

THE ROTUNDA

HISTORY

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND THE DESIGN OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE ROTUNDA

Thomas Jefferson's thinking on establishing a public university for Virginia and on its architectural form had taken shape over many years. As early as 1779, while he was governor of Virginia and the colonies were at war with Great Britain, Jefferson had proposed that Virginia create a system of public education beginning at the primary level and capping it with a university. As his thinking developed, so did his intention to create a new architectural form for higher education. The originality and success of his design have been widely recognized for nearly two centuries, from even before the University opened in 1825. Drawing on the expertise of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, Jefferson would make the Rotunda the dominant architectural feature of his design for the University.

As the Virginia General Assembly was debating the possibility of a state-funded university in 1805, Jefferson outlined his ideas not only about its mission, location, professorships, funding, and management but also the "necessary buildings." "The greatest danger," Jefferson wrote, "will be their over-building themselves by attempting a large house in the beginning, sufficient to contain the whole institution." "Large houses are always ugly, inconvenient, exposed to the accident of fire, and bad in cases of infection," he continued. "A plain small house for the school & lodging of each professor is best. These connected by covered ways out of which the rooms of the students should open would be best. These may then be built only as they shall be wanting. In fact an University should not be an house but a village. This will much lessen their first expences."¹

Five years later, when writing to the trustees responsible for funding the new East Tennessee College, Jefferson further delineated his ideas about the benefits of such an arrangement: professors' quarters, students' rooms, and their connecting covered ways, he felt, would best be arranged around three sides of a lawn, thereby forming "an open square of grass & trees" and making "an academical village, instead of a large & common den of noise, of filth, & of fetid air." Such a plan, he wrote, "would afford the quiet retirement so friendly to study, and lessen the dangers of fire, infection & tumult."² In 1814 Jefferson carefully drew a site plan, intended for a proposed Albemarle Academy

near Charlottesville, which incorporated these same features—a broad lawn, 257 yards wide, which was bordered on three sides by two-story buildings for the professors and rows of one-story dormitories [*Figure 1*]. When a proposal to establish a college in Albemarle County went before the state legislature and was passed in 1816, the institution was called Central College.

In May 1817 the governing body of the Central College, the Board of Visitors, approved the purchase of the land for the college and adopted the overall layout that Jefferson had prepared three years earlier for the Albemarle Academy. The minutes of that meeting note that the plan called for “erecting a distinct Pavilion or building for each separate professorship and for arranging these around a square each pavilion containing a School room and two apartments for the accommodation of the Professor, with other reasonable conveniencies.” The Visitors approved the construction of a single pavilion on either the east or west side of the square and its contiguous dormitories. The minutes did not mention the treatment of the north side of the square.³

In these early proposals for the academy and the college, Jefferson did not suggest what form a library building would take or where it would be located within the academical village. Nevertheless, he had long had a library clearly in mind: he had suggested as early as 1805 that if a public university for Virginia were created “on a plan worthy of approbation,” then he would convey to it his own personal collection of books.⁴ As his architectural plans matured, the library would become the central building of the University.

A few days after the May 1817 meeting of the Board Visitors of Central College, Jefferson wrote to William Thornton, the first architect of the U. S. Capitol, putting forth his overall plan for the college and requesting some help with the design of the pavilions [*Figure 2*]. He asked that Thornton “sketch some designs for us, no matter how loosely with the pen, without the trouble of referring to scale or rule; for we want nothing but the outline of the architecture, as the internal must be arranged according to local convenience.” “A few sketches, such as need not take you a moment,” Jefferson continued, “will greatly oblige us.”⁵ Thornton’s reply, sent later that month, proposed an important alteration to Jefferson’s scheme for the north side of the Lawn, which had three pavilions equally separated by dormitories: instead, Thornton suggested, there should be “a Pavilion for the Centre, with Corinthian Columns, & a Pediment.” The other two pavilions on the north side should be pushed aside from that central pavilion and “joined together” at right angles at the corners of the Lawn. Thornton also recommended that there be only “one Pediment, and that in the center.” The idea was that a central, pedimented pavilion along the north side would have prominence over the others.⁶

On June 12, 1817, the day after Jefferson received the letter from Thornton, he wrote as a “friendly beggar” to architect Benjamin Henry Latrobe, who had served as the

surveyor of public buildings while Jefferson was president; Jefferson included within the text a site plan showing his original scheme, which still indicated three equally spaced pavilions along the north range. He asked Latrobe, much as he had asked Thornton, simply “to take up your pencil, and sketch for us some general outlines of designs no matter how loose, or rough, without the trouble of referring to scale or rule” for “snug and handsome lodges” for the professors. Jefferson asked Latrobe just to think about “the general idea of the external” and hoped he might supply a “few sketches such as shall take you not more than a minute apiece, mere impressions of a first trait of imagination.”⁷ Latrobe replied at once, commenting on Jefferson’s “entirely novel plan of an Academy,” agreeing that the plans of other colleges were “radically defective,” and promising to transmit to Jefferson soon “all that my professional knowledge enables me to suggest and design towards the execution of Your plan.”⁸

As promised, Latrobe replied at the end of June, having “found so much pleasure in studying the plan of your College” that he had spent considerable effort on developing sketches of the scheme and now found “that the drawings have grown into a larger bulk than can be conveniently sent by the Mail.” He had “put the whole upon one very large sheet”; he did not want to double up and fold the sheet, and rolling it around a stick would “make it inconvenient for the Mail bag.” He hoped to send it along with people traveling to Richmond.⁹ Jefferson, who had been at Poplar Forest in Bedford County, did not respond until mid-July. He was very eager to receive Latrobe’s drawing and urged him just to double the drawing and put it in the mail, assuring Latrobe that any folds “may easily be obliterated by the screw press which I possess.”¹⁰ Construction was scheduled to begin soon on the first pavilion, Jefferson explained. He also mentioned to Latrobe that “leveling the ground into terraces will take time and labor.” There was to be “a distinct terras for every 2. pavilions and their adjacent dormitories, that is a pavilion at each end of each terras.”¹¹

Latrobe sent his reply almost immediately, on July 24, 1817. Since he had not yet dispatched his large drawing, he used it as the basis of a sketch that he now incorporated into the letter. The sketch showed that Latrobe had retained Jefferson’s idea of three buildings separated by dormitories along the north side of the lawn, but he transformed Jefferson’s middle pavilion into a large, domed structure with a portico facing south and apses to each side [*Figure 3*]. Latrobe referred to this building as the “Center building which ought to exhibit in Mass and details as perfect a specimen of good Architectural taste as can be devised.” Inside, it would have a lower level with “a couple or 4 rooms for Janitors or Tutors, above a room for Chemical or other lectures, above a circular lecture room under the dome.”¹²

On August 3, 1817, the day after he received Latrobe’s letter with the sketch of the Pantheon-like building, Jefferson wrote to Latrobe again. By that time Jefferson knew

that the width of the lawn could be only about 200 feet, not the nearly 800 feet that he had originally intended. Thinking ahead, Jefferson wrote Latrobe in early August, incorporating into his letter a sketch of a site plan showing the east and west rows of pavilions and dormitories. This time he left the north end of the lawn open on the drawing, so “that if the state should establish” on the site of Central College “the University they contemplate, they may fill it up with something of the grand kind.”¹³

Latrobe and Jefferson corresponded more during August 1817 about the orientation and the elevations of the pavilions but without again referring to the central building.¹⁴ Latrobe delayed writing again until October 6, when he explained that his large drawing of the University, still in his office, had been damaged by storm-driven water during the summer and that he had recently spent time repairing it and redrawing sections. Once again Latrobe did not mention the central building, but he did send “perfectly studied” sketches of the pavilions and offered to make working drawings.¹⁵ Within a week Jefferson had received Latrobe’s letter and thanked him for the “beautiful set of drawings accompanying it.” He assured Latrobe that he would “select the fronts” for the next two pavilions from Latrobe’s drawings, but he did not mention the central building.¹⁶ In a May 1818 letter updating Latrobe, Jefferson noted that the first pavilion (now known as Pavilion VII) would be finished during the summer and explained that the other pavilions and the dormitories would be built next, but another \$100,000, still to be appropriated, would be needed to complete them. Although there were no funds for its construction, Jefferson did refer to the domed building, crediting it to Latrobe as “your central one, which would be reserved for the Center of the ground.”¹⁷

THE ROCKFISH GAP REPORT, 1818

Meanwhile, the bill establishing a state university for Virginia was passed in February 1818. The wording regarding its location stated only that it was to be “convenient and proper.” A board of 24 commissioners was assigned the task of determining the site of the university, its construction, and its curriculum. The commissioners met at the tavern at Rockfish Gap early in August 1818, with Jefferson as chairman, and reached a consensus that Central College was “a convenient and proper part of the state” for the new university. They agreed as well to the general arrangement of its facilities, which were described as follows in the report of their proceedings, which had been drafted by Jefferson:

it should consist of distinct Houses, or Pavilions, arranged at proper distances on each side of a Lawn of a proper breadth, and of indefinite extent, in one direction at least, in each of which, should be a lecturing Room, with, from two to four apartments for the accommodation of a Professor and his family; that

these pavilions should be united by a range of Dormitories, sufficient each for the accommodation of two students only...and that a passage of some kind under cover from the weather should give a communication along the whole range.¹⁸

This was, of course, the plan that had already been adopted for Central College, but the Rockfish Gap report also set forth publicly, evidently for the first time, Jefferson's latest thinking about the treatment of the north end of the Lawn. "A building of somewhat more size, in the middle of the grounds," the report stated, "may be called for in time, in which may be rooms for religious worship, under such impartial regulations as the Visitors shall prescribe, for public examinations, for a library, for the schools of music, drawing and other associated purposes."¹⁹

THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA IS ESTABLISHED, 1819

The Virginia House of Delegates and then the Senate finally passed legislation stipulating that Central College be the site of the new university in January 1819. Jefferson welcomed this news, but he was disappointed with the financial support that the state had pledged. Only \$15,000 a year was allocated, and Jefferson feared that "we shall fall miserably short in the execution of the large plan displayed to the world, with the short funds proposed for its execution." The pavilions already authorized would accommodate only four professors, and with the proposed level of new state funding, he worried, "we can add but one a year; without any chance of getting a chemical apparatus, an astronomical apparatus with its observatory, a building for a library with its library, Etc." "In fact," he wrote, "it is vain to give us the name of an University without the means of making it so."²⁰

The University's first Board of Visitors held their first meeting on March 29, 1819. Four of the members had served on the Board of Visitors of Central College—Joseph Carrington Cabell, of Edgewood in Nelson County, a strong supporter of the University in the state senate and Jefferson's collaborator; John Hartwell Coker, a very close friend of Cabell and owner of Bremond plantation in Fluvanna County; James Madison, the fourth president of the United States, who had retired to Montpelier in 1817; and Jefferson. The other three members were all graduates of the College of William and Mary—James Breckenridge, of Fincastle, an attorney and former congressman; Chapman Johnson, an attorney in Staunton and a state senator; and Robert B. Taylor, of Norfolk, also a lawyer, who had served in the state militia during the War of 1812 as brigadier general. Jefferson was appointed rector, and he and John Coker became the two members of the committee of superintendence. The Visitors also appointed Alexander Garrett as bursar and Arthur S. Brockenbrough as the proctor of the University. The property belonging to

Central College was inventoried and transferred to the new University. In the annual report for the University that he prepared in October 1820, Jefferson recited the language about the library that had first appeared in the Rockfish Gap report—a “building of somewhat more size, in the middle of the grounds”—and noted that it would cost “about 40,000 dollars, and its want will be felt as soon as the University shall open.”²¹ Without additional funding, construction of the library would have to wait until the buildings already underway—the pavilions, dormitories, and hotels, where students would dine—were finished.²²

JEFFERSON’S DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE ROTUNDA

Latrobe, who had promoted having a more massive building at the center of the north end of the Lawn, had died in 1820, leaving Jefferson to work out the further design of the library on his own. Several of Jefferson’s drawings survive. His plan of the first floor [Figure 6] shows a large oval room on the east side of the building and another on the west side. To the north was a smaller oval room; in the center of the building was a hallway; and curved stairways were placed in the area to the south. The first-floor plan also shows the portico on the south side of the Rotunda. At the Pantheon in Rome the portico has eight columns across the front and two additional columns and a pilaster on each side; Jefferson designed the portico for the Rotunda with a similar arrangement on the sides but with six columns across the front, perhaps following the hexastyle portico that Latrobe had shown in his July 1817 sketch. The portico is further detailed in Jefferson’s south elevation of the Rotunda [Figure 5].

Jefferson’s drawings include a plan of the second floor [Figure 8], another of the proposed roof framing [Figure 10], and a building section [Figure 9], which shows the arrangement of the inner colonnade and galleries on the top floor. Also among Jefferson’s papers is a fragment of a study for the first floor plan [Figure 7].²³ The Rotunda would be 77 feet in diameter, half that of the Pantheon. Unlike the Pantheon, where the base of the idealized sphere, based on the diameter of the dome, would be tangent with the ground floor, the base of the idealized sphere of the Rotunda would fall well below ground, in the basement.²⁴

On the back of his drawings Jefferson had worked out specifications for the building. Its overall height would be 58 feet 4-1/4 inches, with the basement story 7 feet 6 inches high, the first floor 16 feet high, and the height of the walls of the library 29 feet 6 inches, with the dome rising an additional 19 feet. The shafts of the columns would be 3 feet in diameter and 23 feet 6 inches high. He calculated the number of bricks that would be needed for the exterior wall, as well as for the two “massive chimnies, serving as buttresses,” the thick walls at the north and south sides that would also be buttresses, and

the columns of the portico, together making a total of 1,112,675 bricks. Adding a half brick to thicken the walls would require another 84,702 bricks, for about 1,200,000 total, which he thought would be “advisable.” For the dome room he worked out the placement of the paired columns and the spaces in between. Finally he laid out the measurements for the curved plate of the roof and for its ribs, which were to be made of four thicknesses of 1-inch plank 18 inches wide, cut into pieces 4 feet long and having breaking joints at every foot.²⁵

Jefferson’s specification book contained notes on sizing the windows for the Rotunda. “The rule for apportioning the area of windows to the volume of the room is to take the cubic contents of the room in feet, and the square root of that for the area of all of it’s windows.” He calculated that the “large oval room below” had 17,600 cubic feet; since its square root was 132 square feet and there were to be four windows, then each window should measure 33 square feet. From that information he decided that each window for that room should be 4 feet wide by 8 feet high. To confirm that size, he noted that the “body of the house (shaft & entablature)” was 34 feet 1-1/2 inches high and that the “voids of the 2 windows (below & above)” of the two stories measured 16 feet. Since the voids were “nearly one half” of the total height, he determined that the 8-foot-tall windows were “in good proportion.”²⁶

Jefferson’s drawings were sufficiently worked out by March 1821 that Arthur Brockenbrough, the proctor of the University, could make the following calculations:

Estimate of the cost of the Library –

1,050.670 bricks at 11\$. p M	11.567.37
10 Bases, 8 half do - 24 Window sills - 2 door do - 1,056 feet of steps running Measure - Pedestal Coping & base & flaging for portico	2.884.30
Covering Dome & Portico with Tin	1,840.00
Carpenters Work & Materials 20 circular Window frames 2 door - 4 front Window do — 2 floors Joists & the entire external finish of Portico, Entablature, Dome roof, Attic &c &c	<u>9,031.19</u>
Total for the Walls & external finish	25,322.86
Carpenters & Joiners work internally 2 Stories do do and materials	7,176.30
for terras on each side	2,500.00
Iron railing	1,500.00
Painting & Glazing	1,800--
Plastering	2,000.00
Iron mongery about	<u>1,000.</u>
	\$41,299.16 ²⁷

Jefferson's drawings for the Rotunda were placed before the Board of Visitors at their April 2, 1821, meeting, and they agreed that "it is expedient to proceed with the building of the Library, on the plan submitted to the board." However, because the state of the University's finances was not at all clear and because some members questioned the accuracy of the construction estimates, the Board made some stipulations: the committee of superintendence was "to ascertain as accurately as may be the state of accounts under the contracts already made, the expences of completing the buildings begun & contemplated." The committee was directed "not to enter into any contracts for the Library until they are fully satisfied that, without interfering with the finishing of all the pavilions, hotels & dormitories, begun and to be begun" that they had funds "also adequate to the completion of the Library so far as to render the building secure & fit for use."²⁸ Funds for the library were to be sufficient "to put up the walls cover it in, & render it secure and fit for use—in which security and fitness for use, are contemplated at least doors, windows, floors, and stair cases."²⁹

STRATEGIES FOR BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION OF THE ROTUNDA, 1821-1822

Some of the Visitors feared that starting the library would leave the other buildings unfinished and the contractors unpaid,³⁰ but Jefferson remained optimistic, writing that the legislature's approval of a \$60,000 loan meant that the pavilions, hotels, and dormitories could be finished and the library begun.³¹ He explained to John Hartwell Cocke, who had not been able to attend the meeting, that the others "were all anxious to begin it this year, but equally agreed not to begin it until we have so clear a view of our funds as to be sure they will suffice to finish it so as to be in no danger of asking more money for the buildings." Much of the uncertainty lay with the proctor's bookkeeping; he had kept the accounts by individual contractor, rather than by building, making it difficult to project how much it would cost to finish the pavilions and how much would be left for the Rotunda.³²

Within a week of the Visitors' April 1821 meeting, Jefferson wrote Cocke that he was hoping to move ahead with making the million bricks that would be needed for the walls of the Rotunda.³³ A few days later Jefferson wrote to Thomas Appleton, the U. S. consul based in Leghorn, Italy, about the capitals for the south portico of the Rotunda, believing that they "would cost in marble there not a third of what they would in stone here." He asked Appleton for a price on ten Corinthian capitals for columns having a 32-4/10-inch diminished diameter and eight "half capitals" for the pilasters; they were "to be copied from those of the Rotunda or Pantheon of Rome, as represented in Palladio." Jefferson wanted the capitals to be done within a year, but Appleton, who was surprised at their large size, replied that they would take nine months to carve once the actual order was

received. However, five years would pass before the capitals would finally arrive in Charlottesville.³⁴

Meanwhile, Brockenbrough had been busy with his account books, and in September 1821 Jefferson wrote his fellow Visitors that actual costs plus the estimated amounts to complete the pavilions, hotels, and dormitories would total \$195,000 and that it would be necessary to use the promised private contributions toward that work. He estimated the cost of the Rotunda to be \$43,675, with the “hull” costing \$30,200 and the balance needed for the interior. By the time Brockenbrough had compiled the financial information, it was too late in the building season to begin construction of the library. It was also clear that the funds for the library would have to come from the state monies promised for the upcoming three years, not from current funds.³⁵

Jefferson wrote James Madison, another of the Visitors, that he was “decidedly of opinion” that they should nevertheless push ahead with the library. “If we stop short of the compleat establishment, it will never be completed.” he argued. “On the other hand,” he continued, “the stronger we make the mass, the more certainly will it force itself into action. The world will never bear to see the doors of such an establishment locked up.”³⁶ Joseph Cabell, whose support as a member of the state Senate had been critical to the progress of the University, agreed that it was politically important to complete the construction work, writing that “the nearer you now get to the end the better.” If the Visitors decided instead to keep the small remaining funds in hand, he thought, that sum “would strike the eye by its insignificance.” If construction were completed or nearly so, however, “the great establishment will stand forth a monument to gratify the pride of its friends, & deter the further opposition of its enemies.” Rather than going back to the General Assembly for more money, Cabell advised, “a quick, silent march seems to be the most proper, at this time. Presently we shall be done with the buildings, and all complaints on that hand will vanish.”³⁷

Jefferson’s pride in the overall progress so far was apparent in a report that he sent in November 1821 to his former secretary, William Short, telling him that “All its buildings except the Library will be finished by the ensuing spring. It will be a splendid establishment, would be thought so in Europe, and for the chastity of its architecture and classical taste leaves everything in America far behind it.” The library, though, was “essentially wanting to give it unity and consolidation as a single object.” It was, he continued, “to be on the principle of the Pantheon, a sphere within a cylinder of 70 feet diameter, — to wit, one-half only of the dimensions of the Pantheon, and of a single order only.”³⁸

Meanwhile, Brockenbrough was preparing a detailed report for the Board of Visitors to review at their upcoming meeting. He explained that “the balance required to complete the present building, exceeds the former estimates.” “If this was a novel case in building,

I should feel much chagrined at it,” he continued, “but as we have numerous precedents before us in all great public works, and indeed in all large private buildings, (occasioned by innumerable contingent and other expenses that man cannot foresee, and which is known to all that are any way conversant in building.) I am the better satisfied.³⁹

At their special meeting, held at the end of November 1821, the Board of Visitors agreed to commission an engraving made of the “ground plat of the University including the library,” even though work on the library had not begun.⁴⁰ The Visitors’ annual report for 1821 stated that the “buildings of accommodation” were well along: six of the pavilions were complete and four more “nearly finished”; two hotels were done and four more almost completed; and 82 dormitories finished and 27 nearly so. The total cost to date of the buildings and the land stood at \$201,550.70, with another \$53,494.79 needed to finish those structures. The library was now estimated at \$46,847.⁴¹

John Cocke reported to Joseph Cabell that before the meeting Jefferson had been convinced that the library should not be begun because of the financial situation,⁴² but in a letter early in 1822 Jefferson restated the strategy—to complete all buildings, including the library, before opening the institution, “because, once opened the funds will all be absorbed by salaries Etc. and nothing left to compleat the buildings.” “The moment therefore of going into operation,” he wrote, “is as uncertain now as it ever was.”⁴³ Later that spring he told Madison that the Rotunda funding had become entangled in the dispute over moving the capital from Richmond to Staunton.⁴⁴ The results of the elections held later in 1822, however, promised that new legislators who were more favorably disposed toward the University and the Rotunda would be in Richmond for the next session and enhanced the possibility of funding for the Rotunda. Jefferson saw the Rotunda as “the key stone of the arch.”⁴⁵

By the fall of 1822 the Board of Visitors could report proudly that ten pavilions facing the Lawn, six hotels, and 109 dormitory rooms had been completed except for a few details. The bills for this work would have been fully paid except that some private subscriptions were still outstanding. These buildings represented all the construction that had been proposed in the Rockfish Gap report of 1818, with the exception of the library. To move ahead on that front, the Board of Visitors agreed at their October 7, 1822, meeting to direct the proctor to “enter into conferences with such skilful and responsible undertakers as he would approve, for the building of the Library, on the plan heretofore proposed, and now in his possession.” He was “to procure from them declarations of the smallest sums for which they will undertake the different portions of the work of the said building, each portion to be done as well, in materials, manner and sufficiency, as the best of the same kind of work already done in the preceding buildings, or as well and sufficiently as shall now be agreed on.” The proposals were also to include prices by line item and a phased schedule.⁴⁶

At the same meeting the Visitors approved the draft of their annual report, including in it an appeal for the means to complete the Rotunda, which was “to contain rooms for religious worship, for public examinations, for a library, and for other associated purposes.” Still fearing that opening the University would mean that the “whole income of the University will be absorbed by the salaries of the professors, and other incidental and current expenses” and would preclude further construction, the Visitors felt that “it is still better to postpone, for a while, the commencement of the institution, and then to open it in full and complete system, than to begin prematurely, in an unfinished state, and go on, perhaps for ever, on the contracted scale of local academies, utterly inadequate to the great purposes” that had been put forth in the Rockfish Gap report and intended by the state legislature. “In its imperfect state,” the annual report continued, the University would “offer little allurements to other than neighbouring students, and that professors of the first eminence in their respective lines of science, will not be induced to attach their reputations to an institution, defective in its outset, and offering no pledge of rising to future distinction.” The “present state of the funds,” the report continued, rendered the “prospect of finishing this last building indefinitely distant.” Half of the University’s income was already devoted to interest on funds that had been borrowed. If the state would forgive the loans and if the customary annual funding could be applied to the construction of the library, it could be completed in three to four years and the school then opened. Better yet, more funding would make it possible to push the library construction more quickly and open the school even sooner.⁴⁷

Jefferson sent Brockenbrough a copy of the Visitors’ resolutions of October 1822, directing him to solicit bids for constructing the Rotunda and to place a newspaper advertisement appealing to subscribers to fulfill their commitments to the school.⁴⁸ By December the proctor had secured prices from the contractors, but the news must have been somewhat discouraging: the earlier estimate of \$46,847 had not included the “two considerable appendages necessary to connect it with the other buildings,” and these terrace wings could push the estimate up by a third.⁴⁹ Some of the news was even worse. Joseph Cabell had seen a letter from contractor James Dinsmore stating that the Rotunda would cost at least \$70,000; Cabell had insisted that the letter be burned so it would not fall into the hands of the University’s enemies. While Jefferson hoped that the new legislature would be more liberal with the University than the previous one, Cabell still thought it prudent not to ask the legislature for more than \$50,000. A proposal for \$70,000, he warned Jefferson, “would probably blow up all our plans,” although a “conditional contract for \$60,000, might not do harm.” Cabell wanted to “ask boldly to be exonerated from our debts by the powerful sinking fund of the state.”⁵⁰ William Cabell Rives suggested another approach, that unappropriated funds (\$66,663.79) then held by the state Literary Fund be sought to build the Rotunda, either as a loan or a grant; once

the Rotunda was done and the University opened, he argued, the legislature could not refuse to forgive the loans. Rives urged Jefferson to send the annual report of the Board of Visitors to Richmond immediately: the “sooner we can bring the subject to the view of the Legislature, the better will be our chance of success.”⁵¹

Jefferson dispatched the report to Richmond on December 23, 1822, just four days after Rives had written, and it noted that the earlier estimate for the Rotunda had not included the cost of the terrace wings.⁵² Rives had also asked whether it would be a better strategy to push for the remission of the debt or for funds for building the library; Jefferson replied that “of all things the most important is the completion of the buildings. The remission of the debt will come of itself.” “To stop where we are is to abandon our high hopes, and become suitors to Yale and Harvard for their secondary characters, to become our first,” he wrote. The Rockfish Gap report, he reminded Cabell, “authorised us to aim at much higher things; and the abandonment of the enterprise where we are would be a relinquishment of the great idea of the legislature of 1818, and shrinking it into a country academy.” Opening the University “in a half-state of readiness,” he continued, would put it “on a subordinate character in the outset, which never would be shaken off.” Instead, “taking our stand on commanding ground at once will beckon every thing to it, and reputation once established will maintain itself for ages.”⁵³

Jefferson thought that Cabell’s “idea of a loan and placing it on the sinking fund an excellent one,” and he challenged Dinsmore’s \$70,000 estimate, saying that it was evidence of Dinsmore’s “greediness.” Jefferson stood by Brockenbrough’s carefully calculated estimate, and even with the added cost of the terrace wings Jefferson believed that “we are safe in saying that another loan of 60,000. D. will place us beyond the risk of ever needing to ask another Dollar on that account.”⁵⁴ By December 30 Cabell had drafted a bill for the loan to build the Rotunda, but he wondered about what dollar amount to propose, worrying that other members of the legislature might question the differences among the various estimates.⁵⁵ By February 5, 1823, the loan, for \$60,000, had been approved by both houses of the General Assembly.⁵⁶

A few months earlier Jefferson had written his friend Maria Hadfield Cosway that he had been spending his time “laying the foundation of an University in my native state.” “I have been myself the Architect of the plan of it’s buildings, and of it’s system of instruction,” he told her. “Four years have been employed in the former, and I assure you it would be thought a handsome & Classical thing in Italy. I have preferred the plan of an Academical village rather than that of a single, massive structure. The diversified form which this admitted in the different Pavilions, and varieties of the finest samples of architecture, has made of it a model of beauty original and unique.” There was “still one building to erect, which will be on the principle of your Pantheon a Rotunda like that, but

of half its diameter and height only.”⁵⁷ With the loan now approved, Jefferson could move ahead with that final structure.

SIGNING THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS AND BEGINNING WORK, 1823

On February 18, 1823, Alexander Garrett, the University’s bursar, wrote to John Hartwell Cocke about how Thomas Jefferson had received the good news that the General Assembly had authorized a loan of \$60,000 to the University for the construction of the Rotunda: it had given Jefferson “heart felt pleasure,” Garrett explained, with “his manner, conversation, and countenance” all depicting “the joy of a father on the birth of a first and long-wished for son; the day after receiving the news he rode to the University (for the first time he had been on horse back since breaking his wrist).” Jefferson was hoping that the workmen would be able to begin preparations for construction at the University immediately, because otherwise they would be “obliged to be looking out for other work for the season, if their employment here is not soon decided on.”⁵⁸ “The big house is still his first object,” Garrett reported.⁵⁹ John Neilson, one of the contractors at work elsewhere at the University, wrote to Cocke a few days later, confirming that he, too, had found Jefferson “in high spirits in consequence of the mony granted by the Asembly.”⁶⁰

Neilson also told Cocke that Jefferson was already busily moving ahead, “full of brickmaking ideas at present” and having already engaged, or about to engage, a superintendent for the brickyard, a “Mr. Thorn (a brick-layer who came here in partnership with Mr Ware).” Jefferson, Neilson told Cocke, had been “better pleased” with the color of the brick that were used in Pavilions II and IV.” Neilson, already worried that the construction of the Rotunda would be “an unprofitable job,” advised Cocke that all the contractors for the Rotunda should be required “to give security for the faithfull performance” of their work “to the full amount of the mony they are to receive”; when work was done imperfectly, a reduction in the price would be “but a small consolation” to the owner. A responsible guide for estimating the brickwork, Neilson stated, would be \$9 per 1,000 bricks. Perhaps somewhat obsequiously, he added that he sincerely wanted to see the work “executed in a manner that will reflect credit on all who are concerned with it”; “in short,” he wished that the construction work be “equal to the grandeur of the design, which I have never seen equaled.”⁶¹

Jefferson, according to Neilson, was well aware that the \$60,000 loan would “barely enable” workers “to close in the building and complete the exterior part of it.” Neilson consequently suggested to Cocke some cost-cutting strategies. The steps, for instance, could be built temporarily of brick, and the stonework put off “until a future day.” The basement story could be finished “in a very plain manner, that would afford ample

convenience for lecture rooms” and could be used while waiting for funds to complete the upper stories.⁶²

Jefferson was indeed ready to move ahead. Early in January 1823 he had told his fellow Visitor James Madison that if the loan bill passed, then a special meeting would be necessary, especially in order “to engage our workmen before they undertake other work for the ensuing season.”⁶³ Jefferson wrote to Madison again in late February, stating that the “acceptance of the loan” was “now approved by five of us.” He told Madison that he planned to “proceed immediately to have the workmen engaged.” Since “there are some very important points to be decided on previously to embarking in such a building,” Jefferson had tried to get Cocke “to join me in setting the thing agoing,” but Cocke could not help because he could not leave home. Since “the case admits no delay,” Jefferson wrote, he would therefore “proceed according to the best of my judgment, and with the aid of mr Brokenbrough, and with all the caution the case admits.”⁶⁴

In less than two weeks Arthur Spicer Brockenbrough, the proctor of the University, had entered into the two key contracts for the Rotunda: one with Abiah B. Thorn and Nathaniel Chamberlain, dated March 8, 1823, for the masonry work and the second with Dinsmore and Neilson, executed on March 11, 1823, for the carpentry work, including the domed roof.

The agreement with the masons stated that the University was to supply the bricks, the lime and sand for the mortar, and the scaffolding. Thorn and Chamberlain agreed “to have the work done on the following manner, viz they are not to put in the wall any samel bricks, nor to use more than one bat to five whole bricks, the bricks to be layed in what is called flemish bond that is header & Strecher alternately.” The walls were “to be solidly grouted from bottom to Top and in every course if deemed necessary by the Proctor with cement of a fourth lime and three fourth good pure sand.” The mortar for the exterior work was “to be made of a third lime and two thirds good sharp sand.” The bricks used on the exterior walls were “to be of the best rubed stretchers and equal in quality and regular colour to the fronts of the Pavilions No 2 and 4.” All walls were “to be run perfectly plum and true, under the penalty of being taken down and put up correctly by other persons” if the contractors refused to redo the work. Thorn and Chamberlain were to put up the scaffolding “in a good & substancial manner” and to leave it in place for the carpenters to use. The masons were responsible for finding the “labourers to make up the mortar and attend the brick layers.” Only “experienced and compitent workmen” were to be engaged in the laying the brick. The masons were to be paid \$2.75 for every thousand bricks laid. The measuring system used to determine payments was to follow the standard procedure at the University, “with one half of the openings deducted from the solid contents.” In a postscript to the contract, Thorn agreed to provide the “necessary

instructions” for setting up the brickyard and then to supervise the making of all the bricks for the Rotunda.⁶⁵

The contract with Dinsmore and Neilson provided similar stipulations about the carpentry and joinery. They were to provide the centering for the brick work, the framing and sheathing of the portico and the roof, the “Corinthian entablature all round complete,” the cornice, and the “stepping on the roof” at the base of the dome. They were also responsible for “All the Window frames & sashes, the two principal floors, the out side doors including the outside finishing,” the staircases, and “the wood bricks and bond timbers &c that may be required hereafter for the finishing of the inside work.” All of their work was “to be executed in the best and most substantial manner.” As in the masonry contract, the University was to provide the construction materials, but Dinsmore and Neilson were to handle the contracts for the lumber, which were to be negotiated “on the best possible terms”; they were to have the lumber “well seasoned before it’s used, to take care of the same and see that there is no unnecessary waste.”⁶⁶

Brockenbrough planned to rely upon the carpenters as inspectors of the masonry work, giving them the “right to examine into the correctness of the work as it goes on and to notify the Proctor if any thing be going on wrong in time for correction.” In addition, the brick work was “to be layed off at the commencement” by Dinsmore and Neilson, and they were “to examine the correctness of it as it progresses, and if not done agreeable to their directions to notify the Proctor in time for correction, but if any part of the brick work done agreeable to the directions of the said Dinsmore & Neilson or either of them, should be found wrong,” then they had to “pay for the necessary alteration of the brick work, including the loss of materials & labour.”⁶⁷

The pricing for the carpentry contract had taken some thought on Brockenbrough’s part and presumably some negotiation. The prices were “to be governed by the average prices of work in Philadelphia undertaken between the time of signing this contract and the completion of the work.” Two mutually-agreed-upon measurers from Philadelphia were to travel to Charlottesville to calculate the completed work; the prices were to “be fixed agreeable to the present prices of work in Philadelphia that is at the percentages above or below their price Books.” For work not covered in the price books, the measurers were to “be guided by what they shall deem justice to both parties.” In the meantime the carpenters were to receive payments periodically for their workers and themselves.⁶⁸

Brockenbrough sent the contracts off to Jefferson immediately, with a special explanation about the Dinsmore and Neilson agreement. The plan for measuring the work, Brockenbrough explained, offered advantages over other methods: it would ensure the “faithful performances of the work, by Men competent to the task”; otherwise, even reliable contractors like Dinsmore and Neilson would have had to bid high to protect

themselves, and any alterations would have proved very costly to the University.⁶⁹ Brockenbrough was betting that the current pricing in Philadelphia was then 10 to 25 percent below the price books and that there would not be much change before the Rotunda was completed. It must have been a relief to Brockenbrough when Jefferson returned the carpentry contract, agreeing with Brockenbrough's reasoning and adding that it was important to have benchmarks "at certain stages of the work to ascertain the exact state of our funds, that we may stop where they fail." Jefferson thought that bringing in measurers from Philadelphia might present "some obstruction" but expected that it could be worked out.⁷⁰

Jefferson followed up on March 12, 1823, with a letter to his fellow Visitors, telling them that he had "authorized Mr. Brockenbrough to engage the work of the Rotunda and have it commenced immediately." There were "only two bricklayers and two carpenters capable of executing it with solidity and correctness," he explained. All had limited financial resources, so instead of asking them to put up the capital for "so great an undertaking" or having the University risk giving them a 50 percent advance with little security, Brockenbrough had settled on terms that would, Jefferson thought, "make our money go the farthest possible, for good work." The contracts were "only for the hull compleat," in other words for the foundations, walls, floors, and roof.⁷¹

The construction was expected to take three years, Jefferson explained: "we can pay for it, see the state of our funds and engage a portion of the inside work so as to stop where our funds may fail, should they fail before it's entire completion." Jefferson's strategy was that once the envelope of the building was complete, then it could "rest ever so long, be used, and not delay the opening of the institution."⁷²

Madison told Jefferson that he approved Jefferson's plan, "in order to avoid a loss of time in executing the Rotunda,"⁷³ and Joseph C. Cabell, too, agreed, writing that "I am at all times disposed favorably to every thing which you think best for the University." Cabell warned Jefferson, though, that at the upcoming meeting of the Visitors Cocke might propose adopting "a course of proceeding somewhat different from the one you seem to have adopted": to pay off existing debts and then "adapt the plan of the Library to the residue of the funds." Cabell also warned Jefferson to avoid another appeal for funds to the Legislature, where, he had heard, patience with the University's building plans was wearing thin.⁷⁴

When the Visitors met on April 7, 1823, Cocke was not in attendance to present any objections, and Jefferson's plan prevailed: the Visitors agreed to accept the loan of \$60,000 from the General Assembly and to request \$30,000 of that amount immediately.⁷⁵ Jefferson had calculated that \$14,000 of that sum was needed to pay off debts and that the balance of \$16,000 was needed "for lumber & other advances for the Rotunda." Further requests would be made in January 1824 and January 1825.⁷⁶ The day after the

meeting Cabell wrote that “we had a pleasant meeting, and the Rotunda goes on, and Mr. Jefferson is delighted.”⁷⁷ At the same time Jefferson recognized that the \$60,000 loan was not enough to complete the Rotunda, and he believed that it would be “prudent to contract only for a part at a time, so as never to go beyond our funds.”⁷⁸

Meanwhile, Brockenbrough was busy lining up additional workers for the job, including slaves owned by others. Writing John Cocke on March 13, 1823, that he would like to hire from him the “one or two brick moulders and a few boys that would answer as bearers off.” Brockenbrough had estimated that, not including the terrace wings, a million bricks would be “amply Sufficient for the building.” He had already contracted for 400,000 hard bricks, with 120,000 scheduled to be ready soon, “by the time the weather will permit their being laid.”⁷⁹

By the end of the first week in April 1823 Brockenbrough was able to report to Cocke that “we have commenced making bricks and hope in one week more to get well underway.” He wrote Cocke twice again, asking him to “send up your Moulder and Six boys as soon as possible.” He had tried to get a “first rate moulder” from the North but so far without success.⁸⁰ Cocke replied that he was sending along Charles, who apparently was a brick moulder, and six “boys,” probably slaves—“Anthony, Giles, Mike, Frank, Mat, & Ben.” All except Ben had had “more or less experience in bearing off bricks.” Cocke intended that another “boy,” Gilbert, would help carpenter John Neilson; if, however, there would be an opportunity for the helper to have “occasional employment with tools,” then Cocke requested that Anthony work with Neilson, because “he is an industrious & Steady boy.” Cocke agreed to part with another moulder in about two or three months, particularly if he would gain experience laying bricks at the University.⁸¹ By the end of November 1823 Brockenbrough was able to report that so far the University had produced between 800,000 and 900,000 bricks for the Rotunda.⁸²

Brockenbrough also told Cocke that “Mr Gorman wants one or two of your stone cutters, and wishes to know on what terms you will let him have them.”⁸³ Cocke replied that his stone cutters were then busy doing work at his own properties but that they could be available after a couple of months. One, he wrote, was “adequate to cutting any plain moulding,” but the other two were only “rough hands.”⁸⁴

REFINING THE DESIGN OF THE ROTUNDA

Jefferson’s plan for the Rotunda provided that both the ground and first floors would have two large oval classrooms, one on the east side and another on the west side, with a smaller oval classroom filling in the north portions. The top floor would be a domed space, intended for the library. While traveling together after the April 7 meeting at the University, Joseph Cabell and George Loyal, a fellow Visitor, had spoken about the

planned arrangement of the classrooms. Cabell, writing later to Madison about the discussion, suggested—provided it “not interfere too much with Mr. Jefferson’s views”—that one or two of the classrooms be “fitted up with seats running around the rooms parallel to the walls & rising one above another, so that the Lecturer’s eye & voice would distinctly reach the eye & ear of every student present.” Cabell proposed that more “convenient accommodation for the greater classes of Chemistry, Natural Philosophy &c. which from their numbers require space, & from the necessity of witnessing experiments demand seats rising one above another.” This configuration was, he explained, “the approved modern construction of large lecturing rooms at the principal Universities in Europe & in this country.” The only disadvantage of such an arrangement, according to Cabell, was that the classrooms would not be appropriate for dancing, which, he thought, “should be taught rather more in the background of the scene.” Based on his observations during travel in Bologna and elsewhere in Europe, Cabell believed that the scientific apparatus itself would probably also require more space than Jefferson had allotted.⁸⁵

Jefferson responded in some detail to these suggestions. If University officials had known how many students would attend the University and what classes they would take, then the classrooms could have been designed quite precisely. However, these numbers were not known, so the lecture room in each of the professors’ pavilions had been designed, Jefferson stated, for approximately 150 students. The oval rooms in the Rotunda, on the other hand, were large enough to hold 300 students, Jefferson stated, making them “too large for the Lecturing voice.” “No human voice can be habitually exerted to the extent of such an audience,” he wrote: professors cannot be expected “to bawl daily to multitudes as our strong orators do once a year.” Instead, he thought, a large class should be divided, and the lecture repeated.⁸⁶ It is difficult to understand Jefferson’s high estimates of the capacity of these spaces.

Jefferson acknowledged that while lecture rooms for some disciplines, such as natural philosophy, chemistry, and anatomy, would “be better with rising seats,” that arrangement would be “not at all necessary for lectures in languages, history, ethics, metaphysics, belles Lettres, Law, Politics Etc.” Once it was known which classes would be held in the pavilions and which would meet in the Rotunda, then “the rising benches can be readily set up” for classrooms where the “eyes as well as the ears are to be employed.”⁸⁷ With the numbers of students uncertain, their “conjectured accommodations” would undoubtedly be found to have been “miscalculated” and “require modifications”; meanwhile, Jefferson wanted to have a plan that would “admit much facility of adaptation to varying circumstances.”⁸⁸

With regard to the space for the scientific equipment, Jefferson suggested that that the professors who offered lectures in their pavilions and needed more space should take

over an adjacent dormitory room. Of the apparatus needed to teach natural philosophy, he wrote, “even the fullest does not occupy much space, not more than may be arranged on shelves along the walls of the lecturing rooms.” The furnaces and stoves needed for experiments by the professor of chemistry could be placed “under the Oval rooms of the ground floor of the Rotunda where there will be abundant space.”⁸⁹

Meanwhile, James Dinsmore had been consulting with Jefferson about the exterior entablature of the Rotunda and the windows. Jefferson had found “no reason to substitute any other than that of my original drawing for the main entablature,” which he had based on plate 26 in the first book of Palladio [*Figure 15*]. The base was to come from plate 23 [*Figure 14*]. Jefferson noted that he had “examined carefully all the antient Corinthian in my possession, and observe that Palladio, as usual, has given the finest members of them all in the happiest combination.” Palladio’s “plates 35. [and] 36. give the handsomest entablatures for windows that I can find any where,” Jefferson continued, “but I would adopt the architrave at the left hand bottom corner of pl. 35, give it a plain frieze instead of his swelled one, and the dentil cornice at the bottom of pl. 36 [*Figures 16, 17*].” Assuming there would be no disagreement from Brockenbrough, Jefferson asked that he send word of these decisions along to Dinsmore and Neilson, who were waiting for the instructions to go ahead.⁹⁰

Over the next two weeks John Neilson was working out more specifics related to construction and studying drawings of the north façade and the “flank view.” He wrote to Jefferson in early May about exactly how high the base of the idealized sphere shown on Jefferson’s drawings should be from the actual ground level of the building. In the drawing of the north façade the “lower edge of the Architrave” was aligned with the center of the idealized sphere, making the base 10 feet high. If this height were too great, then Neilson proposed to Jefferson either elevating the idealized sphere, thereby showing a “greater portion of the roof above the Steps” of the dome, or making the portico columns taller.⁹¹ Neilson did not suggest “depressing the Sphere in the earth,” for he understood that Jefferson would not approve of that alternative. A month later Jefferson initiated a change in the hallways to eliminate the acute angles formed by the intersections of the elliptical walls of the large classrooms with the those of the small north rooms.⁹²

The top floor of the Rotunda, an open, domed space with a gallery, would house the library. In August Jefferson discovered a flaw in his design for this story, telling Brockenbrough that he had “omitted to place a door in front, opening under the Portico.” With the brick walls not yet having been built up to that level, Jefferson had fortunately noticed the mistake “in time to correct it.” He provided Brockenbrough with detailed instructions about the door: “it should be of the width of the main door below, and it’s soffite of the height of the soffites of it’s coordinated windows.” There should be a

“folding sash door so as to give light when shut,” but there should not be any type of gallery in front of the door, for such a projection “would injure the grandeur of the portico.” Instead, across the lower part of the opening there should be an “open panel either Chinese or iron.”⁹³ Brockenbrough had already had made a “stone Sill & window frame” and thought that a window would be better than such a door, but Jefferson disagreed, saying that a door would be “greatly preferable to a window both as to appearance & use, exactly such as in my parlour, except that the bottom panels had better be of wood.”⁹⁴

Jefferson’s plans for the Rotunda also included two broad, one-story wings, or terraces, each about 30 feet deep, which extended out from the portico about 80 feet to connect with the porticos of Pavilions I and II. The facades of the terrace wings were open arcades, with the interiors intended to be used as gymnasia by the students. Martha Jefferson Randolph, Jefferson’s daughter, explained to her son-in-law how in these covered areas the “young men may exercise in bad weather protected equally from the sun & the rain” and that “manual exercise will be a regular branch of their education.” This scheme, she wrote, “occurred to my Father during a fever that confined him upon the sofa. he immediately sent for Mr Brockenbrough and gave him every direction onto the plan when he was actually so weak that he could not sit up to draw it himself.”⁹⁵ John Neilson prepared a drawing of the north façade of the arcade on hand-ruled graph paper [Figure 24]; on the back of the drawing Jefferson noted in late April 1824 that there were actually nine arches rather than the eight shown.⁹⁶

COMPLETING THE MASONRY SHELL OF THE ROTUNDA, 1823

The contractors were soon at work at the construction site. Jefferson was able to tell Cabell on July 4, 1823, that “the Rotunda is rising nobly,”⁹⁷ and Brockenbrough reported at the end of July that the “walls are partly up to the upper floor.”⁹⁸ A month later Neilson reported that “the work of the Pantheon goes on rapidly” and that “we have set our last window frames.” After a visit to the construction site, Jefferson wrote on August 27 that the walls would “reach full height in the course of another month.”⁹⁹ Because the dome would transmit a strong outward thrust on the walls, the plan was to allow the masonry to cure until the summer of 1824 and then construct the dome. The interior, he thought, would take another year to complete.¹⁰⁰

Jefferson’s pride in the progress was evident in a letter that he sent to artist John Trumbull, who was planning to visit Monticello. Jefferson promised that a visit “to our university” would prove to be “well worth the trouble of your journey.” “I can assure you,” Jefferson continued, “that, as a specimen of architecture strictly classical, you will find it unrivalled in this country, and possessing the merit of pure originality in the design.”

He was eager to have it “seen and judged” by men like Trumbull. He warned Trumbull that the rotunda, the building that “is to be it’s greatest ornament, and in fact the key-stone which is to give Unity to all that is already done, will only have it’s walls compleated the present year, and will not recieve it’s roof until the next: but this your experience eye will supply.” He hoped that Trumbull would find it “a subject worthy of your pencil and of the burin of Mr. Durand,” even suggesting that “it would be a very popular print.”¹⁰¹

Meanwhile, Jefferson had compiled the annual report of the Board of Visitors to the state Literary Fund, submitting it on the same day as the Board’s fall meeting, October 6, 1823. Over the past building season the masons had completed the shell of the Rotunda, and Jefferson stated in the report that the “walls are now ready to receive their roof.” However, he also explained that since the roof was “of hemispherical form, and pressing outward in every direction, it has been thought not advisable to place it on the walls, in their present green state, but rather to give them time to settle and dry until the ensuing season, when the roof will be ready, and the walls in proper condition to receive it.” He now predicted that finishing the interior would take longer than the upcoming year.¹⁰²

The financial reports that accompanied the annual report detail the first expenses, which include payments in April and May 1823 to Martha Terrell for hauling sand, to Moses Green and others for carting brick and sand, to Thorn and Chamberlain for brick work, and to various vendors for cords of “brick wood” to fire the kilns. Beginning in May payments were made for lumber, most frequently to Robert McCulloch, and in June for scaffolding materials and installation. William B. Philips was paid \$500 for bricks in June, and John Laurence was paid \$350 for lime in July. At the end of June a ship captain was paid for “freight of 10 window sills,” and in September Thomas B. Conway was paid for 21 window sills.¹⁰³ Payments were made later that fall for flooring and other lumber, for hauling more sand and lime for mortar, to John Neilson, to Thorn and Chamberlain, for the services of blacksmith Uriah Leonard, and for one and a half tons of iron.¹⁰⁴

As 1823 drew to a close, Arthur S. Brockenbrough prepared an estimate of the annual cost of labor and recommended to Jefferson that the work force be reduced for 1824: in 1823 many of the laborers had been focused on making the upwards of 900,000 bricks needed for the walls of the Rotunda. Those workers would not be needed in 1824, he believed, “unless we go into the brick making business again the next year.”¹⁰⁵ Jefferson, however, thought the labor force should remain at the same level, since there was still a “great deal of work to be done yet on the grounds.”¹⁰⁶ Over the winter of 1823-24 payments were made for various vendors for lumber and lime, to the masons and carpenters, and to William B. Phillips for bricks.¹⁰⁷

ORDERING THE MARBLE COLUMN CAPITALS AND BASES FROM ITALY, 1823

By early September 1823 Jefferson had drafted a contract with Giacomo Raggi, an Italian sculptor who had come to do work at the University in 1819, for the ten bases for the columns of the portico and for the two “half bases” for the pilasters, and on September 8 Raggi had signed a contract with the University for this work. The bases were to be of Carrara marble, equal in quality to that in the capitals that had recently been received from Italy for the pavilions. According to the contract, the bases for the Rotunda columns were to be “proportioned to a column of three English feet in diameter, to be modeled with the utmost exactness according to the Bases of the Pantheon in Rome as drawn by Palladio in his book of architecture.” Since the columns of the Rotunda would be made of brick, the bases were to incorporate a cavetto and listel, the quarter-round, concave moulding and the narrow, flat band at the top of the base that were normally considered part of the shaft of a stone column. The bases were to be dressed, “polished and finished in the best manner,” and each base was to be carved from “a single and sound piece of Marble.” The two bases for the pilasters were to have “a front & flank with returns of ten minutes at each angle” where they joined the wall. All were to be packed well and put on board a ship for the United States by June 1, 1824. Raggi was to be paid \$65 for each column base and half that for each pilaster base.¹⁰⁸ When the Board of Visitors met on October 6, 1823, they not only confirmed this contract but also recommended that the capitals of the columns be made of Carrara marble and further suggested that the portico be paved with marble if the cost would be competitive with paving of “country stone.”¹⁰⁹

On October 8, 1823, just two days after the Visitors’ meeting, Jefferson dispatched a letter to Thomas Appleton, the U. S. consul based in Leghorn, Italy, asking him to arrange for the carving of the Corinthian capitals, which were “to be copied exactly from those of the Pantheon, as represented by Palladio. B. 4. chap. 20. pl. 60. Leoni’s edition.” Jefferson explained that the “diminished diameters” of the columns and pilasters both would be “2 feet 8 $\frac{4}{10}$ inches English measure” and sent along a sketch showing how the pilasters were to be “cut diagonally thus so as to present a front and flank each at the corner of the building.” Since the columns were to be made of brick rather than stone and therefore could not be carved, Jefferson also detailed how the astragal, including the cavetto and listel would have to be made part of each capital. In the same letter Jefferson asked Appleton to provide prices for paving the portico floor with marble tiles, each one foot square, to be “polished and accurately squared ready to be laid down.” He also asked Appleton to superintend Raggi’s work on the bases.¹¹⁰ In November 1823 the University sent Appleton \$4,000 as a progress payment for the carving of these capitals and bases.¹¹¹

Jefferson's letter did not reach Appleton for more than three months, but by February 8, 1824, Appleton had "given all the requisite instructions, to the Artist" who would be doing the carving of the twelve capitals. He carefully explained to Jefferson that each capital would weigh at least 10,000 pounds and that therefore large capitals "are never, nor Can they be work'd in a Single peice; for to Sculpture them, they must be intirely Suspended, So as to be turn'd at the will, and Convenience of the Sculptors, and to prevent any possible Contact of their foliage with any other body." "All the great Capitals of Rome and of Italy," he continued, "are of two, and many of three pieces." The capitals for the Rotunda thus would be made of two parts, with the division made horizontally, with the "upper member falling into the ornaments & foliage below." The separation, he promised, would "not be visible, even to a near examination and of consequence, to the Smallest injury, or Detriment to its beauty, or Solidity." Undoubtedly trying to forestall objections from Jefferson, Appleton pointed out that the capitals already received at the University for the pavilions were the "largest ever made, in Carrara, of a Single block." Carving the astragals, cavettos, and listels would add \$20 to the earlier estimate for each capital, and the shipping fees brought Appleton's revised estimate to \$6,140, substantially more than the \$4,000 that the University had sent to Appleton. Since the work would have to be done during the short days of two winters, Appleton thought the June 1824 shipping schedule would be difficult to meet.¹¹²

The squares of Italian marble for paving the portico would cost \$22.50 per hundred.¹¹³ In May Brockenbrough supplied Jefferson with an estimate of the marble paving that would be needed: 1,150 square feet for the portico floor and 160 square feet for the "Platform of the back Steps." Another 40 square feet should be added to the order to cover breakage, making a total of 1,350.¹¹⁴ Jefferson dispatched a letter two weeks later, on May 17, to Appleton, asking him to send 1,400 squares of marble, each one foot square.¹¹⁵

FRAMING THE INTERIOR AND THE DOME AND COVERING THE ROOF, 1824

At the end of March 1824 Brockenbrough wrote Jefferson that Dinsmore and Neilson had "proceeded to purchase scantling and have framed the upper gallery floor of the library" beneath the dome without consulting him; they were "now about to raise it," even though this work was not part of their contract. Meanwhile, Jefferson told Brockenbrough to warn Neilson and Dinsmore "that if they do any thing more than what was proposed to be first done, there will be no funds to pay for it."¹¹⁶

In any case, before the carpenters did much more, Brockenbrough wanted to suggest a change in the design of the library room to Jefferson. Brockenbrough was concerned that the upper of the two galleries, or balconies, for books would conceal part of the

dome itself; instead, he proposed a single gallery with columns 10 feet tall.¹¹⁷ With the circumference of the library room being about 229 feet and the height of the wall to the spring of the arch about 18 feet, there would be more than 4,000 square feet for bookcases with just one gallery. Jefferson told Brockenbrough that he had “considered maturely” this suggestion but nevertheless saw “no advantage in altering the original plan,” explaining that “besides the 4000 feet for presses below the entablature of the columns, we can have another tier of presses above the entablature, of one half more of the space.” Furthermore, the “original peristyle by it’s height & projection from the wall has the advantage of hiding a portion of the vault of which too much would otherwise be seen,” Jefferson stated.¹¹⁸

Jefferson was worried about how the frame for the dome would be constructed, writing to General Joseph G. Swift in May 1824 asking for help in supplying a copy of a 1576 book entitled *Nouvelles inventions pour bien bastir et a petits fraiz, trouvees n’agveres*, which illustrated Philibert DeLorme’s scheme for making the ribs of domes of laminated wood members. Jefferson explained that he had “once owned this book, and understood the principles of his invention,” but he had sold his copy to Congress and now his recollection of DeLorme’s illustration was “not particular enough in every thing”; the “workmen are strangers to it,” and, Jefferson feared, “we may go wrong.”¹¹⁹ (In notes dating from 1823 Jefferson had described “the ribs of the roof to be compleat semicircles of four thicknesses breaking joints.”¹²⁰) Swift loaned the book to Jefferson, who had consulted it and was ready to return it by June 21.¹²¹ In the end Jefferson may have relied substantially on his memory and the carpenters’ expertise, for on May 31 he had reported that work on the Rotunda was advancing well: “the frame of the roof is up, and nearly the whole wooden work ready to put up.” He expected that it would be put into condition “of safety and use this season.”¹²²

Meanwhile, Arthur Brockenbrough was busy trying to locate sheet metal for covering the roof of the dome. In response to his query, the Richmond firm of D. W. and C. Warwick told Brockenbrough that they had copper available in both 18-ounce and 20-ounce weights, but that they did not stock sheet zinc.¹²³ To install the roof Brockenbrough was planning to hire Anthony Bergamin, who, he told Jefferson, had been “strongly recommended as an excellent workman.” A Frenchman, Bergamin had installed the roof on the dome of the Richmond city hall. He was expected to arrive in Charlottesville on May 5, 1824. Since he was not very fluent in English, Brockenbrough asked Jefferson to come to the University the next day to interview him; “the job,” Brockenbrough knew, “requires a man well skilled in the working of metal.”¹²⁴

John Brockenbrough, Arthur’s brother, wrote that he had convinced the Warwick firm to sell sheet copper to the University at a substantial discount, provided that they ordered a considerable quantity. If Bergamin would use 18-ounce copper (at 10 cents a pound),

John Brockenbrough assured the proctor, “you cannot have a better covering than he will make you in this way.” Instead of gutters he advised extending the “copper over the parapet wall.” The proctor, however, was also investigating the possibility of using tinplate, which the Warwick firm offered to furnish for \$11.50 a box¹²⁵; John Brockenbrough told his brother on May 3 that “zinc might be somewhat cheaper, provided it could be procured sufficient thin, but we know nothing of its’ durability.” The University finally decided to use tin, and by June 14 Warwick had shipped to the University thirty boxes of tinplate.¹²⁶

A week later Bergamin wrote Brockenbrough that he had been delayed by work in Richmond but would leave on June 25; meanwhile, his colleague would travel to Charlottesville and could “proceed to the preparative” of the tin.¹²⁷ On June 14 Warwick had also sent along 20 sheets of copper, each measuring 30 by 60 inches and weighing 16 pounds. This may have been the “Brazier’s copper...for gutters or pipes” that Bergamin had said would be needed.¹²⁸ In early July Warwick sent another 75 sheets of brazier’s copper and 50 sheets of copper sheathing.¹²⁹ In mid-July more tin and copper were dispatched from Richmond.¹³⁰ In mid-September Bergamin was paid \$283.69 for his work on the Rotunda and another \$225.15 at the end of the month, indicating that a substantial amount of roofing work had been accomplished. Bergamin’s work included “Copper Roof Gutters, tining on Dome, Cover to Level Cornice, Cutting out Mortar to let in Tin, Gutters to Gymnasia.”¹³¹ More tin was sent from Richmond during October and November.¹³²

At their April meeting the Board of Visitors agreed that it should “take such preparatory measures as can be taken at this time” to fulfill the state government’s directive that the University “be brought into operation with as little delay as practicable.”¹³³ In a letter written a few days after the meeting Jefferson noted that the walls of the Rotunda would be “covered in within the course of the summer, and finished so far as to be in a state of safety and use until funds may occur to complete it.” The capitals and bases would not arrive until 1825, so the portico columns could not be constructed until that time.¹³⁴

On May 25, 1824, John M. Perry, a brick maker who had worked on other buildings at the University and on the serpentine garden walls, signed a contract with the University to make 300,000 “hard well shaped bricks” for \$4.50 per thousand bricks. The order included the specially shaped bricks for the Rotunda columns (to be “shaped agreeable to a mould to be furnished”) and “smooth well shaped bricks” for paving at the Rotunda and the gymnasia. Perry was to pay the proctor for the wood already gathered to fire the kilns and for the clay already dug by the University’s laborers. Perry was entitled to use the University’s brickyard, shelters, and clamps to make the bricks.¹³⁵

At the beginning of June Thorn and Chamberlain were starting “to lay bricks of the attic of the Rotunda,” and Brockenbrough had another new proposal for Jefferson: “had we not as well,” he wrote, “put reservoirs in the two North corners of the Attic by arching over the present openings, thereby making the reservoirs nearly the depth of the Attic and as large in diameter as the space will admit of.” In case of a fire, the water could be diverted “to any part of the building below the domes by pipes or hose.” He asked for Jefferson to let him know as soon as possible if he approved of this scheme. Information on whether these reservoirs were installed in 1824 was not located, but later records indicate that reservoirs were built in 1855.¹³⁶

On April 5, 1824, doubtless in conjunction with a meeting of the Board of Visitors held that day, Brockenbrough prepared a report of actual costs to date for constructing the Rotunda and of the projected expenses to complete the work. To date, Brockenbrough reported, the masonry work had cost \$9,761.72, with \$6,905.47 of that amount being for materials and the balance paid to Thorn and Chamberlain; he calculated that another \$1,000 would be needed to complete the brick work. The column bases and the capitals and the freight from Italy would cost about \$10,165. The sum of \$255 had already been paid for the stone window and door sills, and another \$1,200 would be needed “to complete the stone steps on the back & Terras Stonework.” The cost of other materials, including iron and nearly all of the lumber, so far was \$6,165. He estimated the expense of covering the roofs of the portico and the dome with tin and copper at \$2,000 and the cost of glass and glazing, including the skylight atop the dome at \$500. The total of these expenses was \$31,046.72; not included were nails, other hardware, painting, and bills from other workers, but he assumed that they would not push the cost much over \$41,000.¹³⁷

The University’s account books show that during the spring and summer of 1824 substantial amounts of lumber were procured for the Rotunda, some probably for the framing of the dome. In June a bill for sheeting plank, probably for sheathing the dome, was paid. Neilson and Dinsmore received a substantial amount, \$6,000, for their work.¹³⁸ At the end of September Uriah Leonard was paid for blacksmithing at the Rotunda.¹³⁹ John Gorman, a mason, also worked on the Rotunda in 1824, apparently on the north steps.¹⁴⁰

By September 1824, with the exterior entablature now in place, Jefferson was finally ready to order architectural ornaments for the soffit from William J. Coffee, an English sculptor working in New York City. “Composition will not stand the weather,” Jefferson noted in his letter to Coffee, “and lead is expensive. We conclude therefore in favor of the material of which you made those for us before,” probably a reference to Coffee’s “burnt composition.” He instructed Coffee that the ornaments should take the form of roses, and the design was to be copied from plate sixty in the fourth book of the Leoni

edition of Palladio, which contained details of the exterior of the Pantheon, the same plate that Jefferson had told Appleton to use for the capitals of the portico. Jefferson explained to Coffee that of the two forms of rosettes shown in that plate, he liked “the corner one best,” in which the petals were overlapped rather than being separated. He also sent along to Coffee “a paper on which the pannel to receive the rose” had been drawn to full size; it measured “6.9 wanting 1/16.” The roses, Jefferson thought, “should not quite fill” the panels. Then, he continued, “We shall plant these roses on plain panels not figured ones like those of Palladio.”¹⁴¹

Jefferson had tabulated that 330 rosettes would be needed, plus 10 or 15 more to allow for breakage. He asked Coffee to undertake them with “the greatest dispatch in your power, because the rest of the entablature is put up, and the soffite reserved till we can receive these ornaments.”¹⁴² Coffee replied that he could not “Say at the moment the time you may expect the Ornaments” but would “Say for your Satisfaction that no other business Shall Interrupt your ‘roses’ till the number is Compleat.” He requested information on the distance at which the ornaments would be seen, so that he would know how bold to make the relief.¹⁴³ Jefferson responded that the soffit was “32. f. above the floor of the portico & platform of the terrasses, and 40. f. above the level of the lawn” and explained that the rosettes “will be principally & equally viewed at these two heights.”¹⁴⁴

The Visitors gathered in Charlottesville for their fall meeting in early October 1824, and Jefferson again submitted the board’s annual report to the Literary Fund. A year ago, he noted, the walls of the Rotunda had been nearly completed, and during the present building season it “has received its roof, and will be put into a condition for preservation and use.” The interior, however, was not yet finished.¹⁴⁵

During the same meeting the Board of Visitors officially decided that the “upper circular room of the Rotunda shall be reserved for a Library,” while the “larger elliptical rooms” on the second floor were to be used for “for annual examinations, for lectures to such schools as are too numerous for their ordinary schoolrooms, and for religious worship.” Other rooms on that level could be “used by schools of instruction in drawing, music, or any other of the innocent and ornamental accomplishments of life; but under such instructors only as shall be approved and licensed by the Faculty.” A chemical laboratory was to be located in the basement, but the other rooms were not assigned. The “open apartments,” in the terraces at the ground level on each side of the portico, were set aside for “Gymnastic exercises and games of the Students,” including military exercises. The Visitors also approved a proposal that faculty could hold its meetings “in an apartment of the Rotunda.”¹⁴⁶ Later that year Brockenbrough supplied Jefferson with the dimensions of the dome: it was 27 feet 5 inches “from the top of the last step to the center of the Sky light.”¹⁴⁷

A few days after the October 1824 meeting of the Visitors, a young man en route to South Carolina, Henry Marshall, passed through Charlottesville and recorded his impressions of the buildings of the University in his diary. With regard to the Rotunda he wrote:

The rotunda is said to [be] modeled after the Pantheon at Rome. It is 75 ft in diameter & about 80 ft or more from the ground to the top of the dome. It has a portico fronting towards to the college yard. On the ground floor are two elliptical rooms 50 ft by 30 ft (guess) & one much smaller. There is the same arrangement in the second floor. The 3[rd] story with the dome is all in one. From the college yard you go up steps the whole breadth of the portico directly into the second story. From the lower story is a covered way & terrace to the dormitories. The rotunda is decidedly the most elegantly proportioned building I ever saw. It is the only public building I have seen in this country that is high enough.¹⁴⁸

ENTERTAINING LAFAYETTE AT THE UNIVERSITY, 1824

For Jefferson one of the unquestionable highlights of 1824 was the visit by the Marquis de Lafayette to Monticello and the University of Virginia as part of his sixteen-month-long triumphal tour of the U. S. The two men had not seen each other for thirty-five years. In August 1824, not long after he had arrived in New York, Lafayette wrote Jefferson that he was now “on American ground, welcomed in a manner that exceeds the power to express what I feel.”¹⁴⁹ Lafayette’s plan was to visit Boston and the Hudson Valley and then go on to Philadelphia before heading south to Virginia. In early October, as he awaited Lafayette’s visit to Charlottesville, Jefferson wrote to Thomas Appleton in Italy that the “arrival of genl. La Fayette in this country has kindled a flame of enthusiasm such as hardly ever was seen before,” with town after town presenting “manifestations of affection which shew the gratitude of our country for his former services & sacrifices.”¹⁵⁰ Jefferson’s plan was to host Lafayette and his traveling party at Monticello and entertain him with a public dinner at the University, where, Jefferson stated, the “Rotunda is sufficiently advanced to receive him.” The Rotunda, however, was far from finished. The domed roof had been completed, but the windows had not yet been glazed; Jefferson later described the building as “open and uninclosed.”¹⁵¹ The “academical village,” Jefferson explained to Lafayette, “this Athenaeum of our country, in embryo, is as yet but promise,” since it was not yet open to students.¹⁵²

Lafayette traveled from Richmond for Monticello, where he arrived on the afternoon of November 4. The next day Jefferson, James Madison, and Lafayette rode in a landau drawn by four gray horses to Charlottesville, where they were welcomed by hundreds of villagers. A procession that included the Board of Visitors, cavalry, junior volunteers, and

citizens on horseback and on foot escorted the three honored men along the road at the east side of the University to the south end of the Lawn. At the top of the Lawn stood the Rotunda, where one eyewitness stated, the “first objects that struck the view, were three flags floating on the top of the Rotunda.” The largest flag read “Welcome our Country’s Guest.” The procession, on foot, then “moved slowly up the lawn to the steps of the Rotunda, the General gracefully bowing to the ladies as he passed.” An official walked down the steps of the Rotunda to address Lafayette, calling the University “their future temple of literature and of science” and “a fruit of our glorious revolution.” Lafayette responded that he was very pleased “to receive the kind welcome of the citizens of Albemarle. . .under the beautiful pantheon of this rising University.”¹⁵³

Lafayette, having rested for a short while in the “apartments prepared for him,” then “walked on the terraces, among the ladies” along with Jefferson and Madison. At three o’clock the party climbed the stairs to the top floor of the Rotunda, where four hundred people were gathered for a dinner. The tables were arranged in three concentric circles, and over Lafayette’s seat was an arch of laurel, “entwined around two columns, that supported the gallery.” The first toast to Lafayette was enthusiastically cheered, and the “lofty dome of the Rotunda re-echoed back the sound,” rolling “in billowy volumes around the spacious Hall, and sunk in the deep stillness of enthusiasm.”¹⁵⁴

Scores of other toasts followed. In responding to the toast in his honor Jefferson recounted how, during his service as America’s minister to France, Lafayette proved to be his “most powerful auxiliary and advocate”; Jefferson urged the guests to honor Lafayette “as your benefactor in peace, as well as in war.” Lafayette, “moved to tears,” grasped Jefferson’s hand and “sobbed aloud.” James Dinsmore, the contractor, offered another toast to Jefferson as the founder of the University. The banquet concluded at six o’clock, and a hundred cavalymen escorted Jefferson, Madison, and Lafayette back to Monticello.¹⁵⁵ Writing to his family in France a few days later, Lafayette mentioned the “beautiful and good university,” whose establishment and construction was occupying “the honorable old age of our illustrious friend.”¹⁵⁶

OPENING THE UNIVERSITY BUT NOT THE LIBRARY, 1825

While the construction of the Rotunda had been “sufficiently advanced” to receive Lafayette in November 1824, many components were still incomplete. A month after the festivities, for example, Jefferson was still prodding William Coffee to deliver the rosettes for the soffit. Jefferson complained to Coffee that the “whole scaffolding of the building is obliged to be kept standing only to enable the workmen to put up these small ornaments.” The University would “certainly be opened” to students on February 1, 1825, Jefferson wrote, and it was essential that the Rotunda be finished.¹⁵⁷

Coffee replied from New York that the ornaments were ready to be packed and shipped; he had made the quantity ordered (the 330 actually needed with 15 extras “to meet Chances” on site) and was also sending an extra 10 to cover any breakage by the shippers. Coffee thought it unnecessary to provide any instructions for the University’s craftsmen, except to say that it would be “proper to use round headed Screws for the purpose of Putting them up” and thus avoid splitting the rosettes during installation. If other types of screws were used, he explained, then the “heads must be filed off on the Side.”¹⁵⁸ Coffee claimed that the rosettes were “very hard and will be found to last as long as any Part of the Building.” The ornaments were shipped on December 29 and evidently arrived safely: Coffee was reimbursed \$45.67 a month later, probably for freight,¹⁵⁹ and another \$150 in April 1825 “for composition ornaments for rotunda.”¹⁶⁰

The tin roofing was also presenting problems. In March 1825 John Brockenbrough wrote from Richmond to his brother the proctor that roofer Anthony Bergamin had told him that the “roof was perfectly tight during the September rains, and that the leaking must be owing to the screws, since put in the Tin, to fasten the supports to the steps raised around the base of the Dome.” Bergamin also alleged that “he remonstrated against perforating the tin when he was about the work” and now believed that the “roof will never be secure unless the steps are covered with metal.”¹⁶¹

Meanwhile, Jefferson was becoming anxious that the university would not be able to meet its goal of opening on February 1, 1825, since three of the professors had not yet arrived in Charlottesville.¹⁶² Jefferson was at last able to report that while the delay had prompted some students to enroll elsewhere, “we began on the 7th of March with between 30. and 40” students; since then, he continued, “they have been coming in and are still coming almost daily. They are at this time 65.” He confided that he hoped “they may not get beyond 100 this year, as I think it will be easier to get into an established course of order and discipline with that than with a greater number.”¹⁶³

The window glass for the Rotunda arrived at about the same time as the students. The windows had not been glazed at the time of Lafayette’s celebratory dinner the prior November, and in April 1825 Jefferson described the building as still being “open and unenclosed,” in part because of a mix up with the University’s order at the glass factory.¹⁶⁴ In early January 1825 Thomas May, the Richmond-based agent of the Boston Glass Manufactory, told Brockenbrough that he had just received nineteen boxes of glass; the order included 236 panes measuring 16 by 12 inches, 354 panes measuring 15 by 12 inches, and 176 panes measuring 20 by 13 inches. They were shipped to Charlottesville that same month. By mid-February Brockenbrough had returned the four boxes of 20-by-13-inch glass, and May acknowledged that the factory had made a mistake while “making the transfer of the order to their order Book, there putting it down 20 x 13 instead of 14 x 12.” By March the 14-by-12-inch replacement lights had arrived in

Richmond, along with 24 other pieces to replace glass that had been broken en route and a crate of 6 sheets of double-thick glass, perhaps to be used in the skylight.¹⁶⁵ Another shipment was made in late July, three boxes of double crown glass “Cut to pattern,” which included 2 pieces measuring 21 by 14, 16 pieces measuring 18 by 14, 16 pieces measuring 17 by 12, 1 piece at 14 by 10 inches, 12 pieces at 13 by 9 inches, 5 pieces 12 by 9 inches, and 3 larger sheets; since it was cut into some special sizes, some of this glass may have been intended for the skylight.¹⁶⁶

On August 15, 1825, Benjamin Blackford, of the Isabella Furnace, submitted an invoice for 104 large sash weights, another 34 sash weights that apparently were somewhat larger, some of which may have been intended for the Rotunda. Blackford also shipped “6. Boxes with grates,” perhaps to be used in the fireplaces in the Rotunda and in the chemical ovens.¹⁶⁷

Despite the arrival of the students the domed library room in the Rotunda was not yet finished. At their March 5, 1825, meeting the Visitors agreed that once more funds were received, then up to \$6,000 should be advanced “for the purpose of finishing the interior of the library room.”¹⁶⁸ Soon after the meeting Jefferson wrote Brockenbrough that it would be “worse than useless to procure books without a place to arrange them in.” It would be acceptable, he thought, to use other government funds for bookshelves, tables, and “other necessaries for the library room.”¹⁶⁹ James Dinsmore and John Neilson estimated the cost of finishing the woodwork in the library at about \$3,000; in addition the columns would cost about \$2,000, and the plastering and painting another \$1,000.¹⁷⁰

In January 1825 Jefferson had told Cabell that it would cost another \$25,000 to complete the Rotunda.¹⁷¹ A week after the Visitors’ March 1825 meeting, Jefferson, ill and very worried about the overall finances of the University, asked Brockenbrough to bring to Monticello the data needed to prepare a financial report of past and projected expenses and income.¹⁷² Jefferson drafted the report on March 15, and it included \$3,000 still outstanding to be sent to Italy for the marble capitals, bases, and pavement and the \$6,000 to finish the library room.¹⁷³

THE ARRIVAL OF THE ITALIAN MARBLE CAPITALS AND BASES, 1825

Jefferson had written to Appleton in mid-May 1824, urging him to superintend Raggi in his work on the bases of the columns. Jefferson wanted to have the bases delivered to Charlottesville during that same summer so that the workers could “get up our columns this season” and so that the “columns may have time to settle before their Capitels are put on them.”¹⁷⁴ Raggi finally arrived in Leghorn in May, penniless and in debt, but with an “ardent Desire” to carve the bases, and Appleton told Jefferson that they would probably be finished in August. Raggi made good progress in the first weeks, but one

June evening while asleep in a chair after supper, he tumbled to the floor, breaking his clavicle and becoming unable to use his arms for several months. Appleton therefore directed his own sculptor to proceed with the bases and hoped they would be ready to be shipped, along with the marble paving squares, in October. The capitals would be finished in February 1825 and would probably arrive in Charlottesville in May; thus, Appleton told Jefferson, the bases and columns “will follow each other in just proportion of time.”¹⁷⁵ Jefferson, recognizing that another building season had been lost, reluctantly told Appleton in October 1824 that if the bases did not come until the spring of 1825, “we must be content,” but he hoped that by then also the “capitals and paving squares will be coming to us.”¹⁷⁶ In an update posted to Jefferson in October Appleton reported that the capitals were moving along “fully to my satisfaction” and asked Jefferson to send him an urgently needed progress payment.¹⁷⁷

Thomas Appleton had dispatched a letter from Leghorn to Jefferson on May 12, 1825, announcing that the marble elements for the Rotunda were finally complete. On board the first ship, the *Caroline*, were nineteen cases holding 1,400 marble tiles for paving, and another twelve cases containing the bases for the columns and pilasters. Appleton, who had taken the responsibility of engaging his own sculptor to carve the bases when Raggi was not able to fulfill his contract, paid his sculptor half of his usual fee and hoped that Jefferson would not object to that additional cost. A second vessel, the *William Gray*, also bound for New York, would carry the capitals, which Appleton boasted, “are pronounc’d by the most intelligent, of uncommon beauty of marble, & Superior workmanship” and would “be found of a Superior Stile of workmanship, to any in the United States.”¹⁷⁸ They had been packed, Appleton told Jefferson, “with most extraordinary care & Attention; they are so firmly fix’d inside the Cases, with appropriate Supports of wood, that it is impossible they should move a hair’s breadth—they might even be rol’d over, like a barrel, if there was necessity, without Danger of injury.” As the time for sailing approached, however, the captain of the *William Gray* refused to carry the crates with the capitals, having seen “their great size & weight.” In June Appleton finally convinced the master of the brig *Tamworth* to accept them, but he was bound for Boston, not New York, resulting in more delay.¹⁷⁹

Three months passed before the paving squares and the column bases had safely crossed the Atlantic. Jefferson had written Brockenbrough in late July 1825 that the bases should be arriving soon and advised him that “everything should therefore be got in readiness to run up the columns immediately.”¹⁸⁰ He alerted Brockenbrough at the end of August 1825 that the bases were now in New York and warned that transporting the marble from Richmond to Charlottesville would be “extremely difficult and expensive” and that “special measures should be provided for it.” The marble itself would weigh

thirty tons, plus the heavy cases. He instructed Brockenbrough to ship the marble bases first, so that “instantly on their arrival” workers could start work erecting the columns.¹⁸¹

In early September 1825 Henry A. S. Dearborn, son of Jefferson’s Secretary of War and collector of customs at Boston, wrote Jefferson that the *Tamworth* had arrived in Boston with the capitals, “nicely packed, in strong boxes,” and that he would “ship them by the first vessel, bound to Richmond” with instructions that they should “be handled with great caution.” Appleton had told Dearborn that the capitals “will be found, probably inferior in dimensions, but certainly equal in architectural perfection, to any in the U.S., & that they were copied from those of the Pantheon at Rome.”¹⁸² By September 20 the capitals were aboard the schooner *General Jackson* en route to Richmond. Since he considered this “a boisterous Season of the year,” Dearborn had taken out insurance on the capitals.¹⁸³ Dearborn also told Jefferson that he thought that Congress should exempt the University from all of the import duty on the capitals just as it would duty on books, philosophical apparatus, and sculpture imported for schools of higher learning; he felt that “while they are to embellish the University,” they would also “present Superb models of antient Architecture.”¹⁸⁴ The University paid \$885.08 on October 17, 1825, for the freight and related charges incurred at Boston.¹⁸⁵

The Board of Visitors passed a resolution in October 1825 to petition Congress for a remission of not only a new fifteen percent duty imposed on imported marble (arguing that the capitals had been ordered before the duty was enacted) but also from the preexisting duty as well, in the interests of “a just encouragement to science.” The Visitors agreed to execute a bond for the duties due in order to have time to make an application to Congress, but at the same time they also ordered the proctor to have funds available to pay the duty, in case their application failed.¹⁸⁶ In November 1825 Jefferson was still expecting that the federal government would be charging a tariff of \$2,700 for the capitals and bases, but a few months later he received word from Washington that Congress had approved the remission of all of the duty on the marble.¹⁸⁷ The Visitors intended to authorize the purchase of a clock and bell, to be placed in the Rotunda, if the duty was retracted.¹⁸⁸ It had been two years since Jefferson had written Appleton to order the capitals, and now another building season had passed, precluding the construction of the portico until 1826.

SECURING A BELL AND A CLOCK FOR THE ROTUNDA

Meanwhile, Jefferson pushed ahead with other tasks to complete the Rotunda. In April 1825 he contacted Joseph Coolidge Jr., who lived in Boston and was married to Jefferson’s granddaughter, asking for help with securing a bell; Jefferson wrote that it was his understanding that the “art of bellmaking is carried to greater perfection in

Boston than elsewhere in the U.S.” He explained that the University needed a bell that could “*generally* be heard at the distance of 2 miles, because this will ensure it’s being *always* heard in Charlottesville.” A larger bell would be unnecessary: greater size would only “add to it’s weight, price and difficulty of management.”¹⁸⁹

Jefferson had drawn up specifications for the bell, as well as for a clock, for the Rotunda, and sent them along to Coolidge. The bell was to weigh 400 pounds and be capable of being heard “with certainty” for one and a half miles, as he had explained to Coolidge. The face of the clock was to be made of metal and be approximately 6 feet 2 inches in diameter; it was to be placed in the tympanum of the south portico. The dial plate was to be about 5 feet in diameter. The weights for the clock were to be about 100 feet long; they were to extend straight back for about 30 feet, then turn at a right angle for about 21 feet, and then descend through a 5-foot-diameter hole for 50 feet. The rope for ringing the bell was to follow a similar path on the opposite side of the portico.¹⁹⁰

Joseph Coolidge replied in August 1825 that the clock would cost \$800; he had obtained this price from “the best clock-maker in this place,” Simon Willard, who had made clocks for Harvard College and for the House of Representatives. He promised to produce “as good a clock as can be found in america”; the movement would be made “of purest brass, and of cast steel.” It would take two months to manufacture, and Willard would travel to Charlottesville to install it.¹⁹¹ Jefferson, disappointed, replied that the cost was beyond the present means of the University, especially if Congress insisted on collecting the duty on the Italian capitals and bases for the portico, so the University would be “obliged therefore to do without until our funds are improved.”¹⁹² As an interim measure Jefferson directed Brockenbrough to hang a “temporary bell” atop Pavilion VII, which was being used as the interim library, and to place a clock in the same building with its “face so near the window as that it’s time may be read thro’ the window from the outside.”¹⁹³

Jefferson had promised that the contract for the clock would go to Willard, hopefully in February 1826, but it was spring before Jefferson knew that Congress had remitted the duty on the marble.¹⁹⁴ In May he told John Cocke that “we are now to take measures as to the clock”¹⁹⁵ and at about the same time reported to Brockenbrough that he was prepared to “write to Boston to engage a clock and bell”; first, though, he needed “very exact measures of the dimensions of the tympanum” and “the diameter & depth of the well, for the descent of the weights.”¹⁹⁶ On June 4, 1826, just a month before his death, Jefferson told Coolidge that he was “now authorised to close with mr Willard for the undertaking of the clock” and asked Coolidge to act as the University’s intermediary for this project, to “abridge the labors of the written correspondence, for there will be many minutiae which your discretion can direct, in which we have full confidence, and shall confirm as if predirected.”¹⁹⁷

In less than three weeks the arrangements had been confirmed, and Jefferson confirmed to Brockenbrough that “Mr Willard undertakes our clock, and, without regard to price, says that it shall be as good a one as the hand of man can make.” Willard would travel to Charlottesville to “set it up, observing that the accuracy of the movement of a clock depends as much on it’s accurate and solid setting as on it’s works.” He would also purchase a bell on behalf of the University, estimating that one weighing 400 pounds would be sufficient. The total cost, Jefferson estimated, would be about \$1,000, with \$800 for the clock, \$150 for the bell, and the balance for Willard’s travel expenses. The work was to be finished in September 1826.¹⁹⁸ This letter may have been Jefferson’s last written communication about the University.

MORE WORK ON THE INTERIOR, 1825

Arthur Brockenbrough, meanwhile, was trying to complete the interior of the Rotunda. In June 1825 he asked Jefferson about how he wanted to safeguard the entrance to the library room: did Jefferson want to have a “partition around the well hole of the Stairs and a door in the front of landing or a lobby extending to the rear of the columns next the stairs?”¹⁹⁹ Jefferson replied that the “wells of the staircases are to be secured by a ballustrade” and sent along “a very beautiful form of a balluster” to be used there and on the staircases.²⁰⁰ Brockenbrough, though, felt that Jefferson had not understood the security issues related to the library, so he wrote to Jefferson again, explaining that “without a partition at the head of the stairs any person entering the building, will have free access to the Library.” People using the basement classrooms, he pointed out, would be able to mount the stairs and gain easy access to the books at times when the library was closed. It would be necessary, Brockenbrough wrote, to have some arrangement “to prevent any & every person from Enteri[n]g except with the Librarian,” but no response from Jefferson has been located.²⁰¹ At the end of June 1825 Thomas Fadley was paid \$16.50 “for turning executed for the rotunda, &c.,” perhaps for these balusters.²⁰²

Meanwhile, Dr. John Emmet, the chemistry and natural history instructor, stated that he was “much dissatisfied” with the proposed facilities for his laboratory and lecture space in the Rotunda. He first suggested that a separate building having a lecture room and a wing with a furnace be constructed, but this proposal did not meet with approval. Looking again at the Rotunda, Emmet maintained that the small room that had been set aside for his laboratory would “not answer the purpose for the want of room & light.”²⁰³ Jefferson acquiesced to Emmet’s appeal that he have use of both large oval rooms in the basement, writing that they should be “arranged as he pleases for his chemical purposes.” One of the basement oval rooms had been intended for use as a museum, but Jefferson now told Brockenbrough that the museum could simply be moved to one of the

upper oval rooms.²⁰⁴ These changes were evidently not finished at the end of 1825, for Emmet told Brockenbrough in January 1826 that the space “should be looked to—the tin-man promised most seriously to have the stove-pipe made & put up—as well as the dampers, grate-doors &c—In raising the Stove pipes—let him secure the hanging shelf with Sheet iron—he may then fasten the pipe to the shelf.”²⁰⁵ Charles Bonnycastle, professor of natural philosophy, wished to use a lecture room in the Rotunda, rather than in his pavilion, so that his students could see experiments being done with instruments; he also needed a secure room in the Rotunda for storing the valuable instruments, so they would not have to be carried back and forth from his pavilion for each lecture. Despite the sanction of the Board of Visitors for this work and the fact that it was a minor request, the work was still not complete in April 1826, when Bonnycastle complained to Brockenbrough that “No preparations are yet making for plastering—or, I believe, for any thing else.”²⁰⁶

Jefferson and Brockenbrough were also busy with arrangements for the decoration of the dome room. This matter had been on Jefferson’s mind for some time: two years earlier, in October 1823, for instance, Jefferson had told Thomas Appleton that “40. Composite capitels of *wood*, for columns whose diminished diameters are 15 11/16 Inches English, to be copied from Palladio B. 1. c. 18. pl. 30.” would be needed for the library room of the Rotunda.²⁰⁷ Appleton, however, rebuffed this idea, recommending marble or mastic-covered columns because they would be more durable; furthermore, he wrote, “in no temple, or public edifice I have Seen, are there any Capitals of wood.—in the interior of all our churches in Italy, there are columns of brick or Stone, over which, is cover’d a mastic, which imitates So precisely every Species of marble, that it is utterly impossible, without being prob’d, to Distinguish, if they are marble, or of mastic.” The cost, however, would be 100 dollars each, making a total of \$4,000 for the carving alone. Even forty wooden columns, which would cost \$44 each to carve, would be expensive.²⁰⁸

In June 1824 Brockenbrough had written to Philip Sturtevant of Richmond about carving composite capitels of wood for the library. Sturtevant was eager to do the work, proposing to carve the capitels including the “Neck Moulding in Every respect Out of the Best Timber and in the Best Manner” after plate thirty in the first book of Palladio. Sturtevant was so interested in the project that he begged Brockenbrough not to award the contract to anyone else without contacting him first; despite his “Extremely Low” price of “Seventy five Cents Per inch Measured By Girting the Collum or Capital at the Neck,” he would do the work at a lower price “Rather than Miss of the Job.”²⁰⁹

Sturtevant finally began work in 1825, telling Brockenbrough in June that he had been very fortunate in securing white pine from Maine for the capitels; he had already measured the “Smallest Part” of the column as being 14-3/4 inches, but asked that Brockenbrough or Neilson confirm that dimension to him. In the same letter Sturtevant

reported that he had already “Drawn the Capital and Shall Commence Cutting up my Stuff tomorrow.”²¹⁰ He was paid \$500 in February 1826 and another \$700 in August for the capitals.²¹¹ He told Brockenbrough in November of that year that he had “never worked so Hard in all My Life Before” and had “Worked Nights till 12 and 1 Oclock Even in July and August until I Got them done.”²¹²

Other architectural ornaments for the museum room were discussed with William J. Coffee, whose composition rosettes had been installed in the soffits outside. Joseph Antrim, who had done much of the plastering at the University, had visited Coffee in New York early in the summer of 1825, bringing along drawings of the work to be done in the Rotunda. Coffee then provided prices for composition and lead elements for a Corinthian cornice, including husks, leaves, rosettes, and ox skulls.²¹³ Brockenbrough told Jefferson that Antrim had reported after his trip to New York that “there is so little of that kind of work done there, he could not find any other person in the habit of making composition-work.”²¹⁴ Jefferson, however, suggested that if Brockenbrough thought Coffee’s prices were “extravagantly high,” then he might be able to locate other “workmen in that line” in Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, or even Boston. He also suggested that a motif incorporating “the spread eagle of Delorme would be best.”²¹⁵

Coffee, meanwhile, had been offered a contract to make ornaments for a new cathedral in Montreal and pressed both the proctor and Jefferson for a decision on the work for the Rotunda.²¹⁶ Having learned from Jefferson that Brockenbrough thought his prices were too high, Coffee wrote the proctor in September that while his proposal was “not higher than w[h]at such work commands at this time in this city,” he would offer a discount of twenty percent, because he had “done all the other ornaments” and “should not wish that any other work of this kind [be] introduced in the University.”²¹⁷ Brockenbrough was eventually able to eke out an even better deal with Coffee, boasting to Jefferson that he had negotiated a fifty-percent discount. Coffee now proposed that he would “execute those Ornaments [for] the whole of the frieze (except a very small Part of the small Parts),” as well as the rosettes in his “Burnt Composition.” The leaves of the modillions would be of “thick Lead.” He was eager to move ahead, since the project would take him three months, and he already had commitments for other projects beginning in March 1826.²¹⁸ Brockenbrough still hesitated, though, wondering whether the expenditure “would be prudent or not in the present low state of our finances.”²¹⁹ Coffee had not mentioned the spread-eagle motif, but in October, soon after Coffee had submitted his revised proposal, Jefferson had made a note to Brockenbrough “get Ne[i]lson’s drawing of the Eagle ornament for Frize.”²²⁰ Documents on whether or not the University proceeded with a contract with Coffee for this interior work were not located.

In September 1825 Jefferson had sent Brockenbrough a list of questions pertaining to various University matters. One question dealt with the amount of money needed to complete the Rotunda. Brockenbrough replied that \$42,000 had been spent so far, “exclusive of the circular room,” and that another \$15,000 would be needed to complete it.²²¹ As the year drew to a close, Jefferson acknowledged that he was failing in tracking financial matters: “I have so completely lost sight of our accounts that I do not understand these papers,” he told Brockenbrough, “and must hereafter depend entirely on your self and the committee of accounts for such general statements as it may be necessary to give to the public.”²²² Jefferson’s fragile health had also precluded his attending the reception at the University and the “sumptuous dinner” in the Rotunda when General Lafayette returned to Charlottesville late in August 1825.²²³

At the end of 1825, as he compiled his annual expenses for the University, Brockenbrough again proposed to Jefferson that the labor force be reduced, noting that in the past year workers at the University had made 800,000 to 900,000 bricks for the Rotunda. The University’s accounts for 1825 show substantial expenditures for lumber and for masonry, including payments to bricklayers Thorn and Chamberlain in March and April. Contractors Dinsmore and Neilson were paid \$2,000 in September 1825. Other expenses, in addition to the costs related to the Italian marble, included tin work done by James Clarke, plastering by Joseph Antrim, and \$1,000 paid to D. W. & C. Warwick for tin, copper and other supplies.²²⁴

The 1825 annual report to the Literary Fund stated that the “indispensable” uses for the spaces in the Rotunda at that time were the library, two rooms for the chemical Laboratory, a museum of Natural History, and a room “for examinations, for accessory schools and other associated purposes.” At the time of the report, early October 1825, Jefferson wrote that, along with an anatomical hall, the university was “endeavouring to put them into a bare state of use, although with some jeopardy as to the competence of the funds.”²²⁵ The 1822 annual report of the Board of Visitors stated that the Rotunda was intended to be used for religious worship; this topic was brought up again in 1824, but by 1825 Jefferson had changed his mind and dissuaded Brockenbrough from pursuing any use of University buildings for religious gatherings.²²⁶

JEFFERSON’S FINAL PUSH TO COMPLETE THE ROTUNDA, 1826

The dome room was still not operational as the library during the winter of 1825-26, and Jefferson was impatient, writing Brockenbrough on January 3, 1826, that “it is high time to have our bookcases in hand, and to be pressed as the books cannot be opened until the shelves are ready to receive them.” He had recently learned that the books from France had already arrived in New York and been shipped on to Richmond.²²⁷ With little hope of

winning additional funds from the Virginia General Assembly, Jefferson wrote Joseph C. Cabell in early February that he had gone “immediately to the University and advised the Proctor, to engage in no new matter which could be done without, to stop every thing unessential in hand, and to reserve all his funds for the book room of the Rotunda and the Anatomical theatre.” “Till the latter is in condition for use there can never be a dissection of a single subject,” Jefferson wrote, “nor until the bookroom and cases be completely done can we open another box of books.” Crates of books were arriving from abroad and piling up: “we have now 5 boxes on hand from Paris unopened, 5 more from the same place are supposed to be arrived in Richmond, 7. from London are arrived at Boston, and a part of those from Germany are now in Boston,” Jefferson wrote. Still more boxes were expected, and they all had to “remain unopened until the room is ready, which unfortunately cannot be till the season will admit of plaistering.” Moreover, Jefferson continued, the “joiner’s work goes on so slow that it is doubtful if that will be ready as soon.”²²⁸ Between November 1825 and March 1826 Thomas Fadley was paid \$108 for “turning columns” and other turning for the library room.²²⁹

In April 1826 Jefferson was charged with the task of telling Brockenbrough that the Board of Visitors was losing confidence in him. Apologizing for being the bearer of the news, Jefferson wrote that the Visitors were “not satisfied with the slowness with which the buildings have been conducted the last year, and particularly with respect to the Library, and the Anatomical theatre,” which, they thought, “ought to have been done before this, the books remaining packed so long in their boxes it may be feared are at this time, in a progressing course [of] injury, in add[ition] to the loss of their use to the Professors & Students.” “A greater force of workmen,” he continued, “ought to have been employed, and it is now requested that all which can be employed be immediately put into action first for the completion of the Library room & Shelves, and next the Anatomical building.” Furthermore, transporting the marble capitals to Charlottesville called “pressingly for exertion.”²³⁰

Jefferson expanded on his views about the slowness of the work in a letter of May 20, 1826, to John Cocke: he was “extremely dissatisfied” with the “pain in which our works at the University are going on, and were it not for my great confidence in the integrity of those we employ, I should be unable to resist the suspicion of a willingness in them to make the job last for life.” Jefferson was too ill to visit the University as frequently as he felt was necessary, so he sent along to Cocke “some notes of things of strong urgency” and urged him to come to Charlottesville to review the situation. Even though Jefferson found himself “always injured by the ride there,” he still hoped to accompany Cocke and “endeavor to apply a spur to those needing it.”²³¹

The crates packed with the marble bases and capitals had finally made their way to Virginia; payments for freight were made in February and April 1826, but they still had

not been installed. Jefferson wrote Brockenbrough in early May that the bases should be hauled first and then he should get the “bricklayers immediately to begin the columns.” Then, while the shafts were being built, the capitals could be hauled up to the University.²³²

Meanwhile, by the spring of 1826 the roof on the Rotunda was leaking. Jefferson told Cocke that “the Dome leaks so that not a book can be trusted in it until remedied.” Jefferson’s own opinion was that it would be best to install “another cover of tin laid on the old one.” He felt strongly that A. H. Brooks, of Staunton, “whose competence to it we know,” should be employed for the repairs, not the original installer, Anthony Bergamin, telling Brockenbrough that “we ought not to trust to people of whose skill we know nothing, the ignorance of the Frenchman is what costs us a new roof.” Jefferson estimated that the price of a new roof would be \$800 to \$900.²³³

At the end of May Jefferson drew up a list of instructions for Brockenbrough. Included was the directive that he was to hire Brooks “to come immediately & put another cover of tin on the Dome-room of the Rotunda, without disturbing the old one.”²³⁴ Brockenbrough carried out this order in a timely manner, asking Brooks to come to Charlottesville and to give him a price for the work. Brooks replied immediately, telling Brockenbrough that he could not provide an estimate because he had never “done any work of the kind” and because he would need to see “what is to be done.” Brooks suspected that the “old Covering must Come off,” but in the end he may have simply patched it, for the annual reports show that in August 1826 he was paid only \$23.86 for “covering the dome of the Rotunda,” much less than what a complete new covering would have cost.²³⁵ Meanwhile, in June 1826, the University purchased ten boxes of tin plates “of the next quality better than those formerly Sent.”²³⁶

As soon as the roof was repaired, Jefferson wrote, the completion of the dome room was “to be pushed by every possible exertion.”²³⁷ He instructed Brockenbrough that “we must cover the ill appearance of the plaistering,” evidently meaning the water stains on the interior surface of the dome, “by a whitewash, either of lime or Spanish white.”²³⁸ In another document Jefferson wrote that the plaster ceiling was then “to be coloured uniform with Whiting.”²³⁹ These instructions are at variance with Jefferson’s undated notes specifying that the “Concave cieling of the Rotunda is proposed to be painted skyblue and spangled with gilt stars in their position and magnitude copied exactly from any selected hemisphere of our latitude.” Jefferson had provided detailed instructions on how to determine each star’s “exact position” and specifications for “a seat for the Operator movable and fixable at any point in the concave.” However, the planetarium scheme was apparently not carried out.²⁴⁰

Visitor John Cocke and Alexander Garrett drew up a statement of anticipated expenses for the University at the end of May 1826. Among the items included were

\$120 for William Phillips to build the portico columns of brick, \$100 for John Gorman to install the bases and capitals, and \$500 for Joseph Antrim, the plasterer, to put a smooth finish on the columns.²⁴¹ Antrim was paid \$350 for plastering at the Rotunda in July 1826.²⁴² Payments were made for lumber in the spring and summer of 1826.²⁴³ Other payments that may have been for work at the Rotunda included \$2,000 in April and another \$1,000 in July to Dinsmore and Neilson.²⁴⁴

Jefferson had been in ill health for much of the time that the Rotunda was being built, often unable to travel from Monticello to the University to follow the construction progress or to meet with the proctor and the contractors. Writing from Monticello in late October 1825 Jefferson described his current condition to an acquaintance: “Eighty two years old, my memory gone, my mind close following it 5. months confined to the house by a painful complaint, which, permitting me neither to walk nor to sit, obliges me to be constantly reclined, and to write in that posture, when I write at all.” “The little of the powers of life which remains to me,” he continued, “I consecrate to our University. If divided between two objects it would be worth nothing to either.”²⁴⁵

Five months later, in early March 1826, Jefferson told architect Robert Mills, who would later design the annex to the north of the Rotunda, that his “health is quite broken down.” For the past ten months he had “been mostly confined to the house, and now nearly ending my 83d. year, my faculties, sight excepted are very much impaired.” Problems with his wrists meant he could “write but slowly & laboriously.” Nevertheless, he invited Mills to visit Charlottesville: “I wish your travels should some day lead you this way, where from Monto. as your headquarters, you could visit and revisit our Univy 4 miles distant only. The plan has the two advantages of exhibiting specimens of every fine model of every order of architecture purely correct, and yet presenting a whole new and unique.”²⁴⁶

Jefferson died four months later, on July 4, 1826. His death, James Madison, the new Rector, wrote, “clothed the whole land in mourning” and had fallen “with peculiar force” on the University. Even in retirement, Jefferson had not ceased “to cherish that love of country and of liberty, which had been the ruling principle of his life.” “Reflecting more particularly on the great truth, that as no people can be happy but with a free government, so no government can long be free, without knowledge for its conservative element,” Madison wrote, Jefferson had “determined to close his illustrious career, by devoting the resources of his genius and his vast acquirements, to the erection of this monument to science and liberty: indulging to the last hour of his protracted existence, the gratifying confidence that under the auspices of the State to which it was dedicated, it would more than re-pay whatever might be done for it, by the lights it would diffuse, and the characters it would rear, for the service and the ornament of the republic.”²⁴⁷

True to his 1805 promise, Jefferson had bequeathed his library to the University and had also stated less formally that a “marble bust of him by Caracchi, with the pedestal and truncated column on which it stands, should be presented to the institution.” However, according to his grandson Thomas J. Randolph the “deeply embarrassed state in which his affairs were left” meant that Jefferson’s assets would not be adequate to cover his debts. Because he was fearful that settling the estate would “leave the library exposed to injury,” Randolph hoped to be able to “deposit” the library at the University but with the understanding that it might be necessary to sell the books in the future. The bust, not having been a specific bequest, would probably have to be sold.²⁴⁸ Madison, in a report to the Literary Fund, expressed the hope that the library could become a permanent gift, citing the “pain which would be felt from a loss, and that from such a cause, of a gift so acceptable to the University.” The bust, Madison argued, would be a “fine image of its illustrious Father, which would be at once an appropriate ornament, and a spectacle ever reminding the ingenuous youth, of the love of science which they ought to cherish, and the dedication of its fruits to the cause of their country, of liberty and of humanity, which they ought to emulate.”²⁴⁹

Jefferson had not lived to see the Rotunda completed. The clock and bell had not yet been delivered, and the plasterwork was not finished. In August 1826 Joseph Antrim sent a proposal to Brockenbrough stating that he would “put stucco cornices and do the plastering that remains undone inside of the rotunda” and extend credit for the work for up to two years.²⁵⁰ In September Cocke asked Brockenbrough to get estimates, along with “details of their models,” from Dinsmore and Neilson for constructing the “internal Cornice” in wood and from Antrim for creating it in plaster.²⁵¹

FINISHING THE ROTUNDA, 1826-1828

At the time of Jefferson’s death work was also still needed in the library. Brockenbrough, turning now to John Cocke for advice and confirmation of his decisions as he had to Jefferson, wrote in late August 1826 that the “Faculty wish to be arranging the books in the Library.” However, Dinsmore and Neilson had told him that they would “not be able to get up the hand rail & Balusters to the Stairs so as to secure the room” within a fortnight, as was desired. Brockenbrough complained that “if we are to be governed by their former promises and engagements, it will probably be double that time.” To secure the library Brockenbrough suggested instead that “a temporary partition be put up at the head of the Stairs.” There was already a “sufficiency of Book cases” available, so the actual work of arranging the books could get underway. “Unless some plan of this sort is adopted,” Brockenbrough feared, “the Library will not be in place before the meeting of the Visitors” scheduled for early October 1826.²⁵² Evidently arrangements of some sort

were worked out, for by the time the Visitors gathered at the University that fall, the new Rector, James Madison, was able to report that the “library room in the Rotunda has been nearly completed, and the books put into it.”²⁵³ It was not until 1827, however, that payment was made for “two dozen chairs,” and the “circular tables in the Library” were put in place.²⁵⁴

In the first annual report filed after Jefferson’s death, Madison stated in a commentary dated October 7, 1826, that the “Two rooms for the Professors of Natural Philosophy and of Chemistry, and one large Lecture room, have also been fitted for use.” Outside, the “Portico of the Rotunda has been finished, with the exception of the flight of steps, and the laying of the marble flags, which have been received and paid for.” What remained to be done was the “finishing one other large oval room, one small one, and the entrance hall of the Rotunda.”²⁵⁵

At their October 1826 meeting the Visitors passed a resolution asking the faculty “to cause the small room on the first floor of the rotunda to be finished & fitted for the reception of the natural and artificial curiosities given to the University” by Jefferson and “to have them suitably arranged for preservation & exhibition.”²⁵⁶ Two years later these materials were to be moved to the small oval room in the basement.²⁵⁷

Several small invoices were paid between the fall of 1826 and the summer of 1827. George Wolfe was paid “for turning for the rotunda,” and J. Fitz was paid for “wire work” for the library. Joseph Forsett was paid “for bolts, &c. for rotunda” in March 1827.²⁵⁸ Joseph Antrim was paid in September 1827 for plastering in the Rotunda,²⁵⁹ and John Vowles had supplied “draw locks” for the library. Large sums were paid to Dinsmore and Neilson in 1827, but it is not clear whether the payments were for work on the Rotunda.²⁶⁰

In August 1826 the University had made a partial payment to Joseph Coolidge of \$250 toward the clock and bell, but it was not until late March 1827 that Coolidge was able to tell the proctor that the clock and its dial had been shipped from Boston and was en route to Richmond.²⁶¹ Willard left early in April to “superintend the removal of the clock &c from the vessel to the Canal boat.”²⁶² The order for the bell was not placed until August 1827. Coolidge confirmed the instructions that it was to be “cast, of purest metal, to weigh about 450 lbs.” Although Coolidge had said that the bell would be ready in early September, it was not delivered until several months later. Coolidge was finally paid \$159.25 in February 1828 for a “large bell.”²⁶³ The bell was hung above the ridge of the portico roof, adjacent to the attic.

In July 1827 the Visitors had authorized the proctor to install “a neat iron railing. . . on the right and left of the portico of the Rotunda & adjacent to the same”; its purpose was “to exclude access for the purpose of walking over the gymnasia” housed in the terrace wings.²⁶⁴ The Visitors, however, failed to communicate this order to Brockenbrough until

mid-September; when the order was finally conveyed to Brockenbrough, he was told to confer with the executive committee before determining placement of the railing.²⁶⁵ Brockenbrough duly asked John Cocke about the best location and whether it should be made of cast or wrought iron; Brockenbrough evidently thought the railing was to be “on the right & left of the Rotunda & adjacent to the same,” presumably at the east and west ends of the terrace nearest the Rotunda.²⁶⁶ Cocke, however, suggested placing the railing “as near to the Pavilions as will be consistent with the object for which they are to be erected,” that is, “to secure the privacy of these Buildings.”²⁶⁷

If Lafayette’s 1824 walk on the terraces included walking atop the arcaded wings of the Rotunda, wood railings may have been in place along the north and south sides of the terrace wings for reasons of both aesthetics and public safety. While the drawing of the arcade attributed to John Neilson did not indicate a railing, other early views of the university, such as the 1826 engraving by Benjamin Tanner [*Figure 27*], do show railings with fretwork.

In August 1827 Brockenbrough had given Cocke an update on the construction work, stating that “We are going on tolerably well with our jobs” and noting that “the plastering of the Rotunda will be finished during the vacation.” Meanwhile, the iron work was “nearly completed.”²⁶⁸ Brockenbrough had also “written to Philadelphia for a stone cutter to come on & undertake the Steps.” However, he had found that since that man “asks rather more than I am willing to give,” he wanted to find an artisan in Richmond.²⁶⁹ Brockenbrough had calculated that “it will take about 700 feet running measure” of stone for the steps, which in its rough state would be approximately 18 inches wide and 8-1/2 inches thick.” No contract for the stone steps was written at this time, however.²⁷⁰

There were problems with the performance of the chimneys, making rooms on the west side of the Rotunda “useless.” In a November 1827 memorandum Brockenbrough noted that “Some of the visitors looked at tops of the Rotunda chimneys at their last meeting, but I beleive came to no decisive determination what should be done to prevent their smoking.” Cocke reminded Brockenbrough in November 1827 that he should experiment with a “Sheet iron Funnel” atop the chimneys and suggested that Brockenbrough consult with Dr. Emmett, who knew of “a late improvement in the Construction of these Funnels.”²⁷¹ Cocke also sent along a scheme developed by Professor Bonnycastle “for Curing Smoking Chimneys.”²⁷²

Apparently either the skylight at the Rotunda or the one at the anatomical hall had been leaking in 1827, and Cocke received the following advice from Coleman Sellers of Richmond about a corrective measure that had worked elsewhere: “take off all the glass, and have them well cleaned, and Rubed with whiting so as to Remove any grease that might get on by handling &c then take white lead putty, (made with drying Oil and Tapan)

and bed each glass well into it—so as to Cement their edges together.”²⁷³ The terrace roof over the gymnasium was also leaking.²⁷⁴

Environmental conditions in the Rotunda, according to the faculty, were proving to be less than ideal for both the students and the books. In January 1828 the faculty passed a resolution directed to the Board of Visitors that “the Books in the Library especially those in the Gallery are now materially suffering from damp, and that it is impossible for any person to remain in the Library with comfort during the Winter season.” The faculty also recommended that heating stoves be installed in the lecture rooms, “the fire places having been found insufficient for warming and drying the apartments,” making them “exceedingly disagreeable and unwholesome especially in the morning.”²⁷⁵

In July 1829 the Visitors authorized the executive committee to carry out some minor repairs in the Rotunda: the “pillars in the chemical lecture room” were “to be cased,” and the benches were “to be fixed to a rising platform, as in the lecture room of the Professor of Natural Philosophy.” In addition, the fireplace in the chemical laboratory was “to be altered, so as to improve the draught, in the mode thought most expedient by the Professor of Chemistry.”²⁷⁶

Despite these problems out-of-town visitors to the University often found the overall ensemble, with the Rotunda as its centerpiece, enchanting. In 1828 novelist and diarist Margaret Bayard Smith wrote to her sisters from Charlottesville that “Never have I beheld a more imposing work of Art”; she called the domed library “a magnificent apartment—larger & more beautiful than the library in the Capitol.” She and Professor John T. Lomax “sat in the Library looking over books & conversi[n]g on literary subjects for more than two hours, while the young people were roaming about & climbing to the dome or roof of the Rotunda.”²⁷⁷

REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, 1830S

The stairs leading up to the south portico may not have been constructed until 1832. The stone was quarried by William Leitch, and he was paid in small amounts by the University at various times beginning in September 1830, with the final payment made in January 1833.²⁷⁸ An undated contract between the University and Leitch stipulates that Leitch would “undertake to quarry all the stone for the steps of the Rotunda on Gen’l Cocke’s land.” All stone was to be “of good quality and sufficiently hard so as not to be damaged by weather” and was to be “18½ inches wide on top and 8 ½ inches thick for the front and no less than three feet long.”²⁷⁹ In the spring of 1833 more stone was quarried and hauled to the site by wagon. By April 1833 “81½ feet of coping stone for the basement of the Rotunda” was quarried at a cost of \$.40 per cubic foot, for a total of \$32.60. In 1834

“stone work about the basement of the rotunda, under contract made in 1831” was carried out for a total of \$129.60.²⁸⁰

Leaking in the Rotunda’s skylight and dome would prove to be a persistent problem. In July 1833 the Board of Visitors passed a resolution stating that the proctor should take “immediate measures to stop leaks in the roof of the Rotunda.”²⁸¹ A list of repairs and improvements published in the annual report of the Rector and the Board of Visitors in 1836 indicates that a modest \$.50 was spent “repairing the sky-light in rotunda” in July 1835 and that \$131.82 was spent for “tinning” on the Rotunda and the pavilions in August.²⁸²

At its August 17, 1837, meeting the Board of Visitors agreed that the “blocking course of Wood on the dome” needed to be repaired and painted. In November 1837 the University paid George W. Spooner of Charlottesville \$181.81 for repairs made to the dome of the Rotunda. The Board had also directed in August 1837 that a “marble pavement” be “laid in the Portico of the Rotunda” and that the “Cistern at the Rotunda, now a cause of material injury to the walls of the building” be removed, but there is no record that year of the paving work or removal of the cistern or a clear indication of where the cistern was located.²⁸³ Additional repairs to the roof, specifically to the “copper covering” of the dome, were made by James B. Rogers in October 1839, for \$37.00.²⁸⁴ It is not clear whether the \$145.62 spent in May 1837 on “sheet lead, tin and glass for skylight” or the \$11.50 spent in February 1840 for the “glazing sky light and painting” was for the skylight in the Rotunda or the one in the Anatomical Hall.²⁸⁵

The Board of Visitors had called for alterations to the skylight of the Rotunda in 1840 to stop the leaking, and a glass and tin lantern was installed over the skylight that year. The lantern and accompanying weathervane are clearly depicted in a lithograph of the Rotunda viewed from the south executed sometime between 1846 and 1851. The same components appear in several other lithographs that show the grounds from the east and west, made during the 1850s, 1860s, and early 1870s, though the weathervane, which was in the form of a quill some 8 to 10 feet long, was removed by William A. Pratt, the University’s first Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings, in 1860.²⁸⁶

George Spooner installed new bookcases in the library in October and November 1838 and January and February 1839, at a cost of \$500.00. John Day and Company painted the cases and installed their glass doors in March 1839, at a cost of \$59.57.²⁸⁷

University records reveal little else about specific repairs and improvements made to the Rotunda during the 1830s, suggesting perhaps that no major repairs were made during that time.

In December 1840 the Rector, Chapman Johnson, submitted a summary on the state of the University’s physical plant to the Virginia House of Delegates, reporting that during 1839 and 1840 the “buildings in the university have been put in a good state of repair; and

they, with the public grounds, the library, the apparatus belonging to the several schools, and the other property of the university, are in good condition.” Johnson further noted that the University was flourishing “to a gratifying extent,” and though the country was mired in an economic depression, “the number of students has been nearly as great as at any prior time.”²⁸⁸

A GROWING UNIVERSITY, 1840S AND 1850S

By the middle of the nineteenth century the University was operating beyond full capacity and was essentially bursting at its seams: in the fifteen-year period between 1842 and 1857 enrollment swelled from 128 to 645 students. As of 1850 the University buildings — both dormitories and classrooms — were able to accommodate only 200 students. The University’s growth can be attributed in part to increasing prosperity in the Southern states, which put more Southern parents in the position to send their sons to school. Escalating ante bellum tensions with the North further expanded the student body, as young Southern men seeking an education declined to enroll in Northern colleges and universities and opted to attend the University of Virginia instead. Furthermore, the extension of railway facilities connecting Charlottesville and Richmond in 1850 improved access to the University. The growth of the student body forced the University to rescind its policy that all students live in University housing, and the overflow of students sought lodging in Charlottesville’s inns and boarding houses. Twelve new dormitories built at the University in 1848 brought only a little relief.²⁸⁹

The increase in enrollment soon outstripped available classroom space as well. While a few departments, such as chemistry and natural philosophy, had their own classrooms, the five schools of ancient languages, modern languages, mathematics, moral philosophy, and law had to share only two lecture halls in the Rotunda. By the early 1850s the English department shared this space as well. As the student body grew, faculty members complained that their ability to teach effectively was seriously hampered by the crowded conditions. The mid-century growth of the university also meant that Jefferson’s plan—a more intimate arrangement wherein professors conducted classes primarily within their residences—was changing.²⁹⁰

In response to the ever-increasing need for more classroom space, the University decided to convert the two open gymnasium wings projecting from the southeast and southwest sides of the Rotunda into lecture rooms. As early as July 1833 George Spooner had submitted specifications for this work, but evidently the plan was not seriously considered until July 1840, when the Board of Visitors decided to advertise for proposals and contractors based on plans submitted that year by Visitor John Hartwell Cocke. The Board stipulated that the plan should include the following:

The excavation of a space at least four feet wide parallel with the South walls, of the said Gymnasia, & extending from the steps of the Rotunda to the porticos of the Pavilions 1 & 2 respectively. This excavated passage to be sunk six inches below the level of the floors of the new rooms, to be faced with a brick wall laid in hydraulic cement up to the level of the Lawn & cap [sic] with cut stone & the bottom paved with hard brick, inclining from the walls of the rooms half an inch to the foot, with a graduated blind drain at the base of the outer wall to deliver the water by a continuation of the drain beyond the arched entries at the east & west ends of the said lecture rooms.²⁹¹

Meanwhile, George Spooner was selected to make the alterations in the Rotunda's wings. The work of enclosing the gymnasia and installing lecture rooms began in the spring or summer of 1841, but some aspects of the new construction were quickly deemed unacceptable. On July 1, 1841, the Board of Visitors reported that the "roofs which have recently been erected over the halls at the former gymnasia obstruct the view and are injurious to the aspect of the buildings of the University." The Visitors ruled that the roofs should be altered and noted that it had been "ascertained that they may be reduced without injury to the apartments beneath." The Board recommended "that the proctor be instructed to cause the upper portions of the aforesaid roofs to a perpendicular depth of thirty inches to be removed and substituted by flat roofs covered with copper or zinc, and that he proceed, as soon as practicable, to procure the proper materials for the change hereby required."²⁹²

Spooner made the alterations between late July and November 1841, during which time the University paid him a total of \$2,116.76.²⁹³ The entire project of "converting the gymnasia into lecture rooms" was finished in the summer of 1842, and in July Spooner submitted an additional itemized bill for \$6,115.36.²⁹⁴

At its July 1, 1841, meeting the Board of Visitors had discussed the uses of the new lecture rooms, as well as the uses of some of the rooms in the Rotunda. The Board resolved that the newly enclosed "apartment" that replaced the "Eastern gymnasium" should be "fitted up and appropriated to the general meetings of the University & as a place of religious worship for the professors, officers & their families and of the Students of the University, & that it be placed under the direction of the Faculty." The "western hall" would serve as a "Lecture room for the professor of Natural Philosophy & for the reception of the philosophical apparatus and of the objects of natural History &c bequeathed to the University by Mr. Jefferson." Furthermore, the "two apartments in the first story of the Rotunda, now occupied by the philosophical Apparatus, & by objects constituting the aforesaid donation of Mr. Jefferson" were to be used as additional lecture rooms once the apparatus was removed to the new lecture room in the western hall. The Board also discussed the arrangement of the rooms for instruction in chemistry:

It being represented to the Visitors that the present lecture room of the professor of Chemistry in the basement story of the Rotunda is not as well adapted for the purposes of a lecture room as the opposite apartment in the same story, now used as a chemical laboratory.

Resolved that the Proctor, under the directions of the professor of Chemistry, be instructed to cause those apartments to be altered in their interior arrangements so as that Eastern apartment be used as a chemical lecture room & the western apartment as a chemical Laboratory.²⁹⁵

In July 1840 the Visitors specified that the “Hall and galleries of the Library be newly painted” and that the floors of the Rotunda’s “hall and galleries” be “swept once every day” and “scoured immediately preceding [*sic*] the opening of each session of the University and at the commencement of each succeeding quarter thereafter, and as much oftener as may be necessary to keep them in a clean & neat condition.”²⁹⁶

The Rotunda roof was painted with “soapstone paint” during 1842 at a cost of \$17.60, and John Day submitted a bill for \$27.75 for painting the “stonework” in the “Rotunda chapel” and the lecture rooms in March 1842.²⁹⁷ The University paid Joseph Points a total of \$750.00 for unspecified “repairs to the dome of rotunda” in July and October 1844.²⁹⁸

In July 1845 the Board of Visitors resolved that the proctor “be directed to have wooden flooring placed over the metal covering at the base of the dome of the Rotunda, and cause the ornamental blocking around the dome to be protected by a covering of sheet iron.”²⁹⁹

The addition of the lecture rooms in the former gymnasium deferred the problem of overcrowding for only a few years. “The duty of arranging the lectures in the different schools of the University so as to prevent any interference or serious inconvenience to the Students has become from year to year a more difficult task,” the faculty reported to the Board of Visitors in October 1849. In fact, by that time it had become “utterly impossible to make such an arrangement, owing partly to the considerable increase of the number of Students, and partly to the number of schools attended by each one of them.” In response to the problem the faculty proposed that classes be shortened to one hour, “by which room for at least one additional lecture, daily, would be gained” and “once more lay before the Board of Visitors the urgent want of additional lecture rooms.” The Board adopted the proposal for shortened classes only temporarily, “until further order [could] be taken upon the subject” of new construction.³⁰⁰ Though plans for additional space had not been formalized, the Board of Visitors ordered the manufacture of 300,000 bricks at the end of June 1850, in anticipation of the “erection of such additional buildings as may become necessary for the successful operation of the University.”³⁰¹

The inadequacy of the existing conditions became even more apparent when the Rotunda was inspected by an unnamed “competent architect” in 1850, and it was found that the “*large room in the rotunda was insecure, and could no longer with safety be used for public exhibitions, as it had been for past years.*”³⁰² In October 1850 Rector Joseph C. Cabell presented the following report on the state of the dome room:

[T]he necessity of speedily providing another apartment for the general meetings and public exhibitions, cannot be too often repeated or too strongly enforced. These meetings and exhibitions have heretofore been held in the large upper apartment in the rotunda containing the library, which is the largest in the University, and in some respects admirably adapted to the purpose. The practice has been attended with some injury to the library by reason of the dust arising on such occasions; but if this were the only objection, it might be continued still longer without very material injury or inconvenience. This apartment, however, having been planned and constructed merely for the purposes of the library and its appropriate uses, the floor is not calculated to sustain the pressure of the great additional weight thrown upon it at the period of the annual exhibition, which is estimated to be generally not less than 100 tons, and at the time of great excitement in the audience, to be augmented by oscillation to quadruple this amount.

From indications in the ceiling of the story below, there is evident danger of the floor yielding to the superincumbent pressure arising from this cause, especially as the circle of pillars by which the library is supported, is not sustained by corresponding pillars in the story underneath. A proper regard for the safety of the auditory, as well as of the building, suggests the necessity of as little delay as practicable in transferring the general meetings and exhibitions to another and more suitable position in the University.³⁰³

MAKING PLANS FOR ADDITIONAL SPACE, 1850–1851

By the early fall of 1850 the Board of Visitors was sufficiently convinced that the existing buildings were “totally insufficient for the accommodation of the increasing number of students,” and it was of the opinion that “no time should be lost in taking immediate measures for the erection of such needful buildings.” At its September 25, 1850, meeting the Board of Visitors appointed a two-man committee, composed of Andrew Stevenson and Thomas J. Randolph, to investigate the cost and logistics of constructing a new building that would hold a public hall and space for additional lecture rooms and laboratories. The construction project had a modest budget of around \$25,000, and the committee was authorized to engage an architect to superintend the work. On December 28, 1850, Stevenson informed Rector Joseph C. Cabell that he had written to “two eminent architects...to ascertain what they would charge to come up & visit me & draw

plans &c. for the Building.” The architects that Stevenson had contacted were Robert Mills of Washington, D.C., and prominent New York City architect James Renwick, who had recently won the competition for the design of the Smithsonian Institution Building in Washington, D.C.³⁰⁴

By mid-October 1850 Stevenson had written twice to both Mills and Renwick. Both architects were “willing to come at a moment’s warning.” Renwick stated that he would work only on the following basis: that he “do the drawings & attend the work for two percent of the whole amount expended.” “This is too much,” Stevenson reported to Cabell and suggested that it would be “best to get Mills” to “slip up to the University” from Washington and “help us fix a plan.”³⁰⁵

Mills visited the University in early December 1850, and he and Stevenson inspected the grounds together to determine the most suitable location for the new construction. It is not known what further communications were had with James Renwick, but Stevenson and Randolph quickly selected Mills to undertake the work: “Mills was the “most reasonable,” of the two candidates, Stevenson wrote to Cabell on December 28, reporting that Mills stayed “not two days, & we agreed on the plan.” “I think,” Stevenson assured Cabell, “you will approve of the plans of the Building & its location... It will add to the appearance of the Rotunda, & the whole of the Buildings.”³⁰⁶ On the other hand, Randolph, who was seen as “loyal to the artistic spirit of his grandfather,” had reservations about the design for the annex and feared the fire damage that such a large building could pose. Nevertheless, the need for space and economy overruled the aesthetic concerns, and Mills’s design went forward.³⁰⁷

Robert Mills had studied under Thomas Jefferson, James Hoban, and Benjamin H. Latrobe and is often credited with being the first American-born architect to be professionally trained entirely in the U.S. Born in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1781, Mills worked as an architect in Charleston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Columbia, South Carolina, until 1836, when President Andrew Jackson appointed him architect of public buildings in Washington, a position he held until 1841. In Washington Mills designed and supervised the construction of the U.S. Treasury Building in 1836 and the U.S. Patent Office and General Post Office, both begun in 1839.³⁰⁸ He also won the competition for the design of the Washington Monument in 1836. By the time he was selected to undertake the work at the University of Virginia in 1850, Mills had been living and working in Washington, D.C., for twenty years and was 69 years old.³⁰⁹

Within weeks of visiting the University, Mills submitted full specifications and six sketch plans. He had wanted to publish the full specifications in newspapers, but Andrew Stevenson thought that venture too costly, so copies of the specifications were instead made available to potential bidders through the proctor’s office.³¹⁰

The specifications, dated January 3, 1851, indicate that Mills had designed a four-story addition extending north from the Rotunda. The building would include a sub-basement, a basement, a “principal” story, and an “upper” story. The main portion of the addition, which would soon become known as the Annex, would be 105 feet long and 55 feet wide. A covered colonnade would extend 25 feet from the north side of the Rotunda, connecting it to the south side of the Annex; a 25-foot-deep portico would span the Annex’s 55-foot-wide north facade. Overall, the structure, including its two porticos, would extend 155 feet from the Rotunda.³¹¹ The sub-basement and basement would have 14-foot-high ceilings. The principal story would have 21-foot-high ceilings, and the upper story “to eaves and cove of roof” would be 18 to 20 feet high. A later account indicates that Mills’s original plans called for the basement, first, and third floors to be occupied by several “average size” lecture rooms and by “one large apartment, in addition, for the storage of the costly apparatus belonging to the School of Natural Philosophy.” The second floor would be reserved for a 1,200-seat public hall.³¹²

Mills’s specifications stipulated that the joists of the interior structural system be “framed into girders supported by cast iron pillars or columns.” The roof was to be framed with “principal rafters, with Queen posts, to admit of a cove ceiling to be executed” and covered with either tin or sheet iron. The outside walls were to be faced with “pressed brick, laid in Flemish bond” with “flat joints well settled down and bound with the interior part of the wall and prepared for painting.” The “other parts of the walls” were to be “laid in American bond (3 stretchers to one header.)” The columns in the new portico were to match the columns on the Rotunda’s south portico, extending “up to the eaves of the roof” of the “present Portico.” The bricks in the columns were to be “solidly laid in hydraulic mortar, the facing prepared for stucco work, and the bases and caps of these columns (to be formed of cast iron) to be built in with the brick work.” All wood floors throughout the building were to be constructed of the “best quality heart stuff.”³¹³

Controlling the costs of the new construction was a constant concern. In late January 1851 Stevenson reported to Rector Joseph Cabell that he had “urged Mr. Mills to reduce the general estimate to under \$25,000 — whether he shall be able to accomplish it is to be seen, but I shall struggle hard.” Stevenson expected that the University would have to look to foundries in Baltimore or Philadelphia “to see about casting the capitals and the pillars.” “I hope to succeed in getting rich & handsome capitals,” Stevenson wrote, “equal in appearance and as durable as those of the Rotunda for about \$100 each, including the Bases,” whereas the marble ones at the Rotunda had cost “\$1100 & upwards, each.” Stevenson anticipated a savings of “\$5 to 6 thousand dollars” if they could get the capitals and bases made of cast iron for the desired price.³¹⁴

Robert Mills was in Charlottesville in February 1851 to review his drawings with Stevenson and Randolph. At this time the committee “commissioned him to prepare forms of contract and issue the requisite advertisements.” Mills met with the committee and potential contractors on April 3, at which time “the work, in all its departments, was let to undertakers of respectable standing, upon terms satisfactory to the committee and to the board of visitors.”³¹⁵ The firm of Hudson and Lushbaugh of Staunton, Virginia, was selected as the contractor, and George Spooner was appointed to superintend the work.³¹⁶

The first expenses for the project dated to May 1851. Fifty dollars went toward reimbursing Mills for his travel expenses to Charlottesville, and \$100 was paid to him for his professional services thus far. He did not charge a fee for preparing the plans and specifications but was paid a monthly salary of \$83.33 from December 1851 to October 1852 and was reimbursed for travel expenses.³¹⁷ The sum of \$40.62 was paid for advertising in May 1851, and in June and early July 1851 an additional \$101.87 was spent placing notices to contractors in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, *Richmond Examiner*, and the *Jeffersonian*.³¹⁸

CONSTRUCTION OF THE ANNEX, JULY 1851–1854

Ground was broken sometime in late June or early July 1851. The firm of Sowell and Seay carried out the excavation work, while Hassan and Boyle began stone work, and Word and Brown did brick work.³¹⁹ By mid-August 1851 work was reportedly moving along well, and there was “every reason to believe the building will be covered in by the ensuing winter.” Andrew Stevenson and Thomas Randolph reported to Rector Joseph Cabell that work appeared to be “well executed and the materials of excellent quality.” Stevenson and Randolph credited George Spooner with the smooth progress, reporting to Cabell that in Spooner they had “an entire confidence.” “He examines daily, and indeed hourly the whole work as it progresses,” Stevenson and Randolph reported, “and it is executed under his immediate approbation. So far everything has gone on as well as we could have expected; and if no unforeseen occurrence turns up to prevent it, we anticipate that the exhibition room will be ready for public exercises in June next, and the lecture rooms in the course of 12 or 14 months.”³²⁰ In late September 1851 construction was reportedly “advancing regularly. The first story is built up & the arches for the portico to the same height, excepting a part of one side.”³²¹ The sum of \$11,701.78 was expended on the project in 1851.³²²

The Annex was not completed according to schedule, nor was it finished within budget; Robert Mills’s estimated cost for the building proved to be too low. The University petitioned the General Assembly to borrow \$25,000 to put toward the

construction costs, and the loan was granted in February 1852.³²³ On May 8, 1852, Stevenson told Cabell that he was “not entirely satisfied” with Mills’s estimates, and he was “disappointed to find so much to do & so much money expended.” “The Proctor tells me that \$20,000 has been paid,” Stevenson reported, “and I fear that it will take 15 to 20,000 more. But it is too late to look back & the work must be completed.”³²⁴

In their annual report the Rector and Visitors indicated that the new building “was not finished at the annual meeting in June [1852], as was anticipated in the last annual report.” It was, however, “far advanced towards completion at that time, and sufficiently so for the public exercises at the close of the session to be held in the largest apartment,” which was, presumably, the public hall. The lecture rooms in the basement were already occupied by the schools of chemistry and natural philosophy. The “upper story and the surrounding embankments” remained to be done as of September 1, 1852, but George Spooner assured the University administration that the “whole structure and its appurtenances” would be completed by October 1, 1852.³²⁵

The same annual report included a detailed list of expenditures related to the construction of the Annex made between May 31, 1852, and May 31, 1853, for a total of \$20,332.54. Sowell and Seay continued with excavation work, as did Hassan and Boyle with the stone work, and Word and Brown with the brick work. Joseph Points did the tin work; Watson and Diviney did some of the iron work, while Samson and Pae of Richmond cast the iron capitals; Frank and Clover did the glazing; Terrell and Carter did the plaster work; and T. C. and S. M. Keller undertook the painting. Regular salaries were paid to Mills and to Spooner, and various other men were paid for hauling materials and for “labor.” Some of the men or firms on the payroll were also paid for hiring out slave labor.³²⁶ In a report made the following year, the Rector and the Board of Visitors indicated that \$13,730 was spent on the project between July 2, 1853, and April 4, 1854, including payments made to the same firms employed the previous year. Furthermore, Edmond, Davenport and Company supplied cement; Hezekiah Taylor made the cast-iron railings for the porticos; George McIntyre supplied “glass, paints, oils, &c.”; J. L. Maury did blacksmith’s work; William S. Johnson supplied stoves and pipes; and Flannagan, Abell and Company supplied the carpeting for the platform in the “public room.”³²⁷ Curtains for the “exhibition room windows” and “chairs and cushions for the exhibition room” had been purchased in August and September 1852.³²⁸

Joseph Cabell reported on the usage of the various rooms of the completed building in October 1853:

It has in the subbasement a chemical lecture room and laboratory, not surpassed, if equaled, in point of extent and convenience, at any other institution in our country: in the basement, a spacious philosophical lecture room, besides two other commodious apartments for instruction, and

convenient passages for interior and exterior communication; in the first and second stories, a hall and gallery of capacity sufficient for the largest assemblages that will probably ever attend the public exhibitions; and in the third story, an apartment for a museum, running, like the hall immediately below it, through the whole length of the building, and furnishing extensive accommodation for collections in natural history.³²⁹

The chemistry laboratory was a point of particular pride, with its “perfect ventilation system” and “proper arrangement of furnaces, sand baths, water baths, &c.” The laboratory’s water supply was also “well accomplished at less expense and with vastly more convenience than by the former plan of digging a well near the Laboratory.” The water supply was “brought from the cistern back of the Chapel,” located on the north side of the Rotunda’s southeast wing, “by a leaden pipe & distributed in a fitting manner over the Lecture room and Laboratory.” The Board of Visitors also touted the adaptability and the vastness of the new space:

Connected with the latter is a portion of the north arcade, that has been enclosed and is now used as a cellar for coals &c., but your Committee understand that this arcade, with the portion now used by the Janitor, can be fitted up at any time (by enlarging the windows) so as to furnish an extension to the Laboratory, whenever required and could be made in any respect not much behind the present Laboratory, & when thus extended it might be made to accommodate forty or fifty working students.

It appears to your Committee that the whole building capacity of the lecture room, laboratory &c is not surpassed by any institution of the kind, and equaled probably by very few. Indeed there is nothing in the opinion of the Committee to prevent its development for the most perfect instruction in agricultural, manufactural & pharmacoepial Chemistry.³³⁰

Upon the completion of the Annex, the Rector and Visitors described its relationship to the Rotunda:

It is connected with the rotunda, so as to bring all the lecture rooms, scientific collections and apparatus in the academical department under a common roof, in graceful and commodious distribution; and this completes the architectural accommodation for instruction by lectures and examination in this principal and important portion of the institution. The cost of the building, although considerable, is lost sight of in the contemplation of the great benefits and advantages resulting from its construction.³³¹

The final cost for the entire project, as reported in 1853 and including \$3,000 for “grading and finishing the surrounding embankments, &c.,” would eventually total \$53,228.74, or more than twice the initial cost estimate and budget.³³²

Cabell and the Board of Visitors defended the final cost, arguing that “a building of the same character and extent could scarcely be erected, in the same locality and under the same circumstances, with greater economy and of more faithful execution.” Still, seeds of doubt about the integrity of the design evidently had already been sewn; the Rector and Board of Visitors stated in 1853 that “a more eligible position for such an addition could not have been selected” but that “if the new building detracts at all, it detracts as little as possible from the general aspect of architecture of the university.”³³³

In spite of the initial support for the design, the Annex, even before it was constructed, was acknowledged by some as being out of harmony with the style of the other buildings on the campus. Once built, the Annex would prove to be a hulking appendage, and upon completion it was described as “ugly and incongruous” in comparison to the perfect proportions of the Rotunda. Furthermore, concerns were raised about connecting such a large building to the Rotunda as a fire hazard. Ultimately, however, the need to economize won over all aesthetic suggestions.³³⁴

ATTEMPTS TO INCREASE THE UNIVERSITY’S WATER SUPPLY, 1854–1855

As the student body increased, so did the need for a more voluminous water supply. The water was needed not only for domestic purposes but also to extinguish fires, which were a constant threat to the buildings. In an attempt to solve the water problem at least three new cisterns were constructed at the University in 1851 or 1852, but these small reservoirs did little to alleviate the situation.³³⁵

In 1854 the University engaged engineer Frederick Erdman of Philadelphia to devise a scheme to pipe water to the University from creeks located to the southwest of the grounds. Erdman’s proposal proved too costly, however, and the following year the University hired civil engineer Charles Ellet, also of Philadelphia, who had won national acclaim in the previous decade as a designer of suspension bridges. Ellet’s solution to the water problem included installing tanks within the Rotunda walls:

The right to take possession of the springs necessary to complete the supply had already been granted by the General Assembly. In accord with Ellet’s recommendation, iron pipes were laid down, which connected a reservoir at the back of the Rotunda with numerous fountain-heads situated in the high valleys of the foothills towards the west. The water,—which was first received in the reservoir,—was, by a steam pump, forced up into two tanks located within a cavity of the bricks that supported the bottom of the dome in the rear. Each of these tanks had a capacity of seven thousand gallons; and they were elevated at least seventy feet above the surface of the Lawn. The pressure was sufficient

to drive water from them to any roof within the central grounds of the University, except the top of the dome itself.³³⁶

However, the plan was not successful:

The tanks proved to be defective. The leaking water at first seriously injured the exterior walls of the Rotunda, and then slowly dampened the partitions of the rooms and basement. There was, at one time, a heavy overflow, owing to a shortened provision for waste pipes. Many of the books in the library were, on this occasion, thoroughly soaked, the ceiling was defaced, and the plastering of the lecture halls below was loosened.³³⁷

The problem of getting sufficient water to the University buildings continued to plague the school. In an 1858 report to the executive committee, Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds William A. Pratt reported that “two cisterns with drains leading to them had been constructed on either side of the Rotunda.”³³⁸

REPAIRS TO THE ROTUNDA, 1850S

In June 1853 the library’s collection was reportedly arranged and catalogued in an orderly manner, but other sections of the dome room were crowded with “forty or fifty engravings and prints...hung upon nails driven into the columns, and badly arranged and detracting from the appearance and beauty of the room.” The executive committee of the Board of Visitors argued for the removal of the artwork and its installation in the museum space in the Annex.³³⁹ Some pieces may have been removed around this time, but most stayed in the dome room until 1895.

By June 1853 the steps of the Rotunda were again in need of repair. “In their present state the bases of the columns are in danger,” Visitor Andrew Stevenson reported, and he and the executive committee recommended that the steps undergo “immediate reparation.” In August the University paid Lou Flannery \$90 for “resetting of rotunda steps (in part),” and on October 3 Robert R. Prentis was paid \$133.06 “for repairs to rotunda steps and other masons’ work and for repairing pumps, &c.” It is unclear whether the “other masons’ work” and pump repair were related to the Rotunda.³⁴⁰ Apparently the repairs made in 1853 were not sufficient: in June 1854 the Board of Visitors reported that it was “aware of the immediate necessity of repairs, and it is earnestly recommended that the steps before the Rotunda be reset at once as a few months may result in the entire destruction of the Portico unless these repairs be made.” The Board resolved that the steps of the Rotunda should be “reset immediately, in such a manner as to prevent the destruction of the vault by the rain and frosts of winter.”³⁴¹ In

February 1857 C. M. Warren and Company worked on the “composition roofing to the terrace floor at rotunda portico” for a fee of \$75.40.³⁴²

At the end of the 1850s the Rotunda’s roof was also in need of repairs. Thomas J. Vaughan was paid \$64.42 in April for “tin work on lantern and dome of rotunda.” The University paid George Spooner \$55 for “repairs to rotunda lantern” on June 17.³⁴³ Nevertheless, the librarian reported “leaks in the Library” in late June 1859, and the lantern was removed in 1860.³⁴⁴

The construction of the Annex alleviated the problem of crowding brought on by increased enrollment for only a few years. By 1857, with enrollment nearing 650, still more space was needed for academic purposes. The Board of Visitors did not have “even a room in which to transact their business, without interference with the operations of the University” and were forced to meet in a hotel “two miles distant.” The Board declared that the “physical wants of the university” had become “so pressing as to present serious obstacles to the proper conduct of the schools, and they must of course increase with the increasing number of students.”³⁴⁵ In response to this Buildings and Grounds Superintendent William A. Pratt suggested that two wings be added to the Annex, “each of which should be a precise pattern in style, though apparently not in size, of the Annex itself.” Though the wings were never built, the plan was seriously considered by the faculty. In his history of the University Philip Alexander Bruce commented that had this plan been carried out, it would have created a “bulky cluster of buildings, together with the Rotunda and the Annex,” and “if it had been practicable to enhance the incongruous ugliness of the Annex in any architectural way, this scheme would undoubtedly have accomplished it.”³⁴⁶ Perhaps the expansion was not carried out because of a sudden drop in enrollment triggered by outbreaks of typhoid fever and measles during the 1857–1858 academic year. Several students died, and many more left the University to avoid the pestilence. Many of the students returned by the end of the term, but by then the Civil War was looming on the horizon, and there would be no time or resources for a building campaign.³⁴⁷

THE ROTUNDA DURING THE CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION, 1861–1877

On record the University remained loyal to the Union until May 7, 1861, when Virginia followed South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas in seceding from the Union and joining the Confederacy. Before that, however, rumblings of succession had already been felt on campus. On March 16, 1861, faculty chairman Socrates Maupin recorded in his diary that on the previous night the Rotunda had been broken into and the Confederate flag draped across the dome. The flag was quickly removed, though students were permitted to form military companies and perform drills

on the Lawn. It was not long, however, before the faculty itself ordered the Confederate flag raised over the Rotunda, after the fall of Fort Sumter on April 13, 1861. Shortly thereafter the University buildings, including the Rotunda, were conscripted for use as hospital space, and tents were set up on the grounds to accommodate the overflow of sick and wounded. Following the July 21, 1861, Battle of Bull Run 1,200 casualties overwhelmed the University; another 1,400 troops wounded in the Battle of Port Republic arrived the following June.³⁴⁸

In spite of its occupation by thousands of casualties and battles raging across the state throughout the war years (with a total of 123 battles, Virginia saw at least three times as much action as any other state), classes at the University continued virtually uninterrupted.³⁴⁹ Maintenance and repairs, however, necessarily fell by the wayside as the University struggled to maintain its academic schedule while reluctantly playing host to the Confederate Army.³⁵⁰ During the war years the faculty received a mere “shadow of compensation” or sometimes no salary at all, and the positions of proctor and superintendent of buildings and grounds were eliminated.³⁵¹ Still, in July 1863 the library was reportedly in a state of “neatness” and “good condition,” though there was a “bad leak in the room from the sky-light which ought to be promptly attended to.” There is no record of repairs having been immediately made; in July 1865 the skylight again, or still, required “immediate attention.”³⁵² Perhaps minor repairs were made in an attempt to solve the problem, but leaks in the roof and skylight and pleas for their repair were reported repeatedly in the years following the war. In June 1867 the Board of Visitors resolved that the reinstated proctor be “instructed to make a prompt and efficient alteration in the sky-light of the Rotunda so as to secure it against leaks.” Still, a year later, the Committee on Grounds and Buildings reported that “all the roofs of the Rotunda buildings are said to be in leaky condition.”³⁵³

The war had taken both a physical and financial toll on the University. In 1866 the Rector and the Board of Visitors reported that although the University had “escaped total destruction and ruin” during the war, “its buildings needed many and costly repairs,” and the library was “sadly deficient in all the more recent works of general literature,” having received no new books in six years. By the war’s end the University’s financial situation was in a “truly discouraging condition,” and it had not “a dollar to meet the necessities.” There simply were no funds to make the repairs to the Rotunda, which was “seriously endangered by the presence of the steam engine used to fill the tank — the tank itself is defacing the walls of the building.” In 1868 the water tanks in the Rotunda continued to be a problem; the balustrades on either side of the portico on the south side of the Rotunda were in need of repair; and the “walls of the new building attached to the Rotunda seem to be giving away.”³⁵⁴ Modest repairs were made to the Rotunda’s roof sometime between the end of June 1868 and June 1869.³⁵⁵

At the end of June 1870 the Committee on Grounds and Buildings reported that the “Rotunda has been much improved by the removal of decayed cornice and the substitution of new work, and by the addition of paint on those parts which were in immediate want of it.” Still “much remained to be done to put that building and Hall connected with it in good order,” and the committee recommended an appropriation for that purpose as soon as the University’s finances would allow.³⁵⁶ An inspection of the library in June 1872 showed it to be in “good condition,” but it was agreed that the “procurement of glass doors for many of the cases” was essential for the protection of the library’s collection. However, the University’s post-war financial situation rendered the request “inexpedient” at that time.³⁵⁷

In June 1873 the Committee on Grounds and Buildings requested that the “water tanks over the library” that had been installed under Charles Ellet in 1855 be inspected. Either overflow or leaking of the tanks had caused damage to the roof, and the leaks had “seriously injured” some of the books in the library so that they were rendered “unintelligible and worthless.” Upon inspection the committee determined that the leaks in the Rotunda’s roof were caused by overflow of the tanks and resulting standing water on the roof, and within a few days pipes were “laid on the roof of the Rotunda as to prevent a recurrence of this overflow.”³⁵⁸ A report on the condition of the library dating from July 1874 observed that “everything connected therewith” was then in “excellent condition.”³⁵⁹

In July 1874 the Board of Visitors discussed the continued use of the Rotunda as the site for University social events. Concerned about the risk of fire and the increased cost of insurance, the University librarian requested that public balls no longer be held in the dome room of the Rotunda, as they had been since the early years of the University. However, a report made by Micajah Woods of the Library Committee on June 30, 1874, had indicated that the “danger arising from the use of candles has been obviated by the laying of gas pipes around the galleries, and the jets are so arranged that the lights will project from the galleries and be entirely out of reach of parties on the main floor.” Woods successfully argued for continuing some social events in the Rotunda, writing that the annual ball was “one of the chief items of attraction of the session, and it is particularly proper that the handsomest Hall at our command should be used for the occasion.”³⁶⁰ BV, Minutes, 1 July 1874.

In late June 1877, the Library Committee reported that the dome room, bookcases, and books, were all in “good order.”³⁶¹

THE ROTUNDA AT THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

As the Rotunda aged, its reputation as a hallowed space deepened. Along with this phenomenon, the University librarian seems to have grown weary of sharing the dome room with *fin de saison* revelers. In June 1880 the question of the use of the dome room for non-academic events was again raised, this time by J. L. Maryee, chairman of the Library Committee. "For two or three years past," Maryee complained, "the young ladies & gentlemen attending the commencement exercises have occupied the Library during some hours of each day as a dancing hall. This use of the Room, during the daytime of Commencement week, is disapproved by many of the earnest and influential friends of the University, as incongruous & unseemly, and in the opinion of your Committee tends to create injurious misconceptions as to the judgment and aims of the Authorities controlling the Institution." The Library Committee requested that "dancing and other social diversions" in the dome room be restricted to the annual ball on the evening of commencement, and the Board of Visitors agreed.³⁶²

Throughout the 1860s and 1870s the University continued to struggle with maintaining an adequate supply of water on campus. In November 1882 Proctor and Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings Green Payton reported that though he had recently "constructed a reservoir in the mountain at an elevation sufficient to distribute water over our buildings by gravity alone" by way of a "4-inch pipe," the system could not provide enough water for the University during the dry season. Payton had recommended "making new connections with the disused rotunda tanks," which had evidently been abandoned sometime before, and "refitting the steam-pump, thus keeping the old system as a supplement to the new." Though refilling and using the tanks would pose a threat to the Rotunda's walls, the need for more water was evidently dire enough that the Board of Visitors approved the plan. The work was carried out in 1882 at a cost of \$397.94.³⁶³ Despite these efforts the water supply was again reported to be inadequate the following year. The University employed the services of well-known sanitary engineer and landscape architect Ernest W. Bowditch, of Boston, to devise a water-supply, drainage, and sewer system. Bowditch estimated that a "thorough system" could be installed on the grounds for a cost of \$31,300.³⁶⁴ The University, however, was operating under "straightened means" due to the "heavy debt entailed upon the institution by our predecessors, in their efforts to sustain its reputation." The University's financial situation had become "so embarrassing" that the Rector and Visitors appealed to the General Assembly for relief.³⁶⁵

In June 1883 the Committee on Grounds and Buildings reported upon inspection that it would take "many thousand dollars" to put the University's grounds in "thorough repair." Because funds were scarce, the committee recommended doing only "such things as seem absolutely indispensable and requiring immediate attention." The first item on the

list of critical repairs was the Rotunda's roof, which was in "bad condition." The committee recommended that the roof "be repaired and painted with Iron paint" and that such repairs would cost \$100. The "Arch north of the Annex" was reportedly also in "very bad condition" and needed to be repaired "immediately." This cost was also estimated to be \$100.³⁶⁶

In March 1884 the General Assembly granted the University a \$40,000 annuity for maintenance of the grounds; the first installment was to be used "for constructing a system of sewers and improving water supply."³⁶⁷ By the end of November 1885 "a reservoir of ample dimensions for the storage of a year's supply [of water] and the delivery pipes" were finished and were in "successful operation," at a cost of \$20,177.57.³⁶⁸

On May 31, 1886, the skylight in the dome of the Rotunda was reportedly once again leaking and "in need of attention." Also at this time "nearly 100 of the marble slabs of the floor of the south portico have been cracked or broken and should be replaced." The skylights in the Annex were also reported to be in "bad condition" and leaking, causing damage to the walls in the public hall, "to the ceiling over the north portico, and in the walls in the Drawing Room." Repairs to the Annex were approved, but repairs to the leaking skylight in the Rotunda were deemed "not urgent" and, therefore, likely not immediately carried out.³⁶⁹

That same spring the original bell cracked, reportedly after students removed it from the mounting, turned it upside down, and filled it with water, which froze, splitting the casting and leaving its original tones "harsh and discordant." A new bell was ordered from McShane and Company, of Baltimore. Later, as plans were being made to reuse the original bell in the university chapel, three faculty members reportedly bought it for \$100 and "presented it to the Board of Visitors on condition that it should be kept forever as a relic in one of the public buildings of the University." The cracked bell was placed in the Brooks Museum at some point before 1896, then moved to the Bayly Memorial Museum in the late 1940s, and in 1956 to Clark Hall. After it was rediscovered in 1964, it was placed on display in the Rotunda.³⁷⁰

Electric lights were installed on the University grounds and in its public buildings and dormitories in the spring of 1888.³⁷¹ Between 1888 and 1890 "extensive" improvements were made to the University's buildings and grounds but not to the Rotunda.³⁷²

A report on the Rotunda, published in the University yearbook, *Corks and Curls*, in 1891, describes the building as the "most prominent figure among the buildings" on the grounds and the "real hub of the University, where flows all day the stream of professors and students, as it were, the life blood circulating through the heart of the University world." The description continued, claiming that the "veriest rustic cannot fail to be struck with its beauty and impressed with its completeness; he does not comprehend it, still he

perceives its effect. High above all towers is the red Roman dome, announcing to the scholastic pilgrim afar off that the Mecca, toward which he journeys, has been reached.”³⁷³ The reference to the Rotunda’s dome in this passage suggests that the roof had been painted with red iron oxide, as the Committee on Grounds and Buildings had recommended in 1883.

Along with the increasing flow of students and professors that followed the war and Reconstruction came many shipments of new books. In December 1892 the Library Committee reported that additional shelf space was needed to house the ever-expanding collection. “The gradual absorption of the entire Rotunda” for use as library space, the committee suggested, was thought to be the “best ultimate disposition of this building.”³⁷⁴ Nevertheless, in June 1894 the faculty recommended that a new building be erected to house the University’s library and that the Rotunda be transformed into a memorial hall for alumni.³⁷⁵

THE ROTUNDA IS DESTROYED BY FIRE, 1895

On October 27, 1895, a clear, bright Sunday morning, second-year student Mason Foshee of Brewton, Alabama, decided to forgo church services in favor of a visit to the Fayerweather Gymnasium. As Foshee leisurely made his way along the nearly deserted University Avenue toward Rugby Road, he noticed a “thin wreath of smoke curling from the northwest corner of the Annex.” A fire had broken out at the rear of the top story of the building, in an area used as a drawing studio. It was later determined that the fire had probably originated in a “large closet filled with old papers and in the wall and floor of this closet,” where “electric wires had been run.”³⁷⁶

Within three hours the forty-three-year-old Annex, which also housed the University’s law school, as well as the schools of physics and modern languages, was reduced to a smoldering ruin. A bucket brigade of men and women, university students, faculty, and neighbors formed in an attempt to douse the flames, and the “University hose” was brought out, but due to insufficient water pressure and a “lack of skill and excitement of those who were handling it,” the apparatus proved useless. Meanwhile, crews from the Southern and the Chesapeake & Ohio railroads, along with the fire departments from Charlottesville, Staunton, Lynchburg, and Richmond, were deployed to the scene. As onlookers watched the flames devour the Annex, fear that the fire would spread to the Rotunda and other buildings on the Lawn escalated.³⁷⁷

In an attempt to prevent the fire from reaching the Rotunda, dynamite was detonated in the wood-frame roof of the portico connecting the Rotunda and the Annex. Despite repeated attempts with dynamite and the columns being “battered down,” the portico

continued to stand, providing a direct avenue for the encroaching flames. The east and west wings of the Rotunda, which housed the old chapel and the YMCA reading room and directly connected the Rotunda with the pavilions and dormitories, were dynamited in the race to stop the fire.³⁷⁸

In spite of these drastic efforts, the fire was not contained; it advanced to the Rotunda, filling the building with “thick clouds of acrid, suffocating smoke, which poured in from the openings in the rear of the dome.” Still, a “stubborn Southern spirit” prevailed on campus as masses of volunteers scrambled to empty the Rotunda of its contents:

The door, like all the other doors in the University, was locked, but it soon gave way before the vigorous shoulders which were applied to it. The pictures of the Professors and distinguished Alumni of the University which ornamented the walls were the first things saved...The men going up and down the stairs were at first very much in each others way, until, by the effort of Prof. Mallet, Mr. Forsyth, and some others, a semblance of order was introduced into the crowd, and from then until the flames came into the dome the students went up one stair and down the other in a ceaseless stream.

The men dipped their handkerchiefs in water and tied them over mouth and nose and groped through smoke to the books and pictures. The glass cases holding the books were all locked; the students broke them open with fist and foot and threw the books out of the windows into blankets, which others held below, or carried them down stairs in their arms.³⁷⁹

Some of the students then turned their attention to the mid-1850s marble statue of Jefferson carved by Alexander Galt that stood on the main floor of the Library:

A squad of men, under Dr. Kent’s direction, saved the cases containing the catalogue of the library, while others tried to lift the statue of Jefferson from its pedestal with their hands, an attempt which was naturally unsuccessful...finally ropes were secured and attached to the neck of the Statue. These ropes were then carried up into one of the galleries and from thence willing hands lifted the statue from its pedestal and lowered it onto mattresses which had been placed under it. The mattresses with the statue on them were dragged to the door and the statue slid down the steps on an inclined plane of planks; the whole work being done in stifling smoke and under inconceivable difficulties.³⁸⁰

According to the student newspaper, *College Topics*, as the men rushed in and out of the burning building, women at the scene “met the blinded and choking men as they emerged with the books from the Rotunda and took their burdens from them that they might return more quickly to their work. Many ladies carried across the lawn loads of books which had taxed the utmost strength of athletic men.”³⁸¹ Morgan Poitiaux Robinson, one of the

many students struggling to save the Rotunda that day, reported that women, too, worked feverishly inside the Rotunda, rescuing books and art alongside the men:

They kicked the glass out of the bookcases — in many instances breaking it out with their own bare hands — and worked side by side with the men long after the fire was in the Library. The boys would get down on their knees and hold out their arms, while the women piled the books as high as they could reach on the outstretched arms; or again, the men would fill the women's silken (for it was Sunday) skirts with books and in each case the one carrying the books would take them to the window...and dump them down to the portico of the Rotunda, while others on the portico would carry them down to the Lawn and away from further danger. At first the men had tried to drive the women away, telling them that they would save all the books, etc., but they would not go, but worked everywhere that the men worked.³⁸²

Years after the fire Robinson vividly recalled the chaotic scene inside the Rotunda as the fire raged. “It was an awful scene,” he wrote in 1908; the glow of the fire through the thick smoke “cast a dull, red, fiendish glow over everything.” This phenomenon, combined with the crackling of burning timbers and the sounds of breaking glass, crashing beams, and dynamite explosions, created a “veritable hell” inside the Rotunda before the “whole plaster ceiling of the dome...came down to the floor.”³⁸³

Over the next few hours the fire burned uncontrollably, and at about one o'clock that afternoon the “great dome of the Rotunda slowly and majestically sank into the raging flames.” Bell Dunnington, the twelve-year-old daughter of Professor Francis P. Dunnington, witnessed the fire, and in a letter to her sister the following day wrote that she had never seen a “more magnificent or more awful sight than when the dome caught fire. All of the top part of it was one terrible, glowing mass of flame, and the tin [roofing] had a curious reddish look, though it did not blaze but wrinkled up.” Photographs taken in the days after the fire show that much of the Rotunda's interior was destroyed, leaving little more than a charred, brick shell. All that was left standing were the “walls, the front and back porches, and some blackened pillars.” Fortunately, there were no fatalities, and no serious injuries were suffered.³⁸⁴

Morgan Robinson painted a doleful picture of the scene at the University the night of the fire:

The Lawn was littered with books, instruments from the different laboratories, book-cases, desks, benches, and whatnot, while near the steps of the Rotunda, its recent home, lay the statue of Jefferson, enshrouded in a large canvas and guarded by special watchmen. When the moon came out, as though to take a last look at the pride of Jefferson's latter days, it was a ghastly and heart-rending sight to see the blackened walls and hollow windows, and the tall white pillars, with their marble capitals all smoked up, standing as silent sentinels, on

the old portico, where had stood so many men of note in this country, beneath the shadow of the dome of the Old Rotunda, it was certainly a sad, sad sight.³⁸⁵

Even though the fire wreaked havoc and the “embers glowed for several days,” classes, remarkably, continued uninterrupted. The fire was under control by half-past two on that Sunday afternoon, and by three o’clock the faculty, wasting no time, assembled in the chemistry lecture room “to devise ways and means for carrying on the work of the University without interruption.” That night University mechanics, who had spent the entire day tirelessly battling the fire, “kept hammer and saw and plane going in order that lecture rooms might be ready for morning lectures.” The day after the fire “all work of the University went right on without a break. All classes met at their usual hours, and all lectures were delivered, though in improvised lecture rooms, society halls, etc., just as if nothing had happened.” Morgan Robinson later observed that the “University probably never saw the time when lectures were better attended than they were that day after the fire,” even though “everyone wore a fatigued, worn-out, weary and sorrowful expression as though he had just lost his most valued friend.”³⁸⁶

TAKING MEASURE: LOSSES AND OPPORTUNITIES

At the time of the fire the Rotunda housed, in addition to the library, the lecture rooms of the schools of ancient languages, mathematics, moral philosophy, and English.³⁸⁷ Initial reports indicated that while some of the materials stored in the Rotunda and the Annex were severely damaged in the fire, “the larger part of the library’s contents,” including books, paintings, and statuary, including a bust of the late Professor John B. Minor, were removed from the library in the Rotunda in time to be saved, as were the contents of the law library in the Annex. In fact, however, by early January 1896 the University calculated that while 11,694 books had been rescued, approximately 30,000 others, valued at \$50,000, including some given as gifts to the University by Jefferson himself, were lost. It was later reported that as many as 50,000 volumes were lost. Most of the books that burned were housed in the middle and upper galleries of the Library.³⁸⁸ During the months following the fire, the surviving books were recatalogued, arranged on the shelves in Brooks Hall, then the University’s natural history museum, and made accessible to the student body by early May 1896.³⁸⁹ While much of the art displayed in the Rotunda was also saved, the University’s beloved copy of Raphael’s painting *The School of Athens* by Paul Balze, purchased by the University in 1853 and which hung in the public hall of the Annex, was destroyed.³⁹⁰

A report of the faculty dated October 31, 1895, and the Rector’s annual report of 1895–96 offer conflicting information about the surviving apparatus used to teach physics

and engineering. The faculty report indicated that some of the instruments suffered damage, but that much of the equipment had been removed from the physics lab in the Annex and stockpiled in the Brooks Museum. The Rector's report, however, stated that the "apparatus of the Physical Laboratory and Engineering Department was almost entirely destroyed."³⁹¹

Though undeniably a tragedy, the fire nonetheless opened a window of opportunity to improve the University: the outmoded and cramped spaces could now be replaced with "facilities more ample and splendid" than those that the student body and faculty had previously known. From the disaster the University community took a positive tack, likening their beloved, burned institution to a phoenix, rising from its ashes. The faculty called upon the Board of Visitors to unite with them "in the most active and earnest efforts," not only to restore the "beauty and conveniences" of the fire-ravaged buildings but also to make significant improvements to the University as a whole.³⁹² Faculty members were extremely concerned that the fire would lead to a fall off in enrollment and agreed that it was necessary to act quickly to restore the campus to full — and improved — working order and to assure the student body that the University was as strong as ever.

In its report the faculty declared that the Annex's "contiguity to the rotunda" was the "cause of more than half of [the] disaster" and that the building had been an "architectural blunder" in the first place; the Annex, the report stated, was "devoid of true architectural merit and very costly for the accommodation secured." The Rector, Dr. W. C. N. Randolph, reminded people how his father, Thomas J. Randolph, who was on the building committee for the Annex, had "bitterly opposed" its construction, predicting that "it would lead to the burning of the Rotunda."³⁹³ Further concerns over the possibility of a fire in the Rotunda itself and a call for a safer place to house the library had been voiced in the *Alumni Bulletin* just eight months before the Rotunda was destroyed: "The greatest need is a fire-proof library building. Our present valuable collection is constantly exposed to fire."³⁹⁴

With Thomas Randolph's prediction sadly realized and the Annex and Rotunda burned, the faculty immediately suggested erecting a free-standing "Academical building" constructed of fireproof materials on another site, removed from the Rotunda and the other buildings in Jefferson's Academical Village. They recommended that the ruins of the Annex be demolished immediately, that any "useful material" be moved to the yet-to-be-determined new site, and that the "depression occupied by the old building" be "backfilled with earth." The cost for the completion of a new academic building was estimated at \$90,000.³⁹⁵

Meanwhile, though, in preparation for a meeting of the Board of Visitors on November 4, 1895, the faculty consulted with Harry McDonald, of the McDonald Brothers architectural firm based in Louisville, Kentucky, to determine the condition of the ruins and to develop cost estimates for rebuilding. McDonald was in Charlottesville at the time, overseeing the construction of Christ Episcopal Church. After his investigation McDonald stated that the exterior walls of the Rotunda were “sound” and could be reused in reconstruction. He reported that the walls were in need of “little repair,” though they should be “at once protected against damage from weather” with a new roof, which, he recommended, be installed immediately.³⁹⁶ Soon after the fire Margaret Lewis Randolph, a great-granddaughter of Thomas Jefferson, had viewed the ruined buildings, noting that the Rotunda then looked like “any other burned out building. The North wall of the Annex has fallen for about halfway down.” The walls of the Rotunda, she reported, “they think are all right...the Capitals of the front columns are probably destroyed by the fire, the ornamental parts are dropping off in great many places...Carts are already busy cleaning up the debris and the ashes are smoking inside.”³⁹⁷

While the faculty, students, and Board of Visitors agreed that it was crucial that the Rotunda’s original proportions be faithfully observed in the reconstruction, there was debate over the intended use and interior arrangement of the building.³⁹⁸ Over the years the library had become “so crowded with books that the orderly arrangement of them was impossible, and the consequent utility of the collection was seriously impaired.” In order to accommodate a pleasing, spacious, and modernized library facility within the Rotunda, some members of the faculty suggested that the entire interior — “the whole capacity from the dome down to the portico floor” — should (unlike Jefferson’s multi-story Rotunda with the Library in the domed space on the top floor) be used entirely for the purposes of the library.³⁹⁹ However, some members of the faculty disagreed with this plan, arguing that such an arrangement deviated from the original as-built scheme and was therefore unacceptable. The question of how the interior of the new building would be arranged was not settled until after another architect was selected and final plans were drawn, several months later.⁴⁰⁰

The faculty had recommended in its October 31 report that the Rotunda’s east and west wings, or terraces, on the south end of the building should be “at once reconstructed in their former proportions...and assigned to the use of the library and the School of Natural Philosophy, respectively.”⁴⁰¹ In addition to commenting on the arrangement of the interior of the Rotunda, the faculty suggested that a portico, similar to the one of the south facade, be constructed on the north side, “with proper flights of steps descending to the esplanade to be formed over the site of the old Annex, and thence at the Ramparts to the level of the ground.” The faculty recommended this though the north portico was not part of Jefferson’s as-built design.⁴⁰²

RAISING THE FUNDS NEEDED TO REPAIR AND IMPROVE THE CAMPUS

Even while smoke was still rising from the “crumbling walls and smoking ruins,” students and faculty had gathered to discuss ways to raise the money to rebuild the destroyed buildings. Initial speculation about the cost of repairs, improvements, and replacement of lost equipment ranged from \$100,000 to \$300,000.⁴⁰³ The faculty claimed that the funding could “easily be raised if every friend of the University” did his “duty in [the] matter” and that the “funds requisite for this reconstruction” were “already on hand or immediately in sight.” However, fundraising proved more difficult than initially expected.⁴⁰⁴ Moreover, the University buildings were woefully underinsured: the firm of Peyton and Sinton of Richmond, which carried the insurance, estimated coverage at about \$150,000 for all of the University’s buildings, and the damaged buildings were covered by only \$25,000 in these policies. The *Charlottesville Daily Progress* provided the following breakdown of the insurance coverage of the damaged buildings and materials:

Rotunda	\$8,000
Library and pictures	8,000
Public hall or annex	3,500
Scientific apparatus, etc	3,500
School of Athens	1,000
Old chapel	500
Y.M.C.A	500
	<hr/>
	\$25,000 ⁴⁰⁵

In its October 31, 1895, report the faculty urged that the “work of design be pushed rapidly to its completion and the work of construction begun at the earliest practicable moment.”⁴⁰⁶ In this same report the faculty also proposed that sites be selected and plans designed for a new physics laboratory and separate engineering building. The faculty wanted both of these new buildings to be “isolated from all others.”⁴⁰⁷ In short, the task that lay ahead of the University was monumental: “buildings, projected on a larger scale than had been before attempted” at the University had to be “located, designed, and erected within twelve months,” and the funding had to be secured “with even greater promptness.” Moreover, “the equipment of the Library and of the other departments devastated by the fire” had to be “renewed, and, as far as possible, modernized and enlarged.”⁴⁰⁸

At its November 4 meeting the Board of Visitors assembled a building committee to oversee the restoration of the Rotunda and the construction of new buildings that would satisfy the need for classroom space formerly housed in the Annex. The committee was composed of the Rector, William Cary Nichols Randolph, who was Thomas Jefferson’s great-grandson; two Visitors, W. Gordon McCabe and Armistead C. Gordon; and faculty

members William M. Thornton, professor of applied mathematics and chairman of the faculty, and William H. Echols, a civil engineer who served as an adjunct professor of mechanical engineering and was also the University's superintendent of buildings and grounds in 1895.⁴⁰⁹

Within days of the fire contributions from individuals and offers of financial aid from sympathetic alumni and friends and from other universities around the country began to arrive via telegraph at the University. By November 8, 1895, the fund for the new construction exceeded \$12,000, each dollar from private subscription.⁴¹⁰ Two days after the fire a mass meeting, spearheaded by Virginia Governor Charles T. O'Ferrall, was held in Richmond with the aim of organizing a fundraising program.⁴¹¹

William M. Thornton, an alumnus of the University who had been a member of the faculty since 1875, traveled to New York and Boston in late December 1895 and early January 1896 to appeal to University of Virginia alumni in those cities for contributions. It was a difficult task: he bemoaned his "almost unbroken record of defeats" and "numerous absolute failures" in his campaign; people with the means of making large donations, he found, were "harried by constant appeals from every quarter and for every cause." Nevertheless, he managed to secure several large gifts, ranging from \$2,000 to \$25,000, as well as many smaller donations. By January 6 Thornton estimated that he had raised more than \$42,000 during his trip.⁴¹² In the February 1896 issue of the *Alumni Bulletin* Thornton recounted some of the donations: "The largest gift," of \$25,000, he wrote, "has been that from the generous and public-spirited Charles P. Rouss, of New York City." This gift would be appropriated for the construction of the physical laboratory at the south end of the Lawn, and the building would be named in Rouss's honor. Other contributions included \$2,500 from a Mrs. Sinclair, also of New York City, and \$5,000 from a "liberal friend of the University in Boston." In addition, Thornton reported, "there have been obtained from general contributions in the Northern and Western States, \$1,718; from the District of Columbia, \$2,881; from the Southern States, \$4,048."⁴¹³ An additional \$33,053 had been received from sources throughout Virginia: the cities of Richmond, Norfolk, Lynchburg, Staunton, Lexington, Winchester, and Roanoke contributed a combined \$18,575, and the town of Charlottesville and Abermarle County together contributed \$7,886. The Southern Railroad and the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad gave \$2,000 and, \$1,000, respectively. Other donations from the "State at large" amounted to \$619, in addition to more than \$1,500 collected by public-school children from throughout Virginia. Thornton further reported an additional \$2,930 from the University of Virginia itself.⁴¹⁴

While on his trip Thornton received word of "several gifts of books," including "fifteen hundred volumes from Columbia College" in New York City; a "fine collection of the older editions of the Greek and Latin classics, and of works in general History and

Literature from the library of the late Dr. Torrey, of Cambridge, Mass.; and the entire medical library of the Boston Athenæum, containing many of the older classics in the medical sciences.” “Many publishers,” Thornton reported, “were also induced by our New York alumni to make smaller contributions of books.”⁴¹⁵ While in New York and Boston, Thornton solicited for contributions in local newspapers, including the *New York Post*, *New York Times*, *New York Sun*, *New York World*, *Home Journal*, *Boston Herald*, and the *Boston Transcript*.⁴¹⁶ By the end of 1897 the University would have in hand approximately 40,000 volumes, thus restoring about one half of the original library.⁴¹⁷

In securing the necessary funds, the University turned not only to loyal alumni but to the Virginia State legislature as well. The Visitors urged alumni associations to lobby the legislature for “as liberal an appropriation as possible towards rebuilding and re-equipping the University.” Though the University had hoped for a \$200,000 lump-sum grant from the State, the State instead permitted the University to borrow the desired \$200,000 and awarded an additional \$10,000 annuity to enable it to pay the interest on the debt.⁴¹⁸ The legislature claimed it could not justify giving \$200,000 outright to the University when Virginia was mired in debt and severely impoverished in some regions. One senator argued in support of reducing the annuity to \$5,000 (an amendment that was defeated 30 to 5):

I come from a section of the State where, while we are honestly in favor of an appropriation to the University, we are not able in consequence of any sentimentalism to subscribe more than we are able to do. We are confronted with the fact, however, that the interest upon the State debt is to be paid; our lunatic asylums are needing appropriations, and I cannot conceive how, in the estimation of any senator upon this floor, we can in our present condition subscribe the sum of \$200,000 to the University of Virginia.⁴¹⁹

The following retrospective review of the fundraising was published in the *Alumni Bulletin* in 1898:

By January 18, 1896, there had been raised in cash and pledges from the alumni and other friends of the university about \$75,000, which amount was increased by later gifts to \$86,000. There was in hand from the original Fayerweather bequest and from the Shields bequest enough to raise this sum to \$140,000. The conditions of the litigation with reference to the residue of the Fayerweather estate justified the expectation of about \$120,000 from this source. And the bill of relief before the Virginia Legislature had been so far assured as to give

reasonable assurance of \$200,000 from the bond issue, which they finally voted. Altogether there was about \$440,000 in sight for the work of reconstruction.⁴²⁰

SELECTING THE ARCHITECT

Harry McDonald had acted as the initial architectural consultant in the Rotunda's reconstruction and carried out preliminary work, including taking measurements of the surviving walls of the Rotunda and then using these measurements, along with Jefferson's original drawings, to prepare a set of designs for the restoration of the building. Five of these drawings survive, including ground-floor and first-floor plans, front and side elevations, and one section [*Figures 64-67*].

McDonald Brothers' plans depicted a very different interior from that of the original Rotunda. In order to create more space for the University's growing library collection McDonald Brothers designed the new Rotunda without the floor dividing the dome room from the main level below, creating a single, large room that stretched skyward from the main floor to the dome and oculus. A new skylight would be framed in cast iron and have a higher, more conical shape than its predecessor. The plans included three annular levels of galleries for books: the first gallery level would be supported by twenty pairs of Ionic columns, the second gallery by twenty pairs of Corinthian columns, and the top gallery would be defined by an arcade with Doric pilasters. The drawings indicate that ornament, not included in the drawings, would continue around the circumference of the room between each of the levels. The smooth surface of the interior dome destroyed in the fire would be replaced with coffers set in plaster.⁴²¹

Though McDonald Brothers' plans eliminated the oval rooms on the main floor, these rooms, as well as the "dumbbell" hallway, were retained on the ground-floor level. Staircases with a semi-circular end return connecting the ground and main floors were placed at the north and south ends of the building.⁴²²

In their designs the McDonalds included, as was requested by the faculty, a portico on the north side of the building. This north portico would resemble the south portico, with six Corinthian columns across the front and three columns along each side. The new columns on both porticos were to be fluted. The bases of the columns, the shafts, and the capitals were designed with the same dimensions as the old ones on the south portico. There would be a lecture room under the north portico to help make up for the classroom space lost by removing the three oval rooms on the main floor. The presence of the south terrace wings is vaguely indicated on McDonald Brothers' plans; the north terraces are not included.

The McDonald Brothers' plans indicate a wide use of cast iron throughout the building. The exterior window casings and lintels would be recreated in the "same

design” as the old wooden ones but would now be of more fireproof cast iron. Window sills would be made of stone.⁴²³

The new roof of the Rotunda was to be constructed of tin and galvanized iron. The cornice and the steps of the dome would be galvanized iron and the curved part of the dome between the top step and the cast-iron–and–glass skylight would be covered in tin plate. Overall, the McDonald Brothers’ drawings were heavily annotated with dimensions. The firm began work reconstructing the Rotunda’s terrace wings soon after the fire, working in partnership with local builders, the Spooner Construction Company of Charlottesville.⁴²⁴

McDonald Brothers had been, at least initially, seriously considered for the entire reconstruction project: the Board of Visitors had resolved at its November 4, 1895, meeting to secure McDonald Brothers “at once” and “with their advice and assistance proceed to rebuild the Rotunda and the Wings thereof.”⁴²⁵ Although they created the detailed drawings and engaged in work on the Rotunda in late 1895 and early 1896, McDonald Brothers was, nevertheless, passed over for the commission.⁴²⁶

The faculty had stipulated in its October 31, 1895, report that in order to ensure that the architectural character and classical proportions of the Rotunda be retained, the architect selected to undertake the project should be “not of local repute only but of broad and national consideration.” Furthermore, the faculty requested that the architect take into account “not merely the convenience and elegance of the single structure, but its effect as a member of our general architectural system.”⁴²⁷ The faculty was convinced that it was important to follow the “classical types of design” in the new construction and to locate the new buildings “so as to create a harmonious combination with the original Jeffersonian group”; previous additions, the faculty felt, had “not added in the least degree to the harmony and beauty and magnificence of the original composition.” When creating new plans for the Rotunda, the architect should also “give special attention to the problems of heating, lighting, and ventilation, which in the old building were inadequately solved.”⁴²⁸

Professor William Thornton had written to William Rutherford Mead, partner in the New York-based architectural firm of McKim, Mead and White, on October 29, a few days after the fire, just as Mead was returning from Europe. Back in New York, Mead replied to the news of the fire on November 5, writing “I can only say how much we all regret the calamity which has befallen the University in the loss of a building that was one of the architectural monuments of the country — and our hope that its reconstruction has fallen into reverent hands.” “It would indeed be a misfortune,” Mead continued, “if some one tried to be original and improve on what has gone before — except perhaps as to interior arrangement” of the Rotunda. Mead clearly indicated the firm’s interest in working on the project, telling Thornton that “if no final arrangements have been made,

we can only say we should consider it an honor to be associated with the work and apart from our actual expense should not consider the money side of the matter.” The expenses, he added, would be about three percent of the construction costs.⁴²⁹ Coincidentally, when Mead responded to Thornton, Mead’s partner, Stanford White, was in Richmond to attend the fashionable wedding of a close friend, artist Charles Dana Gibson, and Virginia socialite Irene Langhorne. White returned to New York on November 8 and was likely already aware of his firm’s expression of interest in the project by that time.⁴³⁰

Though McDonald Brothers had already begun work on the reconstruction of the Rotunda’s terrace wings and the building committee had been in communication with McKim, Mead and White, there also was talk of holding an architectural competition.⁴³¹ Several prominent firms, including Barney and Chapman, and Carrère and Hastings, both of New York; E. G. Lind of Baltimore; Edgerton S. Rogers of Richmond; and Shepley, Rutan and Coolidge of Boston all contacted the University expressing their interest in the massive, high-profile project. However, the University quickly scuttled the idea for a competition in the interest of expediency. The faculty feared that students would not return to the University for another session unless they could see “some sign of active preparation for the new buildings & some proof that they will have new lecture-rooms for their next sessions’ work,” and a competition would undoubtedly delay the start of construction.⁴³² This concern was further illustrated when, on January 18, 1896, William Randolph wrote to architect John Carrère of Carrère and Hastings, thanking him for his interest in the work at the University but also explaining that because time was so short, “it would not be wise for us to risk the delays almost necessarily consequent upon an architectural competition”; the members of the building committee had felt “compelled to entrust the work to the hand of one chosen man of undoubted professional eminence.”⁴³³

By the end of the nineteenth century McKim, Mead and White had become the preeminent architectural firm in the U.S., renowned in both the professional and popular press. In his 1931 biography of Stanford White, Charles C. Baldwin described the firm as “vigorous, versatile and interested” and noted that the partners “were part and parcel of the times, entering into the activities of their clients, designing homes, clubs, churches, museums, memorials and office buildings, for a whole generation.” At the time of the fire at the Rotunda McKim, Mead and White had a “near monopoly on prestigious projects” in the U.S., and they had, among other things, recently designed the new campus at Columbia University and New York University’s Bronx campus, both of which included rotunda-form libraries.⁴³⁴

On January 18, 1896, eschewing the competition and offers from other firms, the University of Virginia formally offered McKim, Mead and White the commission for the reconstruction of the Rotunda, as well as for the construction of a complex of three new

buildings across the south end of the Lawn, including the general “Academical Building,” physical laboratory, and mechanical-engineering building. With this decision and invitation, McDonald Brothers was officially supplanted. Randolph, as chairman of the building committee, and Thornton, as chairman of the faculty, conveyed the news to Stanford White that the building committee was inviting him “to become the architect for the reconstruction of the Rotunda and the erection of the new buildings.” Partner Charles F. McKim was indefinitely laid up, recovering from a bicycle accident, and William Mead was more involved in managing the firm than in creating architectural plans.⁴³⁵ The building-committee members later admitted that they had “exceeded their authority” in directly offering the appointment to McKim, Mead and White, but their action was speedily confirmed by the Board of Visitors.⁴³⁶ Stanford White immediately accepted the commission.

In his letter of invitation Randolph urged White to make arrangements to visit the University at “the earliest possible date” with the goal of “inspecting its possibilities or architectural development.”⁴³⁷ Thornton reminded White that when they had met the previous fall, probably soon after the fire, he had explained the “limitations of our resources and the simplicity of the materials in which your work must be done.” Thornton wrote White that he would have to rely “mainly on bricks and mortar” but also pointed out that “Jefferson shewed [*sic*] in our old buildings how much could be done by proportion and composition, and we shall trust you to broaden his demonstration.” Thornton also told White that McDonald Brothers had “retired from the work which they had undertaken” and that White would “not be intruding upon an occupied field, and we desire to give you a free hand in all your work.”⁴³⁸

Before the contract was awarded to McKim, Mead and White, McDonald Brothers had worked on the Rotunda for a total of 79 days, from around November 1, 1895, until January 18, 1896. During that time they informally employed the H. L. Cranford Paving Co. to cover the Rotunda with a temporary roof, which was “speedily done and in a satisfactory manner.”⁴³⁹ They also oversaw Cranford’s rebuilding of the walls of the “adjacent terrace rooms” and then covering them with “flat, fire-proof roofs.” William H. Echols of the building committee later wrote that the McDonald firm “had made the complete design for the restoration of that building and of the present wings east and west, and had completed the east wing in its present condition before they resigned.”⁴⁴⁰

Though much of the work overseen by McDonald Brothers was deemed sufficient, there were some problems that ultimately may have led to the dissolution of the firm’s relationship with the University and the hiring of McKim, Mead and White. The new roofs that were built over the terrace rooms were made of concrete in order to fulfill the University’s desire for fireproof construction. These new roofs, which were much heavier than their sheet-metal-over-wood-frame predecessors, were built upon the

remains of the terrace walls, and there were concerns about their structural safety. An independent engineer called in to examine the work determined that the “steel beam framing supporting the upper concrete terraces was overloaded and that the new structure had begun to crack and sag.” The engineer found that the carrying capacity of the steel beams was inadequate. Ostensibly, on the grounds of this engineering miscalculation, McDonald Brothers was relieved from their work at the University.⁴⁴¹

It seems, however, that McDonald Brothers’ miscalculations may not have been the only reason they were let go from the job: the State legislature dictated that the University would need to engage a large, nationally renowned architectural firm for the work in order to secure the necessary funds for the reconstruction project. Harry McDonald later disclosed that at the January 18, 1896, meeting of the building committee he distinctly stated with regard to the terrace roofs that he intended to “thoroughly strengthen this work, no matter what the cost,” at his own expense. In response, however, William Randolph reportedly told McDonald that the University was “in a hole”; they were being criticized for having made a hasty selection of an architect, and the University would jeopardize its chances of securing State funding if it engaged a local architecture firm, as opposed to a nationally recognized one.

McDonald acquiesced on the condition that his resignation be presented in such a way that it would not damage his or his firm’s reputation. Randolph and the building committee responded with a letter officially informing McDonald Brothers that Stanford White, an “architect of the highest eminence,” would be offered the commission but that the termination of the University’s relationship with McDonald Brothers was a friendly one.⁴⁴²

On January 22, 1896, Stanford White wired both Professor William Thornton and Rector William Randolph to announce his acceptance of the invitation.⁴⁴³ A little more than two weeks later, on February 8, the University sent McDonald Brothers’ drawings and specifications for the Rotunda to White in New York. Thornton stated at this time that McDonald Brothers would be paid for the plans and told White that he “may as well use them for what they are worth.”⁴⁴⁴ In their drawings for the Rotunda, McDonald Brothers had removed the intermediate floor to make the dome room into a two-story space. Their scheme included three tiers of columns with intermediate cornices, which approximated the size and proportions of Jefferson’s individual columns.⁴⁴⁵

Thornton asked White to “preserve and return” the McDonald drawings, as they had constituted the firm’s formal report to the building committee. Thornton also reiterated to White that it was important that work on the Rotunda begin quickly. “Much of the ironwork” needed for the structural work, Thornton suggested, “could be pushed under cover of the temporary roof regardless of the frost or other bad weather.” “Send any instructions you think necessary about the portico floor,” he added.⁴⁴⁶

In preparing to hand over their drawings to Stanford White, McDonald Brothers composed a lengthy and detailed explanation of the drawings and the calculations and decision making that had gone into creating them. "We were directed to follow the old design closely, in the exterior at least," the firm wrote. While the columns retained their overall height of 28 feet 6 inches in the new plans, McDonald Brothers had adjusted the sizes of the bases and capitals to more closely reflect the proportions of the columns at the Pantheon:

Measurements taken from the old walls show the height of the columns of the portico, including base shaft and capital to be 28'6". The survey also shows the diameter of the columns at the base to be about 2'11". Mr. Jefferson's estimations to the marble cutter called for a base for a 3' column with a diminished diameter of 2'8" and a height of 3'5" for the capital. The height of the base of the old columns measured from the floor to the top of the torus is 17 7/8", within 1/8" of the proportions of the same members on the Pantheon. The total height of the entablature and attic base, measured from the [imprint ?] on the building is 8' 9 1/2". Taking the proportions of the Pantheon, the diam. of old columns measured at the base being 3' would require a total height of 29'4".

A column 28'6" high should have a diam. of 2'11" at the base and 2'6 1/2" at the neck. The height of the capital should be 3'3 1/2" and the height of the base from the floor to the top of the torus 17 1/2".

By referring to our drawings it will be found that we have adhered to the proportions for diams. at the base and neck, the total height, the height of capital and that of base, given by Mr. Jefferson.

We think the design would be improved if the diams. of cols. were placed at 2'11" and 2'6 1/2", the height of the capital at 3'3 1/2" and height of base at 17 1/2", leaving the total height of column unchanged as measured from the old building.

We have taken the liberty of fixing the height of the entablature at 6'7 1/2", which bears the same relation to the height of the columns in the Rotunda portico as the entablature of the Pantheon portico bears to its columns. To do this we had to encroach on the height of the attic base, which was, judging from the photographs, a little higher than we have it. We moved the top of the attic base up two inches, thereby increasing the height (combined) for the entablature and attic base to 8'11 1/2". This is so slight that I don't see how it can be objected to.

The cornice in the Pantheon portico had no dentils, but as the Rotunda had these we have put them back. The columns of the old Rotunda and of the

Pantheon had no flutes, but with your approval, we have designed the columns with flutes.

We have removed the antifixae from the attic cornice and replaced them with a parapet. We concluded that it would be a mistake to have the sides of the north portico without railing and have therefore left the protection which we had originally, hoping you will finally approve our action.⁴⁴⁷

MCKIM, MEAD AND WHITE'S PLANS FOR THE ROTUNDA

The reconstruction of the Rotunda was only one part of the multi-faceted work that Stanford White was to undertake at the University, and officials were eager for him to arrive in Charlottesville to begin the design process. By their calculation the University had “less than eight months in which to plan and erect the needed buildings.”⁴⁴⁸ Thornton wrote to White on January 24, 1896, stressing how important it was to move ahead quickly and assuring him of the willingness of the University personnel to assist:

We shall try to have ready for you all the preliminary information necessary to accelerate the work. The various members of the Faculty are engaged now in drawing up memoranda and sketches showing the needs in each of the department buildings. As soon as you are able to trace out your plans for these and determine the best location for them, we should like to begin work on the excavation and to collect materials for the foundations and have everything in readiness for beginning actual building operations as soon as spring opens.⁴⁴⁹

White, however, had fallen ill in late January 1896 and could not travel to Charlottesville.⁴⁵⁰ He promised, though, that he would be there on February 4. He could stay for only one day, but he assured Thornton that the purpose of his trip was to “expedite matters and arrange for a later appointment.”⁴⁵¹

In anticipation of White's visit Thornton sent to him the “data for the several buildings,” including McDonald Brothers' measurements of the Rotunda and drawings showing “sections of the old cornice.”⁴⁵² Furthermore, W. C. N. Randolph informed White that he would convey to him Thomas Jefferson's “original drawings of the buildings of the University.” The drawings were “quite in detail and perfect as to all the buildings,” Randolph wrote, except for the drawing of the Rotunda, which was “not so perfect and not so in detail.” Still, he wrote, the drawing of the Rotunda would serve as “a very good guide as to the original designs of the modifications of the Pantheon.”⁴⁵³

Back in New York, White was visibly concerned about the larger design issues of adding to Jefferson's complex. Edward Simmons, a painter and fellow member of The Players, a men's club in Manhattan, recounted how he had met with his good friend White soon after the latter had returned from Charlottesville. “As we sat together over

something to drink,” Simmons recalled, “he seemed to be puzzled, confused, and silent. I asked him what was the matter. He started and came out of his mood, saying it was the job down South. ‘I’ve seen *his* plans,’ he said, speaking with great deference. ‘They’re wonderful and I am scared to death. I only hope I can do it right.’”⁴⁵⁴ In preparation for the work, White studied Jefferson’s original drawings, sketches of the Lawn, elevations and plans of the Rotunda, and a bird’s-eye view of the grounds.⁴⁵⁵

On February 21, 1896, White wrote to Thornton from New York, reporting that he was “now ready, as far as my drawings are concerned, to present the scheme for the Rotunda, and also the scheme for the lay out of the new Campus” but that he still wanted “to investigate the cost more thoroughly” before presenting his plans to the building committee.⁴⁵⁶ White elaborated on the difficulties he faced in reconstructing the Rotunda within the constraints of the University’s budget:

The approximate estimates which we have made upon the work are far in advance of those which have already been stated for the buildings. I cannot understand how such an estimate of \$90,000 could have been made upon the Rotunda, for a fire-proof building; using limestone instead of cement for the columns, and metal for the window trim, cornice, and roof. We have found it impossible here to construct such buildings as you require for less than 25 cents per cubic ft. fire-proof.⁴⁵⁷

On February 26 White sent his drawings of the Rotunda to Thornton in Charlottesville. “We have endeavored to restore the building exactly to its former state,” White wrote in an accompanying letter, “or rather exactly to the state which we believe Jefferson contemplated finishing it at the time the building was built.” At this time, the scheme for the restored Rotunda, presented in “eight scale studies,” was reportedly more fully developed than the studies for the new buildings to be built at the south end of the Lawn.⁴⁵⁸

Two of the eight studies that White sent to Charlottesville were of the Rotunda’s interior. One study endeavored “to preserve the room in the Rotunda practically as designed by Jefferson — using the lower story as a storage room for books, with a small circular hall for reading-room.” The alternate scheme that White proposed, which depicted the large, open plan similar to the McDonald scheme, was, White wrote, “a nearer approach to the classic and ideal treatment of the interior of such a rotunda. It is the one also which is much the most sensible where a library and reading room to meet the enlarged needs of the University is required.” White strongly advocated the adoption of this alternate scheme, writing that it was “the one which we believe Jefferson himself would have adopted had the Rotunda been intended solely for use as a Library.” White further elaborated on the plans:

The scheme of re-building would contemplate the preserving as far as possible all exterior work in fit condition to use; the substitution of cut limestone and copper where wood and plaster has been heretofore used, and the use of as little wood as possible.

The approximate estimates we have received upon this work run from \$130,000 to \$150,000. We think when working drawings are made and careful estimates are given by Southern firms that these figures will be reduced. At the same time, the amount of cut stone upon the building is so great that we should recommend the adoption of cement for the columns and balustrades, window trim, etc., should we be unable to obtain a sufficiently low figure upon the Rotunda.⁴⁵⁹

White's plans for the rebuilt Rotunda also included east and west terrace wings on the north side of the building, mirroring those on the south. The terraces would be connected by colonnades, running north-south, creating courtyards on each side of the building. Assisting White in preparing the drawings were William Mitchell Kendall and Bert Fenner, both from McKim, Mead and White's New York office, who later became partners in the firm.⁴⁶⁰

White presented his plans for the redesigned Rotunda and the new buildings to the University's building committee on March 2, 1896. The committee adopted the plans but on the condition that White pare down the cost of the entire project, including the new buildings — estimated to be more than half a million dollars, or double the budget — to \$250,000. White's plans had called for constructing all of the new buildings of fireproof materials and installing central heating and a mechanized ventilation system in the Rotunda. In White's revised plans, only the Rotunda would be constructed of fireproof materials; central heating was retained, but the ventilation system was eliminated. After a few other adjustments not related to the Rotunda, the cost estimate was brought down to the necessary amount, and White's plans were approved at the March 13, 1896, meeting of the Board of Visitors.⁴⁶¹

At this same meeting the building committee reported that, to date, \$1,370.47 had been spent on repairs to the Rotunda proper; \$3,465.93 on the terraces and wings; \$629.49 on cleaning, hauling, and stacking bricks from the Annex; \$895.95 on constructing temporary lecture rooms; and \$2,690.57 on "incidental expenses," for a total of \$9,052.41. The repairs included the carpenter (\$778.19), day laborers (\$138.59), watchmen (\$13), removing debris (\$71.95), and materials — lumber (\$284), hardware (\$66.94), cotton cloth for windows (\$10), and rope (\$7.80).⁴⁶²

The Board of Visitors authorized the building committee to enter into construction contracts but with an important caveat: "in no event shall the cost of the completion of the said buildings, ready for use," exceed \$250,000, exclusive of architectural fees. The

architects were responsible for supervising, directing, and inspecting construction and for providing “complete specifications and details.”⁴⁶³

White, for his part, had agreed to deduct from his commission the fee that the Board had already paid McDonald Brothers, and the Visitors thanked him for the interest and enthusiasm in the project. White presumably accepted the University’s thanks graciously, but a few days later he wrote in a private letter that he was being “driven crazy by the University of Virginia work...they are driving everything to get four buildings finished before the 15th of September, and with McKim away, and in addition to the other loads, it does not leave me with much mind left.”⁴⁶⁴

In his March 20, 1896, “Report of the Architects to the Building Committee,” White explained that the remodeling of the interior of the Rotunda was given “most careful study.” “Reasons of sentiment,” he wrote, addressing the question of the arrangement of the interior posed by some members of the faculty in the days after the fire, “would point to the restoration of the interior exactly as it stood.” White, however, successfully lobbied for making the interior of the central part of the building one open space for use as the library. It was an “unquestionable fact,” White wrote, “that it was only practical necessity which forced Jefferson at the time it was built to cut the Rotunda in[to] two stories.” White convinced those initially opposed to a single large space beneath the dome that Jefferson would have “planned the interior as a simple, single, and noble room” without the division into two stories, if it had been possible.⁴⁶⁵

White’s design also made provision for the growth of the library, including four terrace rooms that would project out at ground level and could be occupied by offices or reading rooms until such time as they were needed to house the library collection. The terraces at the southeast and southwest edges of the Rotunda would stand on the sites of the YMCA reading room and old chapel that had been deliberately destroyed by dynamite during the fire. The “two oval rooms in the basement,” which were to be in “direct connection with the main floor of the Library,” could be used as “ordinary reference and reading rooms.”⁴⁶⁶ Rector W. C. N. Randolph, the building committee, and the Board of Visitors “most heartily” adopted White’s plans and specifications for the Rotunda, which were finalized on April 25, 1896.⁴⁶⁷

After their plans were approved McKim, Mead and White prepared another set of eleven drawings that are dated April 7, 1896. These drawings, eight of which survive, show that Stanford White had adopted several of the elements outlined by McDonald Brothers in their plans, including the large open space from the main floor to the top of the dome, the levels of annular galleries for books, the coffered ceiling, and the addition of the north portico. In White’s plans, however, the north portico was shortened from three-columns deep to one-column deep. Though this one-column-deep scheme was

ultimately adopted, the portico area was enlarged from that shown on the drawings, as evidenced in photographs taken after construction was complete.⁴⁶⁸

The north terraces appear on the April 7 plans and elevations, but, curiously, they differ in design and dimension between the firm's site plan and the ground-floor plan of the same date. The site plan shows terraces that extend further out from the building than those in the ground-floor plan, thus creating larger courtyards between the Rotunda and the colonnades that connect the north and south terraces. Ultimately it appears that the scheme on the site plan was followed.⁴⁶⁹

White's plan eliminated McDonald Brothers' inclusion of pairs of Ionic and Corinthian columns on the first and second levels of the interior. Instead, White implemented a twenty-column peristyle of single, larger Corinthian columns that rose from the main level up three stories to support the architrave between the second- and third-level galleries. White's plan for the ground-floor level resembled McDonald Brothers' in that White, too, retained the east and west oval rooms and "dumbbell" hallway. However, the site plan again reveals a different design and includes a smaller north oval room that was actually built in the reconstruction. White eliminated McDonalds' semi-circular staircases at the north and south ends of the hallway and included two sets of curved staircases on opposite sides of the south end of the hallway, similar to Jefferson's original plan. Lavatories were planned for either side of the north entrance on the ground level, abutting the north facade.⁴⁷⁰

White's plan also included four spiral staircases that connected the main floor to the upper galleries at the corners of the Rotunda. According to the plan, bookcases on the first and second gallery levels would be installed perpendicular to the columns, projecting into the gallery walkway from the columns, as well as against the walls, between the windows. Ultimately, the bookcases on the main floor were arranged like this, but the cases on the first and second galleries were installed against the Rotunda's walls, between the windows. The third gallery level, which ultimately would contain a series of closets around the perimeter, had a simple balustrade, the design of which was later changed to be more ornate. White's April 7 scheme also included a fourth level of the gallery, but this plan was ultimately abandoned.⁴⁷¹

The April 7, 1896, side elevation depicts the "16 oz. copper tiles made in special design" later indicated in the specifications, dating April 20, 1896.⁴⁷²

During the winter of 1895–1896 Stanford White solicited an estimate for work for the Rotunda's dome, floor vaulting, and other interior work from the R. Guastavino Company of New York City.⁴⁷³ Rafael Guastavino, who had immigrated to the U.S. from Spain in 1881, created a structural system for building floors and ceilings that used flat clay tiles set in cement mortar. His structures were stronger than concrete structures of comparable weight and were more fire resistant than concrete or steel. Guastavino's

system was also impervious to rot, insects, and damage by the elements. Guastavino had worked extensively with McKim, Mead and White, and his vaulting system had won attention when he worked with them on the vaulted roofs and floors of the Boston Public Library in 1892.⁴⁷⁴

On March 11, 1896, Rafael Guastavino had sent McKim, Mead and White an estimate for work on the Rotunda. For labor and material for the erection of “ceiling floor of vestibule for Library Building,” for the “ceiling support of the main front stairs,” and the “ceiling and rough roof of the pediment,” the estimate was \$4,666. This price included “rough tile work and iron necessary.” Guastavino specified that no concrete was included for the vestibule and stair arches, but it was included for over the pediment. For an additional \$2,710 Guastavino proposed “to furnish labor and material for Dome step rings built of porous terra cotta to allow nailing of metal roof architrave and frieze for the pediment of front elevation.” “No moulding or cornice are figured for this pediment,” Guastavino specified, “but iron is included.” The price for concreting the vestibule and over the stair arches was \$600.⁴⁷⁵

Also on March 11, 1896, the W. H. Mullins Architectural Sheet Metal Company of Manhattan submitted to McKim, Mead and White an estimate of \$9,504 for the copper roofing for the Rotunda. The estimate included the “cornice and gutter round dome skylight, copper fill roofing, steps and cornices on dome, main cornices and gutters on Rotunda and tympanums, interior porch cornices, and window casings and heads all as shown on drawings.”⁴⁷⁶

Stanford White received an estimate for carving the column capitals and bases for the Rotunda from the Piccirilli Brothers’ studio in Manhattan on April 15, 1896. The firm gave three estimates for the work: “each cap with base in first quality Italian monumental marble would cost \$850; each cap with base in #2 Vermont \$1,100.” If the Vermont marble was too expensive, then they proposed a “less expensive marble, saving about \$250 each set, which probably would answer to the purpose.”⁴⁷⁷

Meanwhile, in preparing to begin construction in the early spring, Thornton had asked White to assess the quantity of bricks that the University should have readily available “on the ground when the building operations begin.” Thornton estimated that between 300,000 and 400,000 “old bricks” from the burned Rotunda were available for reuse in the reconstruction, but Thornton pressed White on the number of new bricks that would be needed for “face work.” “Mr. Echols,” Thornton reported, “is looking into all the details and getting ready to make bricks on our own grounds, and I hope that work will soon be begun.”⁴⁷⁸ By the time of the March 13, 1896, meeting of the Board of Visitors “clay almost identical with the clay of the original bricks” had been found, and enough for a half million bricks had been “gotten out and exposed to the weather.”⁴⁷⁹

On April 27, 1896, William Echols informed White that the University had hired the firm of Adams Brothers and Payne of Lynchburg to produce 1.5 million bricks. Theodore Skinner, the on-site superintendent from McKim, Mead and White, wrote to Echols that same day, indicating that the estimate for the brick fabrication did not include “face brick to be used in Rotunda.” “These bricks,” Skinner reminded Echols, needed to be “exactly the same size as those used in the old walls of Rotunda and must have the same smooth texture and color.” The new bricks for the Rotunda would be “wanted as soon as any,” Thornton added, “so it is important that you begin their manufacture at once.”⁴⁸⁰ Echols responded to Skinner’s letter two days later: “The bricks we are now making at the University yard are the size of the Rotunda brick and will cost \$7.00 per m. delivered at Rotunda. How many of these brick do you need? Let me know this, so I can change moulds to 8 x 4 x 2½ as soon as we have made enough of the smaller size.”⁴⁸¹ On May 4 Echols wrote to White, informing him that so far they had made 100,000 new bricks the size of the Rotunda brick and that he needed to know how many more bricks they would need. The building committee was evidently anxious for White to come to Charlottesville. Echols wrote to White: “Expected you here Saturday. When will you come down and take charge of the work?”⁴⁸²

To help manage construction costs, several railroad companies — the Southern, the Chesapeake and Ohio, and the Norfolk and Western — promised the University a 50-percent reduction on shipping the construction materials. Temporary tracks were laid to the University for ease of delivery of construction materials.⁴⁸³

William Thornton’s description of the planned restoration work on the Rotunda was published in the February 1896 issue of the *Alumni Bulletin*. The south facade of the building would be a reproduction of Jefferson’s original design, “as exact as the skill of the builder can achieve.” The Rotunda’s “stately columns, with their graceful Corinthian capitals of white marble, the cornice, the pediment, the swell of the noble dome,” would all be “consciously restored.” Thornton elaborated on the plans for the exterior, including the new portico on the north side of the building:

The same materials will be used, save that the combustible timber will be replaced by incombustible cement and copper. In like manner woodwork will be eschewed in the interior construction, and even steel will be used to a very limited extent, the columns, floor arches, and the dome itself being reconstructed of tiles under the Guastavino patents. The northern face will show an elevation similar to the southern, but the portico will be much less in depth, in order to not detract from the dignity of the southern front, the steps descending between the two new wings, added to correspond with the terrace rooms on the south. The side elevations will present a novel and dignified aspect. The two terrace rooms are to be connected by a colonnade in continuation of that on the Lawn. The flat roofs of the wings and the connecting colonnades, guarded by a handsome

balustrade, will furnish a pleasant promenade about the main building, while the vistas between the columns prevent apparent reduction of its height to spectators approaching from east or west.⁴⁸⁴

The report in the *Alumni Bulletin* also included a description of the new interior of the Rotunda:

The interior partition walls will be removed to the level of the portico floor...and at that elevation will be bridged with heavy steel beams, between which the Guastavino floor arches will be thrown. Upon this floor will be supported a handsome Corinthian peristyle, whose entablature carries the main gallery at a height of 28 feet above the floor. From the entablature springs the inner shell of the dome; from the main wall springs the outer. The two meet at the eye in the crown and are tied together by intermediate braces. The space between the wall and the peristyle is subdivided by perforated iron floors into five book tiers, three below and two above the gallery, the latter being lighted from above through sheets of heavy glass set in alternate panels with the tile into the roof. The capacity of this main library room will be between 90,000 and 100,000 volumes.⁴⁸⁵

CONSTRUCTION OF THE TERRACES

Even before construction contracts were awarded for the Rotunda itself, work on the terraces at the Rotunda was underway. McDonald Brothers had begun construction in late 1895, and specifications for the repair of the terrace roofs, probably drawn up by McKim, Mead and White, were dated February 1, 1896:

Iron.

Present 15" beam girders to be tapped for the connections of strengthening framing. Framing shown in black on drawing to be steel I beams of size marked on drawing, framed, and with connections as shown. If wall ends of beams come into arches of openings they are to be hung from the wall above the arch in wrought iron stirrups.

Plastering.

Cut out plaster at each point where strengthening beams and present four inch beams cross to permit of blocking up of the 4" beams, and repair all plaster after iron is erected.

Damp-proofing.

Flash all side walls with 16 oz. copper. On top of present mastic coat lay a damp-proofing course composed of four layers of heavy asphaltic roofing felt laid in and well cemented together with hot asphaltic cement, and coated with same on top surface. Before concrete for pavement is laid, put on a one-half inch thick

coat cement mortar composed of parts of Dyckerhoff Portland Cement to three parts of clean sharp sand.

Post & McCord's estimate for ironwork erected is ... \$750.00

T. New's estimate for flashing and damp-proofing is 725.00⁴⁸⁶

On February 3, after having reviewed the specifications with Echols, Thornton informed White that the tight schedule would not allow for plastering and that it "should be deferred until the total dead load has been placed on the roof." Thornton also reported that the roof of the eastern terrace was leaking, in spite of patching.⁴⁸⁷ By February 8 Thornton and White were in agreement that it was "best to postpone the completion of the terrace rooms and let the contracts for that work along with those for the Rotunda." Though the building committee wanted to have some of the rooms ready for use that spring, Thornton conceded that it was "hardly possible" for them to "finish the rooms in time to make them of any real use this session."⁴⁸⁸

At the March 13, 1896, meeting of the Board of Visitors, the building committee reported that \$3,465.93 had been spent, to date, on the terraces and wings, including \$1,000 paid to the Cranford Paving Company; \$551.83 to Nettycomb and Kell for "cement, etc."; and \$281.80 to Wenger and Brand for "plastering & material."⁴⁸⁹

SELECTING THE CONTRACTOR

Soon after learning that his firm had been selected for work at the University, Stanford White began to investigate prospective contractors. He consulted, for example, Thomas Hastings, John Carrère's partner. Hastings replied on February 6, 1896, that he could only give White "facts concerning our Richmond work, without any advice as to your work — because it is differently located." Hastings supplied the names of contractors in Richmond whom his firm had used for "masonry, carpentry, plumbing, roofing, painting, millwork, and ironwork."⁴⁹⁰

White was concerned about who would be invited to bid on construction work. He had checked on three companies that William Thornton had proposed earlier in March, and White was "not at all satisfied with the reports" he had received. It appeared that these companies had built only "buildings of a very cheap and unimportant character," rather than any that were intended "to last for generations." White suggested that William H. Echols confer with W. C. N. Randolph and Thornton to determine how to proceed with selecting the contractor.⁴⁹¹

Randolph told White, in confidence, that for political reasons he would oppose awarding the work of reconstructing the Rotunda and erecting the three new classroom buildings to just one contractor. "We are a State institution, dependent for our success

upon the backing that the State gives us,” he wrote, “and while I am not for one minute going to yield to any demagogical ideas about it, I am not going to be foolish enough not to throw the rotten tub to the whale” (he warned White not to “ever let this sentence come back to me”). Randolph proposed instead giving the Rotunda contract to a Northern firm, since no Southern firm could “do it and make it fireproof.” He proposed awarding the contracts for the construction of the new buildings to three separate Virginia firms. Still, Randolph wrote, if White felt that this approach would jeopardize the character of the work or involve unqualified contractors, he would agree to hire a single firm. It might “give you and I less trouble to let the whole thing to one man,” Randolph wrote, but “it would not be good for the University.”⁴⁹²

White replied that he would send the specifications to a list of contractors that had been submitted to Randolph. “On the whole,” White added, “I think it would be best to obtain bids from the various firms recommended, reserving to yourselves and ourselves the right of rejecting any and all bids.”⁴⁹³

While the questions of the contractors and bidding rules were being discussed in early April 1896, McKim, Mead and White had selected Theodore Skinner to be the firm’s on-site representative at the University. Skinner, a member of the staff at the firm’s New York City office, had written to White to apply for the post in late February and visited Charlottesville in anticipation of his role as supervisor of the work. Skinner, who was described as a “pleasant gentleman to do business with,” was a graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and already had “practical experience” as a construction superintendent. He sought the position in Charlottesville in the hope that the work there might “lead to a position as instructor in architecture at the University.”⁴⁹⁴

Skinner found the work at the University difficult, describing his assignment as “work, hard work, from 8:30 a.m. until 6 p.m. and sometimes later — Saturdays as well as other days.” His tasks included inspecting materials and workmanship, making drawings, correcting mistakes, and being “ready to talk shop to any of a hundred and one interested parties here, etc. etc.”⁴⁹⁵ Skinner held this post from April 27, 1896, through December 18, 1897.⁴⁹⁶

Skinner was also involved in the dialogue about the selection of the contractor for the restoration work on the Rotunda and the new construction. He reported to White on a conversation he had with Randolph about the selection process, after which White told Randolph that he agreed that “if possible all work should be given to Virginia Contractors.” White further proposed that the terms of the contract be “very severe,” with 10 percent of the contract held for three months after acceptance of the work and a 10 percent bond required. Randolph agreed, saying that he favored making the conditions “very stringent.”⁴⁹⁷

Still, there was confusion over who was to be invited to submit bids. Randolph wired McKim, Mead and White on May 4, 1896, that he was disturbed that he had not yet received from the architects the list of contractors who would be invited to bid on the construction of the buildings; moreover, Skinner maintained that he had not received from Echols the University's list of contractors. On May 5 Thornton sent to White a list of candidates, with a note that the architects were to add to it "such other firms as you approve."⁴⁹⁸ Randolph wired White on that same day that he hoped White would "Submit Specifications at once." The University's list included the Charles E. Langley Company of Richmond, who had contacted McKim, Mead and White about bidding on the work in early February.⁴⁹⁹ A surviving list of proposed bidders for the work includes in addition to Langley three companies from Richmond; one from Lynchburg; one from Charlottesville; one from Charleston, West Virginia; and one from Louisville, Kentucky. Also on the list, and designated as having been suggested by McKim, Mead, and White, were H. L. Cranford, of Washington, D.C.; Norcross Brothers, of Worcester, Massachusetts; and Probst Construction Co. and George A. Fuller and Co., both of New York City.⁵⁰⁰

The bids were opened with White, Thornton, and Echols in attendance, on May 22, 1896, and the building committee planned to meet the next day.⁵⁰¹ A single construction contract for the restoration work and the new construction was awarded to the lowest bidder, the Charles E. Langley Company, and the documents were signed on May 26. The Board of Visitors, at its meeting on June 17, ratified the building committee's decision to award the construction contract to Langley for \$269,440. This amount exceeded the sum that had been authorized by the Visitors in March" but was approved by the Board of Visitors on June 17, 1896.⁵⁰²

The Charles E. Langley Company had been highly recommended to Stanford White by architect Thomas Hastings, who told White that Langley was a "very intelligent mechanic," with "unusual judgment in matters of building." Carrère and Hastings had worked with Langley on the Richmond Hotel. Hastings strongly recommended using Langley as the general contractor for the University of Virginia work, believing him to be "perfectly responsible" and "very conscientious."⁵⁰³

In the spring and summer of 1896 the University entered into contracts with several companies for subcontracting work: C. C. Cocke of Charlottesville was engaged to supply 1 million common bricks at a cost of \$6.50 per thousand bricks; Adams Bros. and Payne of Lynchburg was engaged to supply 1.5 million good quality, hard brick at a price of \$5.50 per thousand; Edgar N. Cox of Charlottesville was contracted to provide all of the sand that would be required "in and about the construction and repairs of any and all buildings and improvements constructed or repaired" at the University for the price of \$.55 per ton; and E. Dillon and Co. was contracted to provide the lime required in the construction and repairs at a price of \$.33¼ per 200-pound barrel.⁵⁰⁴

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ROTUNDA BEGINS

Once the contracts were signed at the end of May 1896, work began at once, around the first of June. The work at the Rotunda took precedence over the construction of the new buildings, though all work was to proceed simultaneously: the basement lecture rooms in the Rotunda and the four terrace rooms were to be finished as soon as possible and be ready for use by the beginning of the next session, in the fall. It was hoped that all of the work would be completed “by, or very near, the close of the year 1896.”⁵⁰⁵ The contract specifically called for the lecture rooms and terraces to be completed by September 15, 1896, and the entire construction project — both the Rotunda and the new buildings — was to be completed on December 15 of that same year.⁵⁰⁶

At first, work on the Rotunda progressed vigorously. By June 24, 1896, work on reconstructing the dome had begun and was reportedly “going on rapidly.”⁵⁰⁷ On July 7 Skinner reported to White that work was “progressing well,” but questions had arisen about the Rotunda’s original foundation and the foundation to be constructed for the new north portico. Skinner wrote to White:

Today we have found that the old foundations of the “Rotunda” building had no spreading foot or concrete foot: that the new piers and walls of the North Portico foundation sit below the bottom of the old brick work and that although the earth is very compact clay, to prevent a settlement all along the walls, some form of underpinning and bracing must be devised and put in place at once.⁵⁰⁸

Skinner observed that “considering the depth and width of the piers under the columns,” it seemed to him that it was “really necessary to prevent the earth under the old walls from moving to make any settlement impossible.” Skinner sought White’s advice on the matter, but in the meantime, “in absence of better authority,” Skinner suggested that the “inner piers” be “doubly shored” and the “middle piers” have “one shore each.” He continued:

Then, if the piers were drifted under about a foot and walls carried up under old work and wedged up, that with proper bonding of pins no settlement would be possible between pins. A wall, one foot thick and backed up with the concrete floor filling should I think hold the earth in place there. I will have the walls shored up while waiting for your instructions.⁵⁰⁹

On July 8 Skinner sent to White a sketch “showing the arrangement of the Guastavino dome ceiling lights and ceiling of the fourth gallery Restoration of the Rotunda,” which had been approved by the building committee and the contractors “without ‘extras.’” Skinner explained that the omission of the lower skylight ring previously shown on their drawings permitted a promenade around the base of the dome “as there was previous.”⁵¹⁰

As work progressed in July, Skinner discovered that the design for the main staircase in the Rotunda needed to be adjusted. "I have made a sketch of the new arrangement of the stairs for the Rotunda," he wrote to White on July 29, "which I think will be necessary owing to Guastavino's ribs (not his own) but the floor ribs coming deeper than you know in making your details of stairs and landing."⁵¹¹ The following week Skinner appealed to White again on the matter of the stairs, writing that the stairs "do not work out well in connection with the stair well as drawn. Of course the stairs can be built as they are shown, but there is not good head room. I am having a model or rather a platform and some steps built to show how bad it is, and shall expect you to change something." Other than this problem, Skinner reported that the work was "going along fairly."⁵¹²

The August 7, 1896, issue of the *Charlottesville Chronicle* reported on the progress of the construction in detail, noting that work was "progressing rapidly": the new floor in the Rotunda was almost complete and the outer shell of the dome was three-quarters done. The terraces and the connecting colonnades were also "well under way" and would "soon be ready for the fire-proof roofs and the modeling of the balustrade around the terraces." To support the planned fourth gallery, which ultimately was not built, the lower portion of the dome was strengthened by twenty piers, each five feet wide. The lower part of the dome was stepped following the arrangement used by Jefferson, now modified to contain windows and a promenade at the base of the dome.⁵¹³

By mid-August Skinner was ready to address the question of the lighting and the tile for the Rotunda's dome. He wrote to White on August 11, requesting that White send to him a "set of plans of Rotunda showing Lighting outlets for gas and electric fixtures." Skinner also asked that White "consider design of copper tile" for the dome and that he "consider regrading and arranging garden and old retaining wall of terraces, Rotunda."⁵¹⁴ The following week Skinner sent White a telegram, urging him to send the lighting information immediately.⁵¹⁵

Photographs dated August 27, 1896, show the Rotunda covered with scaffolding, with part of the dome reconstructed. Another photograph of the same date shows the condition of the north facade with the ghost marks of the Annex's connecting roof still visible [*Figure 75*]. Work on the Rotunda reconstruction progressed slowly in the late summer and early fall of 1896. Guastavino worked on the outer dome that summer, but on September 28 Skinner reported that work on the Rotunda was "delayed for lack of iron for galleries." As a result the inner dome could not be started, although the outer dome was reportedly "all completed" at this time.⁵¹⁶ The plan for the fourth gallery was eventually abandoned but was still included as of early autumn 1896. In 1973, when the Rotunda was being reconstructed, stairs that had been erected to reach the annular room

on the fourth gallery above the main floor were discovered. The unfinished stairs had evidently been walled up after the plan for the fourth-floor gallery was eliminated.⁵¹⁷

ANOTHER TRAGEDY

On the morning of October 19, 1896, part of the concrete roof of the one-story terrace wing projecting from the Rotunda's northeast edge collapsed, killing two workmen and seriously injuring three others. The two men who were killed were George Tucker, a carpenter foreman, and Eugene Bunch, a carpenter. The other workers sustained head injuries, as well as cuts and broken bones; two were in the building when the roof came down and were buried in the debris, while the third man was on the roof at the time of the collapse and rode it down.⁵¹⁸ Tucker, a native of Greensboro, North Carolina, had moved to Charlottesville with his wife and four children specifically for the work at the University. Bunch, age 24, was unmarried and reportedly lived near the pharmaceutical laboratory on the University grounds at the time of the accident.⁵¹⁹

The cause of the collapse was attributed to the premature removal of the interior scaffolding, before the concrete had hardened sufficiently. The *Richmond Times-Dispatch* explained that the roof "was constructed with steel girders, strengthened by steel cables passing through them. The span of the roof was about thirty feet, and was supported by brick walls." Though the cables did not break after the supports were removed, "the top of the walls was dragged down by the great weight of the cement, girders, and roof." Shortly before the collapse, Skinner had given an order to the foreman not to remove the scaffolding, "as he did not consider the walls dry enough," but the supports were, nonetheless, taken down.⁵²⁰

A coroner's jury assembled on the day of the accident to determine responsibility for the accident.⁵²¹ The investigation, which included extensive interviews of the injured men, continued over the following five days. It was determined that the supports were removed under the direction of one of the supervisors from the Manhattan Concrete Company, and, therefore, the company was responsible for the accident.⁵²²

On October 29 Skinner and Robert Robertson, who had replaced William H. Echols as the University's head of buildings and grounds, inspected the condition of the walls of the two new lecture rooms and reported their findings to White. They checked "all of the pins of the north walls, and would have done so upon the South walls," but the gangway and scaffolds prevented accurate measurement there. They presented the results of their findings to White:

First: There are no signs of any settlements in any of the walls either in those parts when the roof fell in or at any other part of the same wing or in the other wing.

Second: From observations made by transit upon all piers in the north walls, at these points in the height of each pier, one at 1st offset, 2nd at impost [?] of arch, 3rd just below frieze, it appears that the three piers from which the girders fell lean out one 0.065' and two 0.045'. The remaining piers in this wing (the East one) are as nearly vertical as we could measure. The piers in the West wing (now shored up), including even the one carrying the cracked girder, all lean out from 0.03' to 0.06' between the points measured, the pier carrying the cracked girder leaning 0.035. The extreme N.W. corner pier, i.e., the corner of the arcade having 0.04' and having no heavy load makes me think that all the other irregularities may be due original lack of plumbing of the walls by the masons.

Third: The cracked girder in the West room shows a measured deflection of 0.07' at the center but as all the girders in this room have heavy coat of plaster upon them, in some cases covering 7/8" iron electric pipes and gas pipes, it is hard to determine to what extent they have deflected.⁵²³

In spite of all this, Skinner and Robertson concluded that there were no “sways or swags in any of the rest of the roof and no cracks in the walls.”⁵²⁴

On October 31 W. C. N. Randolph wrote to building-committee member Armistead C. Gordon, indicating that he expected both White and McKim to be in Charlottesville on the following Thursday to present in person White’s “report upon the accident to the roof of the Jefferson Building and their proposition for the rebuilding of the new roof.”⁵²⁵

Part of White’s response to the accident was to send his brother, Richard Mansfield White, who was apparently in need of a job, to Charlottesville to serve as an assistant to Skinner. White told his brother that Charlottesville was a pleasant city, that “there are pleasant people there,” and that the experience would be “good training” for him. He advised his brother to be “as useful as [Skinner] would like you to be, but no more so.” “In other words,” he said, “you are to consider yourself not our representative, or the University’s, but simply Mr. Skinner’s aid[e].” White further warned his brother that he was “not to talk about things to the Contractors, the University authorities, or, in fact anybody. If there is any talking to do, leave that for Mr. Skinner. This is very important.”⁵²⁶

MAKING CHANGES TO THE PLANS AND FITTING UP THE INTERIOR OF THE ROTUNDA

On October 24, 1896, while the investigation of the failed terrace roof continued, Theodore Skinner wrote to Stanford White inquiring whether the “concrete columns for the porticos of the Rotunda” could be made hollow, and, if so, “how large a core could be

left out.” Regarding the interior of the building, Skinner wondered what type of book stacks would be used and from whom should such estimates be obtained. Skinner mentioned the “Library Bureau” as one possibility and asked White if there were others from whom he should seek estimates.⁵²⁷

Meanwhile, concern developed about the structural integrity of the Rotunda itself. On October 28 a representative from the Charles E. Langley Company informed Skinner that because of “irregularity of the Rotunda walls which gives the deck beams unequal, and in some cases too small bearing,” they suggested building an 8-inch-thick wall from the first floor to the third gallery. The estimate for this work was \$498.⁵²⁸ Skinner wrote to White the following day suggesting that they follow Langley’s recommendations. “Langley’s suggestion,” Skinner wrote, “seems to me the best solution of many difficulties and the cheapest way to give beams their proper bearing, prevent staining of plastering, and make the Rotunda cylindrical.” The walls of the Rotunda were found to be “very irregular” and varied “about 4” in and out from the true circle.” Skinner requested that the change order for the new work be made immediately, as the gallery beams of the first and second stories were in place and Guastavino was “getting ready for the 3rd gallery.”⁵²⁹ Ultimately, “two new courses of brick were needed on the inner surface of the walls to make them circular and to reduce the diameter enough to support the galleries.”⁵³⁰

As November opened, University officials worried about the pace of construction. According to the contract, the Rotunda was to be completed by December 15, but the collapse of the terrace roof, the resulting investigation, and the construction of the new brick interior wall had slowed work so that construction was behind schedule. At its November 9, 1896, meeting the building committee resolved that it was necessary for McKim, Mead and White to “press” Langley toward the completion of all the work called for in their contract “without additional cost to the University.”⁵³¹ Skinner informed White the following day that the committee was increasingly anxious for work to move ahead rapidly. In the same letter Skinner wrote that he was “awaiting instructions and orders” from White “for the treatment of the north portico steps into the garden” and “for the covering of the dome,” since White had “omitted tile and changed to copper ribs.” Skinner reported that he was delaying Guastavino’s work on the inner dome until White decided whether he wanted to “change the designs or not.” Skinner requested that White send along “drawings of the steps and outer dome casing” to Charlottesville soon.⁵³²

On November 12 White sent Skinner a telegram promising a new plan for the dome. Skinner responded that he was “greatly interested to see the new scheme” and wondered whether White could arrange to “have the twenty skylights in the dome steps let light into the dome thro [sic] the panels.” Skinner also told White that Langley and Co. demanded more money for the “inner skylight of the dome for the Rotunda.” “Will your new scheme

alter this?" he queried White. If so, Skinner argued, the "work on present lines" would have to be stopped. Skinner questioned whether Langley would need to submit an estimate for this new work before making the skylights, or could this be adjusted later.⁵³³

Work proceeded slowly through the end of November and progress often hinged on White's readiness or ability to make decisions about both small and large questions from afar. On November 28 Skinner sent White the following update, pressing White to send his new plans for the dome and to make the decisions that would allow the project to move forward:

Before the work of the wing rooms and basement rooms of the Rotunda can be finished, Langley & Co. desire that the gas and electric fixtures should be set, as otherwise the dirty work of making connections will spoil the finish.

The building committee wish you to make a selection of fixtures for these rooms and also for the Rotunda proper, and procure estimates for the same in place, keeping in mind the limited means of the fund in hand. They want good fixtures in keeping with the building, but as simple and low priced as you consider fit. It is necessary that this matter be taken up immediately in order to forward the work.

The building committee meets here on Friday next the 4th of December so if you are going to submit drawings for the new scheme of the Dome, they should be here by noon of that date or wait one month for the next meeting for approval.

Will you kindly let me know when to expect drawings for this proposed change, or how soon I can start work on the old lines if you have not decided to make the change in design.⁵³⁴

White promptly responded to Skinner's request, promising him new drawings for the garden and for the dome. "I am going to have another inner core built, with an air space between," White informed Skinner, "but I do not wish to order the work ahead until the Building Committee approve, and am, therefore, making a careful drawing." His revised plan called for the inner dome to spring from the main shell of the building, enlarging the interior and decreasing the curvature, thus eliminating the "silo-like" effect that would have been created by the earlier plan. Tension bands were installed at the inner dome's base to assure that no spreading load was added to the outer walls.⁵³⁵ White elaborated on the finish of the inner dome: "My intention is to have a plain white plaster dome, but at the top I would like, if there is no objection, to use the eagle and stars in the hall ceiling at Monticello as a band or ornament around the skylight."⁵³⁶ The coffering and rosettes that White had earlier designed for the inner surface of the dome were done away with in favor of a smooth plaster surface. White's new treatment for the dome, "with a slight change in the porticos," was approved by the building committee at its December 4 meeting.⁵³⁷ White's design has survived only in sketch form, with details of the

decorations but almost no detail of the structure.⁵³⁸ Work on the new inner dome was carried out during the winter of 1896–1897.

By the end of November 1896, Skinner was evidently frustrated by his lack of contact with White, having himself been so long in Virginia and so far from New York. On November 29 Skinner implored William Haase in the New York office to “call Mr. White’s attention to the necessity of deciding about the gas and electric fixtures for the Rotunda immediately and get him to make selections and estimates.” Skinner asked Haase to also get White “to locate the four fine light fixtures specified to be on each side” of the entrances to the Rotunda. Skinner thought that the fixtures should be hung “quite high above the portico floors, and possibly they would make the best effect if suspended near the ceilings.” Still, he needed White’s approval and pressed Haase to “please find out about these locations at once and let me know locations exactly, as the rising is being done rapidly now and delay will make it extra expensive to locate them.”⁵³⁹ Skinner to Haase, 29 Nov. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.

In relaying news to White that the building committee had accepted White’s changes, Skinner queried him on the treatment of the dome. “Will you not,” he wrote, “consider penetrating the new dome for the twenty skylights already in place in the outer dome? If not I shall have them removed and covered over flat with copper.” Skinner promised that he would send White what plans he had of the Rotunda lighting outlets, noting that these plans had “changed somewhat by the changes in rooms” and adding that “the committee again recommended simplicity and cheapness to my attention.” Skinner reported on December 5 that work was “going on well.”⁵⁴⁰ A fire-insurance map dated December 1896 indicates that the structure was then “being finished” and that the terrace wings, connecting arcades, and south portico and steps were in place at that time.⁵⁴¹

On the following day, December 6, Skinner wrote Haase that he was returning by mail to the New York office the “drawings for the new dome of the Rotunda, approved by the committee” in Charlottesville. However, the building committee also insisted that further alterations be made: they requested that the “ceiling of the south porch be lowered from the position shown” on the “original drawings and as in Jefferson’s time to a point at least as low as the top of the architrave shown and that a door be cut through from the 3rd gallery into the room thus formed.” “You are to light same through flat lights in roof,” Skinner instructed Haase, and the same was to be done in the north portico. Skinner continued:

My idea would be to drop the ceiling as low as possible, even to top of columns, by making a beam ceiling of it — quite deeply coffered. You see we will lose the copper cornice any way [sic], why not use some in ornamenting coffers with rosettes...Please ask Mr. White about this at once, and have it decided as it will modify Guastavino’s iron work somewhat, and let me have also prints of the

new drawings, and any new details for balustrade, cornices, and [paneling?] work around gallery just as soon as you can.⁵⁴²

Langley and Co. signed a contract with the National Mosaic Company on December 8, 1896, to lay the mosaic floors in the Rotunda. Antonio Patrizios, president of National Mosaic, met with White two days later, at which time White “verbally approved the sketch designs” and recommended that “square White Carrara Stones” be used “in the body of the floor, but that some changes would be made in the borders.” By January 12, 1897, Patrizios was awaiting from White the drawings indicating the changes.⁵⁴³ By now, the December 15 deadline for completion of all projects was missed by nearly a month.

On January 15, 1897, Langley and Co. submitted a change-order proposal to McKim, Mead and White for \$676.35 for the Rotunda’s new windows and doors:

5 extra inside doors 3’2 x 7’6 x 1¾, jambs trim hardware and painting complete	114.25
8 extra inside doors 3’2 x 7’6 x 1¾, jambs trim transoms hardware complete	25.60
6 prs. Sash 3’5½ x 6’10 5/8 cir. 3 sections with frames trim, shutters, aprons, stools weights, etc. complete	215.70
26 sq. yards extra 6" part. Wire lath plaster 2 sides	72.80
1 Fire proof door	<u>22.00</u>
	\$676.35 ⁵⁴⁴

On January 19 Langley submitted another proposal to McKim, Mead and White for the installation of “granolithic steps” at the south portico based on an estimate made by the Manhattan Concrete Company for a sum of \$5,500.⁵⁴⁵

By mid-January 1897 construction had advanced to the point where a question about the lighting had to be settled immediately. Skinner wrote to White indicating that the specifications called for “165 decorative lamps in the dome.” “I have always understood you to want,” Skinner wrote, “in one group or circle, a crown of lights in fact. Am I right?” He pressed White to decide on the location of the lamps “whether on the bottom of decorated member, or on the fascia, or both” or to determine “some other place for those lights.” “The wiring must be done now, at once,” Skinner informed White, “since the two domes are too close together to admit of working between them.” Skinner asked White to specify whether he wanted to use gas fixtures in addition to electric.⁵⁴⁶

At the end of January Skinner was eager to address the design of the entrance to the Rotunda, as well as other design features. He informed Haase that the “entrance vestibule” needed to be “considered at once” and requested that drawings be sent to him. The matter of “how it shall be cut off — and what shall be done to the floor, walls, and ceiling” had to be decided immediately. “There are several chases which must be get at

able — and are specified covered with paneled boards — they will look queer unless the whole wall space is paneled too — please send me drawing of this treatment as specification as to what wood to use.”⁵⁴⁷ Skinner also instructed Haase to call to White’s attention several “important matters” regarding the Rotunda and asked Haase to do the following:

Make drawing for wood panel to go between the jambs, head, and floor of 1st gallery—This panel will only show from below and outside, the book cases will run all around wall on this gallery.

Make drawings for grilles, for all alcoves on ground floor.

Make F.S.D. [full size details] of names for frieze in main cornice, list of which I enclose.

Select hardware for front and rear doors, and for 3rd gallery cases.

Select designs for electric fixtures, and gas fixtures, and get estimates, which then send to me to submit to the committee.⁵⁴⁸

On February 15, 1897, Skinner asked Haase to finalize “the 3rd gallery details in short order.” With his letter he enclosed a “sketch plan and section of the third gallery floor and of inside the dome, showing the radius, height of [center], and position and size of doorway into stairs and stacks.”⁵⁴⁹

Work on the interior progressed, and by the second week of March 1897 the plasterers were awaiting details from New York on how to finish the interior of the dome. “Please send me full sized details of the stars, clouds and rays of light around the Eagles,” Skinner wrote White. Skinner also requested details of the “new treatment of the pedestals and balustrade around the top gallery” and of the “capital letters for the names” that were to encircle the entablature.⁵⁵⁰

An exterior photograph of the south portico shows the Rotunda very much a construction site in late March 1897. Some of the column capitals on the south portico columns are in place, though uncarved, and the balusters lay in the foreground awaiting installation on the terraces. An undated photograph shows a similar scene on the north side of the Rotunda, where the capitals are in place uncarved and the foreground is piled with construction debris [*Figure 78*].

CHARLES E. LANGLEY AND CO. DECLARES BANKRUPTCY

During the winter of 1897 it was becoming clear that Langley and Company was struggling to carry out its work under the bid of \$269,440 that the University had accepted.⁵⁵¹ Theodore Skinner had approved Langley’s application for payment of its

eighth installment on the Rotunda contract, but Skinner was concerned about Langley's financial position and thought that Langley's request for funds was high and "simply an attempt to get a hold of as much money as possible as soon as they can." "The building will be completed in about two or three months except some carving which will take longer, so that the next monthly payments will have to be very small," he wrote. The contractors evidently needed cash, Skinner continued, "as they have limited capital." However, with the funds set aside in the reserve, Skinner still thought the "University is safe."⁵⁵²

At the end of March 1897 Skinner told White that he had "finally obtained from Langley & Co. the data" that White had wanted about credits and estimated costs of change orders. The difficulty in obtaining information may have been a harbinger of the construction company's financial difficulties.⁵⁵³ Rector W. C. N. Randolph called a special meeting of the Board of Visitors' executive committee in early April to discuss the problem.⁵⁵⁴ A few days later Skinner told White that no action had been taken by the committee "with reference to the possible stopping or omitting of any of the work." However, the executive committee had passed a resolution requesting that Skinner present to them "as soon as possible, a complete report, stating the condition of the contract, with the amounts necessary to complete each building to date."⁵⁵⁵ Randolph had hoped that it would still be possible to complete the "whole work as designed" but feared that switching contractors at this late date would make the project prohibitively expensive.⁵⁵⁶

Amid the discord of trying to solve problems with Langley and Co., *Corks and Curls*, the student yearbook, printed an account of the status of construction as of early April 1897, praising the Rotunda's completed dome as "more graceful to our eyes in recent years" and noting that the columns of the two porticos were then "crowned with capitals of Italian marble, ready for the hand of the carver." The oval lecture rooms in the basement and the "old terrace rooms" were already being used for classes at that time, but the library itself was incomplete, still wanting decorative finishes and furniture. The new terrace rooms were "already under roof," and the connecting colonnades were "practically finished."⁵⁵⁷

The *Corks and Curls* report also described the "several important modifications" that had been introduced into the Rotunda's reconstructed interior: "The inner shell of the dome...has been thrown back to abut against the building wall, restoring to the domed interior its full amplitude. The light iron rail of the gallery has been replaced by an artificial stone parapet, and the piers of this will serve as pedestals for a circle of life-size statues (casts from the antique) overlooking the space below." The inner surface of the dome was not yet plastered or painted the planned sky blue with the "twelve soaring eagles, their beaks and talons picked out in gold." "The space between the circle of

eagles and the central light will be frescoed to represent floating clouds,” the yearbook reported, “fading into the clear vision of the sky.”⁵⁵⁸

Reports furnished by McKim, Mead and White for the April 23, 1897, meeting of the Board of Visitors indicate that there was “some nine thousand dollars in dispute” over extras for all projects between Langley and Company and the architects. In a letter written a week before this meeting, White told Randolph that he felt that the contractors were being dealt with too leniently, but, he noted, “they unquestionably took the work at very low figures, and if it had not been for them the University would not have been able to have built its buildings under the appropriation.” White believed that it was in the best interests of the building project and the University as a whole to help Langley and Co. “along as far as possible” but without allowing “them too much latitude.”⁵⁵⁹

White had also pointed out to Randolph the “very difficult position” that Skinner had been in. He still enjoyed the firm’s full confidence, but in executing the firm’s orders, Skinner had “often incurred the disfavor of the Contractors.” White asked Randolph to help Skinner “by impressing upon Langley & Co. that they must carry out his orders, and do no work without his assent as our representative.” In spite of the tension, a few days before the April 23 meeting of the Visitors, Skinner reported that work was “now progressing favorably.”⁵⁶⁰

White traveled to Charlottesville to meet with Randolph before the Board meeting. At the meeting the Board of Visitors noted that Langley claimed that the amount needed to complete the Rotunda and the new buildings was \$92,518.55 but that the amount included “certain items of Extra work” which were “in dispute and not conceded” and that the “amount actually necessary to complete the work” would not exceed \$89,438.59. The Board of Visitors resolved that until the buildings were completed and accepted by the University, “warrants shall be made only for current pay rolls and to other parties doing work and furnishing materials for work hereafter done and materials hereafter furnished.”⁵⁶¹ The discussions leading up to these decisions were not recorded in the minutes, but it seems evident that the Board was losing confidence in the general contractor.

Before long the situation had deteriorated further. Randolph wrote White a strongly worded letter on May 3, notifying him that Langley’s subcontractors had served the University with notices to stop making payments to Langley and Company and stating that the University was unable to pay Langley and Company “any more money and this will stop their work.” The next step, Randolph wrote, was for the Board of Visitors to act through McKim, Mead and White, as was stipulated in the contract, “in taking possession of the work and material and completing the buildings.” He told White it was “absolutely necessary” for White to attend the meeting of the Board the next week and also to “consider further the question of reducing the cost and leaving out part of the work

provided for in the contract.”⁵⁶² Randolph to White, 3 May 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.

Meanwhile, Charles Langley told White on May 4 that he would be meeting with representatives of the University to “go over the whole ground” and would be “willing to consent to anything in reason.”⁵⁶³ Piccirilli Brothers submitted a bill to the University on May 3, indicating that Langley and Company had paid them \$4,000 to date. Piccirilli had delivered to the University twenty curved sills at \$15 each and ten straight sills at \$10 each, as well as ten Corinthian bases and twenty Corinthian capitals (sixteen for columns and four for pilasters, with the abacus and necking complete) at a cost of \$400 for each capital. The capitals, however, were not yet carved, and the total price for the completed capitals would be \$840 each.⁵⁶⁴

On May 12 Piccirilli Brothers submitted a second bill for the following:

30 sills on the Rotunda	\$400
10 Bases on North Portico of Rotunda	
\$150 each	\$1500
20 Caps on Portico of Rotunda	
Material & Labor \$400 each	\$8000
To finishing same caps \$440 each	\$8800 ⁵⁶⁵

On May 20, 1897, Piccirilli wrote to McKim, Mead and White that estimated cost for “finishing all work contracted” was \$8,800; the capitals were left uncarved for the time being.⁵⁶⁶

The Board of Visitors’ executive committee met on May 14, 1897, to review the situation, and the subcontractors continued the work until May 15. However, the subcontractors and vendors had served notices to the University against Langley and Company for \$43,000, and state law forbade any further payments to them. Langley and Company was unable to meet its payroll on May 15, leaving 150 laborers, who had not been paid since April 1, “upon the grounds without means of subsistence or of getting away.” Langley and Company offered “to surrender their contract and tools and materials” if the University would advance \$4,500 for the overdue payrolls. The committee accepted this offer, believing that in consideration of the “hopeless insolvency” of the contractors, the agreement was in the “best interests of the University.” In accordance with the contract, the committee then executed agreements with two of the subcontractors, including the Guastavino firm for the “completion of certain tile roofing and flooring which will amount to probably \$1,100.” It is unclear from the records whether this work was on the Rotunda or on a portion of the new buildings at the foot of the Lawn.⁵⁶⁷

The executive committee recommended that because the Rotunda was the “most nearly finished of any of the buildings,” it should be “pressed to completion first.” With

the old crew of roughly 150 workers cut by half, work continued.⁵⁶⁸ As of May 15, 1897, a total of \$85,576.98 had been spent on the restoration of the Rotunda.⁵⁶⁹

A NEW CONTRACTOR IS CHOSEN

At the end of May 1897, as the University's relationship with Langley and Company deteriorated, Ross F. Tucker of the Manhattan Concrete Company wrote to McKim, Mead and White, addressing his firm's role in the University's construction project. "Our one object in this matter is to proceed and execute our work with all speed and to deliver the same in a completed and satisfactory condition as soon as possible," Tucker explained. "We hope to meet you and the University on fair and liberal grounds," he continued, "in order that they may be put into the possession and enjoyment of their new buildings as soon as circumstances permit."⁵⁷⁰

With the wish that his firm be able to continue the work, Tucker highlighted some problems that he and his workers encountered in the reconstruction of the Rotunda. "You will understand that with the assignment of the principal contractors went all responsibility in the condition of the lecture room roofs of the Rotunda," he pointed out; the "water proofing of the old roofs was so poorly done that the rooms are useless."⁵⁷¹ Tucker maintained that the leaking terrace roofs were not the fault of the Manhattan Concrete Company:

Everything has been done in order to discover the cause for these leaks without success. At my own expense in addition to all the damp-proofing and other work specified by the architect, I covered all of the vestibule roofs with tin and flashed the balustrade to the same so that there is no possibility for any leak to occur through the terrace roof. The only way in which water can possibly get in is from the outside of the balustrade. The balustrade is placed directly over the wall and it is possible that water is forced in during storms from the outside, under the base of the balustrade. This has been frequently caulked and will probably be stopped altogether when the cement work is painted. This portion of the work was not done under my contract and I am sure that no part of the work done by me.⁵⁷²

Tucker also reported leaks in the ceiling of the faculty room, chairman's office, proctor's office, and the Board of Visitors' room, as well as a leak in the steam pipe in the chairman's office. The pipe had been installed by Langley and Company.

The variation in the color of the brick used in the facades was also unacceptable. Tucker indicated that all of the brickwork had been "gone over with acid and made as uniform as possible" but thought the bricks would still need to be painted to create a uniform appearance. Furthermore, there were problems with the columns. Tucker

reported that Theodore Skinner, along with Tucker's own superintendents and the subcontractors who did the work, all "emphatically state that no lime mortar was used in this work." Tucker continued:

I have already explained that I did all of this work as did the subcontractor, under protest. The University peremptorily ordered the columns to be completed before they had an opportunity to dry. The resolutions of the Committee are on record, as are my protests. Mr. Skinner notified the architects of the circumstances at the time. Under the circumstances it seems impossible for me to hold the subcontractors for pushing the work to completion and putting steam into the building before the work had an opportunity to dry. The fault would have been the same even though any other material had been used, which I am assured is not the case.⁵⁷³

Even considering all of these problems, Ross Tucker aimed to have at least the exterior of the Rotunda finished by June 15. He indicated that the "new west roof" would be "reinforced by additional iron work of an expensive kind" and that all work would be done in the "best manner and as speedily as possible."⁵⁷⁴

Tucker, a college friend of Skinner, was also known to White, since he had worked at Box Hill, White's Long Island estate.⁵⁷⁵ On June 4, 1897, Tucker wrote to William Rutherford Mead, White's partner, expressing interest in taking over the work at the Rotunda. He planned to "leave for Virginia early next week to take up the matter of the proposition embodying the settlement of the claims of the sub-contractors and the completion of the work on the buildings." He hoped "to be able to make a proposition" to McKim, Mead and White and to the University, which would "do away with litigation and its endless delays and enable" the University to "complete the buildings in the shortest time possible."⁵⁷⁶

Meanwhile, W. H. Hoffman, an employee from McKim, Mead and White's New York office, had arrived in Charlottesville and on June 6 filed a report with Mead. Hoffman had already toured the buildings with Skinner and decided that in order to re-bid the remaining work, new specifications would be needed; they would be referenced to the original specifications and would identify the "various materials on the site that could be used." Not being able to find a suitable typist in Charlottesville, Hoffman requested that a typist from the firm's New York office be sent down, along with "his typewriter, plenty of specification paper, transfer paper, binding sheets & tape to bind work," along with his shorthand book. Hoffman understood that there would be four bidders in addition to Tucker, and he told Mead that he was "becoming acquainted with the work and specifying its completion at the same time which is difficult and keeps me over anxious."⁵⁷⁷ Mead apparently went to Charlottesville for the meeting of the Board of Visitors held on June 15; White was spending at least part of the summer in the West.⁵⁷⁸

At that meeting the Board of Visitors authorized the executive committee to proceed with the construction and restoration work by entering into “all such arrangements and contracts as they may deem proper for the completion of the work and may make such modifications in the plans and specifications of the architects as they may deem judicious.” The committee was authorized to award new contracts for all of the uncompleted work or to contract for part of it and hire day laborers to finish the rest of it.⁵⁷⁹

The stress of the situation was affecting Skinner’s health. He wrote Mead two days after the June meeting of the Board of Visitors that when he had accepted the post in Charlottesville “for the sake of getting away from the office, more or less on account of my health,” he had expected to stay only a year. The work proved “much more complicated” and caused him “much more worry” than he had had in his former job in New York, and he had “not gotten neither the rest nor the change” that he had expected. Nevertheless, he was determined to “weather the storm” and did not want to be replaced. Mead replied with a statement of confidence in Skinner’s work.⁵⁸⁰

Meanwhile, Hoffman remained in Charlottesville to help with the situation. On June 19 he met with a committee of the Board. Hoffman filed a report about the meeting with Mead, noting that Randolph had been “very pleasant” to him and seemed to accept Hoffman’s position that the “work was of excellent character and of ample quantity for the small amount of money they had expended on it.” Hoffman had told Armistead Gordon, another committee member, that there was “no doubt” that all of the buildings would be ready for the students when they returned on September 15, although “there might be some work still to do, but it could be arranged that it need not interfere with the use of the buildings by the University.” Ross Tucker had also been at the meeting, and the committee had questioned him about subcontractors.⁵⁸¹

Shortly after the June 15 Board of Visitors’ meeting, Skinner had been told by a member of the executive committee that if the architects could have their materials ready by June 28, the University would move ahead quickly to issue new contracts.⁵⁸² On June 22 Hoffman reported to William Mead in New York that he had completed the new specifications for the Rotunda that afternoon.⁵⁸³

By the summer of 1897, the stress of managing the work at the University was affecting Skinner’s health. He wrote Mead two days after the June 15 meeting of the Board of Visitors that he had accepted the post in Charlottesville “for the sake of getting away from the office, more or less on account of my health,” and had expected to stay only a year. The work proved “much more complicated” and caused him “much more worry” than he had had in his former job in New York, and he had “not gotten either the rest nor the change” that he had expected. Nevertheless, he was determined to “weather

the storm” and did not want to be replaced. Mead replied with a statement of confidence in Skinner’s work.⁵⁸⁴

On July 20, 1897, Ross F. Tucker signed a contract with the University of Virginia to serve as the general contractor for the completion of the work, stipulating that he would carry out all “Carpenter, Mason, Plastering, Painting, Plumbing, Heating & Ventilating, Gas fitting, Cement, Electrical, Hardwood, Iron and other work necessary to the completion of the Rotunda” and the new buildings. Under the new contract all work on the Rotunda and its terraces was to be completed by November 15, 1897, while all work on the new buildings was to be finished by January 1, 1898. Tucker’s price, accepted by the University, for completing all of the work, was \$99,956.⁵⁸⁵

A few days before signing the contract with Tucker, the University had contracted with W. J. Whitehurst for “certain sash, doors, frames, mouldings, glazing, wood work and other like materials”; he would be paid directly for these elements.⁵⁸⁶ Some other contractors also submitted proposals to McKim, Mead and White in mid-July, but it is not clear whether they were accepted or combined with the Tucker contract. Nevertheless, their proposals may have indicated work that still needed to be done. For instance, the Southern Electric Company, of Baltimore, proposed to run “tubing to 5 outlets for back porch lights, to 1 outlet for front porch light; to 4 ceiling outlets in basement for First Floor; to 8 floor boxes on First Floor; to 20 outlets for desks on Third Gallery; to 2 outlets for clock face rooms” in the Rotunda. Southern further proposed to place receptacles for 170 lights around the dome.⁵⁸⁷ W. H. Spelman and Co., of New York City, submitted a price of \$1,315 for the completion of plumbing and gas fittings in the Rotunda.⁵⁸⁸ Sculptors J. Franklin Whitman and Company of Philadelphia submitted a price of \$3,900 on July 15 for carving the Rotunda’s Corinthian capitals but then realized that they had made an error in measuring the capitals on a trip to Charlottesville and revised the price on July 22 to \$6,500.⁵⁸⁹ Ultimately, the work for carving the Rotunda’s capitals went to the firm of Pempeo Coppini and John Grignola, of New York City; the capitals were completed in situ in 1902.⁵⁹⁰

Ross Tucker submitted bills for work completed on the first day of each month from August through November of 1897. The bills show that “granolithic moulds, models, and column work” were completed for \$5,100 in July. Excavation, installation of heating, carpentry, plastering, and marble, iron, and electrical work were done in August for a total of \$20,100.08. Similar work plus the installation of the elevator was carried out in September for \$18,422.64. More of the same type of work was done in October for \$21,447. It is not clear, however, what of this work was done at the Rotunda and what was done at the three new buildings at the south end of the Lawn.⁵⁹¹

On September 30, 1897, Skinner reported to the office in New York that the contractors were “about to finish the shafts of the columns inside the Rotunda.” He

suggested that they finish the columns with a “light grey rough cast cement,” rather than what had been specified, because, he argued, the columns would be “less easily soiled and would be equally durable.” Moreover, Skinner offered the argument that the “contrast in color between the white bases, caps and cornices and the gray shafts would be very pleasing.” “The rough surfaces,” he added “would not tempt the students to write all over them as do the smooth white finishes.”⁵⁹²

On December 10, 1897, Stanford White wrote to Randolph, impressing upon him that among the “most important matters to be carried out as soon as possible” were “the painting white the outside of the roof of the Rotunda, the painting of the interior of the dome and ceilings of the porches of the Rotunda,” and “equalizing the color of the brickwork of the Rotunda,” as well as “cutting of the caps and placing of the statues in the Rotunda.”⁵⁹³ On that same day the Board of Visitors authorized painting the outside of the Rotunda dome white and having the inside of the dome “painted or colored and the Library galleries painted white.”⁵⁹⁴ Also at this meeting the Visitors paid tribute to Randolph, who was resigning as Rector of the University and as chairman of the building committee, for reasons of poor health. Armistead Gordon was elected Rector in his place.⁵⁹⁵

Correspondence dating to the end of December 1897 indicates that the work at the University was winding down.⁵⁹⁶ Skinner left Charlottesville in the beginning of December on account of his stress-induced health problems. On December 29 Richard White, still on location and now overseeing the last of the work for McKim, Mead and White, wrote to his brother that people were approaching him about certain small matters that needed correction both at the new buildings and at the Rotunda and about the final acceptance of the work. He asked whether Stanford wanted him “to attend and to decide as to the lesser matters.”⁵⁹⁷ Tucker wrote to Richard White on the same day, asking him to sign a requisition for the balance due on his contract, less the 15 percent reserve. He hoped that “ere the week is over you can certify that the several buildings are complete and broom clean.” Tucker complained that “University people and others over whom I have no control are tracking dirt into the buildings after I have cleaned them up, and are taking possession of rooms.”⁵⁹⁸

Richard White communicated regularly with the New York Office. On January 5, 1898, he notified his brother that the executive committee of the Board of Visitors was planning to inspect the buildings prior to their formal acceptance. The contractors had “turned over the keys” to Richard White, and he, in turn, had turned them over to the Proctor.⁵⁹⁹ The next day Tucker wrote McKim, Mead and White that the work was “ready for inspection and delivery to the owners.”⁶⁰⁰ Stanford White apparently decided to tour the buildings himself and not rely on his brother’s offer to show the Visitors through the final inspection.⁶⁰¹

On February 26 Richard White reported to his brother that scaffolding was up in the Rotunda, evidently for the painting of the dome, and the workmen were awaiting the “barrel of color which you were to have sent here from New York.”⁶⁰²

FINISHING THE WORK

On February 28, 1898, new members were elected to the Board of Visitors, and at their March 17 and 18 meeting the Visitors spent time closing out the accounts for the work on the Rotunda and the new buildings. The Board extended its gratitude to McKim, Mead and White, thanking the firm for its “personal interest and zeal in carrying out the work” and the “masterly way” in which it “offered a striking solution of practical difficulties in a manner at once harmonious with but expansive of the original design and preserved the distinctly classic features of the University buildings.” To Stanford White the Board specifically extended its gratitude for his “unceasing labors and the unreserved devotion of his single abilities to the accomplishment of the best and noblest results.” The Board boasted that, as completed, the new construction “greatly increased the efficiency and attractions of the University” and “made it a more splendid monument to its great founder, Thomas Jefferson.”⁶⁰³

Theodore Skinner was back in Charlottesville for the meeting of the Board of Visitors on March 17 and 18, 1898. He had gone to Paris after leaving Charlottesville, but when he found himself “unable to work” there, physicians told him to return home and rest for six months. Rather than resting, though, he again traveled to Charlottesville at Stanford White’s direction to represent McKim, Mead and White in settling the final arrangements for the University buildings. Richard White was still there, too, but was suffering from a sprained ankle.⁶⁰⁴

On March 21, 1898, Thomas H. Carter, now Proctor and Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, submitted a report to McKim, Mead and White, outlining the various minor problems with the new buildings that needed to be rectified before the University would accept them. Regarding the Rotunda, Carter noted that there were “cracks and defects in the granolithic cement of the balustrade and steps of terraces,” as well as leaks in the “large cellar under the platform connecting the north steps of the Rotunda” and in the “pump room under the north front of the Rotunda.”⁶⁰⁵ Carter also inquired about the installation of a pipe under the urinals in the Rotunda lavatories.⁶⁰⁶

While in Charlottesville Skinner reviewed Carter’s observations and wrote to White on March 25 that the University was arranging for the work to be repaired and a “settlement of the Tucker contracts” was then “in sight.” Skinner, however, did not elaborate on these matters, as he was bound for New York and told White that they could discuss it in detail in person.⁶⁰⁷

THE DEDICATORY CELEBRATIONS

The new buildings and the Rotunda were dedicated at the commencement ceremonies held in the new auditorium of Cabell Hall on June 14, 1898. The ceremony was attended by several hundred people, including Virginia Governor James Hodge Tyler. The following account of the event was published in the August 1898 issue of the *Alumni Bulletin*:

Pit, dress circle, balcony and gallery were filled, probably four-fifths of the seats being occupied by ladies, whose pretty costumes gave a color to the scene and whose lively chatter swelled into a steady buzz before the Rev. Dr. Randolph McKim invoked divine blessing and thus began the transactions of the day. On the rostrum sat some two hundred men, a distinguished gathering, with Governor Tyler and his staff at the centre or grouped about it. Here were a bishop, a Senator of the United States and many distinguished alumni and guests. When Mr. Wu, the Chinese minister, and Mr. Chow-Iss-Chi, the second secretary of the Chinese legation, and Mr. M. Y. Chung came in and took their seats a Chinese flag (black dragon on a yellow field) faced them, draped on the wall behind those on the rostrum.

Dr. McKim's prayer was followed by the hymn "Rise, Crowned with Light," sung finely by the students.

The Hon. Armistead C. Gordon, of Staunton, read the dedication poem. The audience during the reading was very responsive, and at its close some one on the dress circle proposed "three cheers for our poet," which were given enthusiastically.

Rev. Dr. T. M. Carson, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Lynchburg, then delivered an address, presenting the physical laboratory building, the gift of Mr. Charles B. Rouss, of New York.

Then came the rollicking college song, "Orange and Blue," which set everybody to applauding, which was kept up until other songs were given.

This was followed by an address by Hon. James C. Carter, of New York.⁶⁰⁸

That evening a large reception was held in the Rotunda.⁶⁰⁹ The northwest terrace of the Rotunda, the YMCA hall, had been dedicated separately, two days earlier, on June 12, 1898.⁶¹⁰

Though the buildings had been handed over to the University, some problems with the construction lingered after the dedication. In late July Thomas Carter wrote to McKim, Mead and White, requesting that the firm take the "necessary action in regard to the Rotunda columns." "I wish very much that Mr. Stanford White could see them in person," Carter wrote. "The upper part of the columns for six or eight feet are more solid than the lower, and might possibly be retained, but," he wrote, "I am unable to see that a

complete and uniform job could be made of the columns without taking off the cement from the cores and putting it in anew.”⁶¹¹

White evidently passed this information along to Theodore Skinner, who was, at the time, convalescing in Liberty, Maine, “lying off,” as he himself put it on July 31, 1898, and “trying to get on my feet again” after his stressful year-and-a-half-long stint in Charlottesville. Though he had not yet fully regained his health, Skinner offered his services to White once more, writing that he was ready to help White in any way that he could in order to get the situation at the University settled once and for all.⁶¹²

Regarding the Rotunda’s columns, Skinner wrote that they “were finished in a hurry and at the urgent order of Mr. Robertson,” superintendent of buildings and grounds, but that as far as he knew, the columns were done “exactly in accordance with the revised specifications written by Mr. Hoffman,” of McKim, Mead and White. Skinner told White that Gilman Brothers, a subcontractor for Ross F. Tucker, “prophesied that these columns would do just as they have done, i.e., crack and stain if the specifications were followed.” Skinner said that he made a special trip to New York to consult with Charles McKim on the matter, as White was away in Europe when the question of the columns came up, but that McKim would not “take the responsibility of changing” White’s specifications and instructed Skinner to see that they were carried out as written.⁶¹³ Skinner to White, 31 July 1898, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.

The following description appeared in the August 1898 issue of the *Alumni Bulletin*: “At the northern end [of the Lawn] is the rotunda, a building in the Corinthian style, modeled from the Pantheon in Rome. Its base consists of four terraced wings united at the eastern and western ends by colonnades, and covered by a flat roof, forming, with the north and south porticos, a continuous promenade around the building. This promenade, guarded by its handsome parapet, is a beautiful feature of the remodeled structure.”⁶¹⁴

The anonymous author of the article then turned to the interior of the restored building:

From the centre of the base rises the rotunda itself, circular in plan with its shapely spherical dome and its superb Corinthian porticos. The interior is a single room from the portico level up, devoted entirely to the uses of the library. In addition to the space on the main floor, there are three galleries, the topmost at the springing of the dome being carried by a peristyle of twenty Corinthian columns.

The room is finished in white, except the ceiling, which is sky blue, picked out with stars. The decoration about the central light is a circle of eagles seeming to soar downward through the blue ether. The base of the building contains in

convenient proximity the offices of administration, the law lecture rooms, the law library and the assembly hall of the Young Men's Christian Association.⁶¹⁵

In the 1898 edition of *Corks and Curls*, Stanford White wrote that "If the new buildings are successful, it is mainly due to the fact that the architects have rigidly endeavored to carry out and complete the original scheme as laid down by Jefferson, and that in doing so, the work has been to them a work of love." White concluded: "The State of Virginia may well feel that in the graceful proportions of the Rotunda and of the old buildings, in the gleaming white colonnades with their classic temples embowered in the avenues of trees, and in its beautiful College lawn under its soft skies, that it possesses, if not the finest, or richest, or most imposing, at least the most exquisite and perfect group of collegiate buildings in the world."⁶¹⁶

An 1899 description of the Rotunda states that the interior of the restored building "is of nobler proportions than before, as there are but two stories, the second occupying more than two-thirds of the entire height, rising from the level of the floor of the portico to the dome, making it the most notable and imposing university library hall in the world." The author of this account, University librarian John S. Patton, went on to describe the new north facade of the building and portico, comparing it to the Annex:

The illustration of the north front of the rotunda shows that a handsome esplanade has taken the place of the much criticized annex of former days, a modern architectural excrescence impossible of classification here, which those who care to see the orders of architecture unmixed will be glad has not been restored, especially as its absence gives room for a portico after the model of that which looks upon the lawn, though subordinate to it. It cannot be denied that the rotunda appears of less majestic height because of the flanking arcades, corridors, and wings which make it the centre of a quadrangle, but it is equally undeniable that this loss is in the interest of a happy effect, due to a closer correspondence with its surroundings. Everybody who is at all familiar with the arcades remembers how perfectly they accord with the general architectural plan outlined and in part inaugurated by Mr. Jefferson. These arcades have been extended by covered colonnades to the northern line of the rotunda, and united with it by two low wings on each side. In these wings are the office of administration, the law lecture rooms, and the hall of the Young Men's Christian Association. As the roofs of these colonnades and wings are covered with cement pavements, they, together with the floors of the porticos, form a quadrangular promenade around the entire building.⁶¹⁷

A final calculation revealed that the restoration of the Rotunda ultimately cost \$109,058.⁶¹⁸

A NEW CENTURY

A September 1902 Sanborn fire-insurance map depicts the reconstructed Rotunda with its north and south porticos and four single-story terrace wings projecting from each side of the porticos. The wings are connected by single-story colonnades. The map indicates that the north wings were then used as classrooms, and the south wings were used as offices. A similar map made five years later, in October 1907, shows that the north wings continued to be used as classrooms but that the southeast wing had been converted from office space to classrooms. The southwest terrace wing continued to be used for office space. The skylight in the Rotunda roof is indicated on the map. Written over the dome is the word “Library,” and “Fire Proof Construction” is inscribed over the entire structure. A Sanborn map made in November 1913 shows no changes since 1907.⁶¹⁹

The first few decades of the twentieth century were quiet ones for the Rotunda. What work was done pertained to the landscaping, and there is no record of any major changes or repairs made to the building’s interior. A 1920 Sanborn map indicates that all four of the terraces were by this time being used as classrooms, and this map also indicates that there is a basement level beneath the north terraces. Written next to the Rotunda on the map is the following descriptive note: “(Built 1895) Brick Walls, Floors & Roof. Tile on Reinforced Concrete Covered with Copper. Fireproof Construction.” In November 1921 the University planned to “complete heating equipment” in the Rotunda, as well as in the East Range and the East Lawn. The contract was awarded to Almirall and Company of New York, without competitive bids, for \$60,000. The work was set to begin at the end of November 1921 and was expected to be completed, weather permitting, by the first of January 1922.⁶²⁰

A Sanborn map made in 1929 shows that classes were no longer being held in the Rotunda’s wings at that time; all of the rooms in the wings were now given over to offices and conference rooms.⁶²¹

RESTORATION OF THE EXTERIOR, 1938 AND 1939

The Rotunda served as the University library until 1938, when the entire collection was moved to the new Alderman Library, located across McCormick Road to the west of the Rotunda, leaving the Rotunda without any real function.⁶²² In June 1938 the Board of Visitors authorized University President John Lloyd Newcomb to apply for a federal Public Works Administration grant for improvements to the Rotunda.⁶²³ In July 1938 the University’s Department of Buildings and Grounds made drawings of the Rotunda in preparation for repairs. A special meeting was called at which Rector Frederic W. Scott

and the Board of Visitors gathered to accept the PWA grant on August 12, 1938. A \$75,000 appropriation from the General Assembly of Virginia supplemented the grant.⁶²⁴

On August 12, 1938, the same day that it accepted the PWA grant, the University entered into contracts with architect Stanislaw Makielski, of Charlottesville, for the “restoration of the Rotunda” and with J. S. Miller Jr. for the “electrical engineering services in connection with the restoration of the Rotunda.” Fiske Kimball, an authority on Thomas Jefferson’s architectural work and the neo-classical revival in America, served as consultant on the project. Kimball had been a professor of art and architecture at the University from 1919 to 1923. The minutes of the meeting of the Board of Visitors from August 12, 1938, do not provide any further details.⁶²⁵ At the time, Makielski was associate professor of architecture in the University’s McIntire School of Fine Arts. Instead of awarding a contract to an outside construction firm, the University decided that the work should be carried out under the direction of the superintendent of buildings and grounds, Frank Hartman.⁶²⁶ The \$136,373 project would include new marble steps for both the north and south porticos and new marble balustrades to replace the crumbling concrete ones installed as part of the 1896 restoration. The brickwork of the building would also be “treated” and water drains replaced, in addition to “other minor improvements.” The cryptoporticus may have been added at this time.⁶²⁷

On January 21 the building committee assembled to receive the bids for other components of the work — marble work, terrace paving, roofing, and sheet-metal work. Building-committee members Hollis Rinehart, Lewis C. Williams, and C. O’Conor Goolrick, as well as University president John Lloyd Newcomb, Stanislaw Makielski, and resident engineer G. B. Hazelgrove, were present for the opening of the bids. Contracts were awarded to the lowest bidders: the Georgia Marble Company of Nelson, Georgia, would furnish and set all marble for \$65,200; N. W. Martin and Brothers of Charlottesville would furnish and set all stone flagging for \$4,550 and provide the roofing, waterproofing, and sheet-metal work for \$4,340, for a total of \$74,090.⁶²⁸ Work was underway by the early fall of 1938. On October 6 it was reported that workmen were tearing down the balustrade and steps of the Rotunda in preparation for the new marble replacements.⁶²⁹

The minutes from the April 7, 1939, meeting of the Board of Visitors provide details of the nature of the work to be done on the exterior. The Board of Visitors approved the following contracts, all from Southern firms, involving amounts under \$1,000 for the work at the Rotunda:

<u>To</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Description</u>
Hull Coal Company, Charlottesville, Va.	\$767.50	Est. Cement Requirements
Barnes Lumber Corp., " "	133.60	Est. Masonry Cement
Charlottesville Stone Corp., " "	630.00	Est. Crushed Rock Requirements
E. T. Mankin, Inc., Richmond, Va	189.60	Est. Washed Sand Requirements
Barnes Lumber Corp., Charlottesville, Va.	210.00	Est. Common Brick Requirements
Noland Company, Inc., Richmond Va.	151.90	Est. Galv. Wrought Iron Pipe for Water Lines
C. B. Anderson, Profitt, Va.	325.00	Est. Concrete and Mortar Sand Requirements
Virginia Steel Co., Richmond, Va.	105.00	Reinforcing Steel for North Steps
Charlottesville Hdwe. Co., Charlottesville, Va.	254.00	Reinforcing Mesh
Dietrich Brothers, Baltimore, Md.	216.00	Reinforcing Steel for Slabs
Hajoca Corporation, Staunton, Va.	575.00	Pipe and Fittings for Heating
Massey Bldr's Supply Co., Staunton, Va.	185.47	Sewer Pipe
General Elec. Supply Co. Richmond, Va.	865.25	Electric Conduit and Fittings
Richmond Struc. Steel Co., Richmond, Va.	290.00	Built-up Steel Beams for Colonnades
Charlottesville Lbr. Co., Charlottesville, Va.	620.00	Est. Plaster and Lime Requirements
Cinder Block Company, Richmond, Va.	353.40	Cinder block for Partitions and back up
Bowker & Roden, Richmond, Va.	182.50	Cork Expansion Joint
Charlottesville Lumber Co., Charlottesville, Va.	655.42	Est. Lath and Furring Channel Requirements
Tomlinson Co., Inc., Richmond, Va.	842.80	Galv. Wrought Iron & C. I. Pipe for Drainage
Richmond Struc. Steel Co., Richmond, Va.	285.00	3" Channels for Supporting Furring Channels in 4 basement wings
Dyke Dean, Elkton, Va.	216.53	Scaffolding Lumber
Harris Hdwe., Co., Charlottesville, Va.	104.57	Plaster Bond & Waterproofing ⁶³⁰

Additional contracts awarded on June 7, 1939, indicate that doors and frames were being replaced and that parts of the exterior were being repainted:

<u>To</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Description</u>
Barnes Lumber Corp., Charlottesville, Va.	\$174.00	Paving Brick
Westinghouse Elec. Sup. Co., Richmond, Va.	188.02	3,000' galvanized conduit
R. E. Richardson & Son, Richmond, Va.	1,180.80	Millwork (wdw. frames, etc.)
General Elec. Sup. Corp., Richmond, Va.	325.00	Five Panel Boxes
John T. Lewis & Bros., Philadelphia, Pa.	275.78	White Lead
Harris Hardware Co., Charlottesville, Va.	276.36	Bay State White Paint
Barnes Lumber Corp., Charlottesville, Va.	676.00	Doors and Frames ⁶³¹

Drawings of the new doors by Stanislaw Makileski show that four different styles were needed for four different locations within the building. The exterior doors to the offices under the south terraces were replaced, as were the interior connecting doors between those offices, the doors to the oval rooms on the ground level, and the exterior doors in the north terraces.

A drawing made by Makileski in December 1938 and corrected in May 1939 [Figure 90] shows the uses of three of the terrace rooms at that time: the northwest terrace served as the bursar's office; the northeast terrace served as the registrar's office; and the southwest terrace served as the Bureau of Public Administration. Asphalt tile floors were indicated in the south terrace rooms.

Due to difficulties encountered in the detailing, fabrication, setting, and fitting of the marble, as well as a shortage of skilled marble cutters, setters, and pointers, the work was delayed, and the deadline for completion was extended from August 20 to September 28, 1939. The marble work was described as being "very complicated" and had to be "carefully cut and fitted to existing work, which was found to be out of square, not aligned and at varying levels," thus requiring an "unanticipated amount of detailing and checking." "Many pieces of marble," the Board of Visitors reported in the minutes of its July 19, 1939, meeting, "had to be cut and fitted on site," which contributed to the delay. The extension of the deadline also allowed more time for finishing the stone flagging and the roofing, waterproofing, and sheet-metal work.⁶³²

The contracts for the exterior work were closed out at the Board of Visitors' meeting on October 3, 1939. In January 1940 the *Baltimore Sun* reported that the exterior work had been completed for months, but interior painting was still in progress as workmen touched up the blue spangled ceiling of the dome. In addition to the exterior restoration, new office furniture, both metal and wood, was purchased to outfit the interior.⁶³³ On January 26, 1940, the first in a new series of dances was held in the Rotunda, similar to

the balls and receptions held there before the fire.⁶³⁴ Further work on the interior was delayed because of World War II and would not be undertaken until the 1970s.⁶³⁵

In late 1941 Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds Frank Hartman sought to solve an “acoustical problem” in the Rotunda and contacted Dr. V. L. Chrisler of the National Bureau of Standards to consult. Though Hartman consulted with both Chrisler and Acoustics, Inc., of Washington, D.C., about the unnamed problem and the University had been “practically assured” of receiving funding for the work, the funding never came through and the project was “shelved” indefinitely.⁶³⁶

In 1944 the Board of Visitors elected to create a committee to investigate the best possible functions for the building.⁶³⁷ A few years earlier, in 1939, the Board had begun considering appropriate uses of the dome room, when it appointed a committee of three men to investigate the possibilities. The results of the committees’ findings are not known, but in 1944 Lewis C. Williams was appointed chair of the Committee on the Use of the Rotunda, and in March 1945 he reported to the Board that he needed architectural advice and “requested permission to employ the services of Eggers & Higgins to prepare plans.”⁶³⁸ The use of the Rotunda was discussed at the Board of Visitors’ March 7, 1947, meeting, but no details of the discussion were included in the minutes.⁶³⁹

In February 1950 the Rotunda was the victim of an act of vandalism when a “carefully drawn Communist slogan” translated as “The Government of the Soviet Union — Glory to Stalin” and the hammer and sickle symbols of the U.S.S.R. were painted on the wall of the Rotunda near the Woodrow Wilson School of Foreign Affairs.⁶⁴⁰

PLANS FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE ROTUNDA’S INTERIOR, 1955 TO 1973

After the removal of the library in 1938 the Rotunda received limited attention in University budgets, and it gradually deteriorated. By the mid-1950s Stanford White’s changes to the Rotunda were viewed by some at the University as an abomination, in direct conflict with Jefferson’s plans.⁶⁴¹

On January 13, 1955, Professor Frederick D. Nichols of the University’s School of Architecture met in the Rotunda with the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board of Visitors on how to “correct the alterations” made by Stanford White and restore the Rotunda interior to Jefferson’s design. With Jefferson’s original drawings and notes in hand, the committee discussed restoring the three oval rooms on the main floor to provide space for the University president’s office and for a meeting room that could be used by the Board of Visitors. Following the alterations at the end of the nineteenth century the Board had ceased to hold its meetings in the Rotunda for want of an appropriate space therein, and the Buildings and Grounds Committee discussed the prospect of resuming Board meetings in the Rotunda. The use of the dome room was also discussed, and

committee member Emily P. Smith, president of the Garden Club of Virginia, suggested that it be used as a museum of the University's history. The meeting concluded with the committee agreeing to consult with the Virginia Fine Arts Commission on Nichols's proposal to convert the Rotunda back to Jefferson's plan.⁶⁴² BV, Minutes, 14 Jan. 1955.

The committee and Nichols met with the commission on February 11, 1955, and presented to the commission Nichols's plan for the restoration accompanied by copies of Jefferson's drawings for the Rotunda. The commission was reportedly "impressed" with the "unusual detail of the documentation" in the drawings and "approved heartily" of the proposal for the restoration of the Rotunda to its original plan and appearance.⁶⁴³ Fiske Kimball, who had served as a consultant in the exterior restoration in the late 1930s, was called upon to comment on Nichols's proposal. Though Kimball had expressed some initial hesitation over tampering with any work done by an architect as important as Stanford White, Kimball reportedly expressed "great enthusiasm" for Nichols's ideas. Minutes of the Board of Visitors' meeting of February 12, 1955, report that Kimball remarked that "Jefferson was a greater architect than Stanford White" and that the Rotunda was Jefferson's last great architectural monument. Kimball supported Nichols's proposal for making the Rotunda the administrative center of the University, maintaining that this was "strictly in accord with Jefferson's conception of academic architecture."⁶⁴⁴

In anticipation of the interior restoration, University president Colgate Whitehead Darden Jr. requested that a model of Jefferson's Rotunda in its original form be constructed.⁶⁴⁵ Further consideration of the Rotunda restoration was deferred until the model was completed and set up for viewing on the main floor of the Rotunda during the spring of 1957. The model was constructed by S. Rex Whitehurst, a student in the University's School of Architecture [*Figure 98*].⁶⁴⁶ After viewing the model, the Board of Visitors quickly approved Nichols's plans to restore the interior of the Rotunda to its original design, as it stood from the time of its construction until the fire in 1895. However, construction was entirely contingent upon Nichols's ability to raise the funds for the work from private sources.⁶⁴⁷

Returning the interior of the Rotunda to Jefferson's plan would be a massive undertaking that would require gutting the entire McKim, Mead and White interior. Ultimately, it would take Frederick Nichols more than fifteen years to secure the necessary funds to commence work. At the same time the University had many other building projects that it perceived as being of higher priority, including continued work on the University hospital, an addition to the law school building, and renovations to Minor and Madison halls, among other projects.⁶⁴⁸

On September 25, 1965, President Edgar Finley Shannon Jr., who had succeeded Darden in 1959, appointed a Rotunda Restoration Committee to guide planning.⁶⁴⁹ The

restoration committee met for the first time on November 9, 1965, and agreed unanimously on the general plan for the restoration as outlined by Nichols, to make the dome room a visitor center for exhibits, receptions, and meetings and to replace the oval rooms on the main floor for use of the president and the Board.⁶⁵⁰

On December 20, 1965, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior designated the Rotunda as one of four National Historic Landmarks in Virginia, and President Shannon signed an agreement with the National Park Service for preservation of the Rotunda as a National Historic Landmark on January 7, 1966. A ceremony was held at the Rotunda on April 13, 1966, to recognize the Rotunda's status as a National Historic Landmark.⁶⁵¹

On April 2, 1966, the Board of Visitors selected the architectural firm of Ballou and Justice of Richmond to prepare plans for the restoration of the Rotunda.⁶⁵² Werner K. Sensbach, director of the University's Planning Department, formally informed Ballou and Justice on April 29, 1966, that they had been selected to carry out the work.⁶⁵³

By September 1968 the firm had drawn up plans and sections of the Rotunda both of which were based on "probable actual construction as determined by analysis of pre-fire photos and original plates of Palladio and others referred to as sources." Existing critical dimensions were also noted on the drawings.⁶⁵⁴ Another set of drawings prepared by Ballou and Justice in May 1969 indicates the tentative uses of the reconstructed oval rooms on the main floor: the president's office would be located in the west oval room, the Board of Visitors' meeting room would be in the east oval room, and secretaries would occupy the hourglass-shaped hallway between the two rooms.⁶⁵⁵ A project report and project criteria were submitted by the architect on May 8, 1969. The criteria outlined the uses and the square footage of the planned reconstructed rooms, as well as what areas would be demolished, reconstructed, or restored.⁶⁵⁶

The University entered into contract with Ballou and Justice on December 29, 1970. The contract stated that the fee would be calculated on a cost-plus basis without an upset cost because the Rotunda was a "national historic monument."⁶⁵⁷ By the end of March 1971 the project report, project criteria, cost estimate, and contracts between the University and Ballou and Justice had been approved by the governor's office. Though the planning work was "well underway" at that time, there was a prolonged delay in starting construction because the plans needed to be finalized and also because funding had not been secured.⁶⁵⁸

In a composite wall section prepared in May 1971 the architects continued to work out details as they compared their plans to Jefferson's and the existing conditions.⁶⁵⁹

The engineering firm of Torrence, Dreelin, Farthing and Buford, of Richmond, conducted a preliminary engineering investigation of the Rotunda in June 1971 and found that the roof was sound and that the existing dome could be retained. The firm also concluded that Stanford White's "masonry liner wall" within the walls of the Rotunda

should be preserved, as it was “necessary, both to support the dome and the dome-room floor and to buttress the original walls of the structure weakened in the fire.” Francis L. Berkeley, assistant to President Shannon, reported on the University’s preferences to architect Louis Ballou at the end of June 1971, based on the engineering firm’s findings:

The proposed sole alternative [to retaining the masonry liner wall and dome], demolition of the entire Rotunda structure, and reconstruction of it in a total restoration from the ground up, would serve only one purpose: it would make the dimensions of the interior rooms more faithful to the original dimensions by a few inches. Such an act would be self-defeating, however, because we would thus destroy all that remains (the major part of the exterior) of Jefferson’s original structure in order to achieve a slightly more mathematical precision in restoring the lost portion thereof.

In view of the fire of 1895 and recent legislation, the State Fire Marshal will not in any case permit reconstruction of Jefferson’s wooden roof. The best fireproof roof that we could have is the present dome (built by one of the greatest of a half dozen architects who have shaped the Rotunda), which we judge to conform to the location of Jefferson’s original as closely as possible for tile and masonry construction.

The thrust of your recommendations appears to be to preserve the most that is possible of Jefferson’s work while doing the least violence to the subsequent architectural history of the structure, but always deferring to Jefferson wherever there is a choice between his work and Stanford White’s. This approach and the implementation you recommend are highly acceptable.⁶⁶⁰

By October 1971 Ballou and Justice prepared a full set of drawings, including sections, floor plans for each level, framing plans, details of the first-floor cornices and dome-room colonnade, and mechanical plans showing ductwork and piping below the basement floor, as well as preliminary electrical plans [*Figures 100-106*].⁶⁶¹ The preliminary specifications for the restoration of the Rotunda interior are dated October 1, 1971. The scope of work included the following:

1. Remove all present interior construction and finishes including plaster in the original portion of the Rotunda, retaining only the following:
 - a. Exterior walls, including masonry added to inner face in 1896.
 - b. Present Guastavino tile dome
 - c. Present Basement Oval Room masonry walls
 - d. Present window sash and exterior metal trim and cornices
 - e. North and South Porticos, including attics above and present spaces beneath and steps leading to Porticos.
 - f. All present facilities in wings beneath terraces adjacent to the Rotunda on east and west sides.
2. Provide proper shoring and bracing to all retained portions of the Rotunda during demolition and construction to prevent damage or collapse thereof.
3. Remove present copper roofing, skylight and plinths from the Dome.
4. Construct the following facilities within the shell of the Rotunda, as shown on drawings:
 - a. New duct and pipe space below Basement Hallway floor
 - b. New Basement floor slab and brick flooring
 - c. New Toilet and Service Facilities beneath the South Portico
 - d. New Mechanical Facilities beneath the North Steps, and beneath the South Portico
 - e. New Basement North Oval Room walls
 - f. New First Floor construction
 - g. New First Floor Oval Room walls
 - h. New Second Floor construction
 - i. New Dome Room (second floor) Colonnade and Galleries
 - j. New fireplaces and chimneys at all floors east and west sides and in North Oval Room (First Floor) and at stair landing
 - k. New Structural Floor in Attic over South Portico
 - l. New Main stairway from Basement to First Floor and From First Floor to Second Floor
 - m. New steel spiral staircases in NW and NE stairwells, extending from Basement to Dome Room Upper Gallery, with new exits to exterior at Basement level
 - n. New Elevator in SE stairwell at First Floor and Second Floor (Dome Room)
 - o. New Toilets in SW stairwell at First Floor and Second Floor (Dome

Room)

- p. New interior finishes, trim, doors, ceilings, wood flooring, etc.
- q. New air-conditioning systems to all spaces in Basement, First Floor and Dome Room (Second Floor)
- r. New sprinkler system above ceilings in Basement and First Floor, in spaces beneath North and South Porticos, at ceilings under Dome Room Galleries and in Attics over North and South Porticos
- s. New electrical system and lighting throughout building.⁶⁶²

The Board of Visitors approved the architects' plans on April 7, 1972. The Buildings and Grounds Committee had met on the previous day with Louis Ballou and John Allen of Ballou and Justice to review the preliminary drawings. Ballou and Allen described the drawings for the restored Rotunda as "almost exactly as built by Thomas Jefferson" but explained that certain deviations were necessary to preserve the structural integrity of the Rotunda and to provide such modern conveniences as an elevator and air conditioning. They reported that the Rotunda's dome was sound and that the reconstruction work would not in any way alter the outside appearance of the Rotunda.⁶⁶³

At its April 7, 1972, meeting the Board of Visitors authorized University president Edgar Finley Shannon Jr. to apply for a grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for one half of the total construction estimate of \$2,176,500. The University's goal was to match the HUD funds with non-Federal sources and to have the building restored to its original design by the nation's Bicentennial in 1976. The U.S. Bicentennial Committee recommended that the Rotunda restoration be the nation's number one priority, in terms of preservation projects, for the Bicentennial celebration.⁶⁶⁴ Between 1963 and 1972 several hundred contributions were received by the University for the restoration, including gifts from alumni and an appropriation of \$55,000 from the General Assembly of Virginia.⁶⁶⁵

On April 28, 1972, in the presence of state, local, and national officials, the Department of Housing and Urban Development awarded the University of Virginia a grant in the amount of \$1,088,250.⁶⁶⁶ The Cary D. Langhorne Trust made a gift of \$460,000, with additional income earmarked for the restoration over the next seven years for a total of \$1,017,903. With this gift from the foundation, the University received the matching funds that it needed to begin the restoration work.⁶⁶⁷

Though the HUD grant was indeed a coup, it was subsequently discovered that the grant was actually made without the necessary approvals. The University was not aware of Section 106 regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requiring the state historic preservation office to review and approve of the project. Calder Loth, of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, was assigned to act as a liaison between the

state commission and Ballou and Justice. A special committee was set up by the commission to review the preliminary plans.⁶⁶⁸

In a report dated June 9, 1972, the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission outlined several aspects of the planned work and the commission's suggestions, indicating that more elements of the McKim, Mead and White restoration would need to be retained beyond those outlined in the October 1971 specifications. The report supported the engineers' assessment that it was too risky to remove the reinforcing of the exterior wall installed after the fire, since demolishing it would compromise the structural stability of the original walls. Retention of the reinforcing, however, would make it impossible to recreate Jefferson's exact dimensions for either a new dome or the new oval rooms and would cause the window reveals to be overly thick. Consequently the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission agreed with Francis Berkeley's 1971 assessment that Stanford White's dome should be retained. The exterior height and curvature of White's dome was found to conform closely enough to Jefferson's dome, and its retention, "with necessary adjustments to the design," was not considered a significant compromise in recreating Jefferson's plan. Furthermore, contrary to earlier reports and some leaking in the dome, it was, in fact, structurally sound.⁶⁶⁹ The Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission formally approved the preliminary plans on June 20, 1972.⁶⁷⁰ In its written approval of the plan, the commission included the following remarks on its decision to approve the restoration:

Although the Commission endorses the philosophy that historic buildings should reflect their full history and thus should retain major architectural additions and alterations acquired throughout the building's existence, the Rotunda meets the principal qualification for an exception to this policy: it is a completely documented architectural monument and thus can be returned to its original appearance without compromise occasioned by lack of knowledge.

The present interior developed by Stanford White, following the fire of 1895, now creates the requirement to choose between the retention of the work of one noted American architect and the re-creation of that of the original designer. The quandary of making this selection is modified by the virtual loss of function of the structure since the removal of the Library in 1938 and the unadaptability to effective use of the present cavernous space.

The Commission recognizes that preservation of the White interior as an example of the work of this architect would, under normal circumstances, be most urgently defended. The judgment to remove it must be based on more substantial grounds than the rationale of better adaptive use of convenience to the institution. The factors contribute but the choice must be one of the greater

aesthetic and architectural value of the re-created Jefferson design as against the de facto White adaptation.⁶⁷¹

The commission endorsed the retention of both the 1896 dome and eight-inch-thick McKim, Mead and White reinforcement of the exterior walls. The commission also commented on the proposed function of the restored Rotunda:

By good fortune the restoration of the original interior will result in making the Rotunda a more functional building, in contrast to its present, somewhat abandoned state. The Dome Room is intended to be used as a much needed museum and visitor center as well as meeting place and reception hall. The East Oval Room appropriately is assigned to the use of the Board of Visitors. The West Oval Room, North Oval Room, and approximately one-half of the central hourglass-shaped hall is to be given over to the use of the President's Office.

While ideally the Commission would prefer to see the completed interior restoration made fully available and open to visitors for their inspection and appreciation, it recognizes that adaptive reuse will limit its accessibility. This condition is offset, however, by its increased use as the administrative focus of the University and the consequent increased use by faculty, students, and officials.⁶⁷²

Louis Ballou proceeded with preparing the working drawings that summer.⁶⁷³ The Virginia Fine Arts Commission reviewed and gave approval of the working drawings and specifications after meeting with President Edgar Finley Shannon and the architects on August 4, 1972.⁶⁷⁴ The architects continued to work out details and prepared another set of drawings dated August 25, 1972. These drawings included sections; elevations; floor plans; schedules for doors and room finishes; foundation, fireplace, chimney, mantel, toilet, staircase, bookcase, entablature, and column details; and elevator plans and details.⁶⁷⁵ The drawings were approved on September 15, 1972, though revised drawings and specifications were made in late January 1973 to resolve lighting, mantle designs, design of the glass partition in the main-level corridor, location of a proposed serving pantry, detailing of the bookcases, and handicapped facilities.⁶⁷⁶

The cover article of the July-August issue of the *Alumni News* was dedicated to the restoration. The University issued 7,500 reprints of the article, which was widely distributed among faculty, students, alumni, and others.⁶⁷⁷ In commemoration of the 77th anniversary of the 1895 fire on October 26, 1972, a brandy-soaked cake shaped like the Rotunda was flambéd.⁶⁷⁸

DEMOLITION OF THE MCKIM, MEAD AND WHITE INTERIOR, 1973

The University advertised in the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* in March 1973 for bids for a general contractor to undertake the demolition and restoration work. On July 10, 1973, Virginia governor A. Linwood Holton Jr. authorized the award of the construction contract for the Rotunda restoration work to the lowest bidder, R. E. Lee and Son of Charlottesville for \$1,995,824; the Department of Housing and Urban Development subsequently authorized the award of the contract on July 16, and the University gave its authorization on July 18.⁶⁷⁹ R. E. Lee and Son's original bid had been for \$2,130,824, but the firm indicated that the construction cost could be reduced by \$135,000 if the column capitals could be "furnished of cast plaster rather than carved wood as specified," thereby lowering the construction cost to \$1,995,824.⁶⁸⁰ R. E. Lee and Son had undertaken extensive restoration and repair work at Mount Vernon and Monticello, as well as renovations and additions to several buildings on the University of Virginia grounds, including Thornton, Newcomb, and Madison halls and the Alderman Library.⁶⁸¹

On July 18, 1973, Louis Ballou met with R. E. Lee and Son's president and project manager J. A. Kessler Jr. and with Waller Hunt of the University's Planning Department in the Rotunda.⁶⁸² On September 20, 1973, the University gave R. E. Lee and Son notice to proceed with the work, which was to be completed on December 31, 1975.⁶⁸³ Most of the work was done under the supervision of foreman Fred Warner after the first foreman died suddenly, early in the project.⁶⁸⁴

In demolishing the interior of the Rotunda, the University requested that the following items be removed intact: plaster column capitals (if these could be saved), the main floor skylight, the mosaic flooring of the first floor, the cast-iron balcony railings and wood handrail, the metal balcony floor plates, the stair rails and newel posts, and all finish hardware.⁶⁸⁵

During the demolition in July and August 1973 [*see Figures 107-110*], "all plaster, mortar, bricks, and steel from the Stanford White interior," plus the tile floor of the dome room, "were removed piece by piece, and the rubble was collected for removal through windows and doors, usually in wheelbarrows." The skylight and the copper roofing were also removed, revealing the Guastavino dome, as were the plaster eagles and stars decorating the ceiling. The west colonnade, linking the north and south terrace wings, was temporarily dismantled for more convenient removal of debris.⁶⁸⁶ The copper from the roof was sold for \$4,717 to Coiners Scrap Iron and Metal, in Charlottesville, and the amount was credited to the work at the Rotunda.⁶⁸⁷ David Morris, associate professor of civil engineering at the University, acted as consultant to Ballou and Justice on "construction techniques and procedures to be used during demolition and underpinning operations."⁶⁸⁸

Within just a few weeks of starting demolition workmen found three circular staircases walled up in the hollow spaces in the corners between the Rotunda's inner and outer walls. The staircases were similar to the one in the southeast corner, which had been built by workmen during the 1896–1898 reconstruction and had been in use since that time. The uncovered staircases were not functional, however, in that they led to brick walls. Unfinished, the staircases had no longer been needed when plans for the fourth floor gallery were abandoned in 1897. During the 1970s restoration the staircases were dismantled and the remnants discarded.⁶⁸⁹

In addition to the staircases a pair of small fireplaces, recessed in the north wall of the east oval room in the basement, was also uncovered. It is believed that these fireplaces, or ovens, date to the original construction and were used for chemistry lectures and demonstrations in that room. When they were uncovered, the fireplaces, each about 15 inches wide and 2 feet high, still contained “shards of melted glass and bits of burned wood and charcoal from the 1895 fire.” Gas and electric lines, presumably installed in 1896–1898 to carry lighting and utilities to the upper levels of the Rotunda, were also uncovered at this time.⁶⁹⁰

In July 1973 Lynchburg Steel and Specialty Company of Madison Heights, Virginia, prepared a set of drawings detailing framing plans and beams. The plans were approved, with corrections, by Ballou and Justice on February 1, 1974. Guille Steel Products Co., Inc., of Virginia Beach, Virginia, prepared framing plans for Lynchburg Steel in September 1973, and Ballou and Justice approved them, with corrections, on December 6, 1973.⁶⁹¹

As demolition of the interior continued, the architects worked out various design details, addressing the Rotunda's stairways in December 1973 and the chimneys and fireplaces in March, August, and November 1974.⁶⁹² On January 26, 1974, the Otis Elevator Company prepared drawings for the elevator that was to be installed in the southeast circular stairwell. Ballou and Justice approved these plans on March 15, 1974. The architects approved corrected plans prepared by Greendale Ornamental Iron Company of Richmond for the railing around the middle gallery of the dome room on March 20, 1974.⁶⁹³

Photographs of the original interior of the Rotunda brought to light in the spring of 1974 led to alterations in the plans for the middle gallery and the bookcases in the dome room. In a letter dated April 12, 1974, Louis Ballou described the information provided by the photographs and the resulting changes:

First, it appears quite conclusively to us that the ceiling under the Middle Gallery is at the same elevation as the paneled soffits of the window reveals.
Second, the greater clarity of the photo allows a more precise evaluation of the proportions of the height of the Middle Gallery relative to the height of the

columns. Also, the proportion of the height of the Gallery fascia to the height of the columns can also be determined. The result of these studies has resulted in raising the level of the Middle Gallery to a height of 9'-10" above the Dome Room Floor instead of the originally indicated 9'-6", and increasing the fascia depth from 11-1/2" to 12-3/4". These dimensions as applied to the existing window opening vary only in fractions of inches from the apparent proportions of the photo.⁶⁹⁴

The photographs also showed that there had been no railing at the edge of the middle gallery, nor had there been a spiral staircase in the northwest "corner" of the room; the staircase had been part of Stanford White's design only. Though these features were not original to Jefferson's design, they were retained in the restoration to meet with modern safety codes.⁶⁹⁵

The photographs also shed light on the design of the original bookcases, which proved to be one foot longer than Louis Ballou had originally thought. Ballou explained the details of the bookcases seen in the photographs:

The clearer photograph definitely shows a vertical muntin on each glazed door in addition to the horizontal muntins as we had indicated, and these muntins appear to be painted a dark color. We had indicated that the ledge of the lower portions of the bookcases had an overhang of about 3/4", whereas the photo indicates almost no overhang. Finally, the photo indicated that the crown molding was actually more subtle than we had originally shown.⁶⁹⁶

By July 1974 the Rotunda had been stripped of the McKim, Mead and White interior, leaving a "cavernous, dark, coliseum-like" structure.⁶⁹⁷ After what was described as a "brief lull in activity," construction work began on the interior. Reports distributed at the meetings of the Board of Visitors during 1974 and 1975 indicate that work proceeded on schedule throughout the entire restoration project and that the Rotunda would be ready for occupancy in January 1976.⁶⁹⁸

DEBATE OVER THE USE OF THE ROTUNDA, 1974–1976

As the Rotunda's interior was being demolished, concern over the future use of the restored space grew among the student body. Plans for the Rotunda as the administrative center for the University were discussed on campus and in local newspapers and were strongly discouraged by segments of the student body that felt that converting the Rotunda to an administrative center would limit students' rightful access to the building. In March 1974 a twelve-member Student Council Rotunda Committee was formed; it included six student representatives and six faculty members, including Frederick Nichols and Joseph Bosserman, the dean of the School of Architecture. University president

Frank Loucks Hereford Jr., who succeeded Edgar Finley Shannon Jr. in 1974, took an active part in the dialogue with students. The committee wanted the Rotunda to be used as a “focal point,” where students, faculty, and administration could come together, and they encouraged “maximum openness and flexibility” in the usage of the building. The committee met frequently during an eighteen-month period in 1974 and 1975 to discuss the “hotly contested question” of Rotunda usage.⁶⁹⁹ In April 1974 the committee reported that “it must be remembered that this building belongs to no specific person, group, or institution, but rather is a national landmark entrusted to the stewardship of the University.” “It should not be our intention simply to replicate the original uses of the Rotunda during its first fifty years,” the report stated; “rather, the restored Rotunda should again accommodate those availabilities which enrich the life of the students and faculty within the academical village.”⁷⁰⁰

University officials wanted the new dome room to “work really well” for “committee meetings, dinners and banquets, lectures, musical performances and recitals, symposia, ceremonies and receptions;” improving the acoustics of the room would thus be very important.⁷⁰¹ Louis Ballou consulted with Robert B. Newman of Bolt Beranek and Newman, Inc., consultants in acoustics and vibration based in Waltham, Massachusetts, in October 1974 regarding what treatment of the dome would best improve the acoustics. In response Newman indicated that the “acoustics problems that have always been in evidence in the Dome Room will continue to plague the space unless we face squarely the problem of making the domed surface highly sound absorbing.” “In other words,” Newman wrote, “we get rid of it as a troublesome, focusing reflector. There is no hard sound-reflecting dome in the world that acts as a satisfactory ceiling for an ‘auditorium.’”⁷⁰² Newman recommended installing “some type of perforated facing of metal or vinyl over a highly efficient sound-absorbing glass fiber blanket.” He warned, however, that “such a treatment must be more or less a permanent installation” because the room was simply too large to add or remove components as needed. In conclusion, Newman made the following statement:

I wish we had a magic answer that would give you high sound-absorbing efficiency with the appearance of smooth plaster. There simply isn't any such thing and to search for it is like looking for the fountain of youth or to hope that, when one jumps out of a window, he will go up, not down. The behavior of sound in rooms is governed by simple, physical laws. There is no way around it. If the Dome Room is going to work, we must make it work by application of known physical principles.⁷⁰³

Spitz Space Systems, Inc., of Chadds Ford, Pennsylvania, prepared a sample panel of the proposed acoustical treatment, and on December 6, 1974, representatives from the University, Ballou and Justice, and the Virginia Fine Arts Commission inspected the panel,

which had been installed in the Rotunda for testing. The group unanimously agreed that though the treatment was “in no way a true or Jeffersonian restoration,” it was the “best presently available solution to the problem of rendering the dome room useful for the activities set forth by the Rotunda Committee.” The arts commission voted to recommend approval of the material by the governor.⁷⁰⁴

As the controversy over the ultimate use of the Rotunda swelled, the University frequently had to stave off trespassers and, in one case, attempted arson, when someone set fire to the dome in early November 1974. The fire resulted in minimal damage. R. E. Lee and Son held a contract with a private security firm, but it had expired on October 31, and the contract was not renewed, leaving security to the University police, who did not have the resources to patrol the Rotunda when the workmen were not on site.⁷⁰⁵ At the end of the first week of November the firm hired a new night watchman to be stationed at the Rotunda for the duration of construction.⁷⁰⁶

The question of the use of the Rotunda continued after the construction work was completed in 1976. A nine-member Historic Central Grounds Committee was formed to supervise the general appearance and use of the Rotunda, the Lawn and its gardens, and the nearby McIntire Amphitheater, located to the west of Coker Hall and completed in 1920. Guidelines for the Rotunda’s usage were reworked periodically throughout the next few decades as questions about the building continued to be raised, and “conditions and fees for scheduled uses” became points of contention.⁷⁰⁷

CONSTRUCTION CONTINUES, 1974–1976

Forms for the poured-concrete walls for the access tunnel beneath the basement were in place in May 1974, as local plasterers ran continuous curved cornices and prepared supports for the premolded decorations that would later be applied throughout the building.⁷⁰⁸

Architect Louis Ballou determined the design for the new skylight in the Rotunda by reviewing notes from the early proctors. “We had no information on the shape of the [original] skylight — how many divisions it had or anything about the slope,” he wrote, but “we did know that its diameter was shown as sixteen feet on Mr. Jefferson’s drawing of the Dome Room. We also knew that Mr. Jefferson had built a skylight that didn’t last very long and leaked almost immediately.” In reviewing the papers of Arthur S. Brockenbrough, who was proctor during the original construction, Ballou discovered that Brockenbrough “had ordered three trapezoidal shaped pieces of glass to replace three pieces broken in the skylight.” “The largest dimension of these pieces was over two feet,” Ballou wrote. This is the largest piece of glass that would have been available at that time. From that assumption they calculated the number of panels and the height of

the skylight. By December 1974 the new skylight was in place, as were the furring strips on the Guastavino dome, which was ready to receive the new metal roof.⁷⁰⁹

The question of the color of the roof was discussed in late summer 1975. Several different color samples — white and varying shades of gray, green, and red — were painted on the dome for comparison. After much debate, the roof was painted white; the architects had determined that this was most likely the color of the original dome, as Jefferson had purchased only white paint for the University buildings while the Rotunda was under construction. It was also agreed that white was the most attractive color from a distance.⁷¹⁰

During the demolition work Louis Ballou had discovered that leaks in the floor under the north portico had caused damage to the “structural system holding up the North Portico stairs, within the storage rooms along the cross corridor” and that the system was in a “bad state of deterioration.” Ballou recommended that R. E. Lee and Son examine the area with the structural engineers and make necessary improvements and corrections.⁷¹¹ The contractors replastered the corridors under the north portico sometime before May 1975 but did not identify the source of the leakage.⁷¹² In August 1975 the contractors assessed the scope of the work needed to correct the problem:

We have completed removal of marble on the upper landing including the upper step and installed the waterproofing membrane. We have flooded this area and found it to be tight without leaks. We have also flooded the step area and found that while we still have considerable leakage here, the leakage can be traced almost entirely, if not entirely to the joints.

It appears to us that there is no leakage in the steps except through open joints and that if these joints are recaulked, we will have a waterproof area without the necessity of removing and replacing the marble steps. We point out that the cost of caulking the step joints is relatively minor compared to the large cost of removing the steps, waterproofing beneath them and replacing the steps. Since we believe our chances of success are very good, we recommend this approach and will proceed in this manner unless you advise us on the contrary...

When the work is complete, the upper landing will have a complete new waterproofed membrane installed and the marble relaid with the joints pointed. The steps and adjacent buttresses and balustrade will be completely recaulked.⁷¹³

In a July 17, 1975, letter to Raymond Bice, the chairman of the Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda Committee, Louis Ballou described the columns in the dome room and their placement, indicating changes that had been made to the architects’ plans based on photographs of the columns in the original dome room and Jefferson’s original specifications:

The decision was made by the Committee to reduce the diameter of the columns to 17½ inches, simultaneously correcting the entasis and increasing the apparent space between the columns.

It may interest you to know that according to Mr. Jefferson's original specifications, he called for columns 18 inches in diameter with a space of one foot between them and a space of 4 ½ feet between pairs of columns. This of course was in his first rough computations and would of necessity require adjustment because of the fractional dimension in circumference of a 54-foot circle.

A study of photographs of the original Dome Room reveals that the spacing of the columns was actually determined by the spacing of the modillions in the entablature above. There is a modillion centered over each column. There are 220 modillions in a complete circle, and in each bay, which is 1/20th of the circle, there are 11 modillion spaces. Each pair of columns has three modillion spaces between column centers, and there are eight modillion spaces between pairs of columns. This slightly reduces the space between columns and increases the space between pair[s] of columns from Mr. Jefferson's original rough computations described above.

The photographs also indicate that the height of the columns, including the base and the capital, is ten times the diameter, or 15 feet for an 18 inch column. A study of the relationship of the diameter of the columns to the spacing of the columns, which can be calculated, reveals that the columns were 18 inches in diameter.

It appears that Mr. Jefferson may have varied the proportions of the composite order of Palladio, which he used as a guide, so that there would be more space between adjacent column bases and capitals with his closer column spacing, than could be obtained by exactly following the proportions of Palladio's original.⁷¹⁴

With these revisions, Ballou indicated to Bice, the new columns and their spacing would be "as reasonably close to Mr. Jefferson's original as possible."⁷¹⁵

Steel load-bearing posts were inserted in the center of one column in each pair, and the column capitals were cast from plaster to replicate the original wood capitals. Wood column shafts and bases for the columns in the dome room were manufactured by Knipp and Company of Baltimore and shipped in sections to be assembled on site. The columns were installed in September 1975.⁷¹⁶ The plaster capitals, as well as the decorative moldings in the oval rooms, were made by Knipp's subcontractor, Decorator's Supply Corporation, of Chicago.⁷¹⁷

Prefabricated balustrades had been delivered to the site in sections and assembled atop the entablature in the dome room in June 1975. Though a handrail was not part of

Jefferson's design for the intermediate balcony, one was installed along the edge of the balcony in July to fulfill code requirements.⁷¹⁸

By early March 1975 Spitz Space Systems's recommended acoustical panels for the interior of the dome had been accepted by all parties, as well as by the governor. The contract amount, \$95,995, included fabrication and installation of the panels, as well as the installation of a fiberglass duct liner on the backside of the panels. Frames for the panels were installed in September 1975. The frames were attached to the Guastavino tile and supported "sound-absorbing panels of plastic-coated aluminum backed with fiberglass." The ceiling panels were installed in October 1975.⁷¹⁹

The 140-year-old heart-pine flooring for the dome room was salvaged from other buildings and was laid in the direction from fireplace to fireplace, as indicated by a pre-fire photo of the dome room.⁷²⁰ In 1981 Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr. described the method in which the floor was installed: "Two-by-four 'sleepers' were nailed to the poured concrete over steel joists. Voids were filled with sound-deadening insulation and a continuous plywood subfloor was nailed to the sleepers. The finished floor was then nailed to the sleepers. This effort helped deaden sound in the Dome Room." The floors were sanded, stained (with Min-wax stain no. 211), and coated with polyurethane. The floors were lightly buffed with steel wool and then waxed and buffed again. Installation of the dome room floor was completed in March 1976.⁷²¹

The "free-form" stairs, Vaughan and Gianniny reported, "required close attention to detail." "Said to be the first double free-standing stairs in the United States," they wrote in 1981, "they are of special interest to architects and builders. Framed over steel, the wooden stairs follow smooth curves along the walls of the oval rooms until they intersect with the exterior walls. There they turn along another set of curves." A master craftsman from New York installed the railings, and the stairs were completed in November 1976. The fireplace located in the turn of the east stairway in the original design and covered up in the McKim, Mead and White construction was restored.⁷²²

A sophisticated new heating and cooling system, required to control the environmental conditions in the building to preserve it and the contents, was installed by the end of October 1975. The "labyrinth of valves, pipes, and tanks" used to maintain the climate-control system was contained in a "small room off the ground floor hall." Other utilities were "placed inconspicuously in the attic of the south portico, beneath the steps of the north portico, in the basement, and in a new access tunnel beneath the floor of the basement. The trench for the tunnel was dug twelve feet beneath the floor of the hitherto undisturbed red clay, along the north-south diameter of the building."⁷²³ The Valley Steel Corporation of Salem, Virginia, which undertook this phase of the work, had prepared drawings of the "tunnel slab detail showing supporting accessories" in August 1973. Ballou and Justice approved the plans that same month.⁷²⁴

A NEW ROTUNDA

The Board of Visitors held its first meeting in the east oval room on the main floor of the Rotunda on January 23, 1976, though the restoration project was not entirely completed at that time. At the meeting a report on the status of the construction was distributed and discussed, and February 20, 1976, was set as the completion date.⁷²⁵ On March 26, 1976, the restoration of the Rotunda was described as “essentially completed,” and the dedication was held on April 13, 1976, Thomas Jefferson’s 233rd birthday.⁷²⁶ As part of the ceremony University president Frank L. Hereford Jr. received the key to the Rotunda’s main entrance in the south portico from the Rector, William L. Zimmerman III. The newly revived Jefferson two-dollar bill was issued as part of the ceremony.⁷²⁷

For the nation’s Bicentennial, the *AIA Journal* asked forty-six architects, critics, and historians to nominate what they considered to be the “proudest achievements” of American architecture. The results of the survey were published in the July 1972 issue of the *Journal*: with twenty-nine mentions, the University of Virginia’s “Jeffersonian campus” received more recognition than any of the other thirty-seven nominees.⁷²⁸

One of the principal justifications for the entire restoration project — moving the president’s office to the Rotunda — was never implemented. In December 1974, while the project was still underway, President Hereford determined that the spaces were too limited to adequately accommodate the Office of the President, and he felt that having the building serve simultaneously as a tourist attraction would be disruptive to office functions.⁷²⁹ Although never used as the president’s office, the design configuration of the first floor, with an interconnecting passage between the west oval room and the north oval room, and the toilet to the south of the west oval room, remained unchanged. In the first few years after its completion in 1976, the Rotunda was visited by between 800 and 1,000 visitors per day.⁷³⁰

In mid-April 1977 Louis Ballou submitted to the University an itemized statement for \$251,920.85 for his firm’s architectural services and engineering fees. Of this amount, \$191,161.48 was for architectural services from January 1967 to July 1976. Electrical consultant Leo T. Griffin’s bill amounted to \$29,435.45; structural consultants Torrence, Dreelin, Farthing and Buford’s bill totaled \$10,763.19; \$19,060.73 was due for “consultants, research, and expenses”; and \$1,500 was billed by Ballou and Justice for “coordinating work with consultants.”⁷³¹

R. E. Lee and Son’s charges for the work carried out on the Rotunda totaled \$2,375,758.77. An additional \$27,556 was billed for supervision, \$131,451.50 for equipment, and \$26,055.11 for other expenses. The total cost amounted to \$2,812,742.23.⁷³²

In May 1977 Werner Sensbach, director of the University’s Planning Department, proposed to the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission that glass doors be installed “on

the south side of the Rotunda for both the main floor and the ground floor.” The door on the ground floor would “provide a vestibule through which visitors enter the Rotunda.” The glass doors on the main floor were meant to “open up the view of the Lawn for visitors inside the Rotunda.”⁷³³

In the few years following the completion of work, the role that the Rotunda was to play at the University became more clearly defined, in many ways fulfilling the desires voiced by the Student Council Rotunda Committee in 1974 and 1975. The dome room was accessible to students as a place to study, and, as planned, receptions and special academic events were held there. On the main floor, the Board of Visitors met regularly in the east oval room, and doctoral examining committees and small groups used the north oval room. During the first year after construction was completed, the west oval room was used as the Bicentennial office for the University, but after 1976 it served as the president’s ceremonial office. The basement oval rooms housed the University Guide Service and a University museum. The admissions office regularly used the west oval room in the basement to hold meetings with prospective students. Offices for the vice presidents of academic affairs, student affairs, finance, and development were located in the wings.⁷³⁴

A PROGRAM OF REPAIR, 1982–1985

By the early 1980s the University’s buildings — both the old structures and the newer construction — were in need of repairs and improvements. Over the years, when funds were short, the University had been required to return funds appropriated for maintenance, so such work, especially repairs slated for the older buildings, was often deferred. As maintenance was delayed, more expenditures were inevitably required.

In 1980 the University initiated a comprehensive program of continuous facilities inspection aimed at identifying in detail the nature and magnitude of the deferred-maintenance problem. By October 1982 it was estimated that more than \$10 million would be needed to make up for the deferred-maintenance backlog throughout the entire University. Meanwhile, in June 1980 the Buildings and Grounds Committee had proposed to undertake the repair of some of the University’s older buildings, which included “extensive work” to “correct leaking under the Rotunda deck.” By the spring of 1982 nearly \$4 million had been appropriated by the Virginia General Assembly for deferred maintenance, \$250,000 of which was earmarked for replacing the Rotunda’s decking. The need for “certain roofing and repair projects” was mentioned, though not elaborated on, in the minutes for the Board of Visitors’ meeting on January 22, 1983. Overall the University’s 1982–1984 budget gave first priority for an initial phase of corrective work

on the older buildings. These buildings required continual maintenance, and an endowment for that purpose was needed.⁷³⁵

In May 1984 the esplanades on the roofs of the Rotunda's terrace buildings were in the process of being rebuilt "at a cost of some \$200,000."⁷³⁶ The January 24, 1985, minutes of the meeting of the Buildings and Grounds Committee indicate that at least some of the repair work, though unspecified in the report, done to the Rotunda was completed by that time and that the Rotunda's terraces had "required extensive work."⁷³⁷

In February 1985 the University's Department of Physical Plant prepared a drawing of the existing roof structure of the dome and porticos and annotated the drawing with notes about needed repairs. The notes included specifications for paint types, as well as recommended cleaning and application directions.

At the same time University officials were still attempting to define the best or most appropriate use of the Rotunda. An ad hoc Committee on the Use of the Rotunda presented a report on its findings to the Board of Visitors in October 1986. The report updated the guidelines for the use of the building that had been outlined in 1976, after the restoration was complete.⁷³⁸

The Committee on the Use of the Rotunda concluded that while it was very important to regard the Rotunda as an active, working building rather than a "sterile shrine," the building's special characteristics and historical significance dictated that its use be carefully considered. Especially since the Rotunda's restoration in the 1970s, there had been heavy demand by University groups — including the University Senate, Student Council, the Honor Committee and some fraternities — for use of the building's facilities, and the demand far outstripped the available space. In addition, several thousand people visited the Rotunda in a typical month. Because of the "irreplaceable and fragile nature" of the interior, it was important that the building be used in ways that would not shorten its life. The committee therefore recommended that the University establish a small standing committee to assist the Rotunda administrator in making decisions about requests for use. They recommended that the standing committee have both faculty and student representation.⁷³⁹ The committee found that the use of the dome room to be of special concern because of the "fragile and irreplaceable" heart-pine flooring.⁷⁴⁰ A policy on the use of the Rotunda was approved by the Board of Visitors on October 3, 1986.⁷⁴¹

On January 29, 1987, the Buildings and Grounds Committee discussed "reworking the Rotunda front steps."⁷⁴²

In December 1987 the University of Virginia, along with Monticello, was added to the World Heritage List because it was considered a site of "outstanding universal value to mankind" and because its "deterioration or disappearance would be a harmful impoverishment of the heritage of all nations of the world."⁷⁴³

By the late summer of 1988 almost \$5 million had been spent on the repair and restoration of the University's historic buildings since the inspection program began in 1980. Over the next two years another \$700,000 was expended. Principal funding sources were the "operating budget, maintenance reserve appropriations, and private funding, with substantial support being developed by the Jeffersonian Restoration Advisory Board," which had been established in 1984.⁷⁴⁴ The advisory board became the fundraising arm of the University for the Jeffersonian buildings and grounds, as well as the principal adviser to the Board of Visitors on policies related to the restoration and preservation of those properties.⁷⁴⁵

In its September 1988 report the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board of Visitors summarized the work that had been completed on the historic buildings during the previous eight years: the committee recounted that major exterior and interior repairs were made to many of the Pavilions and to the Monroe Hill House, built in 1826. The Rotunda was not mentioned in this brief report, nor was it mentioned in a similar report released two years later.⁷⁴⁶ Similarly, there was no specific mention of the Rotunda in the recommended program of repairs for 1990 to 1992.⁷⁴⁷

After 1985 the University had greatly increased its maintenance and restoration activities in the Jeffersonian Precinct, to a level of \$1 million per year. These funds covered the cost of building materials, staff time, research, training of craftsmen, and materials analysis; additional funds were still needed to support capital outlays. The Jeffersonian Restoration Advisory Board began working toward creating the endowment that would be needed to maintain the historic buildings; the initial endowment target was \$5 million.⁷⁴⁸

CONSIDERING THE ROTUNDA'S ROLE AT THE UNIVERSITY

During the 1970s construction University officials began to seriously consider how the Jeffersonian buildings were being used, and these questions carried into the 1980s and 1990s. In 1990 the University began to develop policies that would guide treatment of the Jeffersonian buildings and grounds based on the principles of the Venice Charter of 1964. The University's new goal was to occupy and use the University's historic buildings rather than treat them as "museum pieces only to be toured and/or studied." "At the present time," the Buildings and Grounds Committee declared in 1990, "research, maintenance, and restoration must be conducted simultaneously, owing to the constant use of the buildings and the inability to isolate the site from both users and events."⁷⁴⁹

At the same time the University needed to consider the capital requirements for the upgrade and modernization of the historic buildings to bring them into conformance with modern fire-protection and safety standards, to provide satisfactory utility systems, and to

adapt them to contemporary functions. This goal proved to be a significant problem for the University due to the magnitude of its inventory of older buildings. In 1990 nearly a third of the University's academic buildings had been built before World War II, and six percent of the buildings had been built in the nineteenth century.⁷⁵⁰

In order to assess the magnitude of the capital renewal requirements, the University initiated a facilities audit program. Based on the audits completed by early 1990, which included the inspection of 24 buildings, the total capital renewal cost for the University's pre-World War II buildings was estimated to be approximately \$76 million.⁷⁵¹

Beginning in the early 1990s the University had formulated its primary goal, which was to restore Thomas Jefferson's "vision of the reciprocity between the academic and the physical plan of the University." A large part of achieving and maintaining this goal was "to reverse the dispersion of the University across a larger countryside and restore its concentration around the central grounds," reestablishing academic programs and student residences in that area. With no building more central to the University than the Rotunda, these new goals would surely affect its usage.⁷⁵²

Early in 1992 the Office of Architect of the University was officially established, and architect Harry Porter, dean of the University's School of Architecture, was hired to fill the position. The Architect of the University and his staff were to establish their office in the Rotunda. In his new role, Porter was chair of the Master Planning Council and played an active role in the presentations of the Buildings and Grounds Committee.⁷⁵³

A report published in December 1992 illustrated expenditures on restoration projects in the academical village from 1983 to 1992. The spreadsheet shows that the only funds expended for work on the Rotunda during that time, the sum of \$60,000, was in 1985.⁷⁵⁴ After construction was complete in 1976 the Rotunda was used as the University's visitors' center, but by the early 1990s studies by the Buildings and Grounds Committee showed, surprisingly, that visitors to the University, especially prospective students and their families, "probably don't want or need to go there."⁷⁵⁵

In 1993 the University began investigating ways of making the Academical Village accessible to disabled students and visitors. Mesick, Cohen, Waite Architects, now John G. Waite Associates, Architects, along with EDAW landscape architects and Barrier Free Environments, Inc., an accessibility consultant, called for the installation of a mechanical lift near the Rotunda steps to the Upper Lawn Terrace and the modification of four toilets (two in the cryptoporticus and two near the lower north oval room), as well as improvements to the serviceability of the Rotunda's elevator. The consultants also recommended regrading the walkway and raising the level of the paving in the arcade adjacent to the principal office entries at the northwest corner of the Rotunda office wings and installing a lift device to ground-floor toilet rooms inside the Rotunda.⁷⁵⁶

REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS AT THE END OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Harry Porter resigned as Architect of the University in 1994 and was replaced by University alumnus Samuel A. “Pete” Anderson III in May 1995.⁷⁵⁷ In May 1995 the American Institute of Architects awarded the University the Institute Honor Award for the University’s decade-long curatorial program to preserve and restore the buildings in Thomas Jefferson’s Academical Village, including the Rotunda.

During the late 1990s University officials, including curator and architect for the Academical Village James Murray Howard, realized that the Rotunda continued to be in need of repair and improvements, especially as use of the building was considered. In June 1997 Howard compiled a report on the Rotunda, discussing, largely, the dome and roof:

You may have noticed that the dome turned black briefly, from December [1996] until March [1997]. What you were seeing was a chemical primer applied to the metal surface to neutralize rust that blossomed there in late fall. The action was consistent with the University’s posture during the last decade — sustain the present steel outer skin of the dome for as long as may be practical. Thus our immediate aim this year was first to neutralize the rust, then repaint in the white color that has, for the last twenty years, been seen by the public. That repainting has now been accomplished. The four-month project, which had to lie dormant during the coldest months, yielded unexpected insights into the nature of the dome, past and present. Research into historic documents and photographs showed that the dome has undergone many episodes of change. While it is still difficult to prove how the dome was first skinned, we can demonstrate that its shape and color were altered at least five times over 150 years. It is doubtful that the curved surface was white even in the earliest years, when it was more likely a medium gray color; and photographs prove that it was very dark in color throughout much of the 19th and 20th centuries. But we do know that the present brilliantly white dome is a product only of the 1970s. Should we therefore change the dome’s appearance now? No. This year’s physical investigations have allayed the recent belief that we would have to replace the metal skin in a very few years. We now think that this chapter in the life of the building could endure for perhaps another ten years, with adequate maintenance. We also know that the masonry inner structure of the dome is sound, yet it dates only from the era of rebuilding just after the 1895 fire; prior to that the structure was of wood. So whenever we do confront the unavoidable need to replace the metal skin, we face dilemma — what is the appropriate covering for a non-original but perfectly sound masonry structure? Would Jefferson’s earliest skin be correct if the structure below does not correspond historically, or would Stanford White’s copper skin be “truer”? But that

question is for the distant future. Be assured that, for now, the dome can and should remain as we see it, until the next chapter is ready to be written.⁷⁵⁸

Early in 1997, as part of a survey of the existing conditions, the University Facilities Planning and Construction Department mapped out the scope of water damage and likely sources of water penetration into the spaces below the terrace esplanades. Based on the results of the survey, the department recommended concentrated testing of the northeast terrace wing as well as removing a section of the marble base from the south portico for laboratory testing.⁷⁵⁹

James Murray Howard provided the following report on the Rotunda's exterior in June 1997:

Outside, the Rotunda suffers from increasing water problems on the decks that surround the original circular building. Expanded by Stanford White in 1896, reworked in 1938 and 1983, the decks are now subject to chronic leakage that makes some of the office spaces below unsightly and unpleasant. We are presently engaged in studies with architectural consultants to better understand the failure mechanisms and to find ways to resolve them. Phase I of the work, completed in the winter of 1997, surveyed and documented the problem areas. Phase II, now underway, will include testing of the affected areas, necessitating the removal of some marble and bluestone components to determine subsurface conditions and enable us to better predict trustworthy responses. Resolution of the problems at all four decks will probably require several years, which would constitute Phase III of the work. We want to be sure that any new work will stop the habitual destruction that has plagued these decks for many years.⁷⁶⁰

Also in June 1997 the guidelines on the use of the Rotunda, which had been approved in October 1986, were revised and updated. A handicap-access ramp to the Rotunda was being considered in the spring of 1998.⁷⁶¹ Three access ramps were ultimately installed: one at the southwest corner, one on the south side between Pavilion I and the south steps of the Rotunda, and one at the southeast corner.

In the summer of 1997 the Design Committee of the Jeffersonian Restoration Advisory Board initiated improvements in the lower east oval room, which then served, and still does, as a visitors' reception and information area. Since the 1970s restoration the room had been arranged as a museum-like space for visitors. Until 1991 the office of the Rotunda administrator was also located in the east oval room, when it was moved to the lower north oval room. By the late 1990s, however, the University's goal was to alter the museum-like atmosphere of the east oval room and make it more useful as an impressive but informal meeting space that would include displays about the history of the Jeffersonian precinct.⁷⁶²

By the spring of 1998 the marble bases of the columns on the south side of the Rotunda were showing wear and were in need of repair. The plinths were “cracked and the caulked/mortared joints between the pieces opened”; one plinth had completely broken loose, and the plinth beneath the southwest pilaster was “severely damaged.” When that damaged plinth was removed in summer 2000, Stephen P. Ratliff, senior construction manager of the University’s Facilities Planning and Construction Department, found two coins that had been deliberately placed underneath the plinth block. One coin, an 1865 two-cent piece, had the initials “JMB” scratched onto the surface, and the other, an 1879 one-cent piece, bore the initials “CWH.” The number “97” was scratched into the reverse of both coins, suggesting that they had been placed there during the rebuilding of the Rotunda after the fire and that the pilaster plinth had been replaced at that time.⁷⁶³

In spring 1998 workers replaced the stone paving on top of the southwest terrace offices, and steel-and-brass guardrails were installed at each side of the main stair leading from the Rotunda deck to the Lawn level following the designs of James Murray Howard. The rails were fabricated and installed by Iron Crafters, Inc., of Gordonsville, Virginia, at a cost of \$17,180 and were completed in time for graduation exercises in mid-May.⁷⁶⁴

The survey that had been carried out in 1997 was the first phase of a four-phase construction project for the improvement of the Rotunda decking, the final three stages of which were to take place during the summers of 2000 through 2003. The design work was carried out by Stoneking von Storch Architects, of Charlottesville, and Whitlock Dalrymple Poston and Associates, consulting engineers of Manassas, Virginia.⁷⁶⁵

On June 21, 2005, a Request for proposal was issued by the University of Virginia for “consulting services in connection with the writing of an historic structures report for the Rotunda at the University of Virginia.” John G. Waite Associates, Architects PLLC submitted a proposal, dated July 11, 2005, in response to the request and signed a contract with the University on May 5, 2006, for these services.

NOTES

Abbreviations used in notes

AG	Alexander Garrett
ASB	Arthur Spicer Brockenbrough
JCC	Joseph Carrington Cabell
JD	James Dinsmore
JHC	John Hartwell Cocke
JM	James Madison
JN	John Neilson
SW	Stanford White
TJ	Thomas Jefferson
WJC	William J. Coffee
Coolidge Coll.	The Coolidge Collection of Thomas Jefferson Manuscripts, Massachusetts Historical Society.

The texts of many documents relating to the University that date from 1817 to 1828 have been transcribed and are available in the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive at the University of Virginia, Electronic Text Center (<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/jefferson/>). In those instances where only a portion of the text appears in the transcript, the microfilm version or on-line scan of the original document was consulted. The original spellings have been maintained.

The *Documentary History of the Construction of the Buildings at the University of Virginia, 1817-1828*, by Frank E. Grizzard Jr., also available at the Thomas Jefferson Digital Archive, was an invaluable guide to documents relating to the construction of the Rotunda, as was William B. O'Neal, *Jefferson's Buildings at the University of Virginia, The Rotunda* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1960).

The published annual reports of the Rector and Board of Visitors include financial information on payments made for construction. These amounts are often at variance with the sums shown in the manuscript versions of the proctor's ledgers for the same time periods. In this report the published financial records were used unless otherwise noted.

1. TJ to L. W. Tazewell, 5 Jan. 1805, transcript in Mary N. Woods, "Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia: Planning the Academic Village," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 44 (Oct. 1985), 282-283. See this article also for a discussion of architectural precedents for colleges and other institutional structures in the U. S. and Europe that were known to Jefferson.
2. TJ to [trustees for the lottery of East Tennessee College], 6 May 1810, Library of Congress.
3. BV, Central College, Minutes, 5 May 1817.
4. TJ to L. W. Tazewell, 5 Jan. 1805, [source?]
5. TJ to William Thornton, 9 May 1817.
6. Thornton to TJ, 27 May 1817.
7. TJ to B. H. Latrobe, 12 June 1817.
8. Latrobe to TJ, 17 June 1817, in John C. Van Horne, ed., *The Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe*, Vol. 3 (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press for Maryland Historical Society, 1988), 903-4. The editors of the Latrobe papers have commented that "While certain aspects of Jefferson's design may well have impressed BHL, this statement probably also reveals both BHL's flattery of Jefferson and his own false modesty." The editors cite (p. 904) a plan by Latrobe for a national university in Washington, D.C., that resembled many aspects of Jefferson's scheme.
9. Latrobe to TJ, 28 June 1817, in Thomas Jefferson Papers, Library of Congress, American Memory database.
10. TJ to Latrobe, 16 July 16, 1817, in Van Horne, 907-8.
11. TJ to Latrobe, 16 July 1817, in Van Horne, 907-8.
12. Latrobe to TJ, 24 July 1817, in Van Horne, 914-916.
13. TJ to Latrobe, 3 Aug. 1817.
14. BHL to TH, 12 Aug. 1817; TJ to BHL, 24 Aug. 1817.
15. Latrobe to TJ, 6 Oct. 1817.
16. TJ to BHL, 12 Oct. 1817.
17. TJ to BHL, 19 May 1818.
18. *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Fix the Scite of the University of Virginia* (Richmond: John Warrock, 1818), 3-4.
19. *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Fix the Scite of the University of Virginia* (Richmond: John Warrock, 1818), 4.
20. TJ to JCC, 28 Jan. 1819.
21. *Report and Documents Respecting the University of Virginia* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1820), 6-7; this is the report filed in 1819. *Report and Documents Respecting the University of Virginia* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1820), 7; this is the report filed in 1820. BV, Minutes, 29 March 1819, 4 Oct. 1819.
22. TJ to John Wayles Eppes, 30 June 1820. TJ, Statement of Probable Costs for the Buildings, 28 Nov. 1820.

23. These drawings are illustrated in William B. O'Neal, *Jefferson's Buildings at the University of Virginia, The Rotunda* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1960), plates VI-IX, XI, XII.
24. O'Neal, 3.
25. O'Neal, 50-52.
26. TJ, *Operations at and for the College, [1817-1826]*, last page. This book contains Jefferson's specifications for the pavilions, dormitories, and hotels; similar information for the Rotunda appears on the back of his drawings for the Rotunda.
27. ASB to TJ, 29 March 1821, cited in O'Neal, 19-20.
28. BV, Minutes, 2 April 1821.
29. Chapman Johnson and James Breckenridge to JHC, 5 April 1821.
30. Chapman Johnson and James Breckenridge to JHC, 5 April 1821.
31. TJ to Francis Wayles Eppes, 8 April 1821.
32. TJ to JHC, 9 April 1821.
33. TJ to JHC, 9 April 1821.
34. TJ to Thomas Appleton, 16 April 1821. TJ to John Patterson, 15 May 1821.
35. TJ to Board of Visitors, 30 Sept. 1821. TJ, *A View of the Expenses & Funds*, 30 Sept. 1821.
36. TJ to James Madison, 30 Oct. 1821.
37. JCC to JHC, 21 Nov. 1821.
38. TJ to William Short, 24 Nov. 1821.
39. ASB to the Rector and BV, 26 Nov. 1821.
40. BV, Minutes, 29-30 Nov. 1821.
41. *Report and Documents Respecting the University of Virginia* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1821), 3-4.
42. JHC to JCC, 8 Dec. 1821.
43. TJ to Thomas Cooper, 9 March 1822.
44. TJ to James Madison, 7 April 1822.
45. TJ to William Short, 19 Oct. 1822, LOC.
46. BV, Minutes, 7 Oct. 1822.
47. BV, Minutes, 7 Oct. 1822. *Report and Documents Respecting the University of Virginia* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1823), 3; this is the report for 1822.
48. TJ to ASB, 11 Oct. 1822.
49. TJ to Thomas Mann Randolph Jr., 23 December 1822.
50. TJ to Robert Walsh Jr., 21 Dec. 1822. JCC to TJ, 23 Dec. 1822.
51. William Cabell Rives to TJ, 19 Dec. 1822.
52. TJ to Thomas Mann Randolph Jr., 23 Dec. 1822.
53. TJ to JCC, 28 Dec. 1822.

54. TJ to JCC, 28 Dec. 1822.
55. JCC to TJ, 30 Dec. 1822.
56. *Report and Documents Respecting the University of Virginia* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1823), 4.
57. TJ to Maria Hadfield Cosway, 24 Oct. 1822.
58. TJ to JCC, 13 Jan. 1823.
59. AG to JHC, 18 Feb. 1823.
60. JN to JHC, 22 Feb. 1823.
61. JN to JHC, 22 Feb. 1823. Neilson claimed that Thorn had not in fact made those bricks but that he had made the ones for Pavilion VIII, Hotel C, and the proctor's house.
62. JN to JHC, 22 Feb. 1823.
63. TJ to JM, 6 Jan. 1823. TJ to JCC, 28 Jan. 1823.
64. TJ to JM, 24 Feb. 1823.
65. Abiah B. Thorn and Nathaniel Chamberlain, contract with University of Virginia, 8 March 1823. Notes on the quality and details of the work had been drafted by Jefferson; see TJ, Instructions for Bricklaying and Carpentry, c. 1823, and Brockenbrough appears to have drawn on some of Jefferson's text when writing the contracts.
66. ASB, Contract with JD and JN, 11 March 1823.
67. Abiah B. Thorn and Nathaniel Chamberlain, contract with University of Virginia, 8 March 1823. JD and JN, contract with University of Virginia, 11 March 1823.
68. JD and JN, contract with University of Virginia, 11 March 1823.
69. ASB to TJ, 11 March 1823.
70. TJ to ASB, 12 March 1823. TJ to JHC, 13 March 1823.
71. TJ to JM et al, 12 March 1823.
72. TJ to JM et al, 12 March 1823.
73. JM to TJ, 21 March 1823.
74. JCC to TJ, 24 March 1823.
75. BV, Minutes, 7 April 1823.
76. TJ, Memorandum on Finances, 6 April 1823.
77. JCC to Louisa Maxwell Holmes Cocke, 8 April 1823.
78. TJ to JHC, 22 April 1823.
79. ASB to JHC, 13 March 1823.
80. ASB to JHC, 7 April 1823; 13 April 1823.
81. JHC to ASB, 14 April 1823.
82. ASB to TJ, 28 Nov. 1823.
83. ASB to JHC, 7 April 1823.
84. JHC to ASB, 14 April 1823.

85. JM to JCC, 16 April 1823.
86. TJ to JM, 30 April 1823.
87. TJ to JM, 30 April 1823.
88. JM to JCC, 16 April 1823. TJ to JM, 30 April 1823; fuller text in James Madison Papers,
89. TJ to JM, 30 April 1823; JM to JCC, May 10, 1823.
90. TJ to ASB, 22 April 1823.
91. JN to TJ, 5 May 1823.
92. TJ to ASB, 16 June 1823.
93. TJ to ASB, 10 Aug. 1823.
94. ASB to TJ, 11 Aug. 1823. TJ to ASB, 11 Aug. 1823.
95. Martha Jefferson Randolph to Nicholas P. W. Trist, 4 April 1824.
96. O'Neal, plate XIII.
97. TJ to JCC, July 4, 1823.
98. ASB to JCC, 27 July 1823.
99. JN to JHC, 23 Aug. 1823.
100. TJ to E. S. Davis, 27 Aug. 1823. TJ to William Short, trans., 8 Sept. 1823, TJP, LC.
101. TJ to John Trumbull, 15 July 1823, quoted in Grizzard, Appendix K, 24-25.
102. *Report and Documents Respecting the University of Virginia* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1823), 30-42; LD 5662, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
103. *Report and Documents Respecting the University of Virginia* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1823), 30-42.
104. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 20, 22.
105. ASB to TJ, 28 Nov. 1823.
106. TJ to ASB, 28 Dec. 1823.
107. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 24, 26.
108. TJ to ASB, 2 Sept. 1823. Giacomo Raggi and ASB, contract, 8 Sept. 1823.
109. BV, Min., 6 Oct. 1823.
110. TJ to TA, 8 Oct. 1823.
111. TH to ASB, 22 Nov. 1823. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 22.
112. TA to TJ, 8 Feb. 1824.
113. TA to TJ, 8 Feb. 1824.
114. ASB to TJ, 3 May 1824.
115. TJ to TA, 17 May 1824.

116. TJ to ASB, 29 March 1824.
117. ASB to TJ, 28 March 1824.
118. TJ to ASB, 29 March 1824.
119. TJ to Joseph G. Swift, 22 May 1824. William Bainter O'Neal, *Jefferson's Fine Arts Library, His Selections for the University of Virginia Together with His Own Architectural Books* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1976), 83-87; plate 24 is a reproduction of a DeLorme drawing of the laminated ribs.
120. Notes on the quality and details of the work had been drafted by Jefferson; see TJ, Instructions for Bricklaying and Carpentry, c. 1823,
121. TJ to Joseph G. Swift, 21 June 1825.
122. TJ to WJC, 31 May 1824, Coolidge Coll.
123. D.W. and C. Warwick to ASB, 6 April 1824.
124. John Brockenbrough to ASB, 3 May 1824, PP, Box 4, Folder May 3, 1824. ASB to TJ, 3 May 1824.
125. D.W. and C. Warwick to ASB, 7 June 1824.
126. D. W. and C. Warwick to ASB, invoice, 14 June 1824. John Brockenbrough to ASB, 3 May 1824, PP, Box 4, Folder May 3, 1824.
127. Anthony Bergamin to ASB, 21 June 1824.
128. D. W. and C. Warwick to ASB, invoice, 14 June 1824; D. W. and C. Warwick to ASB, 14 June 1824.
129. Warwick to ASB, invoice, 6 July 1824.
130. Warwick, invoice, 13 July 1824.
131. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 32. These published figures differ from the handwritten proctor's ledgers, which show that Bergamin was paid \$626.82 on September 13, 1824. The description of the work is quoted in O'Neal, 14.
132. Brockenbrough and Harvie to ASB, 4 Oct. 1824. Andrew Smith to ASB, invoice and letter, 10 Nov. 1824. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 24.
133. BV, Minutes, 5 April 1824, RG 1/1/2, Vol. 1, p. 57, Small Collections.
134. TJ to WJC, 10 April 1824, Coolidge Coll.
135. John M. Perry and ASB, agreement for brickwork, 25 May 1824, PP, Box 4, Folder 1824, Workmen's Papers.
136. ASB to TJ, 4 June 1824.
137. ASB, Estimate of the Cost of the Rotunda, 5 April 1824.
138. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 28, 30, 32.
139. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 34.

140. Proctor's Ledger, Rotunda Account, May 10, 1824, p. 318. ASB to TJ, 14 July 1824.
141. TJ to WJC, 4 Sept. 1824, Coolidge Coll.
142. TJ to WJC, 4 Sept. 1824, Coolidge Coll.
143. WJC to TJ, 11 Sept. 1824.
144. TJ to WJC, 19 Sept. 1824, Coolidge Coll.
145. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 3.
146. BV, Min., 4 Oct. 1824, pp. 68, 74-75..
147. ASB to TJ, 21 Dec. 1824, quoted in O'Neal, 33.
148. Henry Marshall, "Charlottesville and the University: An 1824 View," *Magazine of Albemarle County History* 29 (1971), 29-30.
149. Lafayette to TJ, 29 Aug. 1824, in Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette, *Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1929), 420.
150. TJ to TA, 8 Oct. 1824.
151. TJ to Joseph Coolidge, 12 Oct. 1824, microfilm edition, Thomas Jefferson Papers, University of Virginia. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1824), 3. In a letter of 4 Feb. 1825, Bergamin to ASB, Bergamin states that his work had been finished but he had not been paid. TJ to ASB, 21 April 1825.
152. TJ to Lafayette, 9 Oct. 1824.
153. *Richmond Inquirer*, 16 Nov. 1824; a partial transcription of this account, which was originally published in Charlottesville's *Central Gazette*, appears as "Reception of General Lafayette in Albemarle," *The Magazine of Albemarle County History* 24 (1965-66), 53-66.
154. *Richmond Inquirer*, 16 Nov. 1824.
155. *Richmond Inquirer*, 16 Nov. 1824.
156. Mémoires, Correspondance et Manuscrits du Général Lafayette, publiés par sa famille, Vol. 16 (Paris: H. Fournier Aîné, 1838), 183-184.
157. TJ to Coffee, 9 Dec. 1824.
158. WJC to TJ, 20 Dec. 1824.
159. WJC to TJ, 1 Jan. 1825; 16 Jan. 1825; 31 Jan. 1825. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1825), 26.
160. Ann. Report 1825 p. 30.
161. John Brockenbrough to ASB, 11 March 1825, Proctors' Papers, RG 5/3, Box 5, Folder 460.
162. TJ to JCC, 11 Jan. 1825.
163. TJ to Joseph Coolidge, Jr., 12 April 1825.
164. TJ to ASB, 21 April 1825.

165. Thomas May to ASB, 8 Jan. 1825, 11 Jan. 1825, 14 Feb. 1825, 10 March 1825, 4 April 1825, 14 May 1825. More glass was ordered in 1825, but it is not clear whether it was intended for the Rotunda; Thomas May to ASB, 9 July 1825, 20 July 1825.
166. Thomas May to ASB, 27 July 1825, 4 Aug. 1825, 24 Aug. 1825.
167. Invoice, Benjamin Blackford to ASB, 15 Aug. 1825.
168. BV, Min., 5 March 1825, RG 1/1/2, Vol. 1, p. 85.
169. TJ to ASB, 9 March 1825.
170. JD and JN to ASB, 5 March 1825.
171. TJ to JCC, 11 Jan. 1825.
172. TJ to ASB, 11 March 1825.
173. TJ, Statement of University Funds, 15 March 1825.
174. TJ to TA, 17 May 1824.
175. TA to TJ, 10 and 25 June 1824, 28 July 1824.
176. TJ to TA, 8 Oct. 1824.
177. TA to TJ, 8 Oct. 1824, LC.
178. TA to TJ, 4 May 1825. TA, Account for Marble Columns, 4 May 1825. TA to TJ, 22 June 1825. Jefferson wrote Appleton on 10 Aug. 1825 stating that he had not heard from him since 8 Oct. 1824 and setting forth the accounts for the marble.
179. TA to TJ, 22 June 1825. Appleton sent his final accounting for the project in July; TA to TJ, 12 July 1825.
180. TJ to ASB, 23 July 1825.
181. TJ to ASB, 30 Aug. 1825. Jonathan Thompson to TJ, 9 Sept. 1825. The tax collector at the custom house in New York, Jonathan Thompson, told Jefferson that he had shipped the marble to Richmond on board the sloop *Eliza Allen*; Jonathan Thompson to TJ, 9 Sept. 1825.
182. Henry A. S. Dearborn to TJ, 6 Sept. 1825. TJ to ASB, 13 Sept. 1825.
183. Henry A. S. Dearborn to TJ, 20 Sept. 1825.
184. Henry A. S. Dearborn to TJ, 22 Sept. 1825.
185. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 12.
186. BV, Minutes, 5 Oct. 1825, RG 1/1/2, pp. 95-96.
187. TJ to Ellen W. R. Coolidge, 14 Nov. 1825. Jonathan Thompson to TJ, 17 Nov. 1825. William Cabell Rives to TJ, 13 March 1826, 30 Nov. 1826. TJ to ASB, 2 May 1826. John Brockenbrough to ASB, 9 May 1826. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 20. William Cabell Rives to TJ, 13 May 1826.
188. BV, Min., 7 April 1826 (from UVL, ETC. Copy transcribed from Small Coll may be imperfect)
189. TJ to Coolidge, 12 April 1825.
190. TJ, Specifications for the Rotunda's Clock & Bell, c. 11 April 1825.

191. Joseph Coolidge Jr. to TJ, 5 Aug. 1825.
192. TJ to Coolidge, 13 Oct. 1825.
193. TJ to ASB, 3 Jan. 1826.
194. TJ to Ellen W. R. Coolidge, 14 Nov. 1825.
195. TJ to JHC, 20 May 1826.
196. TJ to ASB, [c. May 1826].
197. TJ to Coolidge, 4 June 1826.
198. TJ to ASB, 22 June 1826
199. ASB to TJ, 6 June 1825.
200. TJ to ASB, 7 June 1825. The drawing has been lost.
201. ASB to TJ, 9 June 1825.
202. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1825), 34.
203. John Patton Emmet to TJ, 12 May 1825. ASB to TJ, 6 June 1825.
204. TJ to ASB, 7 June 1825.
205. Emmet to ASB, 5 January 1826, quoted in Grizzard, chapter 10, p. 7.
206. Charles Bonnycastle to ASB, 10 April 1826.
207. TJ to TA, 8 Oct. 1823.
208. TA to TJ, 8 Feb. 1824.
209. Peter Sturtevant to ASB, 17 June 1824.
210. Peter Sturtevant to ASB, 18 June 1825.
211. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 16, 22. Peter Sturtevant to ASB, 13 July 1826. Sturtevant wrote Brockenbrough in the fall wanting an advance of \$300; Sturtevant to ASB, 5 Nov. 1826.
212. Sturtevant to ASB, 5 Nov. 1826.
213. WJC to ASB, 12 July 1825.
214. ASB to TJ, 23 July 1825.
215. TJ to ASB, 24 July 1825.
216. WJC to ASB, 26 July 1825. WJC to TJ, 19 Aug. 1825.
217. WJC to ASB, 4 Sept. 1825.
218. WJC to ASB, 25 Sept. 1825. ASB to TJ, 1 Oct. 1825.
219. ASB to TJ, 1 Oct. 1825. It is not clear from the Proctor's Ledgers or Jefferson's papers that Coffee ever did this work; there is no listing in the ledgers under his name in the Rotunda accounts between 1825-1830 (although payment might have been made to someone else on his behalf); similarly no payments to him are included in the accounts published in the annual reports between Sept. 1825 and July 1828.

220. TJ to ASB, 12 Oct. 1825.
221. TJ to ASB, 19 Sept. 1825.
222. TJ to ASB, 15 Nov. 1825.
223. *Richmond Enquirer*, Sept. 6, 1825.
224. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1825), 24-38. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 12-14.
225. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1825), 4.
226. TJ to ASB, 21 April 1825.
227. TJ to ASB, 3 Jan. 1826.
228. TJ to JCC, 4 Feb. 1826.
229. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1826), 22.
230. TJ to ASB, [7] April [1826].
231. TJ to JHC, 20 May 1826.
232. TJ to ASB, 5 May 1826. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 12-14.
233. TJ to ASB, 5 May 1826. TJ to JHC, 20 May 1826. TJ to ASB, [c. May 1826].
234. TJ to ASB, [c. May 1826].
235. A. H. Brooks to ASB, 13 June 1826. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 22.
236. Invoice, Daniel Warwick to ASB, 12 June 1826.
237. TJ to ASB, [c. May 1826].
238. TJ to ASB, 5 May 1826. TJ to JHC, 20 May 1826.
239. TJ to ASB [c. May 1826].
240. TJ, Operations at and for the College, pages 3, 4, 39, quoted in O'Neal, 52-54.
241. JHC and Alexander Garrett, 31 May 1826.
242. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1826), 22.
243. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1826), 18, 22
244. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1826), 18, 22.
245. TJ to Gen. T. Smith, 22 Oct. 1825.
246. TJ to Robert Mills, March 3, 1826, TJ Papers, DLC.

247. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 3.
248. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, Exhibiting the Results of an Examination into the Progress of the Students, &c., &c.* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1827), 3,7.
249. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, Exhibiting the Results of an Examination into the Progress of the Students, &c., &c.* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1827), 3.
250. Joseph Antrim to ASB, 7 Aug. 1826.
251. JHC to ASB, 27 Sept. 1826.
252. ASB to JHC, 20 Aug. 1826.
253. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1826), 3.
254. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1829), 20. ASB to JHC, 8 Aug. 1827.
255. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1826), 4.
256. BV, Min., 3-7 Oct. 1826.
257. BV, Min., 1 Oct. 1828.
258. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1827), 18, 20, 22, 24.
259. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1829), 20.
260. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1829), 20, 22, 28.
261. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, 1826), 22.
262. Joseph Coolidge to ASB, 31 March 1827. The University paid for Willard's expenses in Charlottesville; *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1827), 28. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1829), 20.
263. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund* (Richmond: Thomas Ritchie, Printer, 1829), 20, 24, 32.
264. BV, Min., 18 July 1827.
265. Nicholas P. W. Trist to ASB, 11 Sept. 1827.
266. ASB to JHC, 7 Oct. 1827.
267. JHC to ASB, 10 Nov. 1827. Grizzard, Chap. 11, p. 9.
268. ASB to JHC, 8 Aug. 1827.

269. ASB to JHC, 8 Aug. 1827, 7 Oct. 1827.
270. ASB to JCH, 4 March 1828, quoted in Grizzard, Chap. 11, note 802.
271. JHC to ASB, 10 Nov. 1827. ASB, Memorandum, 9 Nov. 1827, quoted in Grizzard, Appendix K, 38. Trouble with the chimneys continued in the fall of 1828; BV, Min., 3 Oct. 1828. Grizzard, Chap. 11, p. 13.
272. Charles Bonnycastle, Plan for Curing Smoking Chimneys [c. 5 Oct. 1828], transcribed in Grizzard, Appendix S.
273. Coleman Sellers to JHC, 19 Jan. 1828.
274. Grizzard, Chap. 11, p. 8.
275. William Wertenbaker to ASB, 15 Jan. 1828, quoted in Grizzard, Chap. 11, p. 7. Benjamin Blackford of the Isabella Furnace sent an invoice on Nov. 30, 1827, for “2 Largest Oval Stoves” and one large Philadelphia stove; since this invoice predates the faculty resolution, these stoves may have been intended for another location.
276. BV, Min., 20 July 1829.
277. Margaret Bayard Smith to Anna Bayard Boyd and Jane Bayard Kirkpatrick, 2 Aug. 1828, 12 Aug. 1828, quoted in Grizzard, Epilogue, notes 2, 6.
278. William Leitch to the University of Virginia, 4 Jan. 1833, Proctors’ Papers, RG 5/3, Box 9, Bills and Accounts, Univ. of Virginia. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 1 (New York: MacMillan Co., 1920-22), 269.
279. Contract, William Leitch and University of Virginia, 1833, Proctors’ Papers, RG 5/3, Box 9, Bills and Accounts, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
280. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1834*, p. 6. John Smith, invoice, 29 April 1833, RG 5/3, Box 9, Bills and Accounts, Proctors’ Papers, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. William Leitch, invoice, May 1833, RG 5/3, Box 9, Bills and Accounts, Proctors’ Papers, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
281. BV, Minutes, 17 July 1833, p. 307. There is no indication in the annual reports of 1833 or 1834 that repairs to the skylight were made during those years.
282. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1836*, p. 9.
283. BV, Minutes, 17 Aug. 1837, p. 394. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1838*, p. 17.
284. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1839–40*, p. 22,
285. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1837*, pp. 6–7. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1839–40*, p. 22, University of Virginia health System Web site, http://www.healthsystem.virginia.edu/internet/library/historical/uva_hospital/centennial/beginnings.cfm (accessed 6 Dec. 2006). The Anatomical Hall was designed by Jefferson and built in 1826. It was razed in 1938.
286. BV, Minutes, 4 July 1840, p. 427. William B. O’Neal, ed., *The American Association of Architectural Bibliographers, Papers*, vol. 6 (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1969), 102–122. Though the Rotunda’s weathervane is usually depicted as having been in the shape of an arrow, O’Neal writes that its form is not certain. In 1933 University alumnus John M. Payne, who attended the University from 1858 to 1860, distinctly recalled that the

weathervane was indeed in the form of a quill during his tenure at the University, and it was the quill-shaped weathervane that was removed in 1860: “The Vane was in the form of a Quill [*sic*] Pen some 8 or 10 feet long — gilded. The point of the pen would point to the letter N. E. S. W. as the wind blew.”

287. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1839–40*, pp. 12–13,
288. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1840*, p. 3,
289. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co., 1920-22), 16. Francis Fry Wayland, *Andrew Stevenson, Democrat and Diplomat* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1949), 212. In the spring of 1845 student enrollment at the University was 194. Ten years later, in the 1855–1856 academic year, it was 558, and then next year it grew to 645, the largest for any year prior to the Civil War. By comparison, in 1855–1856 enrollment at Yale was 619, at Harvard 669. When Virginia had 645 students in 1857, Harvard had 697. Supplement to the Annual Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1849, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. City of Charlottesville, Virginia, Web site, “History of Charlottesville Transit Service,” <http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=672> (accessed 4 Dec. 2006). *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1850*, p. 9. George Humphrey Yetter, “Stanford White at the University of Virginia: The New Buildings on the South Lawn and the Reconstruction of the Rotunda in 1896” (master’s thesis, Univ. of Virginia, May 1980), 10.
290. BV, Minutes, 9 Oct. 1849, pp. 549–551. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 22. “University of Virginia’s Loss,” *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895.
291. BV, Minutes, 4 July 1840.
292. BV, Minutes, 1 July 1841.
293. George W. Spooner, Proposal for Gymnasia, 20 July 1833, University of Virginia Web site, 22 Documents Concerning the Founding of the University of Virginia, 1829–1860, <http://etext.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/Jef14Gr.html> (accessed Dec. 6, 2006). *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1842*, p. 9.
294. George Spooner to the University of Virginia, invoice for converting the two gymnasia on each side of the Rotunda into a Lecture room and Chapel furnishing all materials for same, July 1842, RG 5/3, Box 14, Folder 1842, Bills and Accounts, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
295. BV, Minutes, 1 July 1841..
296. BV, Minutes, 4 July 1840..
297. Day and Welsh, invoice, 29 Aug. 1842, RG 5/3, Box 14, Folder 1842, Bills and Accounts, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. John Day to the University of Virginia, invoice, 9 March 1842, RG 5/3, Box 14, Folder 1842, Bills and Accounts, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
298. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund, for the Year Ending June 30, 1845*, p. 12.
299. BV, Minutes, 3 July 1845.
300. BV, Minutes, 9 Oct. 1849.
301. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1850.

302. Andrew Stevenson and Thomas J. Randolph to Joseph C. Cabell, 14 Aug. 1851, Report E, in *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1851*, p. 21.
303. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1850*, p. 9.
304. BV, Minutes, 25 Sept. 1850.. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 22. Andrew Stevenson to Joseph C. Cabell, 28 Dec. 1850, Cabell Family Papers, 38-111, Box 38, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
305. Andrew Stevenson to John Hartwell Cocke, 15 Oct. 1850, Cocke Papers, 640, Box 134, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
306. Andrew Stevenson to Joseph C. Cabell, 28 Dec. 1850, Cabell Family Papers, 38-111, Box 38, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Rhodri Windsor Liscombe, *Altogether American: Robert Mills, Architect and Engineer* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994), 282. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 22.
307. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 3 (New York: The MacMillan Co. 1921), 23.
308. National Archives Web site, National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC), "Documenting the Career of Architect Robert Mills," *Annotation* (Newsletter of the NHPRC) 26:3 (1998): <http://www.archives.gov/nhprc/annotation/september-98/robert-mills.html> (accessed 1 Dec.2006). Great Buildings Web site, "Robert Mills," http://www.greatbuildings.com/architects/Robert_Mills.html (accessed Dec. 1, 2006). U.S. Treasury Web site, "Robert Mills, 1781-1855," http://www.ustreas.gov/offices/management/curator/exhibitions/2002exhibit/print_robertmills.html
309. Rhodri Windsor Liscombe, *Altogether American: Robert Mills, Architect and Engineer* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994).
310. Andrew Stevenson to Joseph C. Cabell, 24 Jan. 1851, Cabell Family Papers, 38-111, Box 38, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
311. Robert Mills, Specifications of the manner of executing a certain Building proposed to be added to the Rotunda on the north side of the University buildings, 3 Jan. 1851, RG 31/1/2:6.771, Folder 1851 Jan. 3, pamphlet and spec., Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
312. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York:MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 22-24.
313. Robert Mills, Specifications of the manner of executing a certain Building proposed to be added to the Rotunda on the north side of the University buildings, 3 Jan. 1851, RG 31/1/2:6.771, Folder 1851 Jan. 3, pamphlet and spec., Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
314. Andrew Stevenson to Joseph C. Cabell, 24 Jan. 1851, Cabell Family Papers, 38-111, Box 38, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. After consulting with foundries in the North, Stevenson reported to Cabell that the University could save upwards of \$13,000 on the column capitals and bases.
315. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1851*, p. 11.
316. Andrew Stevenson to Joseph C. Cabell, 8 April 1851, Cabell Family Papers, 38-111, Box 38, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Rhodri Windsor Liscombe, *Altogether American:*

- Robert Mills, Architect and Engineer* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994), 283. George Spooner is listed in the 1837, 1838, 1839–40, 1842, 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849 annual reports of the Rectors and Visitors of the University of Virginia as having done repair work on various buildings during those years.
317. Univ. of Virginia Bursar's Account Book, 8437 (1851–1854), 59–64, as cited in Rhodri Windsor Liscombe, *Altogether American: Robert Mills, Architect and Engineer* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1994), 283.
 318. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1851*, p. 16. Bursar's Records, Addition to the Rotunda, 1851, p. 59, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 319. Bursar's Records, Addition to the Rotunda, 1851, p. 59, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 320. Andrew Stevenson and Thomas J. Randolph to Joseph C. Cabell, 14 Aug. 1851, Report E. in *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1851*, p. 21, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 321. Gessner Harrison to Joseph C. Cabell, 20 Sept. 1851, Cabell Family Papers, 38-111, Box 39, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 322. Bursar's Records, Addition to the Rotunda, 1851, pp. 59–60, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 323. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 24.
 324. Andrew Stevenson to Joseph C. Cabell, 8 May 1852, Cabell Family Papers, 38-111, Box 38, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 325. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1853–54*, p. 9.
 326. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1853–54*, pp. 28–29.,
 327. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1854*, p. 16.
 328. Bursar's Records, Addition to the Rotunda, 1852, p. 64, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 329. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1853–54*, p. 10.
 330. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1853.
 331. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1853–54*, p. 10.
 332. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1853–54*, p. 9.,
 333. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1853–54*, p. 9.,
 334. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 23-24.
 335. Rivanna Archaeological Consulting, "Archaeological Mitigation Adjacent to the Cryptoporticus, University of Virginia Rotunda Access Project," 2001, p.8. BV, Minutes, 28 June 1852. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 18–19.
 336. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 20–21.
 337. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 20–21. Jeanette Cabell Coley, "A Biography of Charles Ellet Jr.," Civil

- War Studies.org Web site http://civilwarstudies.org/articles/Vol_5/charlesellet.htm (accessed 1 Dec. 2006). Charles Ellet Jr. was originally from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, but traveled across Europe and the eastern part of the United States, studying engineering and canal systems, and, eventually, designing suspension bridges. His most famous bridges were the first wire suspension bridge built in the United States, which spanned the Schuylkill River at Fairmount, Philadelphia, in 1842, another at Niagara Falls in 1848, and a third over the Ohio River at Wheeling, West Virginia, in 1849. The Wheeling bridge, at 1,010 feet, was then the longest suspension bridge in the world. Ellet enlisted in the Union Army in March 1862. He died on June 21, 1862, from a gunshot wound sustained at the Battle of Memphis, sixteen days earlier.
338. William A. Pratt, Report to the Executive Committee, 1858, Proctor's Papers, Accession #38-174, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections, as cited in Rivanna Archaeological Consulting, "Archaeological Mitigation Adjacent to the Cryptoporticus, University of Virginia Rotunda Access Project," 2001, p. 8. Features on a plan of the University that Pratt drew in 1858 and on another, anonymous plan drawn in 1870 may indicate the presence of cisterns. It is unclear whether the cisterns mentioned by Pratt were built in addition to the three that were installed in 1851 or if they are two of those three.
339. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1853.
340. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1853. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, July 1, 1855*, p. 53.
341. BV, Minutes, 27 June 1854.. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1854.. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1854*, p. 9.. Sometime during 1853 or early 1854 the University appealed to distinguished New York architect Alexander Jackson Davis for "the most advisable mode and the probable cost of permanently repairing the terraces" at the University. The Report of the Rector and Visitors from July 1, 1854, does not specify which terraces were in need of repair, but they may have included the two south terraces of the Rotunda. Though Davis did not come to the University himself, he sent builder George Nichols, who made a "detailed estimate and a report on the subject of the terraces," which was presented before the Board of Visitors in June 1854. Nichols's estimate and report were approved, and Davis was appointed as architect of the project at the June meeting. Between June and the end of July, Davis "furnished a working plan and estimate to be used in letting work to the contractors."
342. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1857*, pp. 55–56.
343. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1857*, pp. 55–56.
344. BV, Minutes, 30 June 1859.
345. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1857*, pp. 47–48.
346. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 25.
347. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1859*, pp. 36–37.
348. H. E. Howard, *Charlottesville and the University of Virginia in the Civil War* (Lynchburg, Va.: H. E. Howard, Inc., 1988), 17, 50.
349. CWSAC Battle Summaries, <http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/ABPP/BATTLES/bystate.htm> (accessed 7 Dec.2006).

350. H. E. Howard, *Charlottesville and the University of Virginia in the Civil War* (Lynchburg, Va.: H. E. Howard, Inc., 1988), 50. Howard reports that the Board of Visitors complained that the University's use as military hospital had been ordered without proper authorization and that its continued presence would be a detriment to the University's educational mission. The Board demanded removal of the patients and stated that it would not give consent for such usage of the University grounds. The University also sought compensation for damages and called upon Confederate authorities to pay "a proper rent for the use of the buildings." Though the University supported the Confederacy, it is clear that its top priority remained the education of its students.
351. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1866*, p. 3.
352. BV, Minutes, 4 July 1863. BV, Minutes, 6 July 1865.
353. BV, Minutes, 27 June, 1867. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1868.
354. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1866*, pp. 3, 4, 8. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1868. In 1866 there were 258 students enrolled at the University, "of whom 167 are from Virginia, 18 from Maryland, 17 from Alabama, 10 from North Carolina, and the rest distributed amongst eighteen other states."
355. BV, Minutes, 30 June 1869.
356. BV, Minutes, 29 June 1870..
357. BV, Minutes, 25 June 1872.
358. BV, Minutes, 28 June 1873. BV, Minutes, 30 June 1873.
359. BV, Minutes, 1 July 1874.
360. BV, Minutes, 1 July 1874.
361. BV, Minutes, 28 June 1874.
362. BV, Minutes, 30 July 1880.
363. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1881–1882*, p. 6.
364. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1882–1883*, p. 8.
365. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1882–1883*, p. 8.
366. BV, Minutes, 26 June 1883.
367. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1883–1884*, p. 3.
368. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1884–1885*, p. 4.
369. Unsigned letter to Col. C. S. Venable, 31 May 1886, RG 5/3, Box 16, Proctor's Papers, Univ. of Virginia Special Collections.
370. "Missing Rotunda Bell Found," *Daily Progress*, 25 Nov. 1964. "Ding Dong," *Cavalier Daily*, 9 Dec. 1964. "For 'Hoos the Bells Toll," *Inside UVA*, 15 Feb. 1990.
371. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1887–1888*, p. 12.
372. *Report of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, 1889–1890*, pp. 3–4.
373. "A Sketch of the University Architecture," *Corks and Curls*(1891): 14–15.
374. BV, Minutes, 8 Dec. 1892.

375. BV, Minutes, VII (1895–1903), p. 67, as cited in George Humphrey Yetter, “Stanford White at the University of Virginia: The New Buildings on the South Lawn and the Reconstruction of the Rotunda in 1896” (master’s thesis, Univ. of Virginia, May 1980), 14.
376. *Richmond Dispatch*, 28 Oct. 1895; [Richmond] *Times*, 28 Oct. 1895; *Norfolk Virginian*, 29 Oct. 1895; *Washington Post*, 29 Oct. 1895; *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895. All sources cited in note 3 Richard Guy Wilson, of “*Arise and Build!*” *A Centennial Commemoration of the 1895 Rotunda Fire* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1995), 3. *College Topics*, 4 Nov. 1895. From University of Virginia, *Manual of Information* (Roanoke: 1899), quoted in Paul B. Barringer, *University of Virginia: Its History, Influence, Equipment and Characteristics* (New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1904), 112. In volume 42 of *Corks and Curls* (1956-57), the cause for the fire was attributed to “faulty insulation” resulting in “a short circuit in the wiring of the roof of the auditorium [Annex].”
377. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. *College Topics*, 4 Nov. 1895. *College Topics*, 9 Nov. 1895. “University of Virginia’s Loss,” *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895.
378. “University of Virginia’s Loss,” *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895. Morgan Poitiaux Robinson, *The Burning of the Rotunda* (Richmond: F. J. Mitchell Printing Co., 1908), 20. University of Virginia, *Manual of Information* (Roanoke: 1899), quoted in Paul B. Barringer, *University of Virginia: Its History, Influence, Equipment and Characteristics* (New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1904), 112.
379. *College Topics*, 4 Nov. 1895.
380. *College Topics*, 4 Nov. 1895. Morgan Poitiaux Robinson, *The Burning of the Rotunda* (Richmond: F. J. Mitchell Printing Co., 1908), 16.
381. *College Topics*, 4 Nov. 1895.
382. Morgan Poitiaux Robinson, *The Burning of the Rotunda* (Richmond: F. J. Mitchell Printing Co., 1908), 14, 17.
383. Morgan Poitiaux Robinson, *The Burning of the Rotunda* (Richmond: F. J. Mitchell Printing Co., 1908), 17–18.
384. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. *College Topics*, 4 Nov. 1895. Bell Dunnington to Sadie Dunnington, 28 Oct. 1895, in *Arise and Build!: The Great Fire, Firsthand Accounts*, www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/rotunda/fire/dunnington.html (accessed 24 Aug. 2006)
385. Morgan Poitiaux Robinson, *The Burning of the Rotunda* (Richmond: F. J. Mitchell Printing Co., 1908), 23.
386. “University of Virginia’s Loss,” *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895. “Rotunda Walls All Right,” *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 31 Oct. 1895. University of Virginia, *Manual of Information* (Roanoke: 1899), quoted in Paul B. Barringer, *University of Virginia: Its History, Influence, Equipment and Characteristics* (New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1904), 112. Morgan Poitiaux Robinson, *The Burning of the Rotunda* (Richmond: F. J. Mitchell Printing Co., 1908), 21, 23.
387. “University of Virginia’s Loss,” *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895.
388. *College Topics*, 11 Jan. 1896, from University of Virginia, *Manual of Information* (Roanoke: 1899), quoted in Paul B. Barringer, *University of Virginia: Its History, Influence, Equipment and Characteristics* (New York: Lewis Publishing Co., 1904), 112. The University of Virginia

- Annual Report from 1895–96 indicated that out of the 62,000 volumes in the library only 15,000 were saved. *University of Virginia Annual Report, 1895–96*, p. 3.
389. *College Topics*, 16 May 1896.
 390. John T. Thornton to Rosalie Thornton, 27 Oct. 1895, in *Arise and Build!: The Great Fire, Firsthand Accounts*, www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/rotunda/fire/docs/thornton_letter.html (accessed 24 Aug. 2006). Barringer, 24.
 391. “University of Virginia’s Loss,” *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. While it was used as a temporary storage space for the displaced library and Annex collections, the Natural History Museum was entirely closed to visitors. *University of Virginia Annual Report, 1895–96*, p. 3..
 392. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895..
 393. “Rotunda Walls All Right,” *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 31 Oct. 1895. Thomas J. Randolph was Rector of the University of Virginia from 1857–1864. He was the son of Martha “Patsy” Jefferson Randolph — her second child of twelve. Rector W. C. N. Randolph was, therefore, Thomas Jefferson’s great-grandson.
 394. “The Library,” *The Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1895): 110. This report also states that the Rotunda, during the “severe winter” of 1895–96, suffered from water damage, “on account of the melting of the heavy snow-fall.”
 395. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. “The University of Virginia Appeals,” *NYT*, 10 Nov. 1895.
 396. “Rotunda Walls All Right,” *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 31 Oct. 1895. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. Society of Architectural Historians Web site, <http://www.sah.org/oldsite06012004/aame/biom.html> (accessed on 17 Aug. 2006). Harry P. McDonald, FAIA,., was born at Romney, Virginia, in 1847 and graduated from Washington and Lee University in 1870. In 1880 he settled in Louisville, Kentucky, and with his brothers practiced architecture under the firm name of McDonald Brothers. Among the works he executed are the Kansas State House and St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in New Orleans. He was elected a member of the Western Association of Architects in 1885 and by act of consolidation became a Fellow of the AIA in 1889. He died on February 18, 1904.
 397. Margaret Lewis Randolph to Patsy Jefferson Taylor, 30 Oct. 1895, as cited in Frederick Doveton Nichols and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., “Thomas Jefferson, Stanford White and the University of Virginia Rotunda: A Controversy of Styles,” unpublished manuscript (Charlottesville: 1984), 3-5.
 398. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895.
 399. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. There was some dissent over the recommendation that the interior of the Rotunda be reconstructed differently than the original building. While some members of the faculty and the Board of Visitors supported the idea of the single, open space beneath the dome, there was enough opposition to the idea that a statement was published in the 7 Dec. 1895, issue of *College Topics* that the “internal arrangement” of the Rotunda would be “exactly as it was before.” Ultimately, however, the space beneath the dome was not divided by floors, as it had been in the original construction.
 400. *College Topics*, 7 Dec. 1895.

401. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895.
402. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. *College Topics*, 7 Dec. 1895. Stanford White, "The Buildings of the University of Virginia," *Corks and Curls* 11 (1898): 127. "It was evidently Jefferson's intention to build a portico at the north end of the Rotunda," White wrote in *Corks and Curls* in 1898, after the restoration was completed. "In the restoration this new portico was added, and a great flight of steps carried down to the terrace and then to the road, with a happy and dignified result."
403. "University of Virginia's Loss," *NYT*, 28 Oct. 1895. "University Relief Fund," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 31 Oct. 1895. "The New Buildings," *The Alumni Bulletin* (Aug. 1898): 47.
404. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. The report states that the money "already in hand" was the "Fayerweather money."
405. "University Relief Fund," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 31 Oct. 1895.
406. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895. In order to make the most of the next building season in the coming spring and to move the work along quickly, the faculty proposed that new bricks matching those used to construct the Rotunda be manufactured immediately in preparation for the imminent construction.
407. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895.
408. "The Work of Restoration," *The Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 133.
409. BV, Minutes, 4 Nov. 1895.. *College Topics*, 9 Nov. 1895.
410. "University Building Fund," *Richmond Dispatch*, 8 Nov. 1895.
411. "It Must Be Rebuilt," *Richmond Dispatch*, 30 October 1895. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 273. Acts and Joint Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Virginia, 1895-96 (Richmond: J. H. O'Bannon, 1896), 159. These sources were cited in "The Conflagration and the Making of the 'New' University," *Arise and Build!*, by Richard Guy Wilson, www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/rotunda/physical/keepsake/RGWarticle.html (accessed 23 Aug. 2006).
412. *College Topics*, 6 Jan. 1896. "W. M. Thornton Dies; Virginia Educator," *NYT*, 12 Sept. 1935.
413. "The Work of the Restoration," *Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 137.
414. "The Work of the Restoration," *Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 137-38. Richmond contributed \$14,125; Norfolk, \$2,967; Lynchburg, \$573; Staunton, \$319; Lexington, \$260; Winchester, \$175; and Roanoke, \$156. It is not clear how the sum of \$2,930 from the University reported in the *Alumni Bulletin* figures into the other funds raised by the University.
415. *College Topics*, 6 Jan. 1896.
416. *College Topics*, 6 Jan. 1896.
417. Univ. of Virginia Report for the Session 1896-97, Rector W. C. N. Randolph to Super of Pub. Ins. John E. Massey, (Charlottesville Printing Company and Old Dominion Press, n.d.), 14.
418. Univ. of Virginia Report for the Session 1895-96, Rector W. C. N. Randolph to Super of Pub. Ins. John E. Massey, (Charlottesville Printing Company and Old Dominion Press, n.d.), 3.
419. "The University Bill," *Charlottesville Chronicle*, 24 Jan. 1896, cited in *College Topics*, 25 Jan. 1896.
420. "The New Buildings," *Alumni Bulletin* (Aug. 1898): 47.

421. "Design for Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia, McDonald Bros. Architects, Louisville, Ky., Section A-B," n.d., Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
422. "Design for Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia, McDonald Bros. Architects, Louisville, Ky., Section," Ground-floor Plan, n.d., Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
423. "Design for Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia, McDonald Bros. Architects, Louisville, Ky., Section," Ground-floor Plan, n.d., Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
424. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895.. Richard Guy Wilson, "The Conflagration and the Making of the 'New' University," *Arise and Build!*, www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/rotunda/physical/keepsake/RGWarticle.html (accessed 23 Aug. 2006). Thornton to White, 24 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
425. BV, Minutes, 4 Nov. 1895.
426. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896. The record shows that inadequately engineered work on the Rotunda and its wings in the winter of 1896 resulted in the building committee asking for the McDonald Brothers' resignation. This must have occurred before January 18, 1896, when Thornton wrote to Stanford White that the "McDonald Brothers had retired from work which they had undertaken."
427. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895.
428. Report of the Faculty, 31 Oct. 1895, in BV, Minutes 4 Nov. 1895.
429. William R. Mead to Doctor [Thornton?], 5 Nov. 1895, RG-5/3, Proctor's Records, Box 22, Misc. Correspondence, 1895–1910, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
430. White to J. A. Chanler, 2 Nov. 1895, SW, Press Book 14, p. 233, Avery Architectural Library. White to Mr. Coleman, 8 Nov. 1895, SW, , Press Book 14, p. 255, Avery Architectural Library.
431. Carrère to Charles A. Coolidge, 14 Jan. 1896, Box M-15, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.. Carrère reveals in this letter that he had spoken with Mead about the prospect of an architectural competition for the work at the University and that the firm of McKim, Mead and White did "not want to compete at all," that from a "business standpoint" they could not be "justified in competing," but because of the "interesting" connection with the University of Virginia they were willing to make "a very marked exception."
432. W. Gordon McCabe to Carrère, 20 Jan. 1896, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
433. Randolph to Carrère, 18 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
434. Richard Guy Wilson, "The Conflagration and the Making of the 'New' University," *Arise and Build!*, www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/rotunda/physical/keepsake/RGWarticle.html (accessed Aug. 24, 2006). Charles C. Baldwin, *Stanford White*, (New York: Da Capo Press, 1931): 113, as cited in George Humphrey Yetter, "Stanford White at the University of Virginia: The New Buildings on the South Lawn and the Reconstruction of the Rotunda in 1896" (master's thesis, Univ. of Virginia, May 1980), 34.
435. Randolph to White, 18 Jan. 1896, Box 173, File 3, MMW, N-YHS. Thornton to White, 18 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. Richard Guy Wilson, "The Conflagration and the Making of the 'New' University," *Arise and Build!*, note 34, www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/rotunda/physical/keepsake/RGWarticle.html (accessed Aug. 24, 2006). The construction of a separate law school building was also part of the original plan, but this plan was scrapped because of expense.

436. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896.
437. Randolph to White, 18 Jan. 1896, Box 173, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
438. Randolph to White, 18 Jan. 1896, Box 173, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
439. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896.
440. Philip Alexander Bruce, *History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919*, vol. 4 (New York: MacMillan Co. 1920-22), 274. Frederick Doveton Nichols and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., "Thomas Jefferson, Stanford White and the University of Virginia Rotunda: A Controversy of Styles," unpublished manuscript, 1984, i-14.
441. Benjamin P. Ford, "Archaeological Mitigation Adjacent to the Cryptoporticus, University of Virginia, Rotunda Access Project" (Charlottesville: Rivanna Archaeological Consulting, 2001), 8.
442. Two documents, Harry McDonald's account of the Jan. 18 meeting of the building committee and W. C. N. Randolph's letter to McDonald Brothers, were cited in Nichols and Gianniny's manuscript, pp. n-2-3. The only note that the authors gave as to the provenance of these documents was University of Virginia, correspondence, Dir. of Grounds and Buildings, W. H. Echols, 1895-1896.
443. Frederick Doveton Nichols and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., "Thomas Jefferson, Stanford White and the University of Virginia Rotunda: A Controversy of Styles," unpublished manuscript, 1984, n-7.
444. Thornton to White, 8 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
445. Frederick Doveton Nichols and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., "Thomas Jefferson, Stanford White and the University of Virginia Rotunda: A Controversy of Styles," unpublished manuscript, 1984, 1-8.
446. Thornton to White, 8 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
447. McDonald Brothers to the Univ. of Virginia Building Committee, 2 Feb. 1896, RG-1/1/3.682, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
448. Randolph to Carrère, 18 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
449. Thornton to White, 24 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
450. Randolph to White, 24 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
451. White to Thornton, 27 Jan. 1896, Box M-4, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
452. Thornton to White, 1 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. Thornton to White, 29 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
453. Randolph to White, 24 Jan. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS. Thornton to White, 1 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896, p. 20.
454. Edward Simmons, *From Seven to Seventy: Memories of a Painter and a Yankee* (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1922), 241.
455. McKim, Mead and White, receipt of drawings delivered to Thomas H. Carter, June 1898, MMW, N-YHS, Box 171, Folder I. Thomas H. Carter, list of Thomas Jefferson drawings received from McKim, Mead and White, June 1898, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. This list is an inventory of Thomas Jefferson drawings that were used by McKim, Mead and White and returned to the University by them. The list includes the "bird's-eye view of the University

- grounds and buildings, and drawings of the Rotunda south front; interior library; ground plan; interior view; and a sketch with notes, specifications, estimates, etc., on the reverse side.”
456. White to Thornton, 21 Feb. 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Univ. of Virginia, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 457. White to Thornton, 21 Feb. 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 458. White to Thornton, 26 Feb. 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, , Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections..
 459. White to Thornton, 26 Feb. 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
 460. Richard Guy Wilson, “The Conflagration and the Making of the ‘New’ University,” *Arise and Build!*, www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/rotunda/physical/keepsake/RGWarticle.html (accessed 24 Aug.2006).
 461. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896. William M. Thornton, “Engineering Instruction at the University of Virginia,” 1924, Mss. 2612, p. 6, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections..
 462. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896, p. 21. The report of the building committee provided these numbers but made an error in its calculation: the report states that a total of \$9,050.43 was spent as of March 13, 1896. For more information on the breakdown of expenses, including the incidentals, see the March 13 report of the Board of Visitors.
 463. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896.
 464. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896, p. 29. White to Ethel[red?], 19 March 1896, Press Book 15, p. 334, Stanford White Collection, Avery Architectural Library.
 465. “Report of the Architects to the Building Committee,” *Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 139. In the *History of the University of Virginia* (p. 276) Barringer suggests that Jefferson split the area within the Rotunda into two floors “by the imperative need of obtaining space for laboratories and lecture-halls” (p. 276).
 466. “Report of the Architects to the Building Committee,” *Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 139. “The Work of the Restoration,” *Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 135–36. *College Topics*, 14 March 1896. Memorandum on Letterhead of Chairman’s Office, University of Virginia, c. 29 Jan 1896, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. This document, in Thornton’s hand and probably dating to around January 29, 1896, indicates how the new rooms associated with the Rotunda would be used. The “East Basement Room” would “be assigned to Greek”; the “West Basement Room” would be used for Latin instruction; the “East Terrace Room” would be used for English Literature; the “West Terrace Room” would be used for French and German instruction; and the “Room under the North Portico” would be used for History and Political Economy. Frederick Doveton Nichols and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., “Thomas Jefferson, Stanford White and the University of Virginia Rotunda: A Controversy of Styles,” unpublished manuscript, 1984, d-7.
 467. Randolph to White, 27 March 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS. White to Echols, 25 April 1896, RG-5/5, Box 1, MMW Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.

468. McKim, Mead and White, untitled ground-floor plan, 7 April 1896; "First Gallery Plan (Second Gallery Plan Similar) for Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia," 7 April 1897, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
469. McKim, Mead and White, "Basement Plan for Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia," 7 April 1897; "Plan of Rotunda & Garden, University of Virginia," 7 April 1896, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
470. McKim, Mead and White, "Basement Plan for Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia," 7 April 1897; "Longitudinal Section, , Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia," 7 April 1896, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
471. McKim, Mead and White, untitled ground-floor plan, 7 April 1896; "First Gallery Plan (Second Gallery Plan Similar) for Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia," 7 April 1897, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. R. Guastavino made annotations to McKim, Mead and White's 7 April, 1896 plans sometime during 1897. On the plans Guastavino indicates that the fourth floor was omitted in the final design.
472. McKim, Mead and White, "Side Elevation, Restoration of Rotunda, University of Virginia," 7 April 1897, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. McKim, Mead and White, "Carpentry, Roofing, and Glazing, Restoration of the Rotunda, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va." 22 April 1896, Box 2485, Acc. 3263, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
473. R. Guastavino to MMW, 18 Feb. 1896, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
474. Peter Austin, "Rafael Guastavino's Construction Business in the United States: Beginnings and Development," *APT Bulletin* 30:4 (1999): 15. Frederick Doveton Nichols and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., "Thomas Jefferson, Stanford White and the University of Virginia Rotunda: A Controversy of Styles," unpublished manuscript, : 1984, q-1.
475. Guastavino to MMW, 11 March 1896, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
476. J. T. Wagner, W. H. Mullins Architectural Sheet Metal to MMW, 11 March 1896, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
477. Piccirilli Brothers to White, 15 April 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
478. Thornton to White, 1 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. Thornton to White, 8 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
479. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896.
480. Skinner to Echols, 27 April 1896, RG-5/5, Box 1, MMW Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
481. Echols to Skinner, 29 April 1896, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
482. Echols to White, 4 May 1896, MMW, N-YHS.
483. Thornton to White, 20 March 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
484. "The Work of the Restoration," *Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 135–36.
485. "The Work of the Restoration," *Alumni Bulletin* (Feb. 1896): 135–36.
486. Specification for the Repair of the Terrace Roofs at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
487. Thornton to White, 3 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.

488. Thornton to White, 8 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
489. BV, Minutes, 13 March 1896.
490. Thomas Hastings to White, 6 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
491. White to Echols, 27 March 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections..
492. Randolph to White, 28 March 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
493. White to Randolph, 6 April 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
494. "The University Buildings," *Alumni Bulletin* (May 1896): 13. Skinner to White, 28 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
495. Skinner to Mead, 26 July 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
496. McKim, Mead and White, Bill Books, Vol. 6, p. 298, MMW, N-YHS.
497. White to Randolph, 18 April 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Randolph to White, 22 April 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
498. Randolph to McKim, Mead and White, telegram, 4 May 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
499. Skinner to Echols, 2 May 1896, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Thornton to White, 5 May 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. Charles E. Langley Co. to McKim, Mead and White, 6 May 1896, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. Randolph to White, 5 May 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. Charles E. Langley to MMW, 3 Feb 1896, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
500. Proposed list of Bidders on University of Virginia, [1896], Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS. The three Richmond firms in addition to Langley were W. A. Chesterman and Co., G. J. Hunt, and Menton E. Ancarrow. John P. Pettijohn and Co. were from Lynchburgh, Va; A. F. Withrow Lumber Co. was from Charleston, W. Va.; M. T. Lewman and Co. were from Louisville, Ky.; and Walton and Vandergrift hailed from Charlottesville. Thornton to White, 18 March 1896, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. Regarding Pettijohn, Chesterman, and Withrow, Thornton wrote to White on March 18, 1896, that there were "reasons both of fact and of policy why these should be invited to make a tender on the work."
501. Skinner to White, telegram, 20 May 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
502. C. P. Benson,, copy of resolutions adopted at meeting of building committee on 9 Nov. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. BV, Minutes, 17 June 1896.
503. Thomas Hastings to White, 6 Feb. 1896, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS. William M. Thornton, "Engineering Instruction at the University of Virginia," 1924, Mss. 2612, p. 6, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. In this 1924 report Thornton made the following observation about the acceptance of Langley: "The Norcross Brothers, a firm of first-class repute, bid \$450,000. Langley after several months of active work, went bankrupt. The University took over the job, completed it, and as shown by the Proctor's final report, spent in all \$450,000. The Norcross bid was doubtless fair and reasonable and ought to have been accepted."
504. Contract, University of Virginia and C. C. Cocke, 12 Aug. 1896, RG 5/3, Box 22, Folder 1895-96/Robertson; Contract, University of Virginia and Adams Bros. and Payne, 4 May 1896, RG 5/3, Box 22, Folder 1895-96/Robertson; Contract, University of Virginia and Edgar N. Cox, 5 June

1896, RG 5/3, Box 22, Folder 1895–96/Robertson; Contract, University of Virginia and E. Dillon and Co., 5 June 1896, RG 5/3, Box 22, Folder 1895–96/Robertson. All files in University of Virginia, Special Collections.

505. "The University Buildings," *Alumni Bulletin* (May 1896): 13. White to [?], 25 May 1896, MMW, SW,, Press Book 16, p. 138, Avery Architectural Library. Shortly after the contracts were signed, Stanford White left for a six-week trip to Canada and returned to New York in mid-July 1896.
506. Thornton to the Friends and Alumni of the University of Virginia, 7 July 1896, RG 19/1/2.991, Box RG +8/1/1.281, Folder 1896, July 7, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
507. Skinner to Haase, 24 June 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
508. Skinner to White, 7 July 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
509. Skinner to White, 7 July 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
510. Skinner to White, 8 July 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
511. Skinner to White, 29 July 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
512. Skinner to White, 6 Aug. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
513. Nichols and Gianniny, s-6. "University Buildings," *Charlottesville Chronicle*, 7 Aug. 1896.
514. Skinner to White, 11 Aug. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
515. Skinner to MMW, 17 Aug. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
516. Skinner to White, 28 Sept. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
517. Nichols and Gianniny, q-7.
518. "The Roof Fell In," *Richmond Dispatch*, 20 Oct. 1896. "Disaster at the University," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 19 Oct. 1896.
519. "Disaster at the University," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 19 Oct. 1896.
520. "The Roof Fell In," *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 20 Oct. 1896.
521. "The University Accident," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 20 Oct. 1896.
522. "The Verdict," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 23 Oct. 1896.
523. Skinner to White, 29 Oct. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
524. Skinner to White, 29 Oct. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
525. Randolph to A. C. Gordon, 31 Oct. 1896, Gordon Papers, File 1896, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections,
526. White to Richard Grant White, 29 Oct. 1896, SW, Press Book 17, p. 44, Avery Architectural Library.
527. Skinner to White, 24 Oct. 1896, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
528. Charles E. Langley and Co. to Skinner, 28 Oct. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
529. Skinner to White, 29 Oct. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. It is not known if White authorized this change.
530. Nichols and Gianniny, s-7–8.

531. C. P. Benson, Secretary, Superintendent of Grounds and Buildings of the University of Virginia, 9 Nov. 1896, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
532. Skinner to White, 10 Nov. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
533. Skinner to White, 12 Nov. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
534. Skinner to White, 28 Nov. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
535. Nichols and Gianniny, q-7-8.
536. White to Skinner, 12 Nov. 1896, PR 42, Box 501 M/3, Folder Univ. of Virginia, MMW, N-YHS.
537. Skinner to White, 5 Dec. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
538. Nichols and Gianniny, q-7-8.
539. Skinner to Haase, 29 Nov. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
540. Skinner to White, 5 Dec. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
541. Sanborn Map Co., *Insurance Maps of Charlottesville, Va.*, Dec. 1896.
542. Skinner to Haase, 6 Dec. 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
543. Antonio Patrizios, Pres., National Mosaic Co. to White, 12 Jan. 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
544. Charles E. Langley and Co. to McKim, Mead and White, 15 Jan. 1897, Box 171, File ?, MMW, N-YHS.
545. Charles E. Langley and Co. to McKim, Mead and White, 19 Jan. 1897, Box 171, File ?, MMW, N-YHS.
546. Skinner to White, 17 Jan. 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
547. Skinner to Haase, 28 Jan. 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
548. Skinner to Haase, 8 Feb. 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
549. Skinner to Haase, 15 Feb. 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. The sketch plan and section of the third-floor gallery that Skinner enclosed with his letter to Haase have not been located.
550. Skinner to White, 10 March 1896, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
551. Skinner to Robert Robertson, 12 Jan. 1897, RG 515, Box 1, File MMW Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections..
552. Skinner to Mr. Martin, 10 March 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
553. Langley and Co. to White, telegram, 13 March 1897; telegram [17?] March 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
554. Skinner to White, 29 March 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
555. Skinner to White, 6 April 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
556. Randolph to White, 8 April 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
557. "The New University—Her Buildings and Equipment," *Corks and Curls* 10 (1897), 119-120.
558. "The New University—Her Buildings and Equipment," *Corks and Curls* 10 (1897), 119-120.
559. White to Randolph, 16 April 1897, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.

560. White to Randolph, 16 April 1897, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS. Randolph to White, telegram, 22 April 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. White had planned to attend that meeting, but it is not clear whether that happened; McKim, Mead and White to Randolph, 16 April, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS. Skinner to McKim, Mead and White, 19 April 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
561. BV, Minutes, 23 April 1897, pp. 120–124.
562. Randolph to White, 3 May 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
563. Charles E. Langley to White, 4 May 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
564. Piccirilli Brothers to McKim, Mead and White, 3 May 1897, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
565. Piccirilli Brothers to McKim, Mead and White, 12 May 1897, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
566. Piccirilli Brothers to McKim, Mead and White, 20 May 1897, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
567. BV, Minutes, 15 June 1897, p. 144.
568. BV, Minutes, 15 June 1897, pp. 144-145.
569. BV, Minutes, 15 June 1897, pp. 176-177. These minutes include a summary of expenditures of the building committee from 15 Nov. 1895 to 15 June 1897. Overall \$264,991.60 was spent on the building projects. Relevant to the Rotunda on the itemized list are references to the cost of tearing down the remains of the Annex (\$617.34) and the heating of the Rotunda in the winter of 1897 (\$244.56)
570. Ross F. Tucker of the Manhattan Concrete Company to McKim, Mead and White, 21 May 1897, Box 171, File 2, , MMW, N-YHS. Manhattan Concrete Co. to Judge Moon, 4 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
571. Ross F. Tucker of the Manhattan Concrete Company to McKim, Mead and White, 21 May 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. Manhattan Concrete Co. to Judge Moon, 4 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
572. [Ross F. Tucker?], Schedule of Defects, University of Virginia, c. 1897, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
573. [Ross F. Tucker ?], Schedule of Defects, University of Virginia, c. 1897, Box 172, File 3, MMW, N-YHS.
574. Ross F. Tucker to McKim, Mead and White, 21 May 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. Manhattan Concrete Co. to Judge Moon, 4 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
575. Skinner to Mead, 17 June 1897, Box 172, File 17, MMW, N-YHS.
576. Tucker to Mead, 4 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
577. W. H. Hoffman to Mead, 6 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
578. Moon to Mead, 14 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. White to Randolph, 28 July 1897, RG-5/5, Mss. 8437, Correspondence of Buildings and Grounds, Box 1, Special Collections, Special Collections..
579. BV, Minutes, 15 June 1897, p. 139.
580. Skinner to Mead, 17 June 1897; 19 June 1897; Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
581. Hoffman to Mead, 19 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS. It is not clear from the letter whether this was a meeting of the executive or the building committee.

582. Skinner to Mead, 19 June 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
583. Hoffman to Mead, 22 June 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
584. Skinner to Mead, 17 June 1897; 19 June 1897; Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
585. Agreement for General Work and Materials for Rotunda, Physical, Academical, Mechanical and Boiler House Buildings at Charlottesville, Virginia, The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia with Ross F. Tucker, July 15, 1897, MMW, N-YHS, Box 3, File ?
586. Agreement for General Work and Materials, Rector and Visitors of the Univ. of Va. with Ross F. Tucker, 20 July 1897, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
587. Southern Electric Co. to Skinner, 8 July 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
588. W. H. Spelman and Co. to McKim, Mead and White, 10 July 1897, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
589. J. Franklin Whitman and Co. to McKim, Mead and White, 22 July 1897, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
590. George Humphrey Yetter, "Stanford White at the University of Virginia: The New Buildings on the South Lawn and the Reconstruction of the Rotunda in 1896" (master's thesis, Univ. of Virginia, May 1980), 77.
591. Ross F. Tucker to McKim, Mead and White, 1 Aug. and 1 Sept. 1897, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. Ross F. Tucker, orders for extra work, 1 Sept. 1897– 3 Dec. 1897, Box 172, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. Tucker submitted to the University several orders for extra work from Sept. to Dec., none of which clearly relate to the Rotunda.
592. Skinner to MMW, 30 Sept. 1897, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
593. White to Randolph, 10 Dec. 1897, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
594. BV, Minutes, 10 Dec. 1897.
595. BV, Minutes, 10 Dec. 1897.
596. Ross F. Tucker to Richard M. White, 28 Dec. 1897, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
597. R. White to White, 29 Dec. 1897, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
598. Tucker to R. White, 29 Dec. 1897, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
599. R. White to White, 5 Jan. 1898, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
600. Tucker to McKim, Mead and White, 6 Jan. 1898, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
601. R. White to White, 7 Jan. 1898, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS. D. Harmon to White, 11 Jan. 1898, Box 171, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
602. Richard M. White to Stanford White, 26 Feb. 1898, Box 172, File 4, MMW, N-YHS.
603. BV, Minutes, 18 March 1898, p. 268.
604. Skinner to White, 15 Feb. 1898; 20 March 1898, Box 172, File 15, MMW, N-YHS.
605. Thomas H. Carter to McKim, Mead and White, 21 March 1898, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
606. J. E. Phillips to White, 6 Oct. 1898, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS. The original inquiry for the pipe under the urinals was made in March, and it is evident from this letter written seven months later that the work was still not done. Phillips estimated that the work would cost at least \$90.

607. Skinner to White, 25 March 1898, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
608. "Commencement, June 1898," *Alumni Bulletin* (Aug. 1898): 52. James C. Carter was a New York City lawyer who had ties to Virginia. According to his obituary in the *Virginia Law Register*, 11 (May 1905), Carter was "remembered by Virginia lawyers as having several times attended the annual meeting of our State Bar Association, and for a splendid lecture in opposition to certain legal reforms in pleading. After that address but little was ever heard of these reforms in Virginia. . .all his life he had a high admiration for Virginia and Virginians." Upon his death in 1905, Carter bequeathed \$10,000 to the University of Virginia.
609. "Commencement, June 1898," *Alumni Bulletin* (Aug. 1898): 52.
610. "Dedication of the YMCA Building," *Alumni Bulletin* (Aug. 1898): 49.
611. Thomas H. Carter to McKim, Mead and White, 28 July 1898, Box 171, File 1, MMW, N-YHS.
612. Skinner to White, 31 July 1898, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
613. Skinner to White, 31 July 1898, Box 172, File 2, MMW, N-YHS.
614. "The New Buildings," *Alumni Bulletin* (Aug. 1898): 47.
615. "The New Buildings," *Alumni Bulletin* (Aug. 1898): 47.
616. Stanford White, "The Buildings of the University of Virginia," *Corks and Curls* 11 (1898): 130.
617. John S. Patton, "University of Virginia," *Annual Reports of Officers, Boards, and Institutions of the Commonwealth of Virginia for the Year Ending September 30, 1899* (Richmond: J. H. O'Hannon, 1899), xcvi.
618. Leland M. Roth, *The Architecture of McKim, Mead and White, 1870–1920, A Building List* (New York and London: Garland publishing Co., 1978), 160.
619. Sanborn Map Co., *Insurance Maps of Charlottesville, Va.*, Sept. 1902, Oct. 1907, Nov. 1913.
620. Charles Hancock to E. A. Alderman, 28 Nov. 1921, RG 1/1/2, Box 9, Folder Board of Visitor Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
621. Sanborn Map Co., *Insurance Maps of Charlottesville, Va.*, 1929.
622. University of Virginia Web site, Maps of the University of Virginia, <http://www.virginia.edu/imap>, (accessed Oct. 23, 2006). Alderman Library was designed by University alumnus Robert E. Lee Taylor of Baltimore and built between 1936 and 1938. It was named in honor of Edwin Anderson Alderman, the University's first president.
623. BV, Minutes, 11 June 1938, vol. 10, p. 297.
624. BV, Minutes, 11 June 1938, vol. 10, p. 301. The PWA grant was made in a letter to the University by H. T. Cole, Regional Director under the date of 2 Aug. 1938, Docket No. Va. 1312-F, Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works.
625. BV, Minutes, 12 Aug. 1938, vol. 10, p. 303. "Fiske Kimball," FactMonster, <http://www.factmonster.com/ce6/people/A0827648.html> (accessed 21 Nov. 2006).
626. Francis L. Berkeley Jr., "Mr. Jefferson's Rotunda: Myths and Realities," *UVa Alumni News* (July–Aug. 1972): 7. William H. Wraneck, "Jefferson Rotunda at University of Virginia Reopening after Second Restoration," *Baltimore Sun*, 14 Jan. 1940. Univ. of Virginia, Office of the Landscape Architect, Binder 3, Rotunda and Lawn.

627. "Restoration Work on Rotunda Opens," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 6 Oct. 1938, Univ. of Virginia, Office of the Landscape Architect, Binder 3, Rotunda and Lawn.
628. BV, Minutes, 21 Jan. 1939. The Vermont Marble Company, the Georgia Marble Company, the Marsteller Corporation, the Vickery Stone Company of Indiana, Bailey Plumbing and Heating Company, Brown and Taylor, and N. W. Martin and Brothers each submitted bids.
629. "Restoration Work on Rotunda Opens," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 6 Oct. 1938, Office of the Landscape Architect, Univ. of Virginia, Binder 3, Rotunda and Lawn.
630. BV, Minutes, 7 April 1939.
631. BV, Minutes, 7 June 1939.
632. BV, Minutes, 19 July 1939.
633. William H. Wraneck, "Jefferson Rotunda at University of Virginia Reopening after Second Restoration," *Baltimore Sun*, 14 Jan. 1940. Univ. of Virginia, Office of the Landscape Architect, Binder 3, Rotunda and Lawn. BV, Minutes, 3 Oct. 1939, vol. 10, p. 334. Security Steel Company of Avenel, N.J., supplied the metal office furniture and Anderson Bros., Inc., of Charlottesville supplied the wood office furniture.
634. "The Rotunda Dances," Office of the Landscape Architect, Univ. of Virginia, Binder 3, Rotunda and Lawn.
635. Francis L. Berkeley Jr., "Mr. Jefferson's Rotunda: Myths and Realities," *UVa Alumni News* (July–Aug. 1972): 7.
636. Frank E. Hartman to V. L. Chrisler, 2 Dec. 1941; V. L. Chrisler to Frank E. Hartman, 5 Dec. 1941; Roy G. Pratt to Frank E. Hartman, telegram, 28 Dec. 1941; Frank E. Hartman to Roy G. Pratt, 21 February 1942, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
637. BV, Minutes, 14 Oct. 1944.
638. BV, Minutes, 8 March 1939; 15 March 1945. The committee appointed in 1939 to investigate the use of the dome room was made up of University president John Lloyd Newcomb, R. Gray Williams, and C. O'Connor Goolrick.
639. BV, Minutes, 7 March 1947.
640. "Communist Paints Sign on Rotunda," *The Cavalier*, 16 Feb. 1950.
641. BV, Minutes, 4 Nov. 1895, as cited in Francis L. Berkeley Jr., "Mr. Jefferson's Rotunda: Myths & Realities," *University of Virginia Alumni News* (July-Aug. 1972): 7. Nichols and Gianniny, w-4.
642. BV, Minutes, 14 Jan. 1955.
643. BV, Minutes, 12 Feb. 1955.
644. BV, Minutes, 12 Feb. 1955.
645. BV, Minutes, 17 Dec. 1955. The model has been preserved and is kept in a university storage facility.
646. BV, Minutes, 15 Sept. 1956; 7 June 1957.
647. BV, Minutes, 7 June 1957.
648. BV, Minutes, 8 Oct. 1960. At the 8 Oct. 1960, meeting of the Board of Visitors the Rotunda project was deferred while it waited for funding. Plans for the northwest wing of the Rotunda

were evidently discussed at the meeting but were not approved by the Building and Grounds Committee at this time. According to the minutes, no details about the plans were given at the meeting.

649. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
650. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
651. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
652. BV, Minutes, 2 April 1966.
653. Werner K. Sensbach to Ballou and Justice, 29 April 1966, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
654. Ballou and Justice, "Composite Typical Section, The Rotunda, University of Virginia," 10 Sept. 1968, no. 21930, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia. Ballou and Justice, "Dome Room Half Plan, Composite Plan, The Rotunda, University of Virginia," 10 Sept. 1968, no. 21930, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia.
655. Ballou and Justice, "First Floor Plan, Alterations and Restoration of the Rotunda, University of Virginia," 8 May 1969, no. 21924, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia.
656. Alteration and Restoration of the Rotunda, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, Project Criteria, 8 May 1969. Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
657. Contract between the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia and Ballou and Justice, 29 Dec. 1970. Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
658. Restoration and Renovation of the Rotunda: A Progress Report and an Outline of Procedures, 30 March 1971. Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. Francis L. Berkeley Jr. to Louis W. Ballou, 30 June 1971, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. The cost estimate could not be determined.
659. Ballou and Justice, "Rotunda, Composite Wall Section," 25 May 1971.
660. Francis L. Berkeley Jr. to Louis W. Ballou, 30 June 1971, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
661. Ballou and Justice, "Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, University of Virginia," preliminary plans, 1 Oct. 1971, no. 21805, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia.
662. Ballou and Justice, Architects and Engineers, Preliminary Specifications, Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Commission, No. 6700, 1 Oct. 1971.
663. Buildings and Grounds Committee, Minutes, 6 April 1972, in BV, Minutes, 7 April 1972, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
664. BV, Minutes, 7 April 1972, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006). Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
665. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).

666. BV, Minutes, 2 June 1972, [http:// etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov](http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov) (accessed 2 Aug. 2006). Francis L. Berkeley Jr., "Mr. Jefferson's Rotunda: Myths and Realities," *UVa Alumni News* (July–Aug. 1972): 5. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, [http:// etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov](http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov) (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
667. BV, Minutes, 2 June 1972, [http:// etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov](http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov) (accessed 2 Aug. 2006). Application for Approval of Award of Contracts, Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, 22 June 1973, Facilities Management Project Files.
668. Calder Loth to Brian Hogg, Univ. of Virginia Office of the University Architect, 6 July 2006,
669. Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission to Univ. of Virginia Special Committee appointed to study the Rotunda Restoration, 9 June 1972.
670. Stanley W. Abbott, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission to Edgar M. [sic] Shannon, 20, June 1972. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, [http:// etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov](http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov) (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
671. Stanley W. Abbott, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission to Edgar M. [sic] Shannon, 20, June 1972,
672. Stanley W. Abbott, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission to Edgar M. [sic] Shannon, 20, June 1972.
673. Vincent Shea to Junius R. Fishburne, 27 July 1972.
674. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, [http:// etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov](http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov) (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
675. Ballou and Justice, "Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, University of Virginia," set of 24 drawings, 25 Aug. 1972, no. 68375, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia.
676. J. Norwood Bosserman to Werner K. Sensbach, 16 Oct. 1972; Frederick D. Nichols to Louis K. Ballou, 25 Oct. 1972; David W. Weiss to Francis L. Berkeley Jr., 16 Nov. 1972; Louis W. Ballou to Francis L. Berkeley Jr., 22 Nov. 1972, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. Application for Approval of Working Drawings and Specifications for the Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, 15 Sept. 1972, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. J. Warren Burch and J. C. Jones to R. R. Morrissette, 26 and 31 Jan. 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
677. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, [http:// etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov](http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov) (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
678. "The 'Rotunda' Burns," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 28 Oct. 1972, Alderman Library Vertical File: Rotunda, Fire. *Cavalier Daily*, 30 Oct. 1972.
679. Werner K. Sansbach to Douglas Hamner Jr., 13 April 1973; Werner K. Sensbach to Frederick D. Nichols and Vincent Ragnas, 13 July 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. Advertisement for Bids for the Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, 9 March 1973, Facilities Management Project Files.
680. J. A. Kessler Jr. to Ballou and Justice, 5 July 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
681. Overall Qualifications of R.E. Lee and Son, Inc., 12 April 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.

682. Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, Progress Meeting no. 1, 18 July 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. Application for Approval of Award of Contracts, Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, 22 June 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
683. Rotunda Chronology, attachment in BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
684. "Rotunda Supervisor Improves on Jefferson," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 25 May 1975.
685. Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, Progress Meeting no. 1, 18 July 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. R. E. Lee and Son, Demolition Procedure and Sequence, 4 Oct. 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. The main-floor skylight, reportedly in "fair condition," was later put up for sale by the Virginia Department of Purchases and Supply.
686. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973-1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 85, 93, 100.
687. J. A. Kessler Jr. to Ballou and Justice, 29 April 1974, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
688. Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda, Progress Meeting no. 1, 18 July 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. J. A. Kessler Jr. to Ballou and Justice, 13 Aug. 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
689. J. A. Kessler Jr. to Ballou and Justice, 18 Oct. 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. "Rotunda Yields Mini Mystery," *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 24 Oct. 1973. "Workmen Uncover Rotunda's Secret," *Cavalier Daily*, 22 Oct. 1973.
690. Vaughan and Gianniny, 85-86.
691. Lynchburg Steel and Specialty Company, drawings, July 1973, no. 39233, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia. Guille Steel Products Co., Inc., "First Floor Framing Plan," "Upper gallery Framing Plan," "Dome Room Floor Framing Plan," 24 Sept. 1973, no. 21915, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia.
692. Ballou and Justice, "Half Plan of Main Stairs, First Floor to Second Floor," 7 Dec. 1973. Ballou and Justice, "Oval Room Entablature," 7 Dec. 1973. Ballou and Justice, "Chimney and Fireplace Details," 12 March 1974. Ballou and Justice, "Revised North Oval Room Fireplace," 22 Aug. 1974.
693. Otis Elevator Company, "Half Floor and Ceiling Plan, Restoration and Adaptation of the Rotunda," 26 Jan. 1974, no. 21918, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia. Greendale Ornamental Iron Company, "Plan of Railing at Middle Gallery, Rotunda, University of Virginia," n.d., approved 20 March 1974, no. 21914, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia.
694. Louis W. Ballou to Frederick D. Nichols, 12 April 1974, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
695. Louis W. Ballou to Frederick D. Nichols, 12 April 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
696. Louis W. Ballou to Frederick D. Nichols, 12 April 1973, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
697. Vaughan and Gianniny, 85-86.

698. BV, Minutes, 17 May 1974; 10 Jan. 1975; 14 March 1975; 30 May, 1975, 3 Oct. 1975, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
699. Robert Chambliss Light, Jr., Rotunda Renovated: Controversy Resolved, unpublished memoir "Council Group Studies Utilization of Rotunda," *Cavalier Daily*, 14 March 1974. Additional faculty members of the committee were Architecture professor James A. Cox, Speech professor John Graham and Humanities professors John J. Longley and W. Bedford Moore III. Student members included third-year students Steve Semes, Gary Pavis, Tenny Wellford, and Cham Light; first-year student Kel-Ann Sheldon; and second-year law student Waite Rawls. "Rotunda Use Discussed," *Cavalier Daily*, 21 March 1974. "Use of Rotunda Remains Controversial Question," *Cavalier Daily*, 10 April 1974. "Rotunda Committee Urges 'Multiple Usage' in Report," *Cavalier Daily*, 25 April 1974.
700. "Rotunda Committee Urges 'Multiple Usage' in Report," *Cavalier Daily*, 25 April 1974.
701. Robert B. Newman to Louis W. Ballou, 22 Nov. 1974, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
702. Robert B. Newman to Louis W. Ballou, 22 Nov. 1974, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
703. Robert B. Newman to Louis W. Ballou, 22 Nov. 1974, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
704. Excerpt from the minutes of the Art Commission meeting held in Charlottesville, December 6, 1974, 17 Dec. 1974, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
705. "Trespassers Invade Rotunda Site," *Cavalier Daily*, 5 Nov. 1974. "Arson Reported in Rotunda Fire," *Cavalier Daily*, 13 Nov. 1974.
706. "R. E. Lee Uses Rotunda Guard to Discourage Night Trespassers," *Cavalier Daily*, 7 Nov. 1974.
707. Vaughan and Gianniny, 77. "Rotunda Use Revisions Draw Fire from Historic Committee," *Cavalier Daily*, 1 March 1976.
708. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973-1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 109, 111.
709. Vaughan and Gianniny, 106-107.
710. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973-1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 119, 123. Rotunda Improvements, 13 June 1997, Building and Grounds Committee Notebooks, p. 17, RG-1/1/3, Box 16, Folder 1997-1998, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Research undertaken in 1996 and 1997 concluded that it is "doubtful" that the dome was painted white in its early years; it was probably painted medium gray.
711. Waller S. Hunt Jr. to Vincent Shea, 31 May 1974, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
712. J. A. Kessler Hr. to Ballou and Justice, 9 May 1975; 12 June 1975, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
713. J. A. Kessler Hr. to Ballou and Justice, 15 Aug. 1975, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.

714. Louis W. Ballou to Raymond Bice, 17 July 1975, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
715. Louis W. Ballou to Raymond Bice, 17 July 1975, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
716. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 112–115.
717. J. A. Kessler Jr. to Ballou and Justice, 20 June 1974; Louis W. Ballou to R. E. Lee and Son, 28, Jan. 1975, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
718. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 112–115.
719. J. A. Kessler Jr. to Ballou and Justice, 3 March 1975, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 115. “Tour Marks Near Completion of Rotunda Restoration,” *Cavalier Daily*, 5 Dec. 1975.
720. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 67–68. “Rotunda Supervisor Improves on Jefferson,” *Charlottesville Daily Progress*, 25 May 1975.
721. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 119, 125, 129. J. A. Kessler Jr. to Ballou and Justice, 17 March 1976, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
722. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 125, 129. “Restored Rotunda Differs Drastically,” *Cavalier Daily*, 27 Oct. 1975.
723. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 109.
724. Valley Steel Corporation, “Tunnel Slab Detail Showing Supporting Accessories,” 9 Aug. 1973, no. 21920, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia. Valley Steel Corporation, untitled drawing, 9 Aug. 1973, no. 21920, Facilities Management, Univ. of Virginia.
725. BV, Minutes, 23 Jan. 1976, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
726. BV, Minutes, 26 March 1976, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
727. “Officials Open ‘New’ Rotunda,” *Cavalier Daily*, 14 April, 1976.
728. “Highlights of American Architecture,” *AIA Journal* 65 (July 1976): 88–158.
729. Calder Loth to Brain Hogg, Univ. of Virginia Office of the University Architect, 6 July 2006. Frank L. Hereford Jr. to Junius R. Fishburne Jr., 4 Dec. 1974.
730. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 137.
731. Ballou and Justice Architects invoice for restoration and adaptation of the Rotunda, commission no. 6700, 13 April 1977; Louis W. Ballou to Werner K. Sensbach, 31 March 1977, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
732. Project Completion Report, 28 July 1977, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.

733. Werner K. Sensbach to H. Bryan Mitchell, 10 May 1977, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
734. Joseph Lee Vaughan and Omer Allan Gianniny Jr., *Thomas Jefferson's Rotunda Restored, 1973–1976* (Charlottesville: Univ. of Virginia Press, 1981), 137. BV, Minutes, 22 Jan. 1976, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
735. Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 6 June 1980, pp. 2–3, RG-1/1/3, Box 12, Folder Oct. 5, 1979–June 6, 1980, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Beginning in the early 1980s, new State regulations governed the selection of architects for university projects: architects selected to undertake projects valued at over \$100,000 now had to be approved by the State Department of Engineering and Buildings. The University's Board of Visitors, however, could select architects for projects under \$100,000 without the approval of the State. To be considered for work at the University, architects selected for these projects had to have prior experience with university projects and also had to be located within 100 miles of Charlottesville. Deferred Maintenance at the University of Virginia in the Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 12 Oct. 1982, pp. 1–2, RG-1/1/3, Box 12, Folder Jan. 1982–Mar. 1983, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 15 Oct. 1982, p. 2, RG-1/1/3, Box 12, Folder Sept. 1982–June 1983, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.. Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 25 March 1982, pp. 2–3, RG-1/1/3, Box 12, Folder Oct. 1981–June 1982, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.. BV, Minutes, 22 Jan. 1983, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
736. Status Report Maintenance Reserve Appropriations, 1982–1984 Maintenance Reserve Program, pp. 1–3, RG-1/1/3, Box 12, Folder May 1983–Nov. 1984, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
737. Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 24 Jan. 1985, p. 4, RG-1/1/3, Box 12, Folder 1981–1985, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
738. Final Report of the President's Ad Hoc Committee on the Use of the Rotunda, 28, Aug. 1986, in BV, Minutes, 3 Oct. 1986, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
739. BV, Minutes, 3 Oct. 1986, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
740. BV, Minutes, 3 Oct. 1986, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
741. BV, Minutes, 3 Oct. 1986; 13-14 June 1997, <http://etext.virginia.edu/minutes/bov> (accessed 2 Aug. 2006).
742. Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 29 Jan. 1987, p. 2, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder Oct. 1985–May 1987, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
743. James Murray Howard, "The Academical Village of Thomas Jefferson" in *ICOMOS Information* (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1989), 19.
744. University of Virginia, Condition of University Facilities, Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 19 Sept. 1988, pp. 3–4, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1988–1989, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. University of Virginia, Condition of University Facilities, Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 27 Oct. 1990, p. 5, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1990, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.

745. Raymond M. Haas to John Casteen III, 2 Nov. 1990, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1990, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
746. University of Virginia, Condition of University Facilities, Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 19 Sept. 1988, pp. 3–4, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1988–1989, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. Information on Monroe Hill House from the University of Virginia Web site, <http://fmweb.virginia.edu/facilities/facinfo.asp?bldg=2085> (accessed Oct. 12, 2006). University of Virginia, Condition of University Facilities, Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 27 Oct. 1990, p. 5, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1990, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
747. Recommended Program, 1990–1992 Capital Budget Program, 25 Jan. 1989, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1988–1989, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. In 1989 the proposed budget for 1990–1992 included a \$10,250,000 maintenance-reserve request for the University’s buildings, an unspecified amount of which would be set aside for the University’s historic buildings. Responsibilities and Procedures of the Architectural Advisory Committee, University of Virginia, Department of Physical Plant, 15, June 1989, p. 1. RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1991, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. An architectural advisory committee was established in 1989 to review and critique the design development of building projects at the University.
748. Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 25 Nov. 1986[?], RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1988–1989, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
749. Raymond M. Haas to John Casteen III, 2 Nov. 1990, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1990, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
750. University of Virginia, Condition of University Facilities, Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 24 Jan. 1990, pp. 1–5, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1990, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. The reports discussing the University’s funding needs for maintenance and improvements to its older buildings spoke in general terms. Though the reports specifically mentioned some of the work completed or needed in the academic buildings and Pavilions, there was no mention of the Rotunda.
751. University of Virginia, Condition of University Facilities, Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 24 Jan. 1990, pp. 1–5, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1990, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
752. A Vision Statement for the Planning and Design of the University of Virginia Buildings and Grounds, 2 April 1991, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1990–1991, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
753. Leonard Sandridge to the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 13 Jan. 1992, RG-1/1/3, Box 13, Folder 1992, Buildings and Grounds Committee Minutes, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
754. University of Virginia Restoration of the Academical Village, Actual Expenditures (in thousands), December 1992, submitted as part of a report made by the University’s Facilities Management, 20 Jan. 1993, RG-1/1/3, Box 14, Folder 1992–1993, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.

755. Report of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 3 Sept. Nov. 1992, RG-1/1/3, Box 14, Folder 1992–1993, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
756. Accessibility Study for Jefferson’s Academical Village, 7 Dec. 1993; Prioritized List of Accessibility Tasks, 5 May 1993, RG-1/1/3, Box 14, Folder 1993, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections. The consultant consortium included Mesick Cohen Waite of Albany, N.Y., (preservation architects); Barrier-Free Environments of Raleigh, N.C., (specialist architects in design for the disabled); and EDAW, Inc., of Alexandria, Va., (landscape architects).
757. Colette Capone to the Buildings and Grounds Committee, 12 May 1995, RG-1/1/3, Box 15, Folder 1995, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
758. Rotunda Improvements, 13 June 1997, Building and Grounds Committee Notebooks, p. 17, RG-1/1/3, Box 16, Folder 1997–1998, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
759. Stephen R. Jacques, Rotunda Deck Improvements, 27 April 2000, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
760. Rotunda Improvements, 13 June 1997, Building and Grounds Committee Notebooks, p. 18, RG-1/1/3, Box 16, Folder 1997–1998, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
761. Univ. of Virginia Board of Visitors Agenda item Summary, 29 May 1998, RG 1/1/3, Box 15, Folder 1997–1998, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
762. Rotunda Improvements, 13 June 1997, Building and Grounds Committee Notebooks, pp. 17–18, RG-1/1/3, Box 16, Folder 1997–1998, Buildings and Grounds Committee Correspondence, Univ. of Virginia, Special Collections.
763. Shashi Kavde to Pete Syme, memorandum on Rotunda column bases, 18 May 1998, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files. E-mail, Joseph Dye Lahendro to Clay Palazzo, 20 Dec. 2006 and 24 Jan. 2007.
764. James Murray Howard to Leonard G. Hassel and Bill Martin, 20 March 1998, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.
765. Determinations and Findings, Rotunda Deck Improvements, 1 Nov. 2000; A. Rhett Whitlock to Michael D. Stoneking, 9 July 2002, Univ. of Virginia, Facilities Management Project Files.