civil Engineering classes required the department to have more drawing rooms and laboratories. Existing classrooms were converted to labs, and to replace them, the second floor of Maxcy was renovated into four recitation rooms. By 1923, Lincoln Field no longer had an adequate number of laboratories either, and a temporary structure of sheet metal, 66' x 80', was built to the east of the building to provide additional space [Superintendent, 1923].

Lincoln Field Building continued to serve the Engineering Department until 1964, when they moved into the new Physics and Engineering facility at the Barus & Holley building. Geological Sciences then moved into Lincoln Field; the department still occupies the building.
In 1901, President Faunce described to the Corporation several facilities needed to support the growing University. They included a Biological Laboratory, University Chapel, Psychological Laboratory, an expanded library, a classroom building. Mostly, he emphasized the need for a student center. "The lack most keenly felt by our students today is that of a building in some central location devoted to the social and moral welfare of the student body - a building with reading rooms, reception rooms, class rooms, rooms for various college organizations, and a hall for social and religious meetings - a building which shall be the fireside and hearthstone of the entire student life."

The University soon received a letter from John D. Rockefeller Jr., class of 1897, in which he proffered a gift from his father to fund just such a building. The task of selecting a site was involved, but the north end of middle campus was eventually chosen from four potential candidates.

"The lot on George Street will be occupied by another building. Lincoln Field is out of the question, as it is now remote from the center of student life. Ten years hence it will be a beautiful campus, but to place the building there today would imperil all its uses. . . . The landscape specialists [Olmsted] consulted by the Corporation assure us that from an aesthetic standpoint a building placed there will be a positive improvement. It is evident to those responsible for the conduct of the University that the entire tract of land we possess must be used for buildings in the next few years, unless the growth of the institution is to be permanently checked. . . . The land of the University was given us by the fathers for the education of young men, intellectually, socially, religiously. For such purposes, if we have to choose between grass and buildings, we must choose the latter. Happily, however, we can still have both, and the new building standing at the end of an extensive lawn will ennoble all the buildings around it" [Faunce, 1902].

The architects chosen were McKim, Mead & White, also the architects of the State Capitol of Rhode Island, completed in 1900. The cornerstone of the new social hall was laid June 1902. It became obvious that the building, as designed, would exceed the gift of $75,000, and the donor subsequently added $25,000 more to finish the project. The endowment of $25,000 was subscribed by 760 persons among the faculty, students, alumni, and friends of the University. "Never before did any building on our campus appeal to so large a constituency and evoke so general a response. We hope that on next Commencement Day we shall be able to welcome our returning graduates to the spacious halls and cheerful firesides of the completed structure" [Faunce, 1903].

The building was intended to benefit the "social and religious" lives of Brown students. The conjunction of these two entities was unusual; many contemporary colleges maintained separate buildings for these pursuits.

"Such a division of functions is not in accord with our idea of religion, as a permeating power in the entire college life. It tends to make religion an isolated and cloistered virtue, and it tends to exaggerate the social into the convivial element. . . . The separation of religion from life is precisely what we wish to avoid. When the Christian students on any institution constitute a class apart from the rest, there is likely to be on the one side narrowness of view and provincialism of judgment, while on the other side the social craving may find satisfaction in dubious paths. It is our purpose in this unique student home, which belongs to no one organization, to bring together the various factors, musical, athletic, literary, and social, of our student life, to furnish a hearthstone for Faculty and Alumni on many a winter evening, and to unite our entire constituency in close and indissoluble bonds" [Faunce, 1903].

The building was opened in early February of 1904 to grand praise, although at least one architectural critic found
cause for complaint regarding its design.

"It is a very large building, the work of Messrs McKim, Mead & White, and while it is Georgian in style, and thus a concession to the Colonial origin of the college, its mass and the scale, drawn athwart the north end of the Middle Campus, give one the impression that it is too ponderous for its work. Taken in itself the building is good, though the chimneys, had they been larger, would have added immensely to its dignity, and the ventilators on the roof are inexcusable but the window spacing and the general treatment of it do not scale at all well with Hope College, and owing to the size of the building, its center seems to stand well west of the axis of the Middle Campus, which was fixed long ago by a row of elms on the east walk in front of Sayles. It will seem to stand so out of axis for several years, till the newly planted west row of elms shall overtake its eastern neighbor" [Isham, p. 176].

More importantly, though, it was regarded by the University to be a valuable addition to the institution.

"It will seem almost incredible to our descendants that Brown University existed and expanded for one hundred and forty years without the setting apart of any room in any building for the social and religious life of students. In this respect Brown followed the tradition of all of the older colleges. To the Puritan fathers the religious needs of young men were fully met in the church, their intellectual needs were met in the class room, while physical and social needs were regarded as beyond the pale of college provision. Now we see that nothing that pertains to the upbuilding of a pure, strong, rich manhood is foreign of college administration. Thirty years ago a movement for the establishment of gymnasiums swept through American colleges, and the work done in such buildings has been a powerful re-enforcement of the moral life. Now another movement, of still greater significance, is sweeping over the country, and our colleges and universities have built ‘Houston Hall,’ ‘Dwight Hall,’ ‘Barnes Hall,’ ‘Marquand Hall,’ ‘Dodge Hall,’ and ‘Rockefeller Hall’ - each bearing the name of a single donor, but each doing a work larger and nobler than any donor could foresee. Our own building is not the costliest among these structures but it is excelled by none in amplitude, convenience, appropriateness, and beauty of interior. The plans of all other such buildings were carefully studied before our own plans were completed" [Faunce, 1904].

One function that eventually became more significant was dining. The first designated refectory building on campus was demolished to make way for the John Hay Library in 1910 and was replaced by a new one in a house at 101 Waterman. The house, at the southwest corner of Thayer and Waterman streets, was purchased in 1908 from the John Brown Estate. "The new dining-room will seat about one hundred, and fifty to sixty more can be accommodated on the second floor. A modern kitchen and adequate serving plant has been installed" [Superintendent, 1908]. By 1910, the house was leased to a fraternity, which renovated it for use as a chapter house. The dining hall was not replaced until 1914, when the limited dining services in Rockefeller Hall were expanded. The renovation entailed converting the dining room in the basement into a lunchroom, enlarging the kitchen, and turning the first floor reading room into a dining room. "By the new arrangement many more students can be accommodated, and all of them can take their meals in a hall well lighted and ventilated, amid agreeable surroundings, and in close contact with rooms for social intercourse and for the various student activities" [Faunce, 1904].

In this way, the building continually changed to respond to the evolving culture of the campus. Eventually, however, Rockefeller Hall could no longer adapt within its walls, and a significant addition was built. President Faunce had retired in 1928 and passed away the following year; this project was the first on the campus under the new president, Clarence Barbour.

"In 1930, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., gave $600,000 to enlarge the structure that his father had paid for 30 years prior. The money was given with the condition that Rockefeller Hall and its addition be called Faunce House as a memorial to the late President Emeritus W.H.P. Faunce, who served Brown during Rockefeller Jr.’s time there as a student.

"Faunce House will include the present Rockefeller Hall, and will extend to the east line of the lots which we now own and which were occupied by two dwelling houses, one of which has been used as a residence and the other as the home of the School of Education. The so-called Taft house has been razed and the other building has been moved to the rear of the adjacent lot, so that it can still serve the purposes of the University. It is hoped that Faunce House will be ready for occupancy a the beginning of the academic year 1931-32" [Barbour, 1930].

The addition housed a theater, the need for which was discussed more than five years earlier.

"The study of dramatic literature and the dramatic art deserves a permanent home upon the campus. This means the erection of a ‘little theatre,’ either in a new building or through the enlargement of Rockefeller Hall. The unexpected growth of our classes in Music - 180 students are enrolled in a single course - demands better equipment than can now be found upon the campus. A building wholly devoted to Music is one of our dreams. The study of the history and appreciation of the arts of painting, sculpture, and architecture should receive new emphasis, corresponding to the emphasis we have given to applied science and business administration. In the School of Design we have at our doors a million-dollar art gallery and a cooperative administration; yet we make comparatively little use of these assets. To develop the aesthetic life of our students..."
- so closely allied to the social and religious life - is a prime duty in the immediate future” [Faunce, 1925].

The report of the Brown Union made to the President in 1930 described that the gift would “facilitate the important work of providing an adequate social center for the undergraduates of Brown University. . . . We are particularly proud to have our name changed to Faunce House, for to carry out the ideals of our late and revered Dr. W.H.P. Faunce is the finest purpose that any organization could have.” The building was dedicated on September 23, 1931. The project was considered a success, as described by President Barbour: “The operation of Faunce House during the year 1931-32 has more than justified the erection of the new unit. The development of dramas and of other student activities has been greatly stimulated and facilitated. One of the most important new features is the theatre which has been in use practically every day during the entire year.” His notes also describe the new dining facilities and the adaptation of the old auditorium into an art gallery.

The building was renovated many times over the years. In 1939 the Blue Room was created as a place for Brown men to bring their dates; no women were allowed unescorted. The Brown Station of the U.S. Post Office was transferred to the ground floor of Faunce at the east end of the building in October of 1951. A renovation of the building occurred around this time, creating a bookstore adjacent to the post office and relocating the game room to the west wing basement. A bowling alley was also considered, but the plan was ultimately abandoned. A lounge was created in 1969 on the first floor that the students called “The Airport Lounge.” In the 1980s a renovation of the building was undertaken; it was intended to refocus the building as a student center, as some space had by this time been dedicated for administrative purposes. The Blue Room was relocated to the center of Faunce, and a grand stair was installed. A café was installed in the basement. The Leung Gallery was created on the second floor as a lounge and meeting place; it was named for Mr. and Mrs. Leung of Hong Kong, who were the patrons of the renovation and parents of Brown students. Currently Faunce also contains the offices of the Chaplain and space for various student organizations. There is a mailroom in the basement, as well as a few student services, including a barbershop.
Throughout his life, John Carter Brown, the son of Nicholas Brown (who gave the University its name), amassed a comprehensive library of rare books encompassing the western hemisphere dated before 1801. Upon his death, the collection passed to his widow, Sophia Augusta Brown, who supplemented it with fine prints and manuscripts. Their older son, John Nicholas Brown, class of 1885, inherited the collection in 1898. In accordance with his father’s will, he bequeathed the books, along with an endowment of $500,000 and a $150,000 building fund, to Brown in 1901 [Mitchell, p. 314]. That year, The Providence Journal reported:

"Beginning with the earliest books about New England, the scope of the library has been extended to include everything that relates to the history of North and South America before the year 1801... Within these limits, it was the ambition of Mr. Brown and of his son, the late owner, in fulfillment of whose wishes the present arrangements for the perpetuation of the library as the property of Brown University have been made, to make this library the most complete collection of ‘Americana’ in existence."

President Faunce chronicled the process of constructing a new library for John Carter Brown’s Americana in his 1902 annual report:

"The Corporation have entered into a detailed agreement with the trustees of the library, by which the library will be forever preserved as a family memorial and will at the same time be fully available to all qualified students... Early in our deliberations we resolved to retain, if possible, the plans for the building which were prepared under Mr. Brown’s own direction and were nearly complete at the time of his death. Those plans were the result of competition by some of the leading architects of this country, and probably could not be improved... but the choice of these plans made it necessary to put most of the money into the building, and left us very little to expend on land.

The location selected is on George Street, where the University already owns three houses. By purchasing one other house lot and combining it with the land already in our possession, we were able to furnish a site which seems to all the committee thoroughly suitable and which has been approved by the trustees under the will of Mr. Brown."

The President further noted that the site was appropriate for more reasons than its affordability. Siting the building on the existing campus meant that it could be connected to the central heating station, and maintenance costs would be reduced since dedicated janitorial and night watchmen services would be unnecessary. "On this site the building will be, as every true memorial should be, in a conspicuous position, where every visitor to the city can easily survey its outlines, perceive its significance, and appreciate its great value" [Faunce, 1902].

The houses mentioned by the President and demolished to create the site were Messer House, Howell House, and the rectory of St. Stephens Church. Faunce had previously remarked that "the two houses on George Street known as ‘Messer’ and ‘Howell’ are still occupied as dormitories, but their dilapidated condition makes some change imperative. They should soon be removed, to make way either for a new and thoroughly modern dormitory, or for some other building needed by the University" [Faunce, 1901].

At the dedication in 1904, four-year-old Nicholas Brown presented the keys to the building to President Faunce. "The most notable addition to the resources of the University during the year has been the John Carter Brown Library, fittingly housed in its noble building, and accompanied by its endowment of five thousand dollars. While this magnificent gift does not add one dollar to the general income of the University, it does offer an equipment whose value is far beyond numerical estimate" [Faunce, 1904].

The style of the building reflects the classic Renaissance...
influences popularized by the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893 in Chicago. It was universally thought to be a successful work of architecture, as represented in The Architectural Review.

“This building is fireproof, the walls of Indiana limestone on a granite base, the roof of red tile. The entrance is flanked by two columns with the strange ionic capitals from the temple of Apollo at Bassae. Within is a large reading room with its main axis north, and four smaller rooms. These are floored with wood for the sake of quiet. A base of sandstone runs around the large room, and four monoliths of sandstone support the roof.

“The detail of the library is very good... the building - though Greek is not a convincing style for the environment - is a scholarly and adequate piece of work.

“Unfortunately, however, the Library, which, while not large, is very important, as it houses an unequalled collection of Americana, and which has been given by the architects, Messrs. Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge, an exterior commensurate with their idea of its importance has been placed on the lowest corner of the Middle Campus, and on a site, moreover, which does nothing for it. A comparatively low building, it has been put on a low site. It is not at the end of any vista, for only a part of it can be seen from Brown Street, and it has to be looked down upon from all but one of the thoroughfare lines” [Isham, p. 176].

In the 1980s the John Carter Brown Library became a center “for advanced research in the humanities.” A four-story annex, called The Casperson Building for the parents of the benefactor Finn Casperson ’63, was begun in 1989. The architect of the addition was Hartman Cox. At this time, the reading room was named in honor of the family of W. Duncan MacMillan ’53.
President Faunce alerted the Corporation to the need for a new dormitory in 1902. "A strong element in our Brown life has been the democracy and solidarity induced by our campus dormitories. Students scattered in residence easily become divided in feeling. Unity and loyalty are nourished by dormitory residence." Work began the next year.

"The new dormitory on Thayer Street will not be finished, as we hoped, in September. The many delays incident to all construction of buildings this year will prevent the completion of the building before winter. This dormitory will be fitted with the best systems of heating, lighting, ventilation and baths that can be secured. We have felt it wiser to build a little in advance of present needs and standards rather than a little behind them. Externally resembling our venerable Hope College, internally the new dormitory will embody all the conveniences of the twentieth century" [Faunce, 1903].

Caswell Hall opened January 1, 1904. It was sited according to the recently completed Olmsted master plan for Lincoln Field and was constructed on the former left field of the original athletic fields. The dormitory had suites and single rooms to house 72 students. It offered unusual amenities such as full furnishings, electricity, and private fireplaces not available in Brown’s current housing. In fact, the cost of rent was much higher than that of any other of Brown’s dormitories.

An architectural journal of the time reported on the new building. "Caswell, designed by Hoppin & Ely of Providence, is a dormitory, and follows, as is clear from the photograph, the lines and color of Hope College. This harmony was insisted upon by the corporation. It is very good in mass and color, though of course it has not acquired the rich red which time has given to the Taunton brick of Hope" [Isham, p. 175]

Caswell Hall still serves as a dormitory.
This clock tower was erected by Paul Banjotti, Italian Consul-General at Liverpool, England, in memory of his wife, Caroline Mathilde Brown Bajnotti (sister of Annmary Brown, daughter of Nicholas Brown, class of 1811, the University’s namesake).

“"The selection of site and design (except the inscription) is left entirely to the discretion of the University. When we remember that the one whom this structure is to commemorate was a lady of Providence, that she was one of the famous family who gave the University their name, and that some of her husband’s warmest friends are among our Faculty and Corporation, the propriety and significance of the proposed memorial are obvious. While it is not intended to serve utilitarian ends, it will add greatly to the beauty of our grounds, will cultivate the aesthetic side - too often neglected - of student life, and will commemorate an affection which reaches across the sea, and a personality that has enriched both America and Italy" [Faunce, 1902].

The tower was completed by September 1904. It was sited at the “north-west corner of the Front Campus, the highest point of the grounds except that held by the University Library, with the view of which, up along the campus from George Street, it in no way interferes. There has been furious controversy - among the critics - about this choice of site, and perhaps it may not be the right one; but the tower itself is a beautiful thing“ [Isham, p. 176]

President Faunce declared: "In the graceful campanile with its low-toned bell we have one structure whose only function is to minister to the life of the spirit" [Faunce, 1902].

As part of a landscaping effort on the front lawn in 1953, an inscription was made on the north and west sides of the tower, reading "Brown University Founded 1764" [Wriston memo, June 18, 1953].
As Brown grew, so did the Women’s College. A women’s dormitory was built for the college in 1901, paid for by the donor of Slater Hall, completed on the campus twenty years earlier. “Mrs. Horatio N. Slater has generously offered to present to Brown University the family homestead at 66 Benefit Street, to be used as a dormitory for the students of our Women’s College. The offer was duly accepted by the Corporation, and Mrs. Slater is now adding another story and renovating the building throughout” [Faunce, 1900]. Although the women were then satisfactorily housed, Pembroke Hall was no longer adequate to support all of the other needs of the college. “Frequently we cannot accommodate all the classes that ought to meet at the same hour, and the crowding of all activities, educational, social, religious and athletic under one roof is undesirable from all points of view. . . . One way out of the difficulty would be the erection of a gymnasium, which as in many other institutions, might serve as a center of social and academic life, as well as of physical culture” [Faunce, 1902]. Discussions thus began regarding a new building: a gymnasium.

President Faunce announced in 1905 that a $50,000 gift made previously by Frank A. Sayles had been appropriated for the construction of a women’s gymnasium. He reported that a committee had been made and plans for the building were almost completed. There were two sites being considered, one presented by the Rhode Island Society for the Collegiate Education of Women and another by an anonymous donor. He estimated that the building would be completed by the next Commencement; the foundations were laid in April of 1906. The women’s college holdings were increased that year with a lot of land on Cushing Street, directly east of the site for the new gymnasium, given by Mr. Stephen O. Metcalf and Mrs. Eliza G. Radeke. This addition of land allowed “the development of a true campus, with walks and shrubs and shade trees. The work of clearing away adjacent buildings had been carried on during the summer, and already we feel the creation of a new academic atmosphere, with that inner quietness which only spacious and dignified surrounding permit” [Faunce, 1907].

The gymnasium was completed December 1, 1907. “The large hall for class drill is supplemented by lockers and baths of latest pattern, by ample office room, and by a bowling alley which is the gift of the Andrews Association. One of the most useful parts of the building is the section devoted to recitation rooms. This has relieved the pressure on Pembroke Hall, and is much appreciated by the teaching staff” [Faunce, 1907]. In 1916, the Superintendent announced the acquisition of the lot just west of Sayles Gymnasium: “an iron fence has been erected on Cushing Street, and high wire screens enclose the plat on three sides. It is intended to use this land for athletic purposes.”

In the 1970s, Sayles was used for co-ed classes, women’s sports, and open recreation. The building continued to be used for recreational sports and offices until 1990, when the Physical Education Department vacated it in anticipation of its renovation for classroom use in 2001. The project was recognized with six design awards, including the National AIA Honor Award for Interior Architecture, the Providence Preservation Society Award, the Rhode Island Monthly Gold Award, the Associated General Contractors Builder Award, the Rhode Island AIA Merit Award and the New England AIA Honor Award. Architect for the project was William Kite Architects, Inc., of Providence.
In 1903, President Faunce announced that the greatest need for a building was a new general library. The existing library (now Robinson Hall) had become excessively overcrowded; enlarging the building was considered, but the idea was ultimately abandoned.

"The modern university library is not a mere place for storage and administration; it is a great laboratory, in which the best work in all departments of human knowledge is done. If the library is spacious, convenient, inviting, affording opportunity for quiet work in the presence of great stores of human learning, it will constitute in itself an educative power of no small magnitude, and will stimulate and invigorate every department of study. If the library is cramped, ill-lit, ill-adapted to study, poorly prepared to preserve what it contains, students will be hindered in research, replied from familiarity with the great minds of the past and present, and those who possess rare collections of books will be slow to entrust them to our keeping. Any change in the present building will mar what we have, without providing what we need.

"A library building, in order to meet our real necessity, should have space under one roof for all these departmental libraries, gathering up these disjecta membra into one great collection, and surrounding it with many quiet rooms for departmental study. It is obvious that an entirely new structure on a new location can alone supply these requirements."

This was the state of the library as described by President Faunce in 1903. The crusade for a new library still continued:

"The only university libraries larger than our own are, in order of size, Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, Yale, Cornell, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Princeton. For such a collection as we have, we may well plan and labor until we see it fittingly housed. We should build for three hundred thousand volumes at once, and have space for indefinite expansion from generation to generation. The library is the very heart of the University" [Faunce, 1905].

Progress was made in 1906, when it was announced that Mr. Carnegie had offered a gift of $150,000 for a library, named for his friend, John Hay, class of 1858, if the university could raise an equal amount to serve as the endowment for the building. President Faunce announced on Commencement of that year that $313,000 had been accumulated. There was some debate about what amount was appropriate for the project.

"Some enthusiastic friends of Mr. Hay have suggested that the new memorial should cost toward a million dollars; but such a structure would be simply a crushing burden. We do not need it at the present time, and its maintenance would simply divert funds from the support of instruction to the support of janitors, attendants, and the payment of huge bills for light and heat. If Brown University can secure a million dollars in the immediate future, it should use it chiefly for instruction, not for buildings. The truth is that in the present transitional era in American colleges, no library can be built that will be adequate for fifty years to come. The noble structures at Columbia and Cornell are already outgrown. Any building that we can erect will in a single generation be found inadequate both in size and in scope. The very purpose which a library building should serve is still unsettled, and the scope of its work a matter of debate in all faculties. The only wise course is to erect a portion of the library that is to be - the central and most important portion; and in the original scheme to provide explicitly for enlargement from generation to generation, as university ideals unfold and necessities require. To attempt a complete thing is to meet with disappointment" [Faunce, 1906].

The President also noted the advantage of bringing all the departmental libraries together in one building. "A student
of philosophy, for example, will work to much better advantage if the libraries in history and in literature are close beside him rather than, as now, in widely separated buildings. The unity of our library will then become apparent, the unity of all knowledge be emphasized ... This demonstrates the notion of cross-disciplinary work that has come to define the curriculum at Brown.

In 1907, President Faunce detailed the progress that had been made on the new library.

"One year ago I announced that $300,000 had been secured for the proposed John Hay Library. Little did we anticipate at that time that the problem of site would be even more difficult than the problem of funds. The entire year has been devoted to the careful study of proper location. It must be confessed that no ideal site for the building is now available. The University is situated on rolling ground, with scarcely a square rod that is really level. While this fact adds to the picturesqueness of winding paths and shaded vistas, it greatly increases the architectural problems involved in each new structure. We may congratulate ourselves on the general success with which those problems have been surmounted.

... But our greatest problem comes with the new library. Not only have we no space large enough upon our campus, but many properties adjoining our campus have been rendered unsuitable by the building of the railroad tunnel. That tunnel enters the hill one block north of the First Baptist Meeting House, and emerges near the Seekonk River.

It is to be about eighty feet below the surface at Prospect Street and about forty feet below at Thayer Street. It passes under University property on Waterman Street and on Manning Street. It has compelled us to reject sites that were otherwise suitable. If the tunnel were already finished it might be safe to erect a structure above it; though even then a building of large mass might suffer serious injury. ... The Library Committee, however, is unanimous in being unwilling to take the risk of placing our most expensive building in a location subject to any question of safety" [Faunce, 1907].

The railroad tunnel did eventually cause damage, albeit minor, to Brown property. In 1908, they were forced to temporarily abandon the Superintendent’s house near Brook and Manning Streets due to settlement from the blasting [Superintendent, 1908].

The site ultimately chosen was on the corner of College and Prospect streets, which contained Chancellor Bowen’s house (recently acquired by the University) and the second President’s House. The President’s House, built by architects Tallman & Bucklin in 1840, sat on land donated by Nicholas Brown; this gift came simultaneously with that of Rhode Island Hall. The Greek Revival house was built as a residence for President Wayland but stood empty after the departure of President Andrews in 1898; a new house was constructed for President Faunce in 1901 on another site. The old president’s mansion was used as temporary student housing after a fire in Maxcy 1899, and was ultimately converted into the Brown University Cooperative Refectory in 1901. President Faunce recounted the virtues of the site to the Corporation in 1907:

"The advantages of this site are obvious. It is central, so that the library will be at the heart of the University life. It is near the present library building, so that the two buildings can be administered together is desired. While the sloping surface will present difficult problems, yet this will make it certain that light can never be cut off on the west, and the task of administration might be easier if students entered on the Prospect Street level, while books were brought in at the lower level on College Street. ... Moreover, the cost of this site is less than any other, since more than half the land has long been in our possession. For these and many other reasons I fully concur in the recommendation of the committee."

The Architects Shepley, Rutan & Coolidge of Boston were chosen in the winter of 1907. Charles C. Soule was retained as adviser on interior plans; Professor Frank W. Chandler of Massachusetts Institute of Technology joined the team as library consultant. Chandler and Brown librarian Koopman made a pilgrimage to 50 newly constructed library buildings around the country to aid the development of their own. Architectural plans were approved by the Executive Committee by the fall of the following year, 1908. The cornerstone was laid by 1909, and it was estimated that construction would be finished by August, 1910. "The last stone on the walls of the John Hay Library was laid March 3" [Faunce, 1910]. The dedication occurred on November 11, 1910. The building was made in the Beaux Arts style, the same style as the John Carter Brown Library, built ten years before.

In addition to creating a home for the library collection, the English Department also took up residence in John Hay, on the ground floor. Unfortunately, plans to convert the old library into a home for the departmental libraries never came to fruition due to lack of funds. The building sat empty until 1912, when it was partially opened to the Economics Department, which moved into the first floor. In 1913, the Departments of Education and Philosophy moved into John Hay from the Van Wickle Administration Building across College Street. The Library Committee complained in its report to the President in 1914 about the various encroaching departments, citing the passage of students through the building as a noise nuisance detrimental to the atmosphere of the library. Eventually the departments were removed, but the library became outgrown regardless.

Need for the library’s expansion was a constant complaint in the Library Committee’s annual report to the President, and plans for expansion began being discussed. "The purchase of the houses, 36 Prospect Street [Prospect House]
and 57 Waterman Street [Blistein House], gives an opportunity for the future development of the John Hay Library. As it will probably be many years before this land will be used for such extension, both houses have been leased to fraternities, and the properties are thereby made to yield an income until such time as the sites may be required* [Faunce, 1920]. By 1923, Faunce described the library as "crowded to capacity, and larger provision will soon be imperative.* Five years passed with no action having been taken, although mention of the declining situation was made year after year in the annual President's Report. Action was finally taken in 1928: "The library is crowded beyond the point of comfort or even decency. The Corporation has therefore appointed a special committee to formulate plans for the extension of the present structure, and one subscription of $25,000 toward the enlargement has already been received" [Faunce, 1928]. Faunce retired that same year, and no progress was reported for some time.

The Depression made the next President's term quite different from that of Faunce, who had built an enormous amount on the campus over the course of his 30-year term. Barbour had similar intentions for expansion, but the economic climate did not permit it. "Doubletless it is true that funds for building construction to any degree approximating that which has characterized the past quarter of a century will not appear in the years which are immediately before us" [Barbour, 1934].

They continued to make do with the current library building, improving their situation through smaller efforts, and furthering their plans for an extension. "A few readjustments have slightly increased the capacity of the John Hay Library and we have annexed some storage space in the 'Old Library' buildings for books which are in less frequent use demand. . . . The gift promised by Colonel Webster Knight toward an extension of the building, mentioned in last year's report, has come to us prematurely, and, to our sorrow, by testamentary bequest" [Barbour, 1933]. The gift of $100,000 was given with the condition that the extension be built within ten years. The Library Committee reported in 1935 on "the proposed future extension" and noted that a smoking room was added to the street level floor in the summer of 1934.

There was definite progress reported in the Library Report for the 1935-1936 academic year.

*Although the John Hay Library Expansion Fund and the bequest of Colonel Webster Knight still aggregate only a substantial fraction of the amount required for an adequate extension of the building, the increasing needs of the Library and the more hopeful trend of the times have impelled and encouraged us to make more specific and detailed studies of estimated needs and projected floor plans. It appears that an extension along Prospect Street to Waterman Street, the full depth of the present building, might be adequate for the next 15 years or so.*

A building committee was assembled to oversee the work in 1938. By that time, architectural plans for an extension to the North were being drawn by Shepley, Bullfinch & Abbott.

"As designed, the extension provides for a new reserve book reading room, a new divisional reading room, carrels in the stacks for approximately sixty readers, and shelf space for about 150,000 volumes. Provision is also made so the 57 Waterman Street [Blistein House] may be used for offices which will have direct access into the new library. We are now in the hopeful but somewhat fearful state of wondering whether the plans drawn fall within the amount of money available. Speculation is useless. We have hope, however" [Wriston, 1938].

There were several issues discussed about encompassing 57 Waterman in the scope of the project. The meeting
Views on co-education continued to evolve after its inception at Brown in the 1890s. In 1908, President Faunce reported, "The solution we have reached at Brown is now being widely studied and adopted elsewhere. Educators east and west have affirmed that our plan of ‘coordinate education’ avoids the dangers of ‘coeducation,’ and secures to our women the benefits of the independent women’s college." That year, three more lots of land, located on Cushing Street opposite Sayles Gymnasium, were given to the Women’s College. "It is obvious that the next duty of the College is to erect a modern dormitory on that land. . . . The present dormitory is insufficient and far away. For the cultivation of a home atmosphere, for the development of the social and musical and aesthetic sides of student life, there is now needed a well equipped residential hall adjacent to the present buildings."

More than half of the building fund came from the estate of Dr. and Mrs. Horace G. Miller, which was bequeathed to the Women’s College; various subscriptions made up the balance. The dormitory was to be sited on land given by a member of the Corporation, near Sayles Gymnasium [Bronson, p. 485]. "The Women’s College Dormitory will also be ready for use with the beginning of the autumn term. Ground was broken for this building early in March, and the contractor is furnishing us a sixty-room building ready for occupation in less than seven months" [Superintendent, 1910].

Lida Shaw King, the Dean of the Women’s College, reported on the dormitory in 1911:

"The building was opened on September 26 [1910], two days before the opening of the College year. By that time almost all of the forty-eight rooms had been engaged, and later in the year the others were filled. The Hall has proved to be a delightful student home, and is satisfactory from the point of view of housekeeping in almost every respect. The few weak points which we have discovered are remediable, while the architectural features, the plan of the interior, and the scheme of decorations and furnishings seem to have met with a very general approval. It is called one of the beautiful buildings of Providence, and is looked upon as a model of the newer type of dormitory, which aims to be like a home rather than like an institution. On October 27 the Executive Committee of the College voted to name the building Miller Hall in memory of Dr. and Mrs. Horace G. Miller."

Andrews, Jacques & Rantoul were the architects for the project. The building, colonial in style, also contained reception rooms and a dining room, and became the new social center for the College [Bronson, p. 485]. The Women’s Advisory Council proclaimed that the building "challenged attention as a radical departure from the institutional type of building that had till then been the generally accepted model for a dormitory." The building still serves as a dormitory.
An important event is the purchase by the University of the large lot on the corner of Waterman and Thayer Street, formerly belonging to the John Nicholas Brown estate. This land is the key to our whole easterly development. With Brown University eastward the course of empire takes its way. Thirty years from now the centre of our campus life will be Lincoln Field. When that quadrangle shall be surrounded by academic buildings and planted with elms, when memorial gates shall stand at the head of Manning Street, when the land we already own on Manning Street shall be filled with dormitories for our students, then we shall discover that Marcus Aurelius has really been placed upon our front campus and is facing the line of future growth” [Faunce, 1908].

The University’s most prevalent need when this land was acquired was a biological laboratory, and so the lot became the site for this new building. “A visit to our present biological laboratory - where some notable work is being done in closets and cellars - would convince any man of the imperative need in biology” [Faunce, 1909]. The need was not addressed again until two years later, upon the bequest of Dr. Oliver H. Arnold, class of 1865. A doctor and life long student of science, he served many years on the visiting committee of the Biology Department. He left $85,000 to Brown, $60,000 for the erection of a new Biology Building, $10,000 toward a fellowship for that department, and another $15,000 for scholarships and an archeology fellowship in the Women’s College. His wife studied archeology and ancient history and was an ardent supporter of the higher education of women. The “Arnold Biological Laboratory” was under construction by the end of 1914. “It will stand on the north side of Lincoln Field, fifty feet back from Waterman Street, occupying land on which three dwelling-houses have stood. . . . It will be of simple construction, serviceable rather than monumental, harmonizing with our ‘old colonial’ type of architecture, and will provide ample opportunity for teaching and for research, both of individuals and of classes” [Faunce, 1914]. Of the three houses previously mentioned, one was demolished - 101 Waterman, which had been converted to a refectory in 1908, then leased to a fraternity two years later. The other two houses (95 and 97 Waterman Street) were moved to 10 and 15 Manning Street and occupied by their former tenants [Superintendent, 1910].

The laboratory’s dedication was held the day before Commencement in 1915. “The architects, Clarke & Howe, have given us a simple, serviceable, fireproof structure, of ample dimensions for the next quarter century, flooded with light, equipped with all the latest appliances and instruments, a building which is a constant invitation and allurement to study” [Faunce, 1915]. Ultimately, $80,000 from the Arnold estate was used for construction costs, and $30,000 more was solicited to pay for the equipment. It provided space for four professors and a Women’s College biology instructor.

There was a large increase of biology students by 1922, and another story was added to Arnold to accommodate them [Faunce, 1923]. Shortly after this, 91 Waterman was established as a supplemental facility for Biology. The building was further expanded in 1949, when a penthouse was constructed. The architect for the work was Conrad Green of Providence, and it was constructed by the Gilbane Building Company. A letter from the President, dated September 23, 1949, announced the completion of the project. “I am pleased to report that the four new animal rooms at the ends of the roof structure of Arnold Biological Laboratory are now in use and seem to be operating satisfactorily.” Over time, Arnold also housed the Biological Sciences Library and new teaching laboratories. Currently, Arnold provides administrative and research space for various divisions of the Bio-Med Department; there is a herbarium in the basement.
During the Great War, Brown's campus was transformed. "The colleges and universities of America went to war as well as their graduates, and Brown University was for a time simply a training school of the Army and Navy. Every building, every dollar of our endowment, every teacher, and every male student over eighteen years of age and physically fit was devoted absolutely to the winning of the war" [Faunce, 1919].

The situation on the Pembroke campus was quite different, however. President Faunce illustrated the disparity between the effects of the war on the men's and women's institutions:

"In some respects the women's colleges of our country suffered more from the psychological reactions of the war than did the men's colleges. The intense emotions aroused by the conflict found among the men appropriate vent in heroic action. They donned the uniform, joined the military organization, experienced hardship, privation, and danger. But for most of the students in our women's colleges there were only the quiet and safe tasks of the Red Cross work at home, or the mild ingenuities of food conversation. To feel the most intense patriotic fervor and be at a loss how to express it in worthy forms was a trying experience for many women's colleges. Bayonet drill for the men and knitting for the women is not a program that involves visible equality of duties."

This inequality is further evident when comparing the development of the men's and women's campuses during the war. About Brown's campus Faunce described the all-encompassing change. "At once our grounds became an armed camp. . . . For our students the War Department laid out a sixteen-hour program for each day, extending from reveille at 6 a.m. to taps at 10 p.m. Mess was served on the lower floor of Rockefeller Hall. The dormitories became barracks, stripped of all furniture save the sleeping cots" [Faunce, 1919].

All building projects on the men's campus that were in the planning phase were summarily abandoned. In contrast, the Dean of Pembroke outlined how "our grounds and buildings have been greatly improved during the year." She described various landscape improvements that rendered the grounds "no longer simply a breathing space, but also a lovely park and a choice setting for revels and pageants" [Dean of the Women's College, 1919]. During this period, repairs were made to existing buildings, and most importantly, a new dormitory was built, named for Stephen O. Metcalf, who donated the land and contributed $80,000 of the total $140,000 of construction costs [Mitchell, p. 381].

"Metcalf Hall faces Miller Hall and is practically the same size; like Miller Hall it is built of brick with stone and wood trimmings, but unlike it, it is of cement construction and fire-proof. The two buildings face each other at a distance of some eighty feet with a lawn between, on which stand several fine trees, and which is outlined with many shrubs. It is a very charming residential campus. The need of this second large dormitory is amply proved by the fact that already forty-nine rooms have been contracted for. . . . The architects are Andrews, Rantoul & Jones of Boston. . . . The cost of the building will be about 130,000, $110,000 of which has already been secured" [Dean of the Women's College, 1919].

The site of the building was formerly that of a small women's residence hall, which was demolished to make room for the new dormitory. Construction of the new dormitory began April 1, 1919, and was completed by commencement that autumn. The building is still used as a residence hall.
In 1920, Charles Klauder was retained as Brown University's advising architect and a comprehensive planning effort was instigated. The first building to be added to Lincoln Field under this new plan was the Metcalf Chemical Laboratory, designed by the Klauder's firm. The need for a new chemical lab was first mentioned in the President's Report in 1915 and then again in 1916. “Chemistry is at the same time one of the noblest intellectual disciplines and an indispensable aid in the processes of modern manufacture. For years our chemical laboratory has been consulted by the leading manufacturers around us. We ought to plan such courses in chemical engineering as shall make our work felt and our graduates sought in every large enterprise founded on the application of chemistry to the arts. And we ought soon replace our present structure, built in 1862, with a modern laboratory manned by a large teaching force.” The impetus for the new building was halted by the onset of the First World War, when all resources and attention were redirected to support the national cause. “During the war all discussion of new buildings for the University ceased. The elaborate designs for a new gymnasium have been seen only by a few friends, and the floor plans for a new chemical laboratory have been studied only by the Visiting Committee in Chemistry” [Faunce, 1919].

Construction did not begin until 1922. “The Jesse Metcalf Chemical Laboratory, provided by the noble gift of $450,000 from Mr. Jesse H. Metcalf and erected as a memorial to his father, is now under construction and may be dedicated at Commencement, 1923. Few other laboratories will be larger, and none will be better in design and equipment” [Faunce, 1922]. The building was completed on schedule and dedicated in October, 1923.

The building was the first of Klauder’s four buildings defining the East end of Lincoln Field at Thayer Street. All four reflect careful examination of Brown’s first building, University Hall. Charles Klauder developed designs and details for Metcalf as a campus building framing the green and uniting the campus.
“The Women’s College has undertaken the building of a new Social Hall. No other structure is now so greatly needed by that College. No other will so strongly appeal to the alumnae. Already the College has a fine gymnasium, fairly adequate lecture-rooms, and excellent halls of residence. But it has no building for the natural cultivation and expression of social aspiration and activity” [Faunce, 1923].

The Dean of the Women’s College described the building’s progress in 1926.

“Ground was broken in the middle of March for the new building, which, by a general consensus of opinion on the part of the Corporation, the Executive Committee of the Women’s College, and the alumnae, is to be called Alumnae Hall, and the cornerstone was laid with appropriate ceremony in May. We are now greatly anticipating its completion next February. We also look forward confidently, because of the splendid increase in our effective equipment, to a new era of service of the College to its student body and to the community.”

The Hall represented the forward thinking approach that the institution had taken with the Women’s College.

“...the building of ‘Alumnae Hall’ at the Women’s College will affect the entire social and intellectual atmosphere of that College. The College needs to-day wider contacts with visiting scholars and teachers, and more intimate relation with its alumnae scattered throughout the country. It needs better facilities for music and art and cultural influences of every kind. No curriculum alone, however excellent, can prepare American womanhood for its leadership in a rapidly changing world. The fact that so large a proportion of the graduates of our colleges for women remain unmarried - whether voluntarily or not - may be in no small measure due to the fact that those colleges twenty-five years ago were relying on the mere duplication of a poor curriculum designed for men, and were oblivious to the fact that something much finer and more refining might be offered to women. The requirements for an academic degree must be the same for men and for women. But the entire social and athletic training and the whole cultural atmosphere of a women’s college should be and may be far superior to the crude program which the nineteenth century imposed upon men” [Faunce, 1926].

Alumnae Hall was dedicated October 11, 1927. Stephen O. Metcalf was a major contributor to the building fund.

“It will stand for more than one century, we hope, a constant influence for refining the taste, widening the horizon, deepening the faith, and ennobling the life of our undergraduate women.

“The expansion of the grounds and buildings of our Women’s College and the growing achievement of an independent life are gratifying evidence that the College is in no sense an appendage of the university, but an autonomous unit with its own ideals, methods, and administrative staff. Never in all the future can that College be separated from Brown University. But as a school of art or medicine or education may be included in a genuine university, so our College for Women has become a distinct and independent unit. To emphasize that distinction and independence leads to self-respect, self-help, and clear vision of the educational goal. This year for the first time the College will publish its own separate budget, separate student organizations, and a separate body of alumnae. In some way the body of 1,500 living graduates should have a voice in determining the policy of the College - perhaps through electing its own representative on the Executive Committee of the College. In every way the graduates should have opportunity to voice their opinions, to bear substantial responsibilities, to feel that on their shoulders must rest the future of the institution which gave them in some sense their intellectual birth” [Faunce, 1927].
The building includes a multipurpose theater/recital hall, the Crystal Room, used for meetings and receptions, and upper floors of offices.

The Pembroke building grounds were further upgraded that year, when a central heating plant was installed in Alumnae Hall that serviced the entire group of women’s buildings. Large strides were made toward creating a unified landscaped campus in the 1940s. The Boston Landscape Architect Arthur A. Shurcliff was involved in the effort, according to a letter to President Wriston, dated April 24, 1944, describing his design for new walls, paths, and grading changes to the grounds.
“The proper housing of students is a matter to which we are giving much attention. Because of dissatisfaction with existing conditions, the University during the summer rented over a hundred rooms in as many different houses in the city, and has sublet these rooms to students on the signing of the same contracts as for dormitory rooms. But the building of new dormitories is a clear necessity. The plans for the new Hegeman Hall are nearly completed and ground will soon be broken on the corner of George and Thayer Streets. . . . This structure, however, will only partially meet the need. In addition it is planned to use certain unrestricted funds of the University in the erection of a second dormitory which may bring to the University a fair return on the investment” [Faunce, 1924].

The second dormitory described was Littlefield Hall. Hegeman Hall was built on the site of St. Stephens row and was funded by the John R. Hegeman Foundation; Hegeman was the president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. It was designed in the early colonial style in accordance with the intention to unify the college through the consistent use of this style, and relate to the design and details of University Hall. Besides dormitory rooms, the Hall had a common reading room with game tables. It was used to house a Naval Unit during WMII; 664 officers were placed in several dormitories at Brown including Littlefield, Hegeman, and Maxcy Halls, as well as Sharpe House.

The building still serves as a dormitory.
A second dormitory was constructed simultaneously with Hegeman Hall, also on Lincoln Field. The name recalled a donor from 20 years prior who had bequeathed his large estate to Brown. The gift came near the beginning of President Faunce’s term in office, one of the first rewards for his formidable fundraising efforts.

"During the year the munificent bequest of Mr. George L. Littlefield, amounting to over half a million dollars, has been paid into our treasury, and has relieved an acute financial situation. In June 1904, we were compelled by the large deficit to take drastic measures for reducing expenses. Assistants in several departments were dispensed with, instructors much needed were not engaged, and supplies were greatly reduced. A still larger reduction would have been necessary this year had it not been for this opportune legacy. The increase in income which this gift brings us will be just about equal to the deficit of this last year. It comes, therefore, to supply a safe and strong foundation to interests that were in peril. As long as the University endures, it will remember with gratitude the name of Mr. Littlefield" [Faunce, 1905].

The dormitory, which provided accommodations for 78 students, was completed by the beginning of the academic year of 1925. Littlefield was used to house a Naval Unit during WWII.

The design is based on distinctive elements of University Hall; a simple back pavilion with regular window openings, arched brick lintels and slate roof. Littlefield continues to serve as a dormitory.
Mr. Edgar L. Marston presented a gift of $150,000 for a new academic building of modern language study. "Through his business experience the donor has been led to realize that America's future place in the world demands greater mastery of the languages of other people, and that such mastery must mean not merely ability to translate a page, but ability to appreciate the culture of other lands and races. The study of languages and literature has never been equipped as has the study of science. The moment the student enters the scientific atmosphere - which in the case of the chemical laboratory is distinctly pungent. But when he enters the recitation room, he usually finds only a chair, a table and a textbook. On the one hand he sees a wealth of apparatus and dazzling experiments; on the other a place to sit while reciting the rules of syntax. Is there no way of providing something of French 'atmosphere' for the student of French, and a real Italian environment for the study of Italian? The way is so simple that it is strange indeed we have not provided it long ago" [Faunce, 1919].

Welles Bosworth, architect of the enormous M.I.T campus complex, received the design commission. The next year President Faunce reported that the project had been delayed, partly due to uncertainty regarding final site selection. In 1924, he again reported delays, this time attributed to high building costs.

"The 'Marston Hall of Modern Languages,' the gift of Mr. Edgar L. Marston of our Board of Fellows, is the latest of Mr. Marston's numerous gifts to Brown. The new structure, built of Indiana limestone, in its architecture somewhat like a famous library in New York City, stands at the corner of Manning and Brook Streets, and when completed will furnish a true home for the study and teaching of the French, German, Italian, and Spanish languages and literature. It will contain large and small lecture-rooms, professors' offices, an excellent library, and in the central hall a large fireplace around which groups of teachers and students may gather for those informal contacts which often bring larger educational results than the scheduled lecture of the curriculum. The hall should be ready in the spring of 1926" [Faunce, 1925].

It was finally dedicated in October, 1926. The building now houses Slavic Studies and Comparative Literature.
The site for the Chemical Research Laboratory was approved April 9, 1937: “Whereas the comprehensive plan for the development of University property prepared in 1922 [by the architect Paul Cret] provided for the location of the chemical research laboratory on a site adjacent to the Metcalf Memorial Laboratory [aka Metcalf Chemical Laboratory]” [Report of the Advisory and Executive Committee to the Corporation, June 22, 1937].

Bids were solicited September 1, 1937; they indicated that the cost of the building as designed would render the endowment inadequate. “Efforts to reduce the cost of the building under the designs which had been prepared revealed the fact that the cost could not be brought within the estimates, and that the saving of any significant amount of money under those designs would defeat some of the most important educational purposes for which the structure was to be built. Under those circumstances it became necessary to reject all bids and undertake the redesign of the building. That is now proceeding and it is hoped that the new plans will be ready to submit to bidders on the first of November” [Wriston, 1937].

President Wriston reported the building substantially completed in October of 1938, and on budget. The building was named the Metcalf Research Laboratory in recognition of the gift of Jesse Houghton Metcalf for its construction. The architect of the structure, Day & Klauder, were also the architects of Metcalf Chemical Laboratory, this building’s immediate neighbor, and Littlefield Dormitory, both built in the mid 1920s. The building completes an important corner of Lincoln Field. The building is based on distinctive elements of University Hall; a simple brick pavilion with regular window openings, arched brick lintels, stone base, and slate roof.
Andrews Hall completed the ensemble of Miller Hall and Metcalf Hall women’s dormitories built on the Pembroke campus; it was needed to accommodate increased post-war enrollment. The site was approved by the Advisory and Executive Committee on October 21, 1944. It was paid for with funds from the Brown Housing and Development Campaign as well as money raised by Pembroke alumnae. The Hall was named after Eilesha Benjamin Andrews, the Brown president who had been instrumental in securing the entrance of women into the University. It was designed in a Georgian Colonial style and connected Miller and Metcalf Halls, and was considered one of the most modern buildings in the country. Its large dining hall on the ground floor was used daily until 1969; now it is only used for special occasions. Andrews is still used as a dormitory.
This was the principal project of the Brown Housing and Development Campaign undertaken after WWII to accommodate increased post-war enrollment. Andrews Hall and Whitehall were also part of this effort. The quad consists of ten colonial buildings; nine dormitories, and a refectory. Each residential building contained fraternity meeting spaces on each end and a dormitory in the center. The Quadrangle was named for President Henry M. Wriston. He was instrumental in the enormous planning and construction effort undertaken for this project. Wriston was credited with transforming Brown into a major American University. He defined significant elements of the curriculum, awakening institutional pride, establish a veteran's college, and eliminate separate classes for Pembroke and Brown. One of his major goals was to make Brown more of a residential campus, which he achieved through the construction of this Quad and Andrews Hall. The fraternities’ problems were also solved; under a proposal in 1943, all the chapters gave their houses to Brown, in exchange for which the University maintained and administered them until the fraternities were established in their new residences in the Quadrangle. At that time, the houses were absorbed into the fabric of the campus for various academic and administrative purposes.
Built as The Cabinet of the Rhode Island Historical Society in 1822, this Greek Revival building was intended to house a collection of Rhode Island-oriented books and printed material. A three-story, two-wing addition was constructed in 1891; the architect for the expansion was Stone, Carpenter & Willson. A second addition was built in 1913. The Society relocated in 1942 and sold the property to Brown for use by the Program of Advanced Instruction and Research in Mechanics (now called Applied Mathematics). In 1947 it was used for the Stenographic Bureau and the Inventory and Purchasing Departments. Graphic Services recently vacated the building and it was renovated by Lerner, Ladds, Bartels as the new home for the Population Studies & Training Center.
This structure, which houses a library and art gallery, was built by General Hawkins as a memorial to his wife, Annmary Brown, whose sister is memorialized by the Carrie Tower. The library also serves as a mausoleum for the husband and wife. The building was designed to have two art rooms, a personal treasure room, a rare book room, and open display of items of General Hawkins' collection. The original Annmary Brown Memorial collections (except for the paintings) were relocated to the John Hay Library in 1990. Currently there are exhibits of General Hawkins' painting collection, personal mementos of its founder and the Brown family, and a British Sword Collection. The administration of the interdisciplinary programs of Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance and Early Modern Studies is located here, and classes for these programs are held in the back art room adjacent to the tombs. The second art room is sometimes converted for related lectures or colloquia.
This late Federal style house was built for William Giles Goddard and Charlotte Ives Goddard in 1830. William Goddard was a lawyer, editor of the Rhode Island American, a professor at Brown, and a member of the board of trustees. His son, Charles Ives Goddard, who eventually became chancellor of the university, inherited the house from his mother, and commissioned an addition in 1882, designed by Stone & Carpenter, at the south side of the house. At that time the entrance was relocated from George Street to Brown Street, and the interior was reconfigured to include a new stair with elaborate stained glass windows designed by John La Farge. The house and its addition include 25,000 square feet of space, a large house even by College Hill standards. The house was deeded to Brown by Goddard’s only daughter, Hope Goddard Iselin. Brown took possession of the house in 1966. The house was restored for use as an alumni center in 1973, by architect Irving B. Haynes and interior decorator Thomas Hagerman, and dedicated in 1974 as the Maddock Alumni Center in honor of its principal donor, Paul L. Maddock ‘33. Named rooms commemorate gifts by groups and individuals. The Heritage Room (library) and 1933 Room (dining room) include original woodwork, wallpapers, and embossed leather panels typical of the Aesthetic Movement in America in 1882. The Brian and Lanpher Rooms, part of the original 1830 house, were redecorated in the early 20th century. The pastel palette and French furnishings reflect the decorating principles popularized by Ogden Codman and Edith Wharton. The Pembroke Room includes furnishings from the former Pembroke Alumnae Hall on Meeting Street. The Alumni Brick Walkway was started in 1996. A recent addition connects the house to the adjoining Nicholson House.
This house was designed in 1879 by Stone & Carpenter for Francis W. Goddard, a son of William Giles Goddard and Charlotte Ives Goddard. It is a striking example of poly-chromed High Victorian Gothic style, with a high hip roof and generally vertical proportions. Samuel Nicholson, president of Nicholson File Company, acquired the house in the early twentieth century, and his wife deeded the house to Brown in 1944, while retaining a lifetime tenancy. In 1963 the 12,000 square foot house was adapted for offices of the Brown University Press and University Relations offices. The house continues to be used as office space, and is now connected to the Maddock Alumni Center.
This house was originally built in 1864 for Zachariah Allen, acquired by William Ely in 1878, and acquired by Brown for use as a Faculty Club in 1938. In 1975 a major renovation was undertaken, and in 1980 a one story dining wing was added, designed by Ira Rakatansky. The house made history when the first telephone call in Rhode Island was made here. The Faculty Club was created by President Faunce in 1922 to improve the “mutual acquaintance which is the prerequisite of intellectual understanding and cooperation”. The original Club, at 13 Brown Street (now Andrews House, used as an Infirmary), included living quarters for single faculty members and graduate students. When the Club moved to its present location, living quarters were provided, for a time, at 166 George Street. In 1944 women were admitted to the main dining room. In 1957 the Pine Room was created in the basement as an informal cocktail lounge. In 1975 four new dining rooms were created within the house, and the basement room was redecorated and renamed the Brown Jug.
34 Prospect Street
Architect - George Corliss
Acquired by Brown University in 1955

The facades of this three story brick Italianate villa conceal technological advances in house building at the turn of the century. This house was built as a residence by George H. Corliss, inventor of the Corliss steam engine, which powered mills and factories across the nation. For this house, Corliss adapted and invented technology to provide thermostatically controlled ducted hot air heat, supplied through a tunnel from a boiler in the adjoining stable, a hydraulic elevator, and concealed sliding window screens. George Corliss’ daughter, Maria Corliss, transferred ownership to Charles Brackett, a motion picture writer, and Brackett gave the house to Brown in 1955, while securing a life tenancy for himself. Brown renovated the house in 1973, for use by the Admissions Office, restoring and preserving elaborately carved wood moldings, marble mantels, and a variety of applied wall treatments, and has continued to maintain the house through the years. The 15,000 square foot interior now accommodates a visitor’s center for prospective students and their parents at the ground floor, and office and conference space for the admissions staff on upper floors. The two story stable has been renovated to provide office space for the Financial Aid office. The house was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1970.
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