JOHN A. G. DAVIS, PROFESSOR OF LAW, AND THE FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, 1830 - 1840

Approved: Edward Younger

Approved: David A. Shannon

Lewis Ashby Martin, III
Charlottesville, Virginia

B. A., University of Virginia, 1973

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the University of Virginia
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Corcoran Department of History

University of Virginia

August, 1974

PREFACE

The foundation of the University of Virginia in 1819, the result of the perspicacity and pertinacity of Thomas Jefferson, marked a turning point in the history of American higher education. Breaking with tradition, Jefferson established a nonsectarian institution in an age when most schools were church oriented and developed the elective system of study when most educators forced young scholars into a rigid program of required study. Soon after its foundation Jefferson's University became the "dominant educational force throughout the South," while educators throughout the nation closely observed Jefferson's academic experiment. [1]

This essay is an examination of the early faculty of the University of Virginia, and a delineation and an analysis of faculty concerns during the seventh through the sixteenth sessions of the University based on subjects recorded in the minutes of each faculty meeting between September 1830, and July 1840. The study is centered around the life and career of John A. G. Davis, Professor of Law during the decade of the 1830's, because in his background, beliefs, and devotion to scholarship Davis epitomized Jefferson's conception of the University of Virginia professor.

---

[1] Charles F. Thwing, A History of Higher Education in America, (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1906), p. 200, 237. John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education In Transition, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968), p. 152-153.

I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Mr. Michael Plunkett and the staff of the Manuscript Room in Alderman Library. Mr. Junius Fishburne, Jr., Director of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission and a great-great grandson of John A. G. Davis, kindly provided me with references to several helpful manuscripts hidden in the bowels of Alderman Library. He also directed me to useful manuscript material located in the Library of the Virginia Historical Society. Mr. Edwin R. Carter referred me to the autobiography of his great-great grandfather, Robert Enoch Withers, who was a student at the University in 1840. I owe a special debt of gratitude to my advisor, Professor Edward Younger, the current occupant of John A. G. Davis's Pavilion X. With Professor Younger's assistance I was able to negotiate the hazards of first year graduate school. His seminar on the writing of history was invaluable, his advice indispensable, and his bourbon incomparable. Professor David Shannon, who helped me understand the Great Depression, generously consented to be the second reader of this thesis. Finally, I thank my typist, Mrs. Sandra Maupin, for all her efforts in my behalf.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"According to the common idea of History's province, Professor Davis would not be a historical personage . . . . Thanks to a few great minds, History's character is undergoing a reformation in this respect: and whenever she shall have learned to commemorate the virtues that purify peace, as well as the stormier ones that fight in the man of war, her heroes will often be such men as the friend we are now met to honour."

Lucian Minor, Esq. to the Society of the Alumni, June 29, 1847.

"'We were very sociable, often dining and passing the evening together, and the life which we led, although seemingly monotonous and devoid of interest, has no doubt appeared to all, in a retrospect, one of the happiest portions of our lives.'"

George Tucker, on the faculty of the University of Virginia.

"We have every variety of follies here, in the small line, from the literary fop, who professes to have read everything, and whose language is oppressed under such an affectation of finery as to be almost unintelligible, to the thoroughly vain man, who can pride himself in a pretty finger, a fine coat, a pair of whiskers, a successful jump at the gymnasium, or a witty saying, with equal self-gratification."

Robert Dabney, on the students of the University of Virginia, February 8, 1841.

THE CAST

On September 1, 1830, the University of Virginia opened for its seventh session. From late August through September stagecoaches rumbled into dusty little Charlottesville carrying most of the 133 eager young matriculates. The great majority, 111 (82 per cent), were native Virginians, but two students journeyed from as far as Mississippi to share in the educational experience at Mr. Jefferson's University. Nine students were from South Carolina, while two each arrived from Alabama and North Carolina. Maryland, Louisiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Pennsylvania and Washington, D. C. each contributed one student to the entering class of 1830.

Most of the matriculates were under twenty, the average student was 18.7 years old, and the great majority, eighty, were attending the University for the first time. Thirty-two students were eighteen years old in September 1830. The two youngest students were fifteen years old, while the two oldest were twenty-six. Eighty students (60.2 per cent) matriculated for the first time, thirty-five for the second, eleven for the third, four for the fourth, two for the fifth, while one student entered for his sixth session at the University.[1]

---

[1] A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Seventh Session, 1830-31. (Charlottesville, Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880), p. 5-9. University of Virginia. Matriculation Records, Matriculation Book 1825-1856, Microfilm, University of Virginia. Ages as of 30 September.

In the course of a decade, as the University established a national reputation for academic excellence, the composition of the student body changed dramatically. In September 1840, total enrollment increased to 179. While the majority of students, 109, still came from Virginia, almost 40 per cent of the student body was from out of state. As expected the Southern states still contributed the greatest number of matriculates. Fifteen students came from Alabama, fourteen from South Carolina, eight from Georgia, six from Tennessee and Louisiana, four from Florida and North Carolina, and two from Mississippi. The border state of Kentucky contributed three students, while two each came from Maryland, Missouri, and Washington, D. C. Representation of the northern states increased, as Pennsylvania and New York each contributed one student. Slowly Jefferson's dream, that the University would be "a temptation to the youth of other States to come and drink of the cup of knowledge and fraternize with us," was being realized.[2]

By 1840, the student body was slightly older than the student body a decade before. Now the average student was 19.2 years old, although in September there were more eighteen year olds (thirty-eight) than any other age group. Thirty-seven of the students were nineteen years old, thirty-four were twenty years old, and nineteen were

---

[2]David M. Culbreth, The University of Virginia - Memories of Her Student-Life and Professors (New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1908), p. 81.

seventeen years old. At the extremes were one fourteen year old boy and one twenty-seven year old man. Despite increased maturity most students still remained at the University for only one session. In 1840, 107 students (59.8 per cent) matriculated for the first time. Forty-nine students returned for a second session, sixteen for a third, six for a fourth, while one student returned for a fifth session at the University.[3]

Upon arrival at the University each student went immediately to the Proctor's office, registered, deposited his money, and received a room assignment. Students over twenty years old were permitted to reside outside of the University, if they obtained the faculty's permission, but most students lived in the dormitories on the Ranges and the Lawn. After reading the rules of the University each student promised to "enter the University with a sincere desire to reap the benefits of its instruction and with a determined resolution to conform to its laws." He then signed the matriculation book, listing his name, birth date, parent or guardian and his residence, and the schools of the University which he proposed to enter.[4]

Each student was required to deposit funds to cover professors'

---

[3] A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Seventeenth Session, 1840-1841. (Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880), p. 5-11. Matriculation Records. Ages as of 30 September.

[4] Matriculation Records.

fees, use of the library and public rooms, three months board, textbooks and stationary, fuel and candles, a ten dollar damage fee, and a two per cent Patron's commission. Expenses exclusive of textbooks, stationary, clothing, pocket money, and medical attention amounted to 238 dollars per student. One hundred and twenty-five dollars covered board including bed, furniture, washing, and attendance; fuel and candles plus a five per cent commission cost fifteen dollars; dormitory rent was eight dollars, if two students shared a room; students paid fifteen dollars for use of the library and the public rooms; finally, fees for three professors totaled seventy-five dollars per session. The maximum allowance for pocket money was forty dollars per session, not including a one hundred dollar clothing allowance.[5]

When classes began, students settled into a regimented existence regulated by the University clock and the laws of the University. Writing to his wife shortly after his arrival at the University, Professor Magill noted, "All our movements are regulated by the University clock - we move like clockwork. At break of day the bell rings to rouse the student from his slumbers, and at every subsequent hour it sounds summoning the professors to their different classes. One has

---

[5]Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Session of 1836-37. (Charlottesville: Tompkins & Noel, 1837), p. 19-20.

no excuse for not being methodical here."[6]

Living in small, poorly ventilated dormitories, dining in hotels (boarding houses) notorious for unpalatable meals, and having few opportunities for relaxing diversions within the University or in the neighboring hamlet of Charlottesville, the students' daily existence left much to be desired. "This day as monotonous as any other day in college," Charles Ellis, Jr. complained in his diary in March 1835, adding on another occasion "a walk in the evening, the only variation of usual monotony."[7] Unquestionably the monotony of life in the isolated University accounted for many student pranks and trivial violations of the regulations. But the serious student, who persevered to attain a degree, probably welcomed the absence of distraction.

Requirements for a degree at the University in its early years were demanding. Honors ranging from a Certificate of Proficiency in a class to the Master of Arts of the University of Virginia degree ensured that most diligence would be recognized and rewarded. The Certificate of Proficiency was awarded to those who demonstrated

---

[6]Mary Tucker Magill, "Doctor Alfred Thurston Magill - A Memorial Sketch By His Daughter," The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, IV (May & Nov., 1897), 811.

[7]Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., March 10-June 25, 1835, entries for March 13 and March 16, University of Virginia. According to Schele de Vere's Semi-Centinnial Catalogue, Charles Ellis, Jr. was born in 1817, attended the University during the sessions of 1834 and 1835, and became a merchant and President of the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad.

" competent acquaintance with any of those particular branches which . . . may be separately attended in a School." To each student who passed every class in a particular school the faculty awarded a diploma, recognizing him a graduate of the school with "proficiency in the general studies of that school." The highest distinction available to students was the Master of Arts degree. This the faculty awarded only to the industrious few who graduated from the Schools of Ancient Languages, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Moral Philosophy, and in any two modern languages. In addition these students had to prepare an essay demonstrating that they could "write the English language correctly."[8]

Presiding over the institution, guiding students, conferring degrees and cultivating the public image of the institution were the members of the faculty of the University. During the decade 1830-40, the faculty was young, enthusiastic, and predominately native born. Three of the eight original faculty members had resigned by September 1830, and a young American professor had replaced each one. Epitomizing the new professors was the Virginian, John A. G. Davis whose professorial career spanned the decade of the 1830's.

---

[8]Catalogue, 1836-37., p. 18. The conception of schools and classes perhaps needs clarification. A School was the equivalent of our department. Classes were the equivalent of our courses. Students referred to all the classes in a School as a "ticket." Thus a student enrolled in the School of Ancient Languages might say, "I'm taking old Gess's [Gessner Harrison's] ticket this session."

John A. G. Davis was born into the prosperous family of Staige and Elizabeth Gardner Davis in Middlesex County on March 5, 1802. Staige Davis, merchant and farmer in Urbanna, retired to his estate, "Prospect Hill," when John was six years old. There Davis experienced a pleasant childhood, romping over the grounds of "Prospect Hill" with his eight brothers and sisters, fishing and digging oysters in the Rappahannock, visiting his father's other farm, the "Plantation," eleven miles from "Prospect Hill," and studying at home with four older sisters.[9]

In 1818, Davis enrolled in the College of William and Mary. At first he disliked Williamsburg, finding the people proud and stuffy and the buildings, "tottering with age." But dislike for his surroundings did not hinder Davis's success in the College, where he impressed everyone with his diligence and disciplined devotion to study. The President of William and Mary, Dr. Smith, "is said to have pronounced him likely to be the most distinguished man of his time in Virginia."[10]

---

[9]Mrs. Catherine Watson's "Reminiscences of the Davis Family," Terrell-Carr Family Papers, University of Virginia. Mrs. Watson was a younger sister. His older sisters were Mrs. Louise McIntire, Mrs. Marie G. Braxton, Lucy Macon Davis, and Elizabeth Davis. Besides Catherine, his younger siblings were George S. and James Henry Davis, and Martha Macon Davis who married John B. Minor, a later resident of Pavilion X.

[10]Letter, John A. G. Davis to Mrs. Louise Davis McIntire, April 5, 1818, Davis Family Papers, University of Virginia. Lucian Minor, Discourse On The Life and Character of The Late John A. G. Davis, (Richmond: Sheperd & Colin., 1847), p. 8. Lucian Minor, brother of John B. Minor, was a prosecuting attorney at the trial of Davis's slayer.

While in Williamsburg Davis fell in love with Mary Jane Terrell, a great niece of Thomas Jefferson. Mary Jane, the youngest daughter of Richard Terrell, a Kentucky lawyer and land speculator, and Lucy Carr, the daughter of Martha Jefferson Carr, was born on March 25, 1803, at Oxmoor near Louisville. Having lost both parents as an infant, Mary Jane returned to Albemarle County and lived with her maternal grandmother. When Mrs. Carr's health failed, Mary Jane went to Williamsburg and lived with her Aunt Jane Cary. At the Cary house in Williamsburg she met and married John A. G. Davis in 1821.[11]

Before the wedding Davis's mother died, and after the ceremony he returned to "Prospect Hill" to manage the estate and care for his younger brothers and sisters. Shortly after his return to "Prospect Hill" a prominent Middlesex attorney, a Mr. Baxter, moved to Richmond, turning over his entire local practice to the fortunate Davis. Though not as knowledgeable of the law as he desired to be, Davis sought his license and was admitted to the bar.[12] In that same year, 1822, his first son, Eugene, was born.

In 1823, disappointed with his law practice in Middlesex County, the ambitious young Davis resolved to move to a more lucrative location.

---

[11]Recollections of Miss Lucy Minor Davis, p. 1, Fishburne Family Papers, University of Virginia.

[12]Letter, John A. G. Davis to Dabney C. Terrell, January 26, 1822, Terrell Family Papers, University of Virginia.

"To one of my profession," he reasoned, "wealth or eminence or both, are or ought to be the objects in view, - unless one or the other can be attained it is needless to pursue the profession.[13] In the spring of 1824, he travelled through West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee but found no town to his liking.

During his western journey his family stayed with Mary Jane's relatives at "Carrsbrook" in Albemarle County, where the Davis's second son, John Staige, was born. His wife maintained contact with Albemarle society and during a summer trip to "the up-country," Davis was introduced to the community. Impressed with the region's potential for future development and the condition of the local bar, he decided to move permanently to Charlottesville. That winter the family stayed at "Carrsbrook" and in 1825, moved into a frame house, "The Corner," on East High Street in Charlottesville. A short time later he purchased the 1,020 acre Nicholas Meriwether farm in the county about one-half mile east of Charlottesville. While settling into the community Davis, resolved "to make myself a lawyer and spare no labor nor exertion doing so." To this end he attended lectures at the University in 1825. Nevertheless his progress at the bar was slow.[14]

---

[13] Letter, John A. G. Davis to Dabney C. Terrell, December 12, 1823, Terrell Family Papers.

[14] Recollections of Miss Lucy Minor Davis, p. 2. Mary Rawlings, Ante-Bellum Albemarle, (Charlottesville: Michie Co., 1935), p. 50. Letter, John A. G. Davis to Dabney C. Terrell, February 9, 1825, Terrell Family Papers. Minor, Discourse, p. 10.

Undaunted by his meager legal practice, Davis delved into a variety of business activities. In July, 1827, with Thomas W. Gilmer he purchased the local newspaper, the Central Gazette, renaming it the Virginia Advocate. When Gilmer sold out in March, 1828, Davis continued to publish the paper with Nicholas P. Trist, until November, when Davis and Trist sold the publication to Frank Carr and Jefferson Clark.[15] The paper espoused Jefferson's strict constructionist principles, which Davis upheld throughout his life.

As the husband of Mr. Jefferson's great-niece Davis maintained a sincere affection for the elder statesman. In 1826 he lobbied in Richmond for Jefferson's lottery, attempting to influence delegates from counties in southeast Virginia to support the lottery. Two years later, in 1828, he combined with Jefferson Clark and T. J. Randolph to print Mr. Jeffersons's papers.[16]

In addition to professional responsibilities as lawyer and publisher John A. G. Davis epitomized the Albemarle agrarian ideal. In 1828 on the Lewis tract he began construction of "The Farm," a red brick mansion based on Jefferson's design for the Randolph home at

---

[15]Lester J. Cappon, Virginia Newspapers, A Bibliography With Historical Introduction And Notes, (New York: D. Appleton - Century Company Incorporated, 1936), p. 66.

[16]Letter, John A. G. Davis to D. C. Terrell, February 14, 1826, Terrell-Carr Family Papers. J. A. G. Davis, entry in Franklin Almanac 1828, October 12, 1828, Terrell-Carr Family Papers.

Edgehill. Living in "The Old Farm," he cultivated his rich bottom land with a wide variety of crops. Years later, though one of the busiest faculty members at the University, he still found time to return often to the solace and serenity of "The Farm."[17]

Always the devoted father and family man Davis lavished much time and affectionate attention on his seven children. At "The Farm" Mrs. Davis gave birth to two more sons, Dabney Carr Terrell and Richard Terrell, while later at the University three daughters, Caryetta, Elizabeth Gardner, and Lucy Minor were born. Ambling over the Albemarle countryside and later the Grounds of the University, the children experienced a wholesome development during their formative years. When the Davises moved to the University, students always boarded with them, tutoring the Davis' boys.[18]

A gentleman as well as a scholar, Davis mingled easily with the Albemarle aristocracy. Entries mentioning evenings spent with the Carr's of Dunlora, the Randolph's of Edgehill, the Trist's of Monticello,

---

[17]Rawlings, Ante-Bellum Albemarle, p. 50. Entries by Davis in the 1828 Franklin Almanac, a farmer's diary, list framepeas, oats, Charleston peas, asparagus, eggplant, tomatoes, cabbage, Washington peas, clover, rye, turnip beets, Dutch Brown lettuce, snapgreens, long bloody beets, spinach, celery, buttersea cabbage, Portugal onions, sweet potatoes, corn, simblings, white mustard, carrots, limas, cucumbers, and radishes as crops grown on the farm. Minor, Discourse, p. 18.

[18]Recollections of Miss Lucy Minor Davis, p. 4. Dabney was born in 1826, Richard in 1830, Caryetta in 1832, Elizabeth in 1835, and Lucy Minor in 1840. Another son, Richard Terrell, was born in 1828, but lived only a few days.

and faculty members of the University fill his Franklin Almanac for 1828. Impressed by his probity, sobriety, and diligence, these people were instrumental in advancing his career.

In 1829 Davis served as Secretary of the Board of Visitors. One year later that body appointed him Professor of Law to fill the chair vacated by Judge John T. Lomax. When the Board of Visitors made the appointment a cry went up, according to Lucian Minor, that Davis was "too young - too little known - some eminent jurist should have been chosen, whose name would at once have given eclat to the school." The product of one year's application of his diligence and legal acumen soon silenced those who doubted the capability and capacity of youth.[19]

As Professor of Law Davis was singularly successful. Despite his work load as a professor and chairman of the faculty during the twelfth, thirteenth, and sixteenth sessions, and part of the seventeenth session, Davis kept up a voluminous correspondence with his former pupils, assisting them with practical problems of the law. He also published two books, A Treatise On Criminal Law and a Guide for Justices of the Peace, based on his own experience as an Albemarle magistrate in 1835. At the time of his tragic death in 1840, Robert Dabney wrote, "the law school was, all things considered, the most flourishing in the

---

[19]Minor, Discourse, p. 12.

institution."[20] A. L. Pickens, a law student, expressed his satisfaction with Professor Davis when he wrote his father in 1838,

> I am so much pleased with our professor, Mr. Davis. He seems to be well qualified for the station which he fills - is polite and affable to his class, yet with sufficient promptitude and firmness, to show that he is not to be trifled with. As far as I have had intelligence, he is much liked and is, I believe, generally considered the best professor here.[21]

Davis's popularity with the student body, the product of an extremely amiable and charitable personality, would intensify the tragedy of his violent death. Ever vigilant of student welfare Professor Davis did not hesitate to bring sick students into his own home, where his wife and servants cared for them. As Robert Dabney concluded after the shooting on the Lawn in 1840, which resulted in Professor Davis's untimely death,

> As to his amiability, kindness, and good principles there was but one opinion. He was the only one of the professors who established the right sort of intercourse, and feeling between himself and his class and his wife was the only one of them that took pains to endear herself to the students . . . . If the other professors and their families had been in the habit of imitating this example, these disgraceful riots would not occur.[22]

---

[20] Minor, Discourse, p. 18. Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Mother, December 7, 1840, Dabney Family Papers, University of Virginia.

[21] Letter, A. L. Pickens to Col. Samuel Pickens, January 5, 1838, University of Virginia.

[22] Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Brother, December 7, 1840.

During the decade 1830-40, an average of forty-eight students per session enrolled in the Law School, and fees for the period 1835-37, averaged $2,121.66. Divided into two classes, the Law School offered courses in government as well as professional law. In the junior class students studied international law, the science of government, constitutional law, and elementary jurisprudence. Students in the senior class were "exclusively occupied with the study of the theory and practice of the law as a profession." To entice prospective students, an early course description noted that, in addition to lectures, students benefited from activities in the Law Society sponsored by the Professor of Law. Prospective law students were also advised that they had at their disposal the use of the library of the University, "the Law department of which is large and valuable." Attesting to John A. G. Davis's professional ability and legal acumen was the phenomenal increase in the size of the Law School between 1830 and 1840. When Davis assumed the professorship in 1830, the class consisted of seventeen students. At the end of the decade seventy-two students were enrolled in the School of Law, an increase of almost 425 per cent over a ten year period.[23]

When John A. G. Davis joined the faculty of the University of Virginia in July, 1830, five of the eight original professors, handpicked

---

[23]Philip Alexander Bruce, History of the University of Virginia 1819-1919, (5 Vols.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921), II, p. 182. Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Session of 1841-42. (Charlottesville: James Alexander, Printer, 1842), p. 2. Catalogue. Session of 1836-37. p. 16-17.

by Thomas Jefferson or Jefferson's agents, remained at the University. Francis Gilmer had recruited three of these men, Charles Bonnycastle, George Blaetterman, and Robley Dunglison, from England, while Jefferson and the Visitors had enticed George Tucker and John Emmet to the University. In 1830, the faculty also included three later appointees, Robert Patterson, Thomas Johnson, and Gessner Harrison.

Robley Dunglison, Professor of Physiology, Medicine, Obstetrics, and Medical Jurisprudence, had held that position since the University's first session in 1825. Born January 4, 1798, in Keswick, a town in Cumberland, England, Dunglison was originally trained as a merchant to take charge of family planting interests overseas. Attracted to medicine, he abandoned his first profession and studied with doctors in Keswick, London, Edinburgh, and Paris. Graduating from the University of Erlangen in Bavaria, Dunglison returned to England where he specialized in obstetrics. In the fall of 1824, he was contacted by Francis Gilmer who offered him the Professorship of Medicine at the University of Virginia. Dunglison accepted and served creditably in that position until 1833, when he resigned to accept a professorship at the University of Maryland. An active participant in faculty meetings during the first six sessions of the University, Dunglison was elected chairman three times between 1825 and 1830. His medical acumen and devotion in the face of hardship carried the University through an epidemic of typhoid

fever in 1829.[24]

Dunglison's replacement in 1833, Alfred Thurston Magill was born in Winchester, Virginia on December 10, 1804. Magill studied medicine in Philadelphia and practiced in Winchester. A popular lecturer, Magill was forced by ill health to resign after four years at the University. R. E. Griffith replaced Magill, but served only two years as Professor of Medicine. His successor was Henry Howard a former professor of medicine at the University of Maryland. Howard, born in Frederick, Maryland and trained in Philadelphia, had engaged in private practice for twenty-four years before he accepted the position at Maryland.[25]

During the decade 1830-40, the School of Medicine was the smallest school in the University, averaging only forty-two students per session. The professor's salary from student fees averaged a modest 1,114 dollars during the three year period from 1835-37. The Professor of Medicine lectured on the theory and practice of medicine, obstetrics, and medical jurisprudence. A list of course offerings in 1836, indicated that "a full course of lectures in medicine in the University is equal to a full course in Philadelphia and Baltimore schools." In addition the University's School of Medicine had an "advantage over the other Medical Schools

---

[24]Robley Dunglison Paperscripts, University of Virginia. Paul B. Barringer, James M. Garnett, Rosewell Page, eds., University of Virginia Its History, Influence, Equipment, and Characteristics, (2 Vols.; New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1904), I, p. 347.

[25]Bruce, The University of Virginia, II, p. 175.

in the United States in having a session of more than ten months instead of about four."[26]

Beginning in the third session the Professor of Medicine was assisted by a Demonstrator of Anatomy and Surgery. In September 1832, the Demonstrator was elevated to the position of full professor. Thomas Johnson served in this position from its creation until the eleventh session in September 1834, when he was succeeded by Augustus L. Warner. In September 1837, James L. Cabell, one of the University's first graduates with the Master of Arts degree, assumed the position. The University boasted an "extensive museum" accompanying this school. Like the Professor of Medicine, the Professor of Anatomy occupied one of the least lucrative positions in the University. Average attendance in the school from 1830-40, was forty-five students per session, while fees for the period 1835-37 averaged 1,365 dollars per year.[27]

During the seventh and eighth sessions of the University Robert Maskell Patterson, Professor of Natural Philosophy, was chairman of the faculty. Born March 23, 1787, Patterson, the son of the Professor of Math and Natural Philosophy at the University of Pennsylvania, received a Master of Arts degree from that institution in 1804. Four years later he received a Doctor of Medicine degree, then traveled to Europe

---

[26] Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 15-16. Bruce, University of Virginia, II p. 182.

[27] Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 175, 182. Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 16.

for further study. Upon his return to the United States Patterson was named Professor of Medicine then Professor of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry at the University of Pennsylvania. Following a reshuffling of the faculty at the University of Virginia in 1828, Patterson was appointed Professor of Natural Philosophy. He was quite popular with the students, who enjoyed his evening dinner parties which helped relieve the monotony of college existence. After being named Director of the U. S. Mint in 1835, Patterson resigned his position at the University.[28]

Patterson's successor, William Barton Rogers, was also a native of Philadelphia. Born December 7, 1804, Rogers studied at William and Mary, taught in Baltimore, and lectured at Maryland Institute. In 1828, the twenty-four year old Rogers succeeded his father as a professor at William and Mary and eight years later succeeded Patterson at the University of Virginia. Undoubtedly the foremost geologist in the state of Virginia, Rogers was actively involved in geological surveys while at the University. An eloquent speaker with a flair for the dramatic, Rogers always filled his classroom. In 1853, Rogers left the University and went to Massachusetts where he participated in the founding of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. There on May 30, 1882, Rogers "died in action" handing diplomas to graduates of MIT.[29]

---

[28] Barringer, University of Virginia, I, p. 349. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 163-164.

[29] Harry Clemons, Notes on the Professors for Whom the University of Virginia Halls and Residence Houses Are Named, (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1961), p. 119-123.

According to an early catalogue the School of Natural Philosophy was equipped with a "very complete apparatus" and "an observatory with its appropriate astronomical instruments." The first class, or junior class as it was called, concentrated on "experimental and graphical" demonstrations. The senior class studied mechanics, hydrodynamics, pneumatics, accoustics, heat, electricity, magnetism, electro-magnetism, optics and astronomy. Attached to the School of Natural Philosophy was a School of Civil Engineering taught jointly by the Professors of Math and Natural Philosophy. Included in this course were lectures on surveying, railroad, canal, and bridge construction, analysis of the steam engine, and mechanical drawing. A most utilitarian school, Natural Philosophy was well attended, averaging ninety students per session during the decade of the eighteen-thirties. Fees netted the Professor an average of $2,404.10 during the period 1835-37.[30]

George Tucker, Professor of Moral Philosophy, was chairman of the faculty during the first session of the University and again during the ninth session from 1832-33. The oldest and most distinguished member of the faculty, Tucker had served three terms in the United States Congress, when Jefferson persuaded him to accept a professorship at the University of Virginia. Born August 20, 1775, in Bermuda, Tucker moved to Virginia and graduated from the College of William and Mary.

---

[30] Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 14. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 182.

A novelist, poet, and essayist, he was the most prolific writer on the faculty. Urbane and erudite, Tucker was described as "the most popular of all the professors . . . the fountains of whose geniality never ran dry, and who never failed to delight with his keen sense of humor, his inexhaustible fund of anecdotes, and his racy information on every subject that arose in conversation."[31]

Dealing with the most abstract subjects taught at the University, the School of Moral Philosophy was one of the smallest schools in the institution. During the decade 1830-40, an average of fifty-nine students per session enrolled in the school, and between 1835-37, tuition fees averaged 1,395 dollars per session. The school was divided into two classes, the junior class studying rhetoric, belles lettres, logic and ethics and the senior class, studying moral philosophy and political economy.[32]

From 1833 to 1835, during the tenth and eleventh sessions of the University, Charles Bonnycastle, Professor of Math, presided over the faculty. Born in Woolwich, England in 1792, Bonnycastle, the son of the Professor of Math at the Royal Military Academy in Woolwich, received his higher education at that institution. Contacted by Francis

---

[31]Clemons, Notes on Professors, p. 133. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 19-24. "George Tucker," The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, VII (May, 1900), p. 11-14.

[32]Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 16. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 182.

Gilmer in 1825, Bonnycastle accepted the Professorship of Natural Philosophy, becoming Professor of Math when Thomas Key resigned to return to England in 1828. Noted for his "quiet and taciturn disposition," Bonnycastle was so shy, that he had "been known to climb a fence and to walk in the mud to avoid passing a student on the walk."[33]

The Professor of Mathematics possessed the most lucrative position in the University. During the decade 1830-40, an average of 103 students per session entered the school. Tuition fees for the period 1835-37, averaged a very profitable $3,201.33 per year. The course was divided into five classes to be completed in two years. During the junior year students learned arithmetic, algebra, geometry, trigonometry and differential calculus. Seniors studied differential and integral calculus, and a class in mixed mathematics was offered for advanced students.[34]

From 1837 to 1839, during the fourteenth and fifteenth sessions of the University, Gessner Harrison, Professor of Ancient Languages, served as chairman of the faculty. A member of the first entering class in 1825, Harrison was one of the first three graduates in Greek and Medicine. When George Long, the first Professor of Ancient Languages,

---

[33]Clemons, Notes on Professors, p. 7-9. Barringer, University of Virginia, I, p. 346-347. "Charles Bonnycastle," The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, VI (February, 1900), p. 107.

[34]Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 13-14. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 182.

resigned in 1828, he recommended that Harrison, one of his best students, be named to replace him. The Visitors acceded to his request and named the twenty-one year old native of Harrisonburg to the position. Two years later he married a daughter of his former professor, now fellow faculty member, George Tucker. Harrison, only twenty-one at the time of his appointment, retained his position for thirty-one years, retiring in 1859 to open a college preparatory school.

Harrison's professorship epitomized Jefferson's conception of the University's role in educating the youth of Virginia. Not only was Harrison a graduate of the University, but his students upon graduation established preparatory schools throughout the state. Years later Harrison remarked that the students of his former pupils were extremely well prepared, when they entered the School of Ancient Languages.[35]

The School of Ancient Languages averaged sixty-nine students per session during the decade 1830-40. For the three year period 1835-37, the professor's fees averaged 4,031 dollars per year. The school was divided into Greek, Latin, and Hebrew classes. In junior Latin the students read Horace, Cicero, and Caesar, while seniors read Juvenal, Livy, and Tacitus. The junior Greek class read Xenophon, Euripides or Aeschylus, and Heroditus. Seniors read Euripides, Sophocles, Thucydides, and Homer. Additional lecture hours were established for

---

[35]"Sketch of Gessner Harrison," Gessner Harrison Papers, University of Virginia. Clemons, Notes on Professors, p. 51. Barringer, University of Virginia, I, p. 344-351.

lectures on the history and geography of ancient civilizations.[36]

John P. Emmet, Professor of Chemistry and Materia Medica, was one of two original faculty members who never served a session as chairman of the faculty. Born in Dublin, Ireland in 1797, Emmet, the son of an Irish patriot, immigrated with his family to the United States, when he was eight years old. Emmet attended West Point where he served as an assistant math instructor. After poor health forced him to resign, Emmet studied medicine in New York then moved to South Carolina, where he practiced medicine and lectured in Chemistry. His lectures attracted the attention of the Board of Visitors, and he was offered the Professorship of Chemistry which he accepted. An habitual experimenter, Emmet was one of the first county residents to attempt grape growing and the cultivation of the silk worm. After two years at the University Emmet married George Tucker's niece, Mary Byrd Tucker. At the end of the eighteenth session in July 1842, Emmet took a leave of absence to recuperate from an illness. He never returned and died August 13, 1843.[37]

The School of Chemistry and Materia Medica was well attended during the decade 1830-40, averaging eighty-seven students per session.

---

[36]Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 182. Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 11-13.

[37]George Tucker, Memoir of the Life and Character of John P. Emmet, M. D. Professor of Chemistry and Materia Medica in the University of Virginia, (Philadelphia: C. Sherman Printer, 1845), p. 4-25. Barringer, University of Virginia, I, p. 345-346.

During the period 1835-37, the professor's fees averaged $3,016.66 per year. The chemistry class met twice a week, and topics concerned "all the important applications" of the science to mechanical arts, agriculture, and domestic economy. The class of materia medica and pharmacy met once a week and included instruction on the operations of the pharmacy, pharmaceutical preparations, and classification of materia medica. An early catalogue noted that the School contained "a very extensive apparatus and laboratory."[38]

Besides Emmet, George Blaetterman, Professor of Modern Languages, was the only other original faculty member never to serve a term as chairman. Born in Germany, Blaetterman moved to England where he attained an excellent reputation as a professor of modern languages. Though a highly knowledgeable man, Blaetterman was an eccentric character who had difficulty interrelating with both faculty and students. Charles Ellis, Jr. confided in his diary that Blaetterman's class was a farce, and student testimony before the faculty indicates that the School was generally less orderly than the other Schools in the University. On one occasion Blaetterman was physically assaulted during his lecture by an irate student, while on another occasion a group of students, throwing pieces of shot, disrupted the lecture. In 1838, students unsuccessfully petitioned to have Blaetterman removed from his position. In September

---

[38]Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 182. Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 15.

1840, the Visitors discharged Blaetterman, after John A. G. Davis, chairman of the faculty, informed them that Blaetterman had publicly beaten his wife.[39]

Enrollment in the School of Modern Languages averaged fifty-seven students per session during the decade 1830-40, while the professor's fees averaged $1,640.66, during the period 1835-37. Assisted by European tutors, Blaetterman taught French, Spanish, Italian, German, and English. If students desired, he was prepared to teach Danish, Swedish, Dutch, and Portugese. Tests for the course consisted of the main classics in each language. Blaetterman lectured twice a week on the literature of each language and offered additional lectures on modern history and political relations.[40]

This was the faculty that guided the University through the decade of the 1830's. Weathering epidemics, student unrest, and public apathy, they laid the cornerstone for the University's continued success throughout the years to come. In the early months of the seventeenth session the University lost three of the six professors who had labored through the

---

[39]John S. Patton, Jefferson, Cabell and the University of Virginia (New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1906), p. 96-97. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 157-160. Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., entry March 19, 1835. University of Virginia, Minutes of Meeting of Rector and Board of Visitors, meeting of September 14, 1840.

[40]Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 182. Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 13.

entire decade of the thirties. George Blaetterman left on September 14, 1840, ingloriously discharged by the Board of Visitors. On October 31, disease claimed Charles Bonnycastle's life. A fortnight later John A. G. Davis lay slowly dying from a mortal gunshot wound. Two years later in 1843, Emmet resigned, and three years after that the venerable Tucker, last of the original members of the faculty, retired after twenty-one years of devoted service to the University. It was Tucker who best summarized faculty feeling for their shared experiences at the University, when he reminisced, "'We were very sociable, often dining and passing the evening together, and the life which we led, although seemingly monotonous and devoid of interest, has no doubt appeared to all, in a retrospect, one of the happiest portions of our lives."[41]

---

[41]"George Tucker," The Alumni Bulletin, VII (May, 1900), p. 12.

ANALYSIS OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY, 1830-40

From the beginning of the seventh session of the University of Virginia in September 1830, to the end of the eighteenth session in July 1840, the secretary of the faculty of the University of Virginia recorded the minutes to 348 meetings or an average of almost thirty-five meetings per year. During this ten year period Charles Bonnycastle, as chairman of the faculty, convoked the greatest number of meetings in a single session, forty-eight, during the tenth session 1833-34, while Robert Patterson presided over the fewest number of meetings in a single session, twenty-five, during the seventh session 1830-31. The busiest months for the faculty as a body were February, averaging 3.8 meetings during the decade, November and April averaging 3.7 meetings, and September, averaging 3.6 meetings. The busiest single month was July 1833, when the chairman called seven meetings. There were no meetings in August during the ten year period.

The faculty usually convened in the late afternoon between three and five o'clock. This insured maximum attendance, since most of the Professors completed lectures by 4:30 in the afternoon. The faculty usually gathered in a lecture room of the Rotunda, the library, or Pavilion VII. When meetings became prolonged or tedious, they would occasionally adjourn and reconvene later in the evening in one of the professor's homes.

Since there were nine members of the faculty, a quorum of five

was necessary to conduct business. According to the minutes, lack of a quorum caused the cancellation of only ten meetings during the decade. Thus the majority of the members responded promptly when the chairman called a meeting. Occasionally after a quorum convened, one or two other members tardily appeared.

The chairman presided over the meeting, usually introducing matters of administrative concern and regulating debates. (To expedite the business of the meetings the faculty, at the second meeting in 1825, astutely authorized the chairman to "put a stop to conversation across the table and . . . direct the members to speak in rotation, commencing where he may please."[1]) When voting on a resolution offered by a member, the chairman's vote counted twice. If the chairman was unable to attend a meeting, the faculty elected a chairman pro tempore from their number.

Since the faculty convened at the end of a long day, which for most members began at sunrise and consisted of from one and one half to three and one half hours of lecturing plus additional hours of lecture preparation and assisting students, the meetings at times degenerated to a social hour, as the members relaxed after a strenuous day of lecturing and professorial duties. At one meeting Professor Emmet felt "compelled to observe . . . that he repeatedly and in vain requested, that the

---

[1]University of Virginia, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty, meeting of April 13, 1825.

meeting be called to order (the conversation of members being general and not addressed to the chair) . . . " Despite his efforts to redirect the attention of the members to the business at hand "indulgences in private conversation" continued. Therefore the irritated Emmet "withdrew because his health would not permit him to endure the excessive cold of the Faculty room for the sake of a jest or two."[2]

On another occasion the meeting was "interrupted by the intrusion of a drunken vagabond into the room." Three students had grabbed the janitor, Dr. Smith, whose duty it was to stand guard at the door during the faculty meetings, and convinced the drunk to saunter into the meeting. After the intruder was dismissed, the faculty called for the three students and reprimanded them.[3]

Sometimes personality conflicts accentuated by the intimacy of the academical village erupted in outbursts of temper during the meetings. William Wertenbaker, the secretary, relates that at one meeting in the early days Thomas Key, the first Professor of Mathematics, became incensed with Professor Blaetterman and kicked at him "'under the faculty table,'" causing Blaetterman to snicker that Key, "'kicked like an ass.'"[4]

---

[2]University of Virginia, Minutes of Meetings of the Faculty, meeting of February 3, 1832.

[3]Ibid, meeting of April 25, 1837.

[4]Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 34.

Despite such diversions and digressions the faculty accomplished an enormous number of administrative tasks during their afternoon meetings. The faculty reviewed routine student requests and ascertained through committee reports and reports from other University functionaries that the University, as both physical plant and academic institution, was running smoothly. The body also acted in a legislative and judicial capacity. They suggested new guidelines for the regulation of University life to be approved by the Board of Visitors and passed new laws to regulate minor facets of daily existence. Finally, they reviewed evidence in cases of student infractions and administered the prescribed penalties for those violations.

A large portion of many faculty meetings was devoted to the granting or denial of student requests for permission to absent themselves from the University, to withdraw from the University for the remainder of a session, to withdraw from a particular school or class within a school, or to withdraw from one school and enter another school. At 197 meetings the faculty considered one or more requests of this nature. Applications for leave from the University increased during Christmas time, while applications for withdrawal from specific schools increased before the examination periods in those schools. Students requested permission to withdraw from the University or to obtain a leave of absence for various reasons including lack of funds, personal illness, family illness, a contagious disease within the University, parental requests, an appointment to West Point, or a meeting with a friend or

relative traveling from a distant state or territory. Students requested brief leaves to attend political conventions, to take geological field trips to caves, and to attend weddings. A student petitioned for permission to withdraw from a particular school because of a heavy course load (attendance at four schools), because he desired to enroll in another school or a class of another school, or simply because he desired to concentrate his efforts in the courses of two or three schools.

After receiving written permission from his parent or guardian the student presented his request to the chairman, who laid it before the faculty. If the faculty deemed the request reasonable, then permission was granted. If permission of the parent or guardian did not accompany the request, or if the faculty questioned the sincerity or the intentions of the student, the request was laid aside or denied.

During the decade 1830-40, the faculty considered applications for admission from students from other institutions and applications for re-admission from students dismissed from the University of Virginia at seventy different meetings. The chairman usually presented several such applications for admission or re-admission during the meetings at the beginning of each session. To be admitted from another institution a student had to present to the chairman a certificate of good conduct from a faculty member of his former school or college.[5] If the student had not secured this certificate, but promised he would do so, the faculty usually

---

[5]Catalogue, 1836-37, p. 11.

permitted him to matriculate with the provision that he present the certificate to the chairman in a reasonable time period. If a student had been expelled or dismissed from another institution, the faculty at the University of Virginia investigated his offense. If the same offense was punishable by a lesser penalty at the University, then the faculty allowed the student to matriculate. During the decade alumni of Kenyon College in Ohio, Bacon College in Kentucky, Franklin College in Georgia, Lexington College, William and Mary, Washington College in Connecticut, Oxford College in Ohio, Amherst, Randolph Macon, St. Louis College, Cambridge University, University of Pennsylvania, Hampden Sydney, Nashville University, Richmond Academy, Huntsville Academy, Jefferson College in Pennsylvania, Georgetown College in Kentucky, Dickinson College, Princeton, Harvard, Yale, Columbia College in South Carolina, the University of North Carolina and the University of Alabama applied to the faculty for permission to matriculate. The magnanimous faculty often readmitted an individual dismissed from the University, if the student appeared contrite, or if his parent, guardian, or an influential friend wrote to the chairman, assuring him of the youth's rehabilitation. Often a readmitted student would be enjoined by a special pledge not to repeat the offense on pain of swift dismissal.

Once admitted to the University some students applied for permission to live outside the precincts of the University. A student requested permission to live off grounds in order to benefit from the exercise obtained in a brisk walk to the University, to live in a place more

conducive to study, or to live in the home of a special friend or relative. The faculty preferred that the student board with a friend of his family or a relative. At eighty-eight meetings the faculty processed one or more such requests. To receive permission to live outside of the University the student had to be twenty years old, although this requirement was waived in the cases of younger brothers of students living off grounds, or students who received special permission from the Executive Committee of the Board of Visitors. As the University expanded in the latter half of the decade, the faculty granted these applications more readily, even giving them to nineteen year olds who were almost twenty. Once this permission was granted, the student promised to abide by the rules of the University. This, the faculty believed, would ensure proper behavior in the boarding house or private home.

This category, pertaining to lodgings away from the precincts, also includes faculty discussions relating to the regulation of rates charged by the owners of boarding houses. Concerned lest the landlords take advantage of their student boarders the faculty established price guidelines for private establishments. Undoubtedly realizing that the service and facilities might be better than that provided resident students, they allowed private landlords to charge student boarders fifty dollars per session more than the University hotelkeepers. To prevent infractions by student boarders the faculty, acting on a resolution by John A. G. Davis, required each landlord to sign a pledge stating that he would prevent all gaming and drinking in rooms, take in no student who did not

have faculty permission to live away from the precincts of the University, allow no dismissed student to reside on the premises, report violations of regulations to the chairman, and observe the Board of Visitors' regulations concerning private boarding houses. Faculty permission to board students expired each year, insuring that each landlord must renew his pledge at the beginning of every session.[6]

Though not included in these calculations of student requests, a number of students over twenty-three requested permission to be exempted from the rules and regulations of the University. The faculty readily granted this permission to qualified students living off the precincts, though there seems to have been some confusion concerning the twenty-three year olds who lived in the University and requested this privilege. The main advantage of the privilege was exemption from the uniform law.

Throughout the decade 1830-40, the faculty considered additional student petitions concerning student grievances, special requests, and sometimes demands. At approximately fifty-seven meetings special student petitions were topics of faculty discussion. In most of these a number of students requested that the faculty rescind a colleague's punishment (suspension, dismissal or expulsion) which the students considered excessively harsh or unjust. These petitions contained many signatures and promised that five or six of the exiled student's acquaintances or

---

[6] Minutes, meeting of September 10, 1839.

friends would pledge themselves as surety for his good behavior. The students promised the faculty that they would report their classmate, if he violated any University regulations. In essence these were petitions for probation or parole. If the petitions offered new evidence or presented circumstances in mitigation or extenuation, or if the student appeared truly humbled and contrite, and the faculty believed that the shock of the sentence coupled with the pledges of his classmates would assure good behavior, they usually commuted the sentence to a reprimand and stern warning. But if the faculty found the petition to contain no new evidence, or if they feared that the students would regard commutation of the sentence as a sign of faculty weakness and not magnanimity, then they would deny the request.

Other student petitions expressed grievances against the hotelkeepers, asked permission to have balls or dinner parties, and on rare occasions demanded that the faculty grant certain privileges or abstain from certain actions. Since the enactments prohibited festive entertainments, students desiring to have a ball or dinner party petitioned the faculty. Requests for parties on special occasions such as the birthdays of Washington and Jefferson were usually granted, after students gave assurances that no spirituous or vinous beverages would be consumed, and that the cost per guest would be moderate. Finally, when especially provoked with the faculty, the students presented resolutions stating that they would not comply with a specific faculty admonition, or resolutions demanding certain privileges which they believed the faculty had illegiti-

mately or unfairly denied them.

Thus, it was unusual for a faculty meeting to pass without the consideration of a request from a student or group of students concerning some aspect of University existence. The faculty judged each request individually. Though most petitions required only a cursory appraisal, some instigated considerable debate followed by motions and countermotions before settlement.

Besides consideration of student requests the exigencies of university administration required that the faculty be constantly informed of the activities of other University officials ranging from the Rector and the Board of Visitors to the janitor. Communication with the Proctor, the librarian, and the hotelkeepers was particularly important to ensure smooth operation of the University. Occasionally the faculty "respectfully" submitted suggestions pertaining to school administration for the consideration of the Board of Visitors. Academically, the faculty's most important consideration was the regulation of examinations and graduation.

At 137 meetings the faculty discussed or reported on individual or group concerns relating to examinations and graduation. In the early years of the decade the faculty established degree requirements and fixed the examination process. The chairman appointed faculty members to examining committees and dates were set for exams in each school throughout the session. As the session progressed, individual members, falling behind in course work and needing additional time for

preparation of the examination, sought permission for a change of examination date which was always granted. Several members dutifully reported each month the standings of the degree candidates in their respective schools. At the conclusion of each session the examination standings in each class and the names of successful degree candidates were officially recorded in the minutes of the faculty.

Not included in the above figure were the many student requests for permission to be excused from one or more exams. Illness during the session, problems with eyesight, or late entrance into a class or school were the usual reasons for such requests. If the faculty knew that the student had been incapacitated during a crucial point in the session or had matriculated too late to prepare the work in his schools, they usually excused him from the examinations. The faculty showed the greatest leniency to a student who was a candidate for graduation in one school, excusing him, if he so desired, from an examination in another school, so that he might concentrate on the subject of the intended degree.

The library, the second academic area of faculty concern, was a topic for discussion at forty-three faculty meetings throughout the decade. In most instances the minutes merely mention acceptance of the librarian's bi-monthly report on the condition of the library. At some meetings a committee of professors was appointed to recommend additional volumes for the library, while at others the faculty established new rules or modified the existing regulations of the library. In a very few instances

the faculty passed resolutions importuning the Visitors to provide additional funds for the improvement of the library.

Throughout the period the Board of Visitors proved reluctant to expend funds on the library. At the faculty meeting of April 15, 1829, after hearing a report from Bonnycastle that the number of periodicals received by the library had decreased from forty-two to six, three of which were medical journals, the faculty agreed that "each individual should order one or more journals upon his own responsibility." After two weeks "private perusal" each member would place his periodical in the library "with a hope that the Visitors, when provided with funds for the purpose will secure them permanently for the University." Yet three years later at the October 18, 1832 meeting, the faculty acknowledged that they were "doomed to the humiliating reflection that they are incapable of affording to the youth sent to their institution that instruction which they may attain at other literary establishments." A committee report disclosed that the library had received no "important addition" since 1825, and no periodicals since 1827, despite the "repeated and urgent representations of the faculty to the Board of Visitors." After a report on the state of the library as one of "great disorder and neglect," the faculty in November 1834, tightened regulations for its use and ordered the librarian to renew his bi-monthly report. From then until the end of the decade the library was a topic of discussion at an average of six meetings per session (slightly more than once every two months), as compared with an average of one meeting per session

during the four sessions from 1830-34.[7]

The faculty's final persistent academic concern, the inattentiveness of students in the several schools, was a topic for discussion at seventy different meetings, during the decade 1830-40. The faculty usually investigated student inattentiveness at the first meeting of the month, when monthly circulars, student progress reports, were prepared and mailed to parents and guardians. At this time the professors read into the minutes the names of their students who were inattentive, habitually unprepared, or excessively absent from daily lectures. The faculty sent each unproductive student notice that if his performance did not improve within the next month he would be subject to dismissal. A similar notice was included in the monthly circular to his parent or guardian. The faculty did not regard academic inattentiveness lightly, "experience . . . having shewn that the greater part of the violations of the discipline which came under their cognizance are committed by students who are making no progress in their studies . . ." Therefore Bonnycastle warned, "the Faculty regard it as their duty to use every means of removing such students from the University."[8]

At twenty-five different meetings throughout the decade, usually at the start of each session, the faculty reviewed requests from outside

---

[7]Minutes, meetings of April 15, 1829, November 2, 1832 and November 11, 1834.

[8]Ibid, meeting of March 8, 1837.

instructors who wished to establish schools within the University or its vicinity to teach non-academic subjects and skills to students. These included requests from instructors of dance, gymnastics, fencing, penmanship, drawing, and military tactics. In most cases permission was granted, providing the instructor follow faculty guidelines for tuition and general operation. When appropriate, instructors, such as the military and gymnastics instructors, were provided with rooms in which to live and given permission to use University buildings and fields for their activities. The faculty granted permission to teach non-academic skills for a single session at a time, insuring a yearly review of each instructor's training and activities.

Though important miscellaneous areas such as finance, community relations, and the legislation of school regulations were the purview of the Board of Visitors, the faculty was also involved with these matters. During the latter half of the decade the minutes reveal that the monthly cashiers report of the Bank of Virginia concerning the financial state of the University was laid before the faculty. Fourteen times during the decade the faculty responded to dictates from the Board of Visitors or recommended to the Visitors means for improving functions of the University. Whenever gifts of books or scientific materials were bestowed upon the University, the chairman appointed a member to send an expression of gratitude to the benefactor. Upon the death of a distinguished Visitor or member of the faculty an appropriate eulogy was recorded in the minutes. Finally, at forty-three meetings the faculty

discussed the regulation of University life such as the establishment of extra lecture hours or the creation of additional rules for students.

The regulation of the University as a physical plant, insuring that faculty, students, and employees existed with a modicum of comfort and order, necessitated that the faculty keep in constant contact with the Proctor, his assistants, and the hotelkeepers. Directives from the faculty to the Proctor (the University's business manager, building inspector, and head of security) and reports from the Proctor to the faculty were topics of discussion at seventy-two faculty meetings from 1830-40.

Regarding the inspection of dormitories, hotels, and buildings of the University as "indispensible," an earlier faculty had ordered it "punctually and diligently and rigidly to be made and reported." During this inspection the Proctor investigated relations between students and hotelkeepers and evaluated the efficiency of individual hotelkeepers. Working closely with the chairman, the Proctor reported monthly on the physical condition of the University including a report on assessments against students for damages to University property.[9] Since he controlled student finances, the Proctor, the key link between the University and the local business community, informed the faculty of excessive student debts with local merchants. He also reported students delinquent in payments to the University for board or lodging. As business manager the Proctor compiled estimates of student expenses and reported to the

---

[9]Minutes, meetings of November 19, 1827, and October 23, 1827.

faculty the amount of wood and candles students consumed. As chief security officer for the University the Proctor informed the chairman of any student violations which he or his assistants discovered. When local magistrates summoned recalcitrant students to appear before the Grand Jury or to testify in court, the Proctor assisted in delivering the students.

The role of investigator, assessor of damaged property, keeper of student funds, and faculty informer did not endear the Proctor to the student body. Once late one night, while investigating suspicious noises on the grounds, he was struck from behind by a student assailant. On another occasion Nicholas A. Peay, a student reported for a violation, cornered the assistant proctor and shouted, "You are too damned fond of reporting. I shall do the same thing tomorrow, that I have done today and if you report me for that, I shall flog you," Peay threatened. "I suppose you will report me for what I am now saying," he continued, "if you do, I shall flog you."[10]

Faculty directives to hotelkeepers or student-hotelkeeper disputes, occupied the faculty's attention at seventy-four meetings throughout the decade 1830-40. The hotelkeepers provided food, linen and laundry service, and servant attendance to the students. After numerous student complaints during the first six sessions of the University the faculty passed resolutions setting standards for the services hotelkeepers provided.

---

[10]Minutes, meeting of July 16, 1831.

Still student complaints persisted.

When enough students became aroused over unsatisfactory service, they presented to the chairman of the faculty a petition listing their grievances. With the assistance of the Proctor the chairman investigated student charges and confronted the hotelkeepers. At the next meeting of the faculty a number of the students who signed the petition of grievances would be called to describe conditions in the hotel. The faculty then requested that the hotelkeeper appear and offer excuses or a rebuttal. The hotelkeeper sometimes had the option of citing students whom he believed would refute the claims of the petitioners. The faculty then summoned these students. If, after an analysis of the testimony and any evidence introduced from the proctor's or chairman's investigation, the students' complaints were substantiated, then the faculty admonished or fined each negligent hotelkeeper.

The majority of student complaints concerned the quality of meals, quantity of food served, service at meals, and conditions in dining rooms. After leaving "a Breakfast [at] which any negro in my father's house would grumble," Charles Ellis confided in his diary, "many is time that I have risen from table with my hunger unsatisfied, but truely because I could not get anything eatable."[11] Students specifically complained that the variety and quantity of vegetables was insufficient, often consisting only of rice and potatoes. They often found the butter rancid, the coffee

---

[11]Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., entry May 29, 1835.

wretched, the tea tasteless, meat poorly cooked, and bread heavy. Sometimes servants in the kitchens and dining rooms were critized for being slow or dirty. Poorly washed utensils, cups and plates, soiled tablecloths, and dirty food were likewise cited by dissatisfied student diners. Hotelkeepers who appeared before the faculty either denied the charges or pleaded that circumstances beyond their control such as illness of servants or scarcity of proper vegetables caused dining inconveniences.

Students also complained about laundry service provided by hotelkeepers. According to University regulations hotelkeepers were supposed to wash student laundry, provide clean towels twice a week, and change linen and bed clothes once every two weeks. Student complaints of clothing lost in the laundry or reports that students were sending laundry out of the precincts and paying to have it cleaned by residents of Charlottesville prompted faculty investigations. In 1831, faculty inspections of the dormitories revealed that the bedclothes and linen, having gone unwashed for four or five weeks, were very dirty. When confronted with evidence of neglect, hotelkeepers claimed that bedding was dirty because students jumped on it with shoes on or dragged it off the bedstands to sleep by the fireplace; one stated that in winter it was impossible to wash and dry sheets and towels because they froze; finally, with regard to items missing from student laundry, a hotelkeeper denied the problem, maintaining that students kept inaccurate laundry lists.[12]

---

[12]Minutes, meeting of February 2, 1831.

Occasionally students complained about the impertinence, incompetence, or filthiness of hotelkeepers' servants. According to a faculty regulation each hotelkeeper was to have a minimum of one servant for every ten boarders in his district. However due to age, illness, or temperament servants were often slow or inefficient. Therefore they were often unable to clean rooms and walkways and provide students with necessary services at appropriate and convenient times.

Dorms were supposed to be cleaned daily and scoured once a fortnight, but faculty probes revealed that this was done only once or twice each half-session. Hotelkeepers blamed shortcomings on student illness or student uncooperativeness. Some claimed that students didn't want to vacate the dormitories long enough for the scouring process. One hotelkeeper declared that "the dormitories in his district have not been scoured during the session as they would soon become dirty again."[13]

Despite the time spent processing student requests and overseeing the smooth, daily operation of the University the faculty also managed the laborious and unpleasant task of investigating and punishing student violations of the enactments of the University. On July 18, 1827, the Board of Visitors "resolved that in every instance in which an infraction of any regulation on the part of a student, comes under the notice of a professor, it shall be his special duty to make an official

---

Minutes, meeting of January 24, 1831.

report of the case to the chairman."[14] Undoubtedly the chairman dismissed many cases with nothing more than a verbal admonition, but at 215 of the 348 meetings during the decade 1830-40, chairmen considered violations serious enough to warrant faculty attention.

During John A. G. Davis's first year as chairman of the faculty the greatest number of meetings (thirty-three out of forty-four) in a single session were devoted either partially or mainly to a consideration of student violations, while during Robert Patterson's first year as chairman only nine out of twenty-five meetings involved consideration of student infractions. At 71 per cent of the 108 meetings over which John A. G. Davis presided the faculty dealt with one or more cases of student violations. Violations were topics of discussion at 67 per cent, 61 per cent, 56 per cent, and 46 per cent of the Harrison, Tucker, Bonnycastle and Patterson chaired meetings respectively.

As might be expected students committed the fewest infractions in September. The rowdies had yet to entrench themselves, students were just settling back into the routine of school existence, and perhaps the pledge signed upon matriculation still had a sobering influence. At only four September meetings (11 per cent) during the decade were student infractions a subject for faculty consideration. At 82 per cent of the February meetings the faculty dealt with student violations. By this

---

[14]University of Virginia, Minutes of Meetings of the Rector and the Board of Visitors, meeting of July 18, 1827.

time the session which commenced in September was half completed and students, restless after a winter's confinement, became unusually rowdy. Thereafter the percentage of monthly meetings concerned with student violations dropped slightly, peaking in May (77 per cent), and then declining as preparation for examinations and graduation occupied students' time.

When the chairman discovered or learned of a serious infraction, he usually called a faculty meeting immediately. The chairman or another faculty member presented the details of the case, and then the janitor was dispatched to summon the principals and round up students who witnessed the infraction. Each student appeared before the faculty, who questioned him and recorded his responses in the faculty minutes. If conflicting or ambiguous testimony occurred students were recalled to testify again.

After a hearing, brief or lengthy depending on the gravity or complexity of the offense, the faculty exonerated or penalized the principals and their accomplices. The most serious offenders received sentences of expulsion, but usually the faculty dismissed violators or suspended them for a specified period of time. Those dismissed were expected to return home, while those suspended were interdicted from the premises of the University and required to spend the time of suspension in a local boarding house or tavern, or if convenient in their own home or the home of a relative or friend.

Suspension occasionally backfired. When two or more students

were quarantined together, for several days with nothing to do, in a tavern ten miles from the vigilant faculty and officers of the University, they were exposed to many temptations unavailable within the confines of the college. In late spring of 1837, two students, suspended for ten days for infractions against the uniform law and confined at the same boarding house, rode to Waynesboro "at which place they visited a tavern drank freely and once to intoxication and behaved in a very disorderly and riotous manner."[15]

Besides suspension and dismissal the faculty punished minor infractions and first offenses with verbal reprimands and admonitions. A reprimand was usually accompanied by a letter to the student's parent or guardian explaining the nature of the offense and warning that repetitions of the offense or any other misconduct would be dealt with more severly.

Student violations during the decade 1830-40, can be divided into three categories: infractions of University regulations established for purposes of regimentation, infractions of regulations established to protect the moral fiber of the students and the reputation of the University, and infractions of regulations established to protect the dignity and person of everyone associated with the University. The first category is clearly separate from the subsequent categories, which tend to overlap, but the distinction is nonetheless useful in an examination of faculty

---

[15]Minutes, meeting of June 5, 1837.

concerns during the period.

University regulations established for the purpose of regimentation to insure an orderly daily existence at the University, included the uniform law and the early rising rule. The purpose of the uniform law was to insure that students did not waste large sums of money purchasing fancy clothes to wear to balls, meetings, sermons, and other activities outside the precincts of the University. The gray uniform, which created a thriving tailoring business in Charlottesville, was intended by the Board of Visitors to serve as an equalizer, bringing the scions of great plantations to the same level as their penurious backwoods colleagues. The Visitors' desire though appropriate for a democratic University, both inconvenienced and irritated a large portion of the student body. Charles Ellis illuminated student sentiment when he confessed in his diary "Blazed down to Charlottesville in a new surtout . . . to dress gentlemanly . . . procurs respect for the wearer, and in fine, I have found that a fine dress adds more to the reputation of a person than it seems to be generally supposed."[16]

At seventy-nine meetings throughout the decade 1830-40, the uniform law or violations of the law were topics of faculty concern. John A. G. Davis seems to have been the most zealous enforcer of the code. During his three complete sessions as chairman, forty-one faculty

---

[16]Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 247-250. Rev. Edgar Woods, Albemarle County In Virginia, (Charlottesville: Michie Company, 1901), p. 94. Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., entry May 17, 1835.

meetings, including a single session high of eighteen dealt with the code and its violations.

Faculty members discovered infractions of the code when they saw students wearing non-uniform attire in Charlottesville, at balls, at sermons, or in public places. Often before faculty meetings the chairman discussed the offense with each violator, then a list of offenders was read into the faculty minutes. Sometimes the faculty summoned each violator and listened to excuses. Students complained that uniforms were dirty and being cleaned, were torn and being repaired, or were too threadbare to wear in public. Some students, to assure the faculty that they were not dissipating their funds on clothes or deliberately violating the rule, explained that the non-uniform item was not purchased during the school session, or that they had traveled to Charlottesville without realizing that they were not wearing the uniform.

The second regulation of daily existence particularly odius to the student body was the early rising rule. Students were expected to be up at sunrise and the janitor was supposed to tour the dormitories catching late sleepers and rousting them out of bed. He took names and reported them to the Proctor who reported them to the chairman. Hotelkeepers were supposed to inform the chairman of those students who didn't eat breakfast at the hotel, but an unpalatable breakfast was often the reason for the violation. "This day made out - to get to breakfast when the bell rang, something unusual," Charles Ellis wrote, concluding with the

complaint, "the breakfast not worth the trouble."[17]

Violators of the early rising rule were not zealously punished until John A. G. Davis's first session as chairman. During that time three meetings included discussions of early rising violations. Throughout the decade only sixteen meetings included a listing of offenders of the rule and the prescribing of punishments, but at these meetings the lists were long and included habitual offenders. Punishment for habitual offenders was suspension for a brief period, usually from one to four weeks.

In addition to the uniform and early rising rules a third regulation designed to insure faculty control over the student body was that which required all students to obtain the chairman's permission before leaving the precincts of the University at night or for an extended time period. Students who left without permission were cited as being absent without leave and usually suspended or dismissed. Students usually left the Grounds without permission because required parental approval was not granted. The most unusual case of student absence without leave occurred in January 1840. "On the night of the 4th instant Mr. Smith P. Bankhead left the University, without permission for the purpose of marrying a young lady with whom he eloped, without the consent of his father, as was generally understood."[18]

The second category of student violations examined during faculty

---

[17] Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., entry March 14, 1835.

[18] Minutes, meeting of January 10, 1840.

meetings, consisted of infractions of enactments designed to prevent student excesses or student actions which would damage the University's image in the eyes of the general public, or which would disturb the daily peace of the University. These included drinking and visitation of taverns, gambling and card playing, possession of weapons and firearms, creating noisy disturbances, and preparing or participating in an unauthorized festive entertainment or party.

Student drinking was particularly repugnant to a sober, rather puritanical faculty. During the decade 1830-40, as temperance forces gained strength throughout the nation, student drinking or attendance at a tavern or confectionary constituted a topic of discussion at eighty-eight faculty meetings.

In many cases of suspected student drinking or drunkenness the student or party of students might have escaped detection had they not committed a more boisterous disturbance while intoxicated, or as the students pleaded, "excited by wine." In Charlottesville too much to drink usually resulted in disorderly conduct, destruction of private property, or an assault. At the University drinking parties late at night were often discovered by an officer of the institution attracted by a cacophony of shouts, laughter, and obscene songs, echoing through the colonnades. After the officer gained admittance to the noisy dormitory, he usually had no trouble finding evidence of the debauch. Jugs, containers, and half-filled glasses lay about the room. Sometimes the authority entered just in time to see a pair of coat tails disappear through

the window at the other end of the room. Often an inebriated student lay immobilized upon the bed. Occasionally, rather than ferret out the miscreants himself, a faculty member would note the source of the disturbance and send the Proctor or janitor to collect evidence very early the next morning. Happily savouring one unnoticed drinking bout, Charles Ellis noted in his diary, "went into Lewis' room to drink wine, had a glorious frolick over a couple of bottles; one Sherry, other Madeira, great deal of noise, and uproar." But the inevitable price for a night of such pleasure was paid the following morning: "Feel the effects of last night's debauch most sensibly, a violent headache and nausea."[19]

The faculty believed that card playing was immoral, and they excoriated gambling. During the first years of the University's existence extensive faculty investigations probed the subject of student gambling. Evidence that hotelkeepers participated in gambling was particularly disturbing.

Yet during the decade 1830-40, only fourteen cases of gambling or card playing were discovered. Compared with drinking, card playing was a quiet sport. Usually students were discovered playing cards only when the prowling proctor passed a dormitory and overheard hushed

---

[19] Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., entries April 2, 1835 and March 21, 1835. Of the students Thomas Abernethy writes, "Many of them came from homes where wine and brandy flowed freely, and where playing cards for stakes was not unusual." Remembering this, it is easier to sympathize with student violators. Thomas Perkins Abernethy, Historical Sketch of the University of Virginia, (Richmond: The Dietz Press, Inc., 1948), p. 11.

conversations relating to the game in progress. When confronted by the faculty, students, if they admitted the offense, stated that they were playing for cigars or for cakes and custards at the confectionary. Usually the student in whose room the game was played denied ownership of the deck of cards.

Student possession of firearms, prohibited by the enactments, was a subject of faculty discussion at nineteen meetings during the decade. In almost all cases students were discovered to have firearms in their possession after they discharged the weapon, thus attracting faculty attention. Several times pistols and powder charges were used in student riots and demonstrations on the Lawn. Although one student was arrested for firing a pistol at a passerby on the road to Charlottesville, most firearm violations involved no premeditated attempt to injure or kill.

Unfortunately accidents did occur. One student was accidentally shot by a drunken colleague when a third friend tried to remove the pistol from the drunken student's hand. Charles Ellis wrote that a friend, "whilst playing with a pistol and pulling the cock back - it slipped and went off sending the ball quite through his hand . . . ."[20]

In many student disturbances excessive noise was often a factor. To the faculty the students must have appeared peculiarly adept at making some of the crudest sounds imaginable. These included obscene songs, chants, loud profanities, shouts, shrieks, whoops, gunfire,

---

[20]Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., entry of May 25, 1835.

firecrackers, whistles, bellringing, and the banging of pots and pans. Undoubtedly many noise violations were short and abrupt, as when Charles Ellis was "startled from my reflections by a mighty shout from the Lawn made from no cause it would seem whatever."[21]

The third and final category of student violations included offenses directed at the person, dignity, or honor of other individuals. At fifty-eight different meetings throughout the decade the faculty examined these abuses. Some were merely minor harrassments such as cursing a professor, tying fireworks to a professor's doors, filling an empty ink phial with gunpowder and attempting to set it off in a professor's window, spreading "filth and ordure" on professor's pavillions, and attempting to "smoke" the building in which members of the Board of Visitors were believed to be sleeping. Other offenses were more serious including the stoning of a house in Charlottesville, an entry by drunken students into a private home, and the attempted pitchforking of a professor's dog. The most serious offenses involved assaults by students on townspeople. professors, the proctor, slaves, and other students. Weapons in these affrays included fists, sticks, stones, bricks, horsewhips, canes, dirks, and pistols. After a student committed an offense of this nature, a detailed faculty hearing would ensue. If the faculty deemed the offense one punishable by the civil authorities or out of its jurisdiction, the members

---

[21]Diary of Charles Ellis, Jr., entry of March 14, 1835. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 266-267.

did not penalize the student or students involved. Some of the most vicious assaults went unpunished by the faculty, when there was strong evidence of circumstances in extenuation or mitigation.

These were the concerns of the faculty of the University of Virginia as expressed in the minutes of the meetings of the faculty during the decade 1830-40. While the statistics prove that the faculty spent an enormous amount of time considering student requests and dealing with the administration of daily life at the University, they also indicate that the faculty expended an inordinate amount of time adjudicating cases of student infractions. Had the faculty been less pedantic in these cases, perhaps they could have spent more time in other areas of academic concern such as developing the inadequate library.

Yet our judgment must not be harsh. For the University these were its formative years. Concerned with establishing the University as a viable institution, the faculty enforced to the letter the regulations of the Board of Visitors. As Thomas Abernethy indicates, it was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that "the Faculty quietly ceased to perform police duty and took no cognizance of any but the more serious infractions of discipline."[22] The murder of Professor John A. G. Davis at the beginning of the eighteenth session, more than any other event,

---

[22] Thomas Perkins Abernethy, Historical Sketch of the University of Virginia, (Richmond: The Dietz Press, Inc., 1948), p. 14.

triggered a series of changes in student-faculty relations that developed into the mutual respect and trust exhibited by each group towards the other, as the turbulence of the early years receded in the two decades before the Civil War.

THE SHOOTING ON THE LAWN - NOVEMBER 12, 1840

As the cold, dark evening of Thursday November 12, 1840, settled over the Grounds of the University of Virginia, John A. G. Davis, Professor of Law, Chairman of the Faculty, and Presiding Officer of the Institution, concluded his family's evening prayer service in their home, Pavilion X, on the East Lawn.[1] After bidding good-night to the youngest of his seven children Professor Davis withdrew to his office in the same building to review the next day's lecture. As he perused his lesson plan by flickering candlelight, a solemn stillness pervaded the Lawn outside his window.

Just two nights earlier the same ground, now silent in inky serenity, had been the scene of a massive demonstration, celebrating General Harrison's victory in the recent Presidential election. On that occasion 200 candles lit the arcades, while burning tar barrels and a bon-fire kindled in front of the Rotunda illuminated the Lawn. Euphoric young Whigs cheered the vanquished Democrats, then called on the professors to speak in honor of their joyous victory, rewarding each with loud, prolonged applause.[2] But on the evening of November 12, the Lawn was still.

Professor Davis no doubt hoped the evening would, like most

---

[1]Scrapbook Clipping of Davis Obituary, Alice Chancellor White Papers, University of Virginia.

[2]Richmond Whig and Public Advertiser, November 13, 1840.

evenings during the current session, pass with no untoward occurrence. However, he was apprehensive, for November 12, 1840, was the fourth anniversary of the great student rebellion of 1836. In preceding years the "ill disposed and wild students" commemorated the massive riot by burning tar barrels and creating noisy disturbances on the Lawn.[3] Undoubtedly, as he sat in the restful quiet of his study, his thoughts returned to that unhappy time in 1836, when, for several days, the faculty faced a full-scale revolution.

In 1836, the student military company had resumed its weekly drill at the beginning of the session without making the usual application to the faculty for permission to parade with muskets on the Grounds. When informed that the company must seek faculty permission to continue drill, the commander complied with the regulation and presented a formal application to the faculty. Having received the commander's request, the faculty presented him with seven conditions which the unit had to accept, before they could legitimately drill again. The faculty ordered that no violation of University regulations occur during drill while the students were bearing arms; that the uniform of the University must be worn during drill; that no member of the unit fire his musket on the Lawn; that no student carry a musket except while on parade; that the faculty had the right to dissolve the company; that the muskets be returned to Charlottesville if violations occurred; and that the company, as a body,

---

[3]Letter, John A. Washington to mother, November 20, 1840, University of Virginia.

was responsible for any and all infractions.[4]

Refusing to admit that the faculty had the right to dissolve the company, the incensed members tabled the faculty's stipulations. When informed of this, the faculty ordered the immediate removal of all muskets from the University. Apprised of this, the company resolved that they were not disbanded; that regardless of faculty dictates they would drill as usual; and that every member pledged "his honor to stand by his comrades." Any action the faculty took against a single member would affect all equally.[5]

On November 11, the faculty was informed that the military company intended to parade as usual. Immediately the faculty expelled the entire company. The next day the members of the unit learned of their dismissal, and "a scene of unparalleled disorder and violence was immediately commenced . . . ." The company hoisted its flag atop the Rotunda "and deliberately shot it to shreds." Ringing the Rotunda bell, enraged members of the company attracted other students. A group of angry youths broke for Charlottesville and stole the bell from the town's Episcopal Church. That night, to the accompaniment of a continuous roar of musket fire, the inflamed students assaulted the Pavilions with

---

[4]John A. G. Davis, An Exposition Of The Proceedings The Faculty of The University of Virginia In Relation To The Recent Disturbances At That Institution (Charlottesville: James Alexander, 1836), pp. 8-9.

[5]Ibid, p. 10.

sticks and stones, shattering window panes and cracking blinds and doors. Fearing for their lives, embattled professors and their families cowered in second story apartments, while terror reigned below.[6]

On Sunday the Rotunda bell rang throughout the day; that evening the holocaust began again. Learning that the mob of angry students might force Pavilion doors, the professors armed themselves. Professor Davis, chairman of the faculty, dashed off a hasty letter to T. J. Randolph, requesting his services as both a Visitor and a magistrate. Fortunately the faculty survived the evening with no casualties. On Tuesday, November 15, two magistrates and a sherriff arrived on the Grounds; a contingent of militia surrounded the Rotunda. On November 16, a grand jury investigation of the riot began, and shortly thereafter, classes resumed.[7]

In a circular to the parents of the dismissed students the faculty offered a brief explanation of their decision. Immediately two student circulars appeared, one written by members of the dismissed company, another by student sympathizers still in residence at the University. The students accused the faculty of using specious arguments and

---

[6]Philip Alexander Bruce, History of The University of Virginia 1319-1919, (5 vols.; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921), II, p. 305-306. Davis, Exposition of Proceedings, p. 12. Sixty-four students were dismissed immediately. Later six others withdrew or were dismissed bringing the total to seventy.

[7]Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 306-307. Letter, John A. G. Davis to T. J. Randolph, November 13, 1836, Randolph Family Papers, University of Virginia.

distorting student actions and conversations. They tried to establish the legitimacy of the military company by representing it as the core of the class taught for several weeks each session by the Military Instructor, Captain Alden Partridge.[8]

Meanwhile, importuned by distinguished fathers of some of the dismissed students and swayed by Chairman Davis's plea for clemency, the faculty magnanimously moved to readmit the military company. Since the students were restricted by the pledges "into which they had inconsiderately entered," the faculty could not discriminate against any of those expelled and was compelled to reinstate the entire unit, including the leaders of the riot. The faculty believed the most disorderly students would be either too ashamed or too stubborn to reapply, and indeed this proved to be the case.[9]

To counter public misconceptions created by the student circulars and subsequent readmission of the dismissed students, Davis, in December, issued a detailed pamphlet, explaining the faculty's actions during the preceding months. He blasted student allegations of faculty deception by demonstrating that the military company and the Military Instructor's

---

[8]Davis, Exposition of Proceedings, p. 3. Circular of the Students of The University of Virginia, In Answer To The Circular of the Faculty, In Regard To The Dismission of Seventy-Two Students, (Charlottesville: James Alexander, 1836).

[9]Davis, Exposition of Proceedings, p. 13. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, pp. 307-308. The pledges refer to the oath taken by each student that punishment for one meant punishment for all.

class were two autonomous units. At least one-half of the company was not enrolled in the legitimate course of the Military Instructor. Deprecating the students' arguments as "specimens of rash assertion and inconclusive reasoning," Davis dismissed the charges of faculty disingenuousness.[10]

Next, Davis sought to allay public apprehensions that the faculty was submitting to student and parental pressure by readmitting those dismissed. Davis reasoned that readmission represented no loss of faculty authority. The company was disbanded and the muskets safely stored in Charlottesville. Readmission was permitted only after a student affirmed that he had not participated in the riot, or after he had made atonement for his misdeeds. Punishing law-abiding students who merely entered into a rash oath benefited no one. In conclusion Mr. Davis wrote,

> If any shall think that in coming to this resolution the Faculty acted with too much clemency, it is hoped that none will fail to see in it an evidence of moderation, and of considerate regard for the interests of the students as well as of the institution, very inconsistent with that arrogant and vindictive spirit which has been ascribed to them.[11]

Professor Davis was particularly disturbed by the subsequent annual celebration of the riot, because he thought, quite rightly, that it represented an unjust defiance of legitimate and benevolent authority.

---

[10]Davis, Exposition of Proceedings, pp. 5, 11.

[11]Ibid., p. 13. Though the faculty considered the oath rash, they still respected it. The only solution was total amnesty.

After the rebellion of 1836, despite the stiff resistance of Professor Emmet and other faculty members, Davis adamantly insisted that the dismissed students be reinstated when each performed a proper penance.[12] Each annual commemorative demonstration made a mockery of his beneficence.

However on November 12, 1840, Professor Davis had reason to believe the annual disruption would not occur. Almost all who were students at the time or active in the disturbances of 1836, had graduated. Last year rainy weather hampered the occurrence of "the usual orgies," thus disrupting the tradition of celebration.[13] But most importantly the young men at the University in 1840, seemed more serious and diligent than those in any other session. The Lawn, now quiet on this usually most revelrous of nights, silently encouraged this assumption.

Suddenly a burst of gun fire, followed by boisterous shouting, shattered the nocturnal stillness of the Lawn. In an instant Professor Davis was on his feet. Leaving his study, he picked up his hat and hastened out of Pavilion X, his home and office. As he stepped outside the front door, he paused to ask his thirteen-year old servant, Charles, if he had seen which way the perpetrators of the disturbance had gone. Charles motioned toward the Rotunda; Professor Davis stepped out into

---

[12] Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 307.

[13] Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Brother, November 15, 1840, Dabney Family Papers, University of Virginia.

the darkness to discharge his responsibility as Presiding Officer of the Institution.[14]

At the north end of the Lawn near the Rotunda two disguised figures constituted the whole of the demonstration. One, a short fellow with a funny gait, Joseph G. Semmes, an eighteen year old from Washington County, Georgia, was disguised in long white underwear worn over his suit. A calico mask concealed his face. His companion, a seventeen year old South Carolinian, William Kincaid, was disguised in a drab suit. He had blackened his face to hide his features. Aided by night's darkness their disguises were so effective, "that their most intimate friends did not recognize them."[15] For ten or fifteen minutes the disguised duo ran about the Lawn, stopping before each professor's door to fire blank cartridges and shriek viciously. Despite the great din they attracted none of their colleagues.

A group of their fellow students watched quietly under the arcade near the alley separating Pavilions VI and VIII, the homes of Professors Rogers and Bonnycastle. When the two demonstrators passed this group, Kincaid hailed them, walked over, conversed and shook hands with them. As he turned to rejoin his small companion and carry on the demonstration, one of the group stepped forth and warned, "'Take care of yourselves for Mr. Davis has just come out of the house to catch you.'"

---

[14]John S. Patton, Jefferson, Cabell and the University of Virginia, (New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1906), p. 155.

[15]Letter, Robert L. Dabney, November 15, 1840. Letter, Charles Eversfield to Mother, November 23, 1840, University of Virginia.

"'We care not for Davis'" snarled the small one dressed in white, and they continued down the Lawn.[16]

Stopping in front of Pavilion VIII, Bonnycastle's house, the disguised students reloaded their pistols with powder charges. Semmes paused momentarily, then from his pocket he drew a rifle ball. He dropped the ball into his pistol. Striking the gun against the wall of Bonnycastle's house, he rammed the bullet into the gun. Kincaid stood fast, discharged his load, and watched, as Semmes walked down the Lawn to harass the occupants of Pavilion X.[17] There Professor Davis stood, waiting to protect the authority of his office and the sanctity of his home.

John A. G. Davis had risked personal injury before while attempting to quell disturbances and restore order on the Lawn. In 1831, with Professors Emmet and Patterson he had faced a barrage of stones, thrown by angry students protesting the University's uniform law. As chairman of the faculty he had ridden out the storm in 1836, and again in 1838, when student violence threatened to disrupt the University.[18] No puny prankster, hidden by a ludicrous calico mask, intimidated him who had survived these vicious insurrections.

---

[16] Letter, Hunter H. Marshall to William C. Carrington, November 19, 1840, University of Virginia. Letter, Robert L. Dabney, November 15, 1840.

[17] Letter, Hunter H. Marshall, November 19, 1840.

[18] In 1838, the students rioted when refused permission to celebrate Mr. Jefferson's birthday with a ball. Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 301, 308.

As Semmes drew near, Mr. Davis stood motionless beside a pillar of the portico. Suddenly he leaped out from the pillar's cover, grabbing at the calico mask. He missed. The two collided momentarily, then Semmes broke loose. He retreated several paces across the Lawn; Davis did not pursue. For a split second they stood face to face, two yards apart. Semmes raised the pistol, aimed, and fired pointblank. Slamming into Davis's midsection, the pistol ball felled the astonished professor. Semmes turned and ran to the edge of the Lawn, paused, glanced back once more, then disappeared into the bushes and the night.[19]

In the cover of the arcade, above Pavilion X, Kincaid had watched the pair. Then suddenly Semmes was out of sight, his profile blocked from Kincaid's view by a column of the portico. But he had seen the powder flash and heard the pistol shot crack and echo through the colonnade.

Kincaid spun around and hastened up the Lawn. He passed the unsuspecting students standing in the alley between Roger's and Bonnycastle's homes. "'What happened?'", one called out. "'Somebody shot!'", was Kincaid's breathless reply. The students assumed a blank had been discharged and did not investigate.[20] Professor Davis lay in agony, unassisted on the Lawn.

---

[19]Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840.

[20]Ibid. As Marshall demonstrates, Kincaid's reply was crucial. He did not say, "Somebody was shot!" Had he done so the students would have been alerted sooner.

At the same instant that Semmes was retreating through the bushes on the edge of the Lawn, and Kincaid was breathlessly running up the East Lawn, young Charles, the servant boy, bolted from the front door of Pavilion X. Charles had witnessed the shooting, while crouching behind some bushes on the side of the Davis residence. After the shot was fired, Charles heard a painful groan, raced to the source of the sound and found his master on the ground. "'Charles I am shot - go and get somebody!'" gasped the stricken Davis. Charles raced back into Pavilion X. He bumped into his mother and informed her of the situation. Wisely, she commanded her son to go across the Lawn and bring Mrs. Tucker, the wife of George Tucker, Professor of Moral Philosophy. Charles tore across the Lawn, glancing at the wounded Davis as he passed. Gasping for breath, he banged on the door of the Tucker home. Professor Tucker opened the door and "called for his wife in great agitation."[21]

While Charles performed his vital errand, a student, suspecting that something was amiss, left the room of Ino Casker, a student who lived just above Pavilion X. Opening the door,he heard a low groan for help and immediately raced to the scene on the lower Lawn. At the same time several other students responding to cries for help, gathered around Professor Davis. Gently the students lifted the professor and carried him to his doorstep. They laid him in the downstairs hallway

---

[21]Recollections of Miss Lucy Minor Davis, p. 4, Fishburne Family Papers, University of Virginia.

of Pavilion X, "hesitating to take him upstairs until the news should be broken to his wife." Meanwhile Mrs. Tucker, following the excited Charles, hurried across the Lawn to Pavilion X. They passed the spot where Mr. Davis fell and made their way through the curious crowd of students at the Davis door. By now a grief-stricken Mrs. Davis had been informed of the shooting, so the students carried the Professor upstairs to a back bedroom called "The Lodging Room."[22]

Next the physicians, Dr. James L. Cabell and Dr. Henry Howard, arrived and began examining the wound. They discovered that the pistol ball had entered the abdomen below the navel, but labored for one hour to find its resting place. Anticipating the worst, fearing that the bullet had pierced the stomach, the doctors were relieved to locate the ball in the hip almost a foot from the mouth of the wound. However, due to the seriousness of the wound and the sensitivity of the location of the bullet, the doctors decided that an operation to extract it would be too hazardous. Nevertheless they were optimistic, predicting a painful but successful recovery. But as Robert Dabney, a student, wrote the day after the shooting, "Still you may conceive that a wound a foot in extent, made by a rifle barreled pistol passing through the groin and in the neighborhood of several large nerves and arteries must be extremely dangerous and painful."[23]

---

[22]Recollections of Miss Lucy Minor, p. 5.

[23]Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Brother, November 13, 1840.

Outside on the Lawn and beneath the arcade, shocked students moved aimlessly between Pavilion X and Ino Casker's room. So stunned were the students by the suddenness of the shooting that for a time no thought was given to pursuit. Clustered in small groups, whispering earnestly, receiving bits and pieces of information from those first on the scene, the dazed and horror stricken community pieced together the tragic night's events. As the news of the shooting spread over the Grounds and drifted out to boarding houses between the University and Charlottesville more and more students filled the Lawn. Anxious students stood meekly outside Pavilion X, earnestly praying for the recovery of their wounded professor. Among the crowd outside the Davis home stood a short fellow from Georgia, paying close attention "to every word that was uttered concerning the possible effect of the shot."[24] It was Joseph Semmes.

Immediately after he had fled the Lawn, Semmes ran around the Lawn to the East Range where he lived, ripped off his disguise, cleaned himself, and in a few minutes had mingled into the crowd in front of Pavilion X. Hunter Marshall noticed his unusual attentiveness, and several students, including Marshall and Frank Rives, suspected Semmes; but in the confused excitement of that November night they kept their

---

[24] Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840.

suspicions secret.[25]

As the night wore on, and it became apparent that Professor Davis, though in great pain, would survive, the students grew less apprehensive. Confusion changed to anger, and anger turned to firm resolve. Whispering groups of anxious students blended into one hushed mass as student leaders took command. Someone had to act and act decisively. The faculty was paralyzed; the townspeople were afraid.[26] On that bleak November night the student body resolved to act alone.

---

[25]Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840. The confusion of the night of November 12, 1840 manifested itself in later accounts of the incident. On January 2, 1909 an alumnus of the University, T. J. Taylor wrote the editor of Harper's Weekly about a conversation he had with a Colonel J. M. Rutland in 1865. Quoting Rutland, Taylor writes "'I was there when Professor Davis was killed. Joe Semmes, the man that stabbed Professor Davis, came into my room immediately afterwards, the knife in his hand, and his hand and the knife bloody, and washed them in my wash bowl, and told me all about it. He said Professor D. attempted to take the mask off his face and he stabbed him to prevent it.' He [Rutland] added, 'It was a small pocket-knife, the blade not more than three inches long.'"

Twenty-five years had lapsed between the shooting and Rutland's revelation to Taylor. Since neither students nor faculty members mentioned a knife at the time of the incident, we can assume that Colonel Rutland was mistaken in his remembrance. He surely was mistaken when Taylor "asked him if he was a witness at the trial. He said no, that no one knew that he knew anything about the affair, he was not summoned and he did not say anything about it . . . ." Minute Book 10 of the Albemarle County General Court shows that J. M. Rutland was one of two witnesses scheduled to appear on behalf of Semmes.

T. J. Taylor's letter to the editor of Harper's Weekly, January 2, 1909, p. 6, is cited in Frank Lloyd Call, II, "John Anthony Gardner Davis 1802-1840 Murder of A University of Virginia Professor" (unpublished term paper, University of Virginia) located in the Bernard Mayo Collection of Historical Material, University of Virginia.

[26]Letter, John Washington, November 20, 1840.

Someone spoke up and claimed he knew who shot Professor Davis, but would not tell the student body as a group for fear of vigilante justice. At length he consented to give the name to a committee of students. However, each one had to give his word of honor to leave the suspect physically unharmed. A committee was immediately elected, and the members drew the informer aside. He told them the assailant was William Kincaid. Charles Eversfield, a committee member, acknowledged that the name "was not generally known and if it had been the person would not have lived many minutes longer."[27]

After Semmes fired the shot, Kincaid had dashed up the East Arcade of the Lawn. He ran to a small stream some distance away and washed the black make-up from his face. Then he returned to his room, hid his suit of drab, and changed into other clothes. There, in his room the committee found him and pressed their accusation.

Kincaid confessed that he had taken part in the demonstration, but swore that he was not Professor Davis's assailant. To prove the veracity of his statement he produced the suit of drab from its hiding place. Knowing that the figure in white had fired the shot, the committee accepted Kincaid's statement of innocence and requested that he disclose to them the identity of his companion, the assailant. Kincaid refused. Firmly the committee commanded him, on his word of honor, to remain upon the premises. Kincaid promised he would stay. The committee

---

[27]Letter, Charles Eversfield, November 23, 1840.

then sent a man to Charlottesville to bring a magistrate, who could legally compel Kincaid to disclose the assailant's identity.[28]

On Friday November 13, the sombre student body assembled in the Rotunda. With J. L. Orr presiding, four resolutions prepared by Frank Rives were presented and unanimously adopted. The student body resolved that they regretted the shooting and wished Mr. Davis a speedy recovery; that they would "use every possible exertion to find out the perpetrator of the act;" that they "viewed the author of the outrageous crime as a base assassin;" and lastly, that their resolutions should be published in the Collegian and in the Charlottesville, Richmond, and Staunton newspapers.[29] Arming themselves the grim, determined student body then proceeded with their investigation. John Washington described the scene:

> The laws of the University were for the time suspended, it was tacitly understood if not publickly (sic) proclaimed that no notice would be taken of those who violated them, yet there was no excess, men of the most excitable temperament, armed to the teeth, came daily in collision, but every one felt it to be a sacred duty to forbear.[30]

Meanwhile the frightened Kincaid, breaking his pledge to his classmates, escaped the Grounds and went to the boarding house of a man named Perrow. Two friends of Semmes, Ashford and Peters,

---

[28]Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840.

[29]An Address to the Public Unanimously Adopted by the Students of the University of Virginia (n. p., n. d.), pp. 1-2.

[30]Letter, John Washington, November 20, 1840.

met Kincaid there and sequestered him in the woods, securing him from further questioning. When Kincaid's absence was discovered the students immediately reacted. According to Robert E. Withers a guard was placed around Perrow's boarding house in case Kincaid tried to return there from the woods. "Committees were sent to the hotels on the various roads where the stages stopped for meals," wrote Withers, "in the expectation that the missing man might attempt to escape by boarding these conveyances at these distant points." With Warwick N. Miller, a student from Kentucky, Withers dashed "fifteen miles on horseback in the afternoon to the Stage House on the Staunton turnpike, where supper was taken by the passengers . . ." "But when the stage arrived," wrote Withers, "we saw that the man that we sought was not among them and we had our long ride for nothing."[31]

While committees of students galloped over the main roads in search of Kincaid, those remaining at the University moved to verify the suspicion that Joseph Semmes was Professor Davis's assailant. Billy Pope, a student, remembered that earlier he had loaned Semmes a pistol with one ball which was "not round owing to a deficiency of lead when molded." Pope cornered Semmes and demanded that he return the pistol and the ball. Semmes replied that he had loaned it to someone else, but refused to identify that person. The students decided that this

---

[31]Robert Enoch Withers, Autobiography of an Octogenarian (Roanoke: The Stone Printing & Mgf. Co. Press, 1907), p. 71-72. Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840.

warranted his detention and sent for a magistrate. The magistrate arrived from Charlottesville and told Semmes to swear on the Bible that he had no part in the incident. Semmes refused to take an oath, stating that "he was an aethiest and did not believe the Bible." The magistrate then requested that Semmes raise his right hand and affirm that he was innocent of wrongdoing. Semmes complied, affirming that he had no knowledge of the shooting.[32]

Robert Dabney, Hunter Marshall, Frank Rives and others believed that Semmes was lying. Dabney had talked with Davis's two oldest sons immediately after the shooting and gathered that the wounded professor believed Semmes was the assailant. Knowing that Professor Davis had an uncanny ability to remember names, faces, and mannerisms, Dabney realized that the perceptive man could have recognized Semmes, even with a disguise, by his "peculiar gait and uncommonly small stature." Despite his persistent denials the students felt that the circumstantial evidence of the missing pistol plus Semmes diminuitive size was strong enough to warrant his appearance before an Examining Court. Since all the law enforcement officers were in pursuit of the fugitive Kincaid, Robert Dabney and two classmates arrested Semmes themselves.[33]

In the "Lodging Room" in Pavilion X Professor Davis, having suffered through a painful night, seemed much improved and was in good

---

[32]Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840.

[33]Letter, Robert L. Dabney, November 15, 1840.

spirits. The doctors were more optimistic than ever and hoped that he would be back on his feet in two or three weeks. The Charlottesville Advocate happily reported, "it affords the numerous friends of Mr. Davis in this community infinite pleasure to learn that the wound is not considered mortal."[34]

On Saturday November 14, the Examining Court, to determine if sufficient evidence existed to try Joseph Semmes for the shooting of John A. G. Davis, was called to order. The students feared the evidence was insufficient, but as the hearing continued stronger evidence was introduced.

One of the first witnesses to testify was Professor Davis's young nephew, Boothe. Boothe, as well as Charles, the servant boy, had observed the shooting from the doorway of Pavilion X. Taking the witness stand, the little boy recounted the struggle between his uncle and the figure in white. In his testimony he stated that the assailant's arm was crippled. Several days before the incident Semmes had sprained his wrist and had not regained full use of his left arm. A student testified that the cap worn by the figure in white matched one worn by Semmes a night or so before the shooting while he was engaged "in a drunken frolick (sic)."

During the first day of the Examining Court many witnesses testfied; the evidence mounted as the afternoon wore on. The cocky Semmes

---

[34]Charlottesville Advocate, November 13, 1840. Reprinted in Richmond Enquirer, November 17, 1840.

seemed unafraid and unconcerned. When informed the doctors would not remove the bullet, Semmes almost confessed his crime. "'Well by God, I'm safe,'" he murmured.[35]

In the Rotunda the student body at another meeting "made every small man in college prove himself innocent." One by one each little man came forth, until judged innocent by his peers. When all were cleared the group resolved to get Kincaid.[36]

Someone in Charlottesville had cryptically announced that "a rope a thousand yards long would encircle Kincaid." The Students elected a committee of four to go to Charlottesville, find this person, learn the meaning of his cryptic phrase, then locate William Kincaid and bring him to the court. The remainder of the student body would remain in place, until the four returned.[37]

Buck Simms, B. F. White, and two others started out on foot for Charlottesville. Suddenly about a mile from the University in a field just west of the Midway Hotel, they spotted Kincaid. They followed him, purposefully calling him by another name so as not to arouse his suspicion. Kincaid made no response. He was on his way to Perrow's house. When he entered the building the committee of four was close behind him. They apprehended him at Perrow's with no resistance on his part, then turned him over to the authorities.[38]

---

[35]Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840.

[36]Ibid.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Ibid.

Meanwhile in Pavilion X at noon on Saturday, Professor Davis's condition was deteriorating. Having located the bullet and cleaned the wound, the doctors had exhausted all their remedies but prayer. Suddenly, late in the afternoon Mrs. Davis burst into hysterical sobs, when the odor of "some drug she had only connected with desperate cases" reached her room.[39] The chaplain was summoned to the "Lodging Room."

The University chaplain, Reverend William S. White, approached Professor Davis's bedside. Around the bed stood the saddened members of the faculty and Mr. Davis's oldest sons. Gently, the chaplain asked the dying man if he could see him. "'Oh, yes,'" was the faint reply.

Reverend White told Mr. Davis that he was probably going to die and questioned, "'Can you say from the heart, thy will be done.'"

"'Certainly,'" Davis answered.

"'Is your spirit in the righteousness of Jesus Christ?'"

"'No other trust,'" was the faint but firm response.

Then Professor Davis motioned to his eldest son, Eugene. Kneeling beside the bed, Eugene, a student at the University, received his father's final blessing. As Reverend White laid Professor Davis's hand upon Eugene's bowed head, he noticed it was growing cold. At that moment the grief-stricken Mrs. Davis in another room sent for Reverend White. As he left the bedside the chaplain heard Professor Davis call for his colleagues and make "a vigourous effort to address them."

---

[39]Lucy Minor Davis Recollections, p. 5.

Grasping the hand of Professor Harrison he softly uttered, "'Promise - trust - you all too.'"

"'You mean that the promises of God's word are your trust and should be ours too?'" asked Professor Harrison.

Professor Davis nodded, yes, then whispered, "'Good-By.'"

John Staige, his second son now came forward and knelt beside the bed. "'Where's my son,'" asked Mr. Davis. As the young man, only fourteen years old, knelt beside the bed, a weeping professor placed Mr. Davis's limp, cold hand on John Staige's head. With intense effort Mr. Davis mouthed the words "Bless you," but he made no sound. A minute later, at five o'clock, he breathed no more.[40] Immediately the surgeons cut into the body and removed the pistol ball. Upon extraction the bullet revealed a flaw identical to that described by Pope the day before. The bullet was rushed to the court and presented in evidence. Semmes now charged with murder was put under tighter custody.

The next day, Sunday, November 15, the Examining Court continued. William Kincaid took the stand and made "a very clear statement." He told the hushed court that the figure in white was Semmes, and that he was Semmes' companion in the disturbance. He testified that he saw Semmes walk down the arcade to Pavilion X and wrestle momentarily with Davis. However, he could not swear that Semmes fired the shot

---

[40]Reverend William S. White, Funeral sermon of John A. G. Davis, Terrell - Carr Family Papers, University of Virginia. The entire death bed scene recounted above is taken from this sermon.

"on account of the pillar which interrupted his view." He did admit that he heard the gun discharge and saw a powder flash. Kincaid's statement, combined with little Boothe's testimony of the day before, and coupled with the flawed bullet, seemed sufficient to condemn Semmes to the gallows. His trial date was set for November 24, and confinement in the local jail sobered him somewhat. Kincaid was placed on five thousand dollars bond to assure his presence as a witness.[41]

On Monday, November 16, a cold, bleak day, Professor Davis's funeral service was held in the Rotunda. A thick blanket of snow covered the Grounds, while the grey sky hung like a pall over the University. Despite the snow a large crowd of mourners gathered in the Rotunda. Friends, relatives, and colleagues came quietly to bid farewell to John A. G. Davis.

Reverend White delivered an eloquent, moving funeral oration. The chaplain sought to convey to the mourners the feeling of Christian cheerfulness with which Professor Davis met his fate. Speaking of his final hour he recounted the Professor's merciful charity as he forgave his slayer. Finally, he told the weeping audience of Mrs. Davis's sublime magnanimity. The day before with tear-streaked cheeks the widow had turned to him and said, "'I have one request to make of you, and that is that you will do all you can to save the young man's life, and in

---

[41] Letter, Hunter Marshall, November 19, 1840. One William D. Fitch went Kincaid's bond according to Minute Book 10, Albemarle County General Court.

the meantime tell him I heartily and freely forgive him.'" The service deeply moved the mourning assembly. Men, women and children "were bathed in tears" from the beginning to the end.[42]

At the conclusion of the sermon, the coffin, held by friends and colleagues, was carried slowly down the Lawn. On the doorstep of Pavilion X six year old Elizabeth and eight-year old Careyetta watched the coffin of their father, as it was borne away. Upstairs Mrs. Davis "in a state of frantic grief," sat with six month old Lucy. Solemnly the coffin was lifted into the black draped hearse and driven to the University cemetery, Professor Davis's final resting place. Creaking slowly through the snow the dark line of sombre carriages returned to the University after the burial. Two stopped behind Pavilion X, picked up the Davis family and moved them to their country home.[43]

After the burial the weary student body and the faculty trudged

---

[42]White, Funeral Sermon. Rev. William S. White, D. D., And His Times, 1800-1873, An Autobiography, ed. by Rev. H. M. White, D. D. (Richmond: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1891), p. 109. Hunter Marshall writes that Mrs. Davis, who was pregnant at the time, was so perturbed by the shooting that she miscarried. Marshall states that the child was buried in Davis's arms.

[43]Lucy Minor Davis Recollections, p. 5. Though Mrs. Davis never fully recovered from her husband's death, the spirit of John A. G. Davis's good works endured in the lives of his sons. Eugene, a lawyer and farmer, constantly devoted his time and resources to charitable causes, development of Sunday Schools, and temperance reform. John Staige became a distinguished doctor and professor of medicine at the University of Virginia. Dabney C. Terrell and Richard Terrell both became respected Episcopal ministers. Scrapbook Clippings of Davis Family Obituaries, Alice Chancellor White Papers, University of Virginia.

back up the snow-covered Lawn to the Rotunda. There each group met separately to pass resolutions in final tribute to John A. G. Davis. The students, standing in Professor Davis's classroom, with J. W. Preston presiding, appointed a committee to draft appropriate resolutions. The committee returned with a moving preamble and five resolutions which were unanimously adopted. They resolved that with Professor Davis's death the world had lost a valued human being; that the University had lost one of its "surest stays;" that they expressed sympathy to the family for their loss; that they would wear a badge of mourning for three months; and that a record of their meeting be delivered to Mrs. Davis and the newspapers.

The Law Class, the student group which sustained the greatest loss, passed unanimously four resolutions drawn by William Bayly of Accomack. "In the fulness of a sympathy which language is incapable of expressing" the group resolved that they especially lamented the loss of Professor Davis; that they would "use all lawful means" to convict his killer; that they expressed condolences to the Davis Family and friends; and that they would wear the badge of mourning throughout the remainder of the session.

The shaken faculty of the University, mourning the loss of their chairman, unanimously adopted three resolutions presented by Professor Tucker. The faculty felt obligated to see that justice was done; they found consolation in the students' actions during these despairing times;

and they resolved to wear the badge of mourning sixty days.[44]

Several days later a student committee of sixteen gathered these three sets of resolutions, added the resolutions from the student body's meeting of November 13, and published them in pamphlet form for public distribution. The students feared that malicious rumors and wild exaggerations would arouse the citizenry already prejudiced against the student body for its past excesses. Appealing for a calm, dispassionate consideration of the condition of the University, the students called upon the friends and alumni of the institution to come to its aid during these troubled times. Trumpeting their own success in apprehending the assailant, his accomplice in the riot, and all of the important evidence, the students hoped to cleanse their somewhat tarnished image.[45]

Semmes's trial scheduled for November 24, was postponed at the request of counsel, and on December 7, it was postponed once more. The defense claimed that it was waiting for a special witness. Some believed Semmes's lawyers used the delays to persuade key witnesses not to testify[46] and to let public passions cool.

---

[44] An Address to the Public Unanimously Adopted by the Students of the University of Virginia, (n. p., n. d.), pp. 2-4, 5-8.

[45] Ibid., pp. 1-3. Throughout the ordeal the students received constant praise and support in the press. Typical is this statement from the Fredericksburg Political Arena, November 24, 1840. "With all this eager zeal to purify themselves and their institution from every trace of so foul a stain, and to have justice done upon the ruthless destroyer of their beloved friend and instructor, the students have manifested a moderation and a good order, equal to any which could have been showed by the most staid citizen."

[46] Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Brother, December 7, 1840.

During this time three of Semmes's relatives arrived in Charlottesville. Suddenly two key witnesses for the prosecution disappeared. One was William Kincaid, who thus forfeited the five thousand dollar bond. The other was a student to whom Semmes had confessed the shooting. This student left the morning after a discussion with Leigh, Lyons, Gilmer, and Rives, attorneys for the defense. They allegedly played upon his feelings, admonishing him to leave unless he wished to have it on his conscience that his testimony sent a friend and classmate to the gallows.[47]

With two key witnesses thus removed the defense was ready to proceed, but at the January session of the County Court the prosecution requested a continuance, which was granted. By February despite the continued absence of Kincaid both sides were ready to proceed. Early on the morning of February 2, 1841, the Albemarle County courthouse was packed with students and townspeople. Thomas Preston, a law student, described the mood of the gathering:

> Never have I witnessed such deep and intense interest - as seemed to prevail - the court house was crowded at an early hour of the day and strong and confident were the hopes of many

---

[47] Letter, Robert L. Dabney, December 7, 1840. Gessner Harrison wrote his father that it was rumored that Harmon Gilmer, one of Semmes's attorneys, persuaded Henry C. Chambers, a witness for the prosecution, to leave town. Harrison expressed disgust at the actions of local townspeople who were allegedly providing Semmes with "nice things for his table." Letter, Gessner Harrison to Peachey Harrison, December 17, 1840. Tucker-Harrison-Smith Papers, University of Virginia.

> that the accused would be discharged - sympathy for the orphan and stranger and friendless youth before them swelled the bosom of all who had a heart to feel, while his noble countenance pale, but not subdued by confinement, or the gaze of hundreds, and often moistened by tears as his counsel spoke of his distant home and friends, pleaded his innocence and caused several to whisper that such a mere boy or stripling could not have murdered Mr. Davis.[48]

In the course of the trial testimony similar to that given before the original Examining Court was recounted. Student testimony revealed that Semmes had on several occasions expressed a desire to celebrate the anniversary of the riot of 1836, and had made several unsuccessful attempts to enlist others in his demonstration. Students also stated that Semmes was seen in a student's room at about eight o'clock on the evening of the shooting loading a pistol and that forty-five minutes later he borrowed a pistol and an imperfect ball from another student.

An abundance of circumstantial evidence pointed to Semmes, but only Kincaid could positively identify him as the figure in white. The defense's ploy of continued delay was working. Discrepancies appeared in the testimony of some witnesses. The passage of time was distorting memories even of such an extraordinary event as the shooting on the Lawn. On February 3, at the conclusion of the attorneys' summations

---

[48]Letter, Thomas W. Preston to Father, February 3, 1841, Virginia Hist. Society, Richmond. Albemarle County Clerks Office, Minute Book 10, January 11, 1841, February 2-3, 1841.

the Court decided to pass the case on to the Circuit Superior Court.[49]

In May defense attorneys asked Circuit Court Judge Lucas Thompson for a continuance "alledging that [Semmes's] indisposition was such as would render it hazardous to his life to undergo a protracted trial." After hearing testimony from Drs. Charles Carter, Harden Massie, and James L. Jones, Judge Thompson granted the continuance until October 11.[50]

Although continued delay allowed passions to cool (one student reported that some of his classmates hoped Semmes would not hang), the sudden reappearance of William Kincaid jeopardized defense hopes for acquittal. On May 12, Semmes applied for bail "upon the ground of his present extreme indisposition and the condition of the jail in which he is confined." The court conducted an examination of "sundry witnesses" but postponed decision until the next day when Judge Thompson overruled the plea.[51]

Later in the day a special commission to inspect the jail reported

---

[49]Letter, Thomas W. Preston to Father, February 3, 1841. Albemarle County Clerk's Office, Minute Book 10, January 11, 1841, February 2-3, 1841. Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Brother, February 23, 1841. In a shorter more passionately biased account Robert Dabney in a letter to his mother on February 8, 1841, praised the prosecutor, Lucian Minor and Attorney General Baxter, while he denigrated defense arguments as "sophestries, chicaneries, and lies.

[50]Law Orders, May 11, 1841.

[51]Letter, G. Francis Dabney to Mother, February 8, 1841. Law Orders, May 12-13, 1841.

to Judge Thompson. After hearing the commission's report and studying a grand jury indictment Thompson ordered William Watson, the jailor for the County of Albemarle, removed from office and fined thirty dollars. Among the charges against Watson were "permitting the use of wine and ardent spirits in the room of Joseph G. Semmes" and "permitting the introduction into the room of Joseph G. Semmes . . . women of loose character."[52]

During the following month Semmes's condition steadily worsened. His attorneys again asked the Court for bail. Acknowledging that Semmes "had contracted a painful and dangerous disease since his confinement in jail which disease was produced in consequence of his having been for a long time confined in a very small, damp, and very badly ventilated room" and that the disease had either become "extremely aggravated" or that Semmes had contracted a new disease, Judge Thompson reversed his previous ruling and granted Semmes bail. On July 8, 1841, Semmes was released after Reuben Grigsby and Benjamin F. Porter of Rockbridge County and William Porter of Orange County agreed to guarantee Semmes's twenty-five thousand dollars bail. Shortly thereafter Joseph Semmes disappeared. Apparently the abject youth, unable to appease his conscience, committed suicide. On May 11, 1842, John H. Peyton, attorney for Semmes, Grigsby and Porter, relinquished to the Court

---

[52]Law Orders, May 13, 1841.

the twenty-five thousand dollars bail.[53]

For a greatwhile after the tragedy on the Lawn the University community lived in a bewildered state of despair and disillusionment. The doleful bleakness of the winter countryside, the chilling, biting winter wind, intensified the melancholy mood pervading the Grounds. Eight days after the incident a student wrote his mother, "everyone seems to have lost the power of application to study and it seems to me to be by far the best plan that many can pursue is (sic) to leave at once . . . ." The faculty seemed listless, passive, ineffective asking "the advice and counsel of every student before they take any step of consequence." Members of the law class, disheartened by so great a loss, made plans to study elsewhere.[54]

Unquestionably the law class was momentarily the most damaged group in the University. When John A. G. Davis became Professor of Law upon the resignation of Judge Lomax in 1830, the class and the professor's salary were small. Under Mr. Davis's careful tutelage the Law School developed into one of national prominence. At his death the salary was a comfortable four thousand dollars a year with a home and

---

[53]Law Orders, July 7-8, 1841, October 11, 1841, May 10, 1842, May 13, 1842. There are several different accounts of Semmes's ultimate fate. Most sources list suicide but the location varies from Paris to Georgia to Texas. It is highly probable that disease killed him or drove him to suicide.

[54]Letter, John Washington, November 20, 1840.

free tuition for the professor's sons included.[55]

The Board of Visitors temporarily appointed a young man, Nathaniel Howard, to fill the vacancy left by Mr. Davis. At the beginning of the next session the Visitors named Judge Henry St. George Tucker, a distinguished Virginian, to the chair. He was an able lecturer, well-liked by the students.[56]

When the session of 1841 began, Robert Dabney wrote his mother that there were about the usual number of students in attendance.[57] Among them were still some youthful profligates whose time, resources, and energy were dissipated in useless hedonistic pursuits. But many who had participated in the tragic events of that bleak weekend in November were sincerely sobered by the experience.

Reverend White recorded in his autobiography that immediately after the shooting of Professor Davis the University experienced a small-scale revival of deep religious sentiment. Attendance at the University's Sunday School and worship service increased, and those attending were in earnest search of spiritual fulfillment. Professor Cabell and his wife joined the church, as did several students. Reverend White concludes, "This went on to increase from year to year, until parents

---

[55]Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Brother, June 13, 1841.

[56]Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Brother, December 7, 1840. Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Mother, September 22, 1841. Evidently one reason for Judge Tucker's popularity was that he did "not work the students much more than half as hard as Mr. Davis used to do."

[57]Letter, Robert L. Dabney to Mother, September 3, 1841.

throughout the country were brought to see that the moral and religious character of their sons was as safe there as anywhere."[58]

But of greater future significance for the University of Virginia than the spiritual revival in the wake of the Davis tragedy was the maturation of the mood of unflinching candor, courage, and correctness the students exhibited as they calmly and collectively sought justice after the shooting on the Lawn. By their actions during the critical forty-eight hours after the shooting of Professor Davis, the students proved to the people of Virginia, and in a larger sense, to the people of the nation, that they were fully capable, when given the opportunity, of accepting the responsibilities of mature adults.

No member of the faculty was more impressed by the students' potential for probity and diligence than Judge Henry St. George Tucker. In sympathy with student bitterness at petty infringements of their liberty, Judge Tucker, as chairman of the faculty, exerted his influence to abolish the uniform code and early rising regulations. As these bothersome restrictions, the source of so much student-faculty discord, were suspended and then abolished, student feelings of animosity and alienation diminished.[59]

Judge Tucker did not stop with these reforms. His greatest contribution and perhaps the lasting legacy of determined student action

---

[58] H. M. White, ed., Rev. William White, p. 110-111.

[59] Bruce, University of Virginia, III, p. 1.

during that grim weekend in November 1840, was the introduction of the Honor System.[60] Stringent regulation of examinations and excessive vigilance by the faculty during examining periods created feelings of tension and hostility in both the students and the faculty. The Honor System obviated stealthy spying during examinations, and soon its spirit permeated every aspect of student life at the University.[61] Indeed, it would not stretch the truth to say that the spirit was conceived that cold November night in 1840, when the students as a body pledged their lives and honor to resolve the fatal shooting on the Lawn.

---

[60]"The Shooting of Professor Davis," Plume & Sword, May, 1963. n. p. The idea that the spirit of the Honor System devolved from the incidents following the shooting is presented in this unauthored Introduction to the Hunter Marshall letter.

[61]Bruce, University of Virginia, III, p. 53.

Appendix I - The Members of the Faculty

Session	Ancient Languages Gessner Harrison	Modern Languages George Blaetterman	Math Charles Bonnycastle	Natural Philosophy Robert Patterson	Chemistry John Emmet
7 - 1830-31				Chairman	
8 - 1831-32				Chairman	
9 - 1832-33					
10 - 1833-34			Chairman		
11 - 1834-35			Chairman		
12 - 1835-36				William B. Rogers	
13 - 1836-37					
14 - 1837-38	Chairman				
15 - 1838-39	Chairman				
16 - 1839-40					

Appendix I - Continued

Session	Moral Philosophy George Tucker	Medicine Robley Dunglison	Law John A. G. Davis	Anatomy and Surgery Thomas Johnson
7 - 1830-31				
8 - 1831-32				
9 - 1832-33	Chairman			
10 - 1833-34		Alfred Magill		
11 - 1834-35				Augustus L. Warner
12 - 1835-36			Chairman	
13 - 1836-37			Chairman	
14 - 1837-38		R. E. Griffith		James L. Cabell
15 - 1838-39				
16 - 1839-40		Henry Howard	Chairman	

Appendix II - Pavilions of the Faculty

PAVILION I

Emmet

PAVILION II

Johnson
Warner
Cabell

PAVILION III

Lomax
Davis
Magill
Griffith
Howard

PAVILION IV

Blaetterman

PAVILION V

Patterson
Harrison

PAVILION VI

Harrison
Rogers

PAVILION VII

PAVILION VIII

Bonnycastle

PAVILION IX

Tucker

PAVILION X

Dunglison
Davis

Appendix III - School Enrollment

Session	Matriculates	Anc. Lang.	Mod. Lang.	Math	Nat. Phil.	Chem. & M. M.	Med.	Med. Jur.	Anat. & Surg.	Moral Phil.	Law	Total Tickets
7	133	57	46	78	57	37	25	4	23	38	17	382
8	140	48	24	64	58	60	41	15	41	57	29	437
9	158	60	23	78	82	70	38	12	36	42	37	478
10	205	77	63	111	74	89	38	3	41	70	47	613
11	211	85	64	120	83	96	37	4	41	50	33	613
12	250	71	67	125	84	123	55	6	63	67	64	725
13	269	78	65	135	110	130	55	6	61	48	55	743
14	230	68	71	115	88	78	32	7	32	80	67	638
15	247	84	81	103	66	108	57	5	60	64	54	677
16	243	63	70	98	95	109	45	6	49	78	72	679
Total		691	574	1027	797	900	423	68	447	594	475	
Ave. per Session		69	57	103	80	90	42	7	45	59	48	

Appendix IV - Faculty Fees 1835-37

	1835	1836	1837	Average
Ancient Languages	$2,180.00	$1,950.00	$1,944.00	$2,091.00
Modern Languages	1,580.00	1,735.00	1,607.00	1,640.66
Mathematics	3,045.00	3,065.00	3,493.00	3,201.33
Natural Philosophy	2,105.00	2,210.00	2,897.00	2,404.10
Chemistry	2,815.00	3,145.00	3,090.00	3,016.66
Medicine	943.00	1,045.00	1,395.00	1,114.00
Anatomy and Surgery	1,130.00	1,500.00	1,465.00	1,365.00
Moral Philosophy	1,280.00	1,710.00	1,195.00	1,395.00
Law	1,475.00	2,755.00	2,135.00	2,121.66

Appendix V - Origin of Students

	Total	Va.	S. C.	Ala.	Miss.	Ga.	La.	N. C.	Md.	Ky.	D. C.	Tenn	Pa.	Fla.	Oh.	N. Y	Mi.	Conn.	West Indies
1830-31	133	111 83%	9	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1831-32	139	118 85%	6	0	1	1	1	4	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
1832-33	158	127 80%	4	3	9	1	2	5	1	0	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
1833-34	204	153 75%	7	6	10	5	2	7	3	1	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
1834-35	210	144 69%	19	8	9	6	5	6	4	3	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
1835-36	248	172 69%	16	13	6	12	9	6	6	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1836-37	269	185 69%	17	21	12	9	8	3	4	3	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	1
1837-38	231	145 63%	21	24	7	10	10	2	3	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
1838-39	247	161 65%	23	23	7	6	10	3	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
1839-40	242	151 62%	20	24	7	10	9	3	1	4	2	3	1	4	1	1	1	0	0
Total	2081	1467	142	124	70	61	57	41	25	21	20	19	11	8	6	3	2	1	3
		71%	6.8%	6.0%	3.4%	2.9%	2.7%	2.0%	1.2%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%

Appendix VI - Student Ages at Matriculation

Age at Matriculation	7th Session 1830-31		17th Session 1840-41	
14	0		1	1%
15	2	2%	3	2%
16	15	11%	12	7%
17	22	17%	19	11%
18	32	24%	38	21%
19	22	17%	37	21%
20	16	12%	34	19%
21	12	9%	14	8%
22	5	4%	8	5%
23	4	3%	7	4%
24	0		1	1%
25	1	1%	0	
26	2	2%	3	2%
27	0		1	1%

Appendix VII - Sessions Attended

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
1830-31	80=60.2%	35=26.3%	11=8.3%	4=3%	2=2%	1=1%	133
1840-41	107=59.8%	49=27%	16=9%	6=3%	1=1%		179

Appendix VIII - Faculty Meetings - By Month

	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Total
1830-31	2	3	1	2	2	2	1	2	4	1	5	25
1831-32	3	2	4	2	2	5	2	5	2	2	5	34
1832-33	3	2	3	4	1	4	2	1	3	1	7	31
1833-34	5	4	6	2	5	6	3	6	5	3	3	48
1834-35	2	2	4	3	5	3	4	3	5	4	3	38
1835-36	3	3	5	8	2	5	4	5	3	5	1	44
1836-37	4	4	5	4	1	5	1	5	4	4	1	38
1837-38	4	4	1	3	3	1	4	5	3	4	2	34
1838-39	5	2	5	3	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	30
1839-40	5	2	3	1	3	4	0	2	1	3	2	26
	36	28	37	32	25	38	23	37	31	29	32	348
Average	3.6	2.8	3.7	3.2	2.5	3.8	2.3	3.7	3.1	2.9	3.2	34.8

Appendix IX - Content of Faculty Meetings

I Student Petitions

	1830-1	1831-2	1832-3	1833-4	1834-5	1835-6	1836-7	1837-8	1838-9	1839-40	Total
Withdraw Class or Univ.	11	15	15	21	22	28	25	20	19	21	197
Admission or Readmission	5	1	4	11	7	8	9	7	14	4	70
Live Outside Univ.	9	6	6	7	8	6	14	9	16	7	88
Special Petitions	1	8	10	10	5	5	7	8	3	0	57

II Academic Concerns

Examination and Graduation	6	10	8	6	16	24	24	17	13	13	137
Library	1	0	2	1	7	7	6	6	5	8	43
Inattentiveness	2	8	6	10	10	4	6	10	8	6	70
Non-academic Instructors	3	6	0	3	3	3	1	3	2	7	25

III Miscellaneous Concerns

School Regulations	1	7	3	2	4	7	10	5	2	2	43
Board of Visitors	0	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	14

Appendix IX - Continued

	1830-1	1831-2	1832-3	1833-4	1834-5	1835-6	1836-7	1837-8	1838-9	1839-40	Total
Finances	3	0	0	1	4	6	9	8	11	7	49
				IV Administration of Employees							
Proctor	4	2	7	3	7	13	8	8	12	8	72
Janitor	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Hotel Keepers	7	2	2	10	10	15	15	8	4	1	74
					V Violations						
Uniform law	2	2	5	7	3	13	18	12	7	10	79
Early Rising	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	6	1	16
AWOL	2	5	2	1	11	9	6	7	7	5	55
Drinking or Taverning	2	2	4	20	11	12	11	13	7	6	88
Gambling	3	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	14
Firearms	2	2	0	2	2	2	1	3	4	1	19
Noise	1	7	2	7	8	5	1	5	5	0	41
Bonfire with Disturbance	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	6
Abuse of another individual	0	5	9	9	5	10	6	4	3	7	58

Appendix X - Meetings Concerned with Student Violations

Session	% of Total Meetings	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Total
1830-31	36%	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	1	9
1831-32	53%	0	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	4	18
1832-33	61%	0	0	2	2	1	4	2	0	2	1	5	19
1833-34	54%	0	1	3	2	5	4	1	4	4	2	0	26
1834-35	61%	0	1	2	1	3	3	4	3	2	3	1	23
1835-36	75%	1	2	4	6	2	3	3	4	3	4	1	33
1836-37	68%	0	3	2	2	1	5	1	5	4	2	1	26
1837-38	65%	0	2	1	2	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	22
1838-39	70%	2	2	4	2	1	3	1	3	0	2	1	21
1839-40	69%	0	2	2	0	3	4	0	2	1	3	1	18
		4 11%	15 54%	21 57%	19 59%	20 80%	31 82%	17 74%	27 73%	24 77%	21 72%	16 50%	215 61.8%

Notes to Appendices

1. Appendix I is based on data collected from University of Virginia Catalogues for the seventh through the sixteenth sessions.

2. Appendix II - John S. Patton and Sallie J. Doswell, The University of Virginia: Glimpses of Past and Present, (Lynchburg: J. P. Bell Company, 1900), p. 25.

3. Appendix III is based on an excerpt from a chart in the University of Virginia Catalogue for the eighteenth session.

4. Appendix IV - Bruce, University of Virginia, II, p. 182.

5. Appendix V is based on data contained in charts in University of Virginia Catalogues for the seventh through the sixteenth sessions.

6. Appendix VI is based on data compiled from microfilm of the Student Matriculation Book for the seventh and seventeenth sessions.

7. Appendix VII is based on data compiled from lists in Catalogues for the seventh and seventeenth sessions.

8. Appendix VIII is based on data compiled from the Minutes of the Faculty.

9. Appendices IX and X are based on data compiled from the Minutes of the Faculty. My method of investigation began with a perusal of the minutes of faculty meetings which occurred between April 1825, and July 1830. In this way I became aware of the recurring topics of faculty concern. I then made charts listing these concerns and checked which concerns were discussed at each meeting. The summation of my checkmarks indicated the total number of meetings during the decade that each subject was a matter for faculty discussion, and thus which items most concerned the faculty. It is important to remember that the figures represent only meetings per session at which the topics were discussed. It does not include the number of times the topic recurred in a single meeting. In Appendix X figures for AWOL violations include cases of dismissed or suspended students who returned to the University without permission. It also includes attendance at unauthorized parties. All figures in appendices IX and X are approximate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Manuscripts

Joseph C. Cabell Papers, University of Virginia.

George Carr Family Papers, University of Virginia.

J. H. Cocke Family Papers, University of Virginia.

Robert Lewis Dabney Family Papers, University of Virginia.

Davis Family Papers, University of Virginia.

John A. G. Davis to Louisa Davis McIntire Letter, University of Virginia.

John A. G. Davis to Dabney C. Terrell Letter, University of Virginia.

Robley Dunglison Papers, University of Virginia.

Charles Ellis, Jr. Diary, University of Virginia.

Charles Eversfield to Mother Letter, University of Virginia.

Fishburne Family Papers, University of Virginia.

Gessner Harrison Papers, University of Virginia.

Hunter H. Marshall to William C. Carrington Letter, University of Virginia.

Bernard Mayo Collection of Historical Material, University of Virginia.

A. L. Pickens to Colonel Samuel Pickens Letter, University of Virginia.

Pollard Family Papers, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

Preston Family Papers, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond.

Randolph Family Papers, University of Virginia.

Terrell Family Papers, University of Virginia.

Terrell - Carr Family Papers, University of Virginia.

Tucker - Harrison - Smith Family Papers, University of Virginia.

John A. Washington to Mother Letter, University of Virginia.

Alice Chancellor White Papers, University of Virginia.

II. Unpublished Proceedings and Records

Albemarle County Clerk's Office. Law Orders, 1837-42.

Albemarle County Clerk's Office. Minute Book 10, 1838-42.

Jordan, Harold T. and Real, Edward H., eds. Index to the Minutes of the Board of Visitors of the University of Virginia Volumes I-V. Charlottesville, 1964.

University of Virginia. Matriculation Records. Matriculation Book, 1825-1856.

University of Virginia. Minutes of the Faculty of the University of Virginia, Volumes I and II. 12 April 1825 - 16 July 1830.

University of Virginia. Minutes of the Faculty of the University of Virginia, Volume III. 14 September 1830 - 26 June 1834.

University of Virginia. Minutes of the Faculty of the University of Virginia, Volumes IV and V. 2 July 1834 - 25 April 1842.

University of Virginia. Minutes of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, Volumes I and II. 1817-1836.

University of Virginia. Minutes of the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, Volume III. 1837-1855.

III. Pamphlets

Abernethy, Thomas Perkins. Historical Sketch of the University of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: The Dietz Press, Inc., 1948.

An Address to the Public Unanimously Adopted by the Students of the University of Virginia. N. p., n. d.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Seventh Session, 1830-1831. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1830.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Eighth Session, 1831-1832. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Ninth Session, 1832-1833. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Tenth Session, 1833-1834. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Eleventh Session, 1834-1835. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Twelfth Session, 1835-1836. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880.

Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Session of 1836-37. Charlottesville: Tompkins & Noel, 1837.

Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Session of 1837-38. Charlottesville: Tompkins & Noel, 1838.

Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Session of 1838-39. Richmond: Shepherd & Colin Printers, 1839.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Sixteenth Session, 1839-1840. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880.

A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Seventeenth Session, 1840-1841. Charlottesville: Chronicle Steam Book Printing House, 1880.

Catalogue of the Officers and Students of the University of Virginia. Session of 1841-42. Charlottesville: James Alexander, 1842.

Circular of the Students of The University of Virginia, In Answer To The Circular of the Faculty, In Regard To The Dismission of Seventy-Two Students. Charlottesville, Va.: James Alexander, 1836.

Davis, John A. G. An Exposition Of The Proceedings Of The Faculty Of The University of Virginia In Relation To The

Recent Disturbances At That Institution. Charlottesville, Va.: James Alexander, 1836.

DeVere, Schele and Nash, Joseph Van Holt. Students of the University of Virginia. A Semi-Centennial Catalogue with Brief Biographical Sketches. Baltimore: Charles Harvey & Co., 1878.

Minor, Lucian. Discourse On The Life and Character of The Late John A. G. Davis, Professor of Law in The University of Virginia. Richmond, Va.: Shepherd & Colin, 1847.

Tucker, George. Memoir of The Life and Character of John P. Emmet, M. D. Professor of Chemistry and Materia Medica in the University of Virginia. Philadelphia: C. Sherman Printer, 1845.

IV. Newspapers

Fredericksburg Political Arena.

Richmond Enquirer.

Richmond Whig and Public Advertiser.

V. Unpublished Dissertation

Jones, Newton B. "Charlottesville and Albemarle County, Virginia, 1819-1860." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1950.

VI. Magazine Articles

"Charles Bonnycastle." The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia. February, 1900, p. 107.

Davis, Eugene B. "John Anthony Gardner Davis." The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, February, 1895, p. 101-103.

"Doctor Robert Maskell Patterson." The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, November, 1896, p. 61-67.

"George Tucker." The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, May, 1900, p. 11-14.

Magill, Mary Tucker. "Doctor Alfred Thurston Magill - A Memorial Sketch By His Daughter." The Alumni Bulletin of the University of Virginia, May, 1897, p. 1-8; November, 1897, p. 77-84.

Taylor, T. J. "Correspondence." Harpers Weekly, January, 1909, p. 6.

"The Shooting of Professor Davis." Plume & Sword, May, 1963.

VII. Books

Barringer, Paul B.; Garnett, James M.; Page, Rosewell, eds. University of Virginia Its History, Influence, Equipment and Characteristics. New York: Lewis Publishing Company, 1904.

Brubacher, John S. and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education In Transition. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.

Bruce, Philip Alexander. History of the University of Virginia. 5 Vols. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1921.

Cappon, Lester J. Virginia Newspapers, A Bibliography with Historical Introduction and Notes. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company Incorporated, 1936.

Clemons, Harry. Notes On The Professors For Whom The University of Virginia Halls and Residence Houses are Named. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1961.

Culbreth, David M. R. The University of Virginia Memories of Her Student-Life and Professors. New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1908.

Moore, Virginia. Scottsville On The James, An Informal History. Charlottesville, Va.: The Jarman Press, 1969.

Patton, John S. Jefferson, Cabell and the University of Virginia. New York: The Neale Publishing Company, 1906.

Patton, John S. and Doswell, Sallie J. The University of Virginia: Glimpses Of Its Past And Present. Lynchburg: J. P. Bell Company, 1900.

Rawlings, Mary. The Albemarle of Other Days. Charlottesville: Michie Co., 1925.

Rawlings, Mary. Ante-Bellum Albemarle, Albemarle County, Virginia. Charlottesville, Va.: Michie Co., 1935.

Rawlings, Mary, ed. Early Charlottesville Recollections of James Alexander, 1828-1874. Charlottesville, Va.: Michie Co., 1942.

Thwing, Charles F. A History of Higher Education in America. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1906.

White, Rev. H. M., ed. Rev. William S. White and His Times. 1800-1873. An Autobiography. Richmond, Va.: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1891.

Withers, Robert Enoch. Autobiography of an Octogenarian. Roanoke, Va.: The Stone Printing & Mfg. Co. Press, 1907.

Woods, Rev. Edgar. Albemarle County In Virginia. Charlottesville: Michie Co., 1901.