

LOUIS MARSHALL, M. D.,
His Administration as President of Washington
College

by
Wm. Buchanan

A thesis submitted to the faculty of Washington
and Lee University, May 15, 1941, in part fulfill-
ment of the requirements for a degree of Master of
Arts in the Department of English.



CONTENTS

Preface

Chapter I: 1773-1830 page 1

Chapter II: 1830-1834 page 21

Chapter III: 1834-1866 page 58

Appendix: page 65

Bibliography: page 67

PREFACE

Louis Marshall was not a great educator, and probably deserved his obscurity. As an unrepentant individualist he is an interesting study. As a representative of personalized education, which was becoming unfashionable in his day, and has since become fashionable again, he is significant.

The catalogues for Washington College during his administration, if any were published, have been lost or destroyed. There are few of his letters extant, for he hated to write. He never published anything, as far as can be discovered. Evidence of his extracurricular activities in Lexington are scarce, probably because he was inactive.

This paper is an attempt to incorporate everything about him that can be brought to light. It is evidential rather than conclusive.

CHAPTER I

1773 - 1830

Dr. Louis (or Lewis) Marshall was born at Oakhill in Fauquier County, Virginia, on October 7, 1773.¹

His father, Colonel Thomas Marshall, was a friend and schoolmate of George Washington, friend of Patrick Henry and General Marquis Calmes, surveyor and agent for Lord Fairfax, member of the House of Burgesses from 1761 to 1767, and member of the Second and Third Virginia Conventions.²

Most of his family took pride in claiming descent from William Mareschal, comrade of William the Conqueror, but Louis himself had a more hard-headed theory:

The tradition held by Dr. Louis Marshall, of Woodford County, Kentucky, during his lifetime, has been accepted with some degree of credit by later members of the various branches of the family, and is certainly as authentic as mere tradition could be. It is that the Thomas Marshall mentioned above (The farthest back to which they can be certainly traced is to Thomas Marshall, a planter in the Washington Parish of Westmoreland County, Virginia, who is supposed to have settled there about 1649.) was the son of John Marshall, which John Marshall was the son of a Thomas Marshall, an Irishman who had been in the army of Charles I and who had left England and come to America during the usurpation of Cromwell.³

-
1. W. M. Paxton, The Marshall Family (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co., 1885) p. 69.
 2. Louisville Courier-Journal, Oct. 25, 1936.
 3. A. C. Quisenberry, The Life and Times of Hon. Humphrey Marshall, 1892, p. 8.

Louis' mother, born Mary Randolph Keith, was not accredited with the same brilliance as the Colonel. Paxton says his children "are thought to have inherited their mental powers rather from the Markhams and the Marshalls, than from the Keiths,"¹ and the epitaph on her tomb is quoted as:

Mary Randolph Keith was born in 1735 and died in 1807. She was good, not brilliant, useful, not ornamental, and the mother of fifteen children.²

John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States, was first of these children, Louis the eleventh.

Colonel Marshall went to Kentucky in 1780, and in 1781 was made Surveyor of Fayette County, one of the three into which the former County of Kentucky was divided.

This was quite a profitable position, since early settlers who had received land warrants from Virginia needed a surveyor to run their boundary lines in order to secure their titles.³

At any rate, Thomas Marshall, then commanding a regiment in the Army of Independence, and also being a surveyor, was sent to Fayette County, (then in Virginia) to do the job of surveying, receiving for this work

1. Paxton, op. cit., p. 19.

2. Quoted from memory in M. M. McKnight, The Marshalls of Kentucky, (Kentucky Progress Magazine, Mar. 1931, p. 29-30.

3. Ibid.

half of what he might survey, which was not so liberal as we might think, considering the difficult travel out here, the hard work through dense undergrowth (all the country being practically a forest, where shrubs, thorns, briars, weeds and high grass were so obstructive to walking), the low value of the land--not over twenty-five cents an acre--and the desire of the State to rest ownership in the hands of individuals for the sake of taxes.¹

When soldiers were paid off in grants the surveying business boomed, and it is estimated that in 1883 he owned around 500,000 acres of the best land in Kentucky, including 3,000 in army grants to his sons, in addition to a 10,000 acre Virginia estate.²

In that year he built Buckpond, a big house of logs, weatherboarded, where he lived until 1800, and where Louis taught preparatory school most of his life.³

In the absence of his father Louis probably went to school to the Rev. James Thompson, a Scot who had emigrated some years before,⁴ or to his sister Elizabeth.⁵

Colonel Marshall took his family back to Kentucky with him in 1785, Louis being one of the five children who made the voyage by flatboat down the Ohio, menaced by Indians and renegade pioneers, who

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid.

3. Courier-Journal, op. cit.

4. Paxton, op. cit.

5. Will of Col. Thomas Marshall, G. Glenn Clift, History of Maysville and Mason County (Lexington, Ky. Transylvania Printing Co., 1936) pp. 356-63. Also Paxton, op. cit., p. 45.

stationed white women along the river bank to decoy settlers ashore.

Louis' account of the trip is given in notes from an interview with him some time around 1858 by the Rev. John D. Shane. The account reads:

I was 12 years old. 1st man to land at Limestone, now Maysville. We went out. Had a wagon, which frightened the Indians. They thought it a carriage for a cannon. From that wagon passed on in safety, till one Williams got among the Indians, and told them otherwise. After he had told them, the Indians fell on the 1st wagons that passed.¹

At Buckpond Louis was taught by Dr. Ebenezer Brooks,² (another Scotch minister, as were all the tutors Thomas Marshall employed) who, according to the Shane interview, had been "silenced for heresy"³ and "had been a minister in the east, but he had been suspended for pelagianism. It was said that he had been corrupted by Craighead."⁴

Louis apparently continued studying with him after he had left his father's service and opened a school at Jessamine, about fifteen miles from Buckpond.

-
1. Rev. John D. Shane, Historical Collections: Fayette County: ca. 1858, Draper MSS (State Historical Society of Wisconsin) 16CC240.
 2. W. H. Ruffner, The History of Washington College, 1830-1845, Washington and Lee Historical Papers, (No. VI; Lynchburg, Va., J. P. Bell Co., 1904) p. 93.
 3. Shane, op. cit., 16CC244.
 4. Ibid. 16CC242.

He later went to school to Isaac Wilson, of Philadelphia, who arrived in 1787 and established the Lexington (Kentucky) Grammar School, his advertisement stating:

The Lexington school has opened again. The learned subjects of Latin and Greek and the different branches of science will be taught by Isaac Wilson, formerly professor in Philadelphia College. The expenses of schooling are reasonable, as charges are four pounds in cash or produce, boarding to be had at reasonable rates.¹

Wilson was "a poor, simple-looking Simon," according to Mrs. Ann Biddle Wilkinson, who had him as tutor to her two young sons.²

In 1788 he became headmaster at Lexington Seminary, later a part of Transylvania College. It was probably during this year that Marshall studied under him, for he told Shane:

I was in the University school the 1st year it opened. Don't know what became of this Wilson--think he went to Ohio--and shortly after died.³

At another point in the interview he speaks of a Wilson "the author of the grammar. . . a good scholar, but a bad teacher" who wrote lyrics in Latin on the

-
1. Kentucky Gazette, Jan. 12, 1788, as quoted in Charles R. Staples The History of Pioneer Lexington (Lexington, Ky., 1939) p. 299.
 2. Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. LVI No. 1 (1932) as cited by Staples, op. cit.
 3. Shane, op. cit., 1600244.

Great Revival, beat his wife and died of the cholera at Blue Licks.¹ These Wilsons might have been confused in the mind of the old Doctor, for Shane prefaces his interview: "No reliability in his statements."²

Marshall told Shane he was in Dumfries, Virginia, in 1791.³ Although some of the dates in the manuscript are obviously inaccurate, this is reasonable enough, since Dumfries is in Prince William County, not far from the seat of the Marshalls of Virginia.

In the winter of 1793-1794 he suffered an attack of yellow fever while in Philadelphia,⁴ probably studying medicine, for that is where most Southerners began their preparation for that profession.⁵

Hugh A. Garland mentions John Randolph's "frolicsome but virtuous" companions there:

Most of these were young men of wealth, education, refined manners, high sense of honor and noble bearing, (who) . . . though unknown to fame, adorned the social sphere in which they moved, and were noble specimens of the unambitious scholar and gentleman. Thomas Marshall, the brother of the Chief Justice, and father of Thomas Marshall, the late member of Congress, is still living. (ca. 1850) He is a man of extraordinary powers, and great learning; his wit and genial humor are not to be surpassed. Those who knew them will agree that his natural talents

1. Ibid. 16CC242.

2. Ibid. 16CC239.

3. Ibid. 16CC246.

4. Ibid.

5. W. B. Blanton, M. D., Medicine in Virginia in the Eighteenth Century (Richmond, Garrett & Massie, Inc., 1931) p. 82.

surpass those of his illustrious brother,
the Chief Justice.¹

Ruffner² quotes Colonel Thomas M. Green, at whose home Dr. Marshall was a frequent visitor,³ to the effect that it was Louis, rather than Thomas, to whom Garland referred. He is undoubtedly correct, for we have Louis' statement that he was there at that time, and he was the father of the Thomas (F.) Marshall, member of Congress, mentioned by Garland.

Moreover, Thomas was thirty-three at the time, married and living in Washington, Kentucky,⁴ and died over thirty years before Garland's book was written. Ruffner says James Marshall was in Philadelphia with Louis, but it is not likely that Garland referred to him, since, according to Paxton, he was twenty-nine, still in Kentucky, and also died two years before Garland's book was published.

"Genial humor," however, is a quality which no other account attributes to Louis Marshall.

From late in 1794 until 1798 Marshall was in Europe.⁵ First he studied at the University of Edinburgh, where most American medical students went. (From 1749

-
1. H. A. Garland, The Life of John Randolph of Roanoke (New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1850) p. 59.
 2. Ruffner, op. cit., p. 93.
 3. Paxton, op. cit., p. 180.
 4. Ibid. p. 51.
 5. Shane, op. cit., 16CC240.

to 1812, 139 graduated there, in addition to numerous others who did not receive degrees.)¹

In the light of Marshall's disciplinary technique at Washington College, it might be worth while to describe the life at Edinburgh:

The life of students there was different from that in most university towns. William Robertson, who for thirty-one years (1762-1793) held the reins of college government, had ideas of his own. He did not believe in keeping students shut up as they were at Oxford and Cambridge, but thought they should mingle with society and not be too strictly supervised. An Italian traveler wrote in 1788, 'The students who amount annually to some 7 or 8 hundred do not live in the College but board in private houses and attend the lectures according as they please.' This liberal attitude accounted, he thought, for the tremendous popularity of the Edinburgh institution. . . .²

Dr. Blanton also quotes a letter from a former Virginia student there to the effect that "more licentious youths are hardly to be found anywhere than I remember to have seen in Edinburgh."³

Another account of the discipline there is given in a letter of Thomas Tudor Tucker, a medical student in 1768:⁴

The Students are in College only during the Hour of reading, the rest of their Time they employ at Home with their Tutors.

1. Blanton, op. cit., p. 86.

2. Ibid., p. 88.

3. Ibid., p. 89.

4. Quoted in Ibid., p. 90, from a MS owned by Mr. and Mrs. George Coleman of Williamsburg, Va.

The Professors have no other authority over them, than to require Decency of Behaviour whilst they are in the College. No Student is obliged to attend any Classes, but such as he chooses, except he is studying any Profession. . .

At this point in the story legend takes a hand.

Paxton says;

He was sent to Edinburg, (sic) to complete his literary and scientific studies; and thence went to Paris, that he might enjoy all the advantages of that city for instruction in medicine and surgery. But the thrilling events of the French Revolution demanded his attention. He became an ardent Republican, and, with some of his fellow students participated in the attack on the Bastille,--was present at the massacre of the Swiss guard,--witnessed the murder of the Princess DeLamballe,--was arrested in the Reign of Terror, and lay in prison for several years. He was at one time condemned to death, but was saved by the stratagem of the turnkey. He was at length liberated through the intercession of his brothers, John and James, then in Paris as representatives of the United States. He is said to have fought several duels, not without fatal results to his adversaries. However the truth may be, he would never suffer one to refer to his career in Paris. He became excited at any allusion to it.¹

Ruffner, most of whose biographical material is taken from Paxton, apparently notices the discrepancy in dates which would have Marshall storming the Bastille at the age of fifteen, before he had ever left Kentucky, and confines himself to the account of the imprisonment.

1. Paxton, op. cit., p. 69.

Mrs. S. C. P. Miller, in Washington and Lee Historical Papers, says that Marshall "had been educated in Paris in the days of the French Revolution, but having forfeited his safety by too free a use of his American right of free speech, a price had been set upon his head, which necessitated the speedy return to his own home."¹

This is entirely possible, although he would have been imprisoned under the Directory, rather than during the Revolution.

James Marshall was sent by George Washington as his personal representative to plead for Lafayette's release from prison² either in January, 1794, or late in 1795, or both.³

John Marshall was sent as envoy to France in July 1797,⁴ but according to Beveridge he never saw James during his stay.⁵ There is no mention of Louis in John Marshall's voluminous correspondence with James concerning the Fairfax estate, which is preserved in the Library of Congress.

The tale about the attack on the Bastille, which took place in 1789, is obviously apocryphal, as are

-
1. Mrs. S. C. P. Miller, sketch of the life of James McDowell, Washington and Lee Historical Papers, No. V, (Baltimore, John Murphy & Co., 1895) p. 60.
 2. A. J. Beveridge, The Life of John Marshall (New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916) Vol. II, p. 33.
 3. Ibid., pp. 203-04.
 4. Ibid., p. 223.
 5. Ibid., p. 232.

the statements that he witnessed the murder of Mme. de Lamballe, which occurred in September, 1792.¹

There seem to be no indications of the origin of this legend, but it is interesting to note that the dates and the facts in it correspond almost exactly to the experiences of Thomas Paine.

Paine was not in Paris when the Bastille fell in 1789, but he went there immediately, arriving in the autumn of the same year. From there he went to England, but the unpopularity of his works and speeches forced him to return to France, pursued by British police. He arrived there September 19, 1792, about the time of Mme. de Lamballe's assassination, and was there when Marie Antoinette went to the guillotine.

He spoke before the Convention on January 19, 1793, recommending the banishment rather than the execution of the King, but Terrorist sentiment was too strong for him, and the speech lost him his popularity.

On December 28 of that year he was imprisoned in the Luxembourg as a direct though belated result of that speech. Robespierre signed his death sentence, but it was not carried out because Paine's cell-mates discovered the system used by the jailers for marking the doors of the cells of condemned men, and hid the marks on their door.

1. S. Matthews, The French Revolution (London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1901) p. 211.

When Gouverneur Morris, who had engineered the imprisonment because of jealousy, was succeeded by James Monroe as American Minister to France, Paine communicated with him through the prison lamplighter, and secured a quick release.¹

Though there is no further evidence to this effect, the similarity of the stories suggests that the Marshall account may have been lifted in its entirety from Paine's life.

The maximum time of Louis Marshall's stay abroad is fixed by two bonds given by him, one dated November 8, 1794, made out for £135:4 (it was customary to give bond for twice the amount borrowed) to Angus McDonald, and another for the same amount dated February 17, 1798, given by Lewis Marshall and Rawleigh Colston (his brother-in-law) in "answer to suit of Sam'l Kercheval, assine of Angus McDonald."

The point of origin of these bonds is unknown, but it is supposed to be Loudon or Fauquier County, Virginia, in the first case. The second is made out to Geo. Noble, High Sheriff of Frederick County. They were recently discovered among some legal papers of John Marshall, now property of the University of Virginia.

It is interesting to notice in connection with

1. H. Pearson, Tom Paine, Friend of Mankind (New York, Harper & Bros., 1937) pp. 99-197. passim

Mrs. Miller's statement that Marshall's cure of McDowell¹ "brought about more tolerance of what was deemed his affectation in changing the e in his English name of Lewis into the ou of French orthography"² presumably while he was abroad, that the first bond is signed "Louis Marshall" while the text of it reads "Lewis Marshall." His father used the original spelling in his will executed July 26, 1798.

On his way home from Paris in 1800 he stopped by Blue Lick springs, which was noted for the medicinal quality of its water. He says:

An old man--a bachelor--forget his name--had come along, an invalid, and drank of the water, and rec'd so much benefit from it, that he built a house there, and never left there. Staid till he died. They told me of it. I drank a glass & in 15 minutes I could have sworn it would make me well. I have ever since had a love for that place.³

That same year he married Agatha Smith, a "quiet, self-possessed lady, who contrasted with her husband in size and manner. . .so wise, prudent and inoffensive that during the feverish period of the Doctor's administration in Lexington, she commanded the respect and personal regard of everybody."⁴

Upon his marriage his father turned over to him

-
1. Infra, p. 13.
 2. Miller, op. cit., p. 60.
 3. Shane, op. cit., 1600246.
 4. Ruffner, op. cit., pp. 96-97.

the Buckpond estate of 575 acres, and spent the rest of his life with Louis' brother Thomas.¹

Here Louis settled down to the practice of medicine and surgery, and according to Paxton, "attained the name of the most learned and successful physician in the State."²

Ruffner mentions Louis Marshall's propensity for getting involved in duels, but mentions specifically only one, that with General Thomas Bodley.³ C. Frank Dunn, of Lexington, Kentucky, who is the best authority on General Bodley today, says he never heard of the incident.

There is correspondence extant, though, concerning an affair in 1811.⁴

One Richard M. Johnson published a scurrilous handbill abusing the character of one John McKinley, who challenged him. Johnson refused "to fight a man in an honourable way who has disgraced himself as Mr. McKinley has done." However, he expressed himself as perfectly willing to fight McKinley's second, Dr. Marshall, except for the fact that "public duty" required him to go to Washington immediately, whereupon he turned the matter over to his second.

1. Paxton, op. cit., p. 69.

2. Ibid.

3. Ruffner, op. cit., p. 93.

4. Draper MSS (State Historical Society of Wisconsin) 5CC21. et. seq.

Upon returning he found Marshall's reply to the effect that Johnson's call was framed to avoid a fight rather than to get one, because

My situation with a family forbids in the general opinion my taking on myself the quarrel of a single man with another single man, & if you had as much feeling as you have ingenuity in avoiding a fight you never would have thrown the necessity on me. We never had a word of difference in our lives, but, Sir, I accept your call and think myself a master with the pistol, but with that instrument a great deal depends on others. . .¹

Marshall therefore chose the small sword, which "is a gentleman's weapon," because "in the hands of a man who understands it execution is certain; it neither snaps nor flashes."

Johnson rejoined that Marshall is attempting to trap him by the use of a novel weapon, with which he is unaccustomed, that the challenged has choice of weapons, and that Marshall should never have assumed the secondship if he were not ready to fight.

On this comic opera note the correspondence ends. There is no record of whether the duel ever took place.

The Doctor's next set of difficulties was at the expense of the Masonic Lodge of Lexington, Kentucky.²

The Lodge obtained permission from the Legislature in 1815 to conduct a lottery to raise \$30,000 to

-
1. Letter from Marshall to Johnson, Draper MSS 5CC25.
 2. J. W. Coleman, Masonry in the Blue Grass, (Lexington, Ky., Transylvania Press, 1933) pp. 95-129.

build a Grand Hall. This was the usual method adopted in that day to raise money for churches and benefit societies.

The lottery got started several years later and

As the grand prize was \$20,000, nearly every citizen in the city and county, not to speak of hundreds and thousands in the state at large, and throughout the southern and western states, including the northwestern territory, purchased tickets.¹

Dr. Marshall won first prize, but by the time the Lodge got around to paying him the paper currency which they received had depreciated, and they had not even enough left to have the Hall built.

Marshall sued for payment in gold, and took the contents of the Lodge treasury, with a ten-year, six percent mortgage on the Hall for the remaining \$10,630.

Several years of litigation and hard feelings followed, and the Grand Lodge finally offered to surrender the hall to Dr. Marshall in full settlement of his claim, but the latter refused, and brought suit to foreclose on his mortgage.

It was thought that the property would nearly, or quite pay the debt. As a result of the suit, the property was offered for sale to the highest bidder, and Dr. Marshall, being the highest bidder, bought the Grand Hall for \$6,000 on November 4, 1835. . . .²

Several other small lotteries had served to raise enough to complete the hall, but it was burned in 1837. 1841 marked the final payment on the debt to Marshall. "The balance of Marshall's claim was \$4,461.18 and this

1. Ibid.

was quite a relief when paid, as it had hung over and harrassed the Grand Lodge for about seventeen years."

As late as 1818, or thereabouts, Marshall was still practicing medicine, for at that time he saved the life of James McDowell, who sometime later was appointed to the Board of Trustees of Washington College. In the treatment of this particular case of fever he used calomel. Apparently he was not entirely trusted by his neighbors, who according to Mrs. Miller had "a growing fear of Dr. Marshall's advanced theories and practice of medicine." On their part "the conduct of this case was watched with most jealous scrutiny, and a grave determination to hold the doctor to account for the life of his patient."¹

Though this success was supposed to have enhanced his reputation as a physician, it cannot have been long before he turned to school teaching, which he continued for the rest of his life.

He turned his home into Buckpond Academy, where sons of the Kentucky gentry were given a preparatory school education, heavily weighted on the classical side.

Among his assistants was W. K. Thompson, known as "Dominie" Thompson, a Presbyterian graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, "a very accurate classical

1. Miller, op. cit., p. 60.

scholar, very strict with his pupils and occasionally a little sarcastic when they neglected their duties."¹

Benjamin Moore was another instructor, who was teaching mathematics, especially trigonometry and surveying, in 1828.²

Marshall probably taught also at Pisgah, a little school established in the community of that name as part of the Presbyterian church there. A man named Steele either assisted him or followed him as headmaster.

(A list of Marshall's students will be found in the Appendix.)

Kentucky's private academies were entirely individualistic affairs, the curriculum and method of discipline varying widely with the whim of the master.

Surveying, arithmetic, geometry, book-keeping, a little English grammar, and very few other practical subjects were taught to boys in private academies. If they were to become politicians, it was necessary for them to know enough Latin and Greek to impress their constituents. Classical literature, the history of England, the rise and fall of the Roman Empire, political science as embodied in Machiavelli's Prince, and like subjects were matters of study and interest. But many Kentucky academy masters believed that the Bible was sufficient textbook for boys. Others, with the medieval practice of Matthew Paris, used manuscripts copied from books found in Virginia. Even at present manuscript arithmetics are fairly common among early family papers.³

-
1. W. O. Shewmaker, Ph.D., D.D., Pisgah and Her People, 1784-1934, Lexington, Ky., Commercial Printing Co., 1935, p. 149.
 2. Ibid.
 3. T. D. Clark, Ph.D., A History of Kentucky (New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1937) p. 307.

From Paxton's account of his abilities it is easy to judge what Dr. Marshall taught at Buckpond.

He was a fine linguist, and well read in science history, philosophy, and belles-letters. His scholars admired and feared him. He was a strict disciplinarian--severe and dogmatic in his style. He treated his scholars often with rudeness, encouraged a combative style of argumentation, and instilled self-reliance.¹

The Academy, however, was something more than a mere preparatory school, for students who graduated under Dr. Horace Holley at Transylvania College went to Buckpond "to finish in the languages."²

The enrollment cannot have been large, because the house could hardly have accommodated more than a dozen students, in addition to the doctor's own sizable family and his assistant. The schoolhouse at Pisgah, which still stands, is even smaller--about the size of a one-car garage.

Many Buckpond graduates were prominent in the political, religious and professional life of the state and of the country. This to some extent can be attributed to the fact that in the almost feudal civilization that was growing up in that time and place, it was the members of the aristocracy who were in a position to be leaders. College training was the

1. Paxton, op. cit., p. 69.

2. Shane, op. cit., p. 150619.

exception rather than the rule, and preparatory school at the hands of one of the members of this state aristocracy was in itself a privilege of aristocrats. The very repetition of certain family names on the Buckpond roll, and the reappearance of these same names in history is indicative of this fact.

Nevertheless, Dr. Marshall offered the best and soundest of classical instruction, which was the backbone of higher education of that day. The fact that he was not a scholar in the deepest sense of the word--did not like to write, was uncritical in examining and forming theories, preferred the technical aspects of classical grammar to its literary attractions--may have led students away from academic bypaths and developed them as men of action rather than scholars. The definiteness of the man, his combativeness and intolerance may have led to the same result.

CHAPTER II

1830 - 1834

Dr. Louis Marshall was elected president of Washington College at a meeting of the Board of Trustees on July 19, 1830. For two ballots the members were deadlocked between him and Dr. McClelland of Rutgers College. On the third ballot he received eight votes, McClelland four. His pay was to be \$1000, in addition to one third of the total tuition, and the use of the president's house.¹

The college at one period during the preceding five years had as many as sixty-five students, but due to riots and disciplinary difficulties, especially with the two literary societies, the enrollment had dropped to about two dozen, where it had stayed for the two or three years immediately before his arrival.

The riots had forced the resignation of Dr. George A. Baxter, who had been president for thirty years, Edward Graham and Henry Ruffner, who composed the faculty. Ruffner was the only member to be re-elected, and with an assistant he had administered the college and taught all the classes until the time of Dr. Marshall's election.²

-
1. Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Washington and Lee University, Vol. I, p. 203.
 2. W. H. Ruffner, The History of Washington College, 1799-1829, Washington and Lee Historical Papers, Vol. No. IV (Baltimore, John Murphy & Co., 1893) p. 101.

(Most of the information on the history of the college during this period is taken from Washington and Lee Historical Papers, which were written by Dr. William Henry Ruffner, from a manuscript left by his father, the Henry Ruffner just mentioned. William Henry Ruffner writes the account in the third person, yet the substance of it is taken from his father's paper, for he says:

The history of his struggles in this direction is given in the private narrative which he left, and from which I have frequently quoted facts, using in some cases the words of the author without quotation marks, intending by this to assume the whole responsibility. From this, the only contemporaneous history of the times, I will now quote at length, only remarking that the author prepared this narrative without any intention of publishing it, unless there should be some special demand for the facts.¹

Therefore, when the expression "Ruffner says" is used in this paper, it refers to this account, and the ideas expressed are those of Henry Ruffner, although which one of them is the author of the exact words is uncertain.)

At the October meeting of the Board, Dr. Marshall appeared before the trustees, who ordered the faculty members to divide the classes between them. Marshall's first action was to shift the classes in

1. W. H. Ruffner, The History of Washington College, 1829-1830, Washington and Lee Historical Papers, No. V, op. cit., p. 5.

mathematics, which had formerly been taught by the president, to Ruffner, taking for himself the teaching of ancient languages, which Ruffner had taught for eleven years. "This was no small request, but Professor Ruffner agreed cheerfully to make the change."¹ This shift was unfortunate, but necessary, since both of the men were language teachers, although Ruffner had included mathematics in his repertoire during the two preceding years.

On December 4, 1830, Marshall was given the privilege of the use of the Washington Society library,² and the next year he was made honorary member of the Franklin Society, which carried the same privileges with respect to their library.³ Their records show that he did not make much use of either of these offers, if any, although both libraries were more complete than those of the College.

The minutes of the Trustees for November 27 of that year contain the following resolution:

On motion, resolved that the plan of abolishing the existing classification of the students & of substituting therefor a system of independent schools, or departments of learning, under the management of different but associated professors, be approved by the Trustees, and that the

-
1. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 2.
 2. Minutes of the Washington Literary Society, Dec. 4, 1830.
 3. Letter in the Minutes of the Franklin Society.

Faculty be required to report on the details of this change at the board.

On motion, resolved that the faculty be authorized to prepare a revised system of laws for the government of the College to be submitted to the Board at the end of the present session.¹

This was the beginning of the contest between Marshall and Ruffner that was to rage during the former's entire term as president of the College, and was not to end until his system was discredited, and he had surrendered his position with the College.

The Board, however, passed over the matter at its next meeting, spending most of the time in the discussion of a proposed Chemistry building. Landon C. Garland was hired as professor of chemistry at a salary of \$600 and one third of the tuition, which at that time was fifteen dollars per student for the usual five-month term. The assignment of courses in mathematics to Professor Ruffner was made official.²

Since the conflict that ensued was one of personalities almost as much as of educational philosophies, it is necessary to devote some discussion to the two principals involved.

As soon as one appraises the temperaments of Louis Marshall and Henry Ruffner, it is evident to him that there was bound to be trouble. In the words of Ruff-

1. Trustees' Minutes, pp. 204-05.

2. Ibid., p. 206.

ner's own narrative: "War, of course, was inevitable."¹

It is easy to pick the factors that were likely to lead to conflict, for Professor Ruffner's usually amiable narrative in mentioning them takes on a perceptible tone of pique.

When Marshall arrived Ruffner had been running the college for a year, apparently with great success. Ruffner says that he did not desire the presidency, but the reasoning he employs in doing so is specious:

His time had not come. He preferred now to act the part of scapegoat--bearing as he did all the odium and censure of the reformation he had effected--and to have cleared the way for a new president to manage the institution with ease and reputation. . . . And besides, the experiment of calling from abroad a president of distinguished name to give eclat to the institution, and to govern it by moral suasion, had not been tried; and until it was tried, the system of Professor Ruffner could not--at least for years--gain general approbation.²

These sound like the rationalizations of hindsight, rather than the hopes of an ambitious young professor.

But it was also quite apparent that Washington College was not in the position for an experiment at that particular time. The students were not numerous, and it was impossible to pick and choose the best among

1. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 2.

2. Ruffner, No. V, op. cit., p. 16.

them to use as test cases, dismissing those who could not work under the new methods.

Moreover, Marshall's ideas on most subjects were out of tune with the tenor of the place. He had acquired his philosophy during the French Revolution, and any hint of Jacobinism was probably strongly suspected in this little valley community. Neither of the other two members of the faculty at that time had ever studied abroad, or anywhere of importance except in Virginia. Most of the professors up to that time had been Presbyterian divines. Marshall to them was a man whose faith had been tainted with leanings toward infidelity in his youth, though these tendencies had been long abandoned. He was the first president of the college who was not a minister.

Ruffner hints at nepotism in his choice, for more than once in his account he mentions that Marshall had four relatives or in-laws on the Board of Trustees. One of these was James McDowell, whose life Marshall had saved some years before,¹ and another was his father, Colonel James McDowell, who had been on the board at the time Ruffner had been appointed professor, and had sought unsuccessfully to prevent the selection on the grounds of Ruffner's "unpopularity." What lay behind this charge is difficult to determine,

1. Supra, p. 17.

since the Ruffner accounts of it profess complete astonishment at the idea. Throughout his account of the squabbles among Marshall, the trustees and himself, the dissenters on either side are described by a vague "certain members of the board."

Moreover, Marshall's temperament was not of a type conducive to good relations where a contest has been started.

Dr. Marshall was really a very eccentric man, irregular in his temper, extreme in his likes and dislikes, singular in many of his views and habits, unsystematic, arbitrary, and impatient of contradiction. . . .¹

Paxton mentions his bluff and dictatorial manner, and describes him as "more feared than respected--more admired than loved."² He was described by Dr. Lewis G. Barbour as "a very pronounced man, reminding us of Dr. Samuel Johnson."³ Shane says of him, "If he cannot carry his point, he gets violently angry, and makes any sort of statement."⁴

Dr. Marshall's experience at Buckpond was not the sort that would best qualify him for a position as president of Washington College. In Kentucky he had been the sole authority, with no trustees to direct him, and no faculty to conflict with him. He had been

-
1. Ruffner, No. V, op. cit., p. 11.
 2. Paxton, op. cit., p. 71.
 3. Shewmaker, op. cit., p. 149.
 4. Shane, op. cit., 16CC247.

dealing with a smaller number of boys, whom he handled individually, teaching each one as much or as little as he felt necessary. The word "college" probably connoted to him the days in medical school in Philadelphia, Edinburgh and Paris, where the students were men of professional calibre, and purposeful in their pursuit of knowledge. Here the boys were fourteen to twenty years of age, and apparently were not very serious students. Northern fathers at the time were not in the habit of sending only one or two of their sons to college to prepare them for specific professions. But in the South, it was customary to divide the education among all the sons of the family, even though some of them would not use it to any advantage except in managing an estate, or quoting Latin at political meetings. These students, as a consequence, were not interested in knowledge, either for its own sake, or for the prestige a degree would give them, or for professional purposes. They would stay in school as long as they were contented and could get by without too much work, but they did not in the least mind withdrawing singly or in groups when conditions did not suit them. Hence they were a difficult disciplinary problem. At one time eighteen Washington College students resigned in a body, and left for home.¹

1. Ruffner, No. IV, op. cit., p. 100.

Several years before, Ruffner had instituted some reforms, obviously badly needed, in altering the classification of students and stiffening the curriculum, and had made some attempts in the direction of a stricter discipline, but "was not successful, except to a very moderate extent."¹

Saturday and Sunday before that time had been "days of college vacation; generally days of idleness and mischief." Ruffner had instituted regular classes and recitations on Saturday morning, and had filled Sundays with recitations on Bible lessons and lectures on Christianity, but the Saturday classes had not been successful.

His philosophy of college discipline is well expressed in the following paragraph:

In those days to depend largely on such motives as now go a great way toward the government of students, would have been to license idleness and disorder. Government must be adapted to the governed. Good students require no government, and Washington College had then only a moderate percentage of these, whilst the anarchical element was large, and had for some years been becoming more defiant. The governmental system was fast losing its grip, and a crisis was evidently at hand. Students in study hours contrary to the rules were often loitering on the streets of the town, or ranging over the neighboring farms. . . Probably the condition of affairs was at this time aggravated by the results of some of Mr. Jefferson's views in respect to college discipline which were seen elsewhere in disorders worse than those which

1. Ibid., p. 99.

have been described. Occasional efforts would be made by the faculty of the College to arrest this tide of evil, but success in such a case could be achieved only by vigilance and the bold assertion of legal authority, combined with tact and common sense. . .¹

Decrease in enrollment had followed an attempt to punish rioters in 1827, and the number of students had stayed at about two dozen until Dr. Marshall arrived.

His theories on curriculum and discipline were both diametrically opposite to those of Professor Ruffner. According to his system each department was to be made a separate school. There were to be no more classes, each student coming to the professor's office to recite or to be tutored when he felt it necessary. The requirements for a bachelor of arts degree remained substantially the same, but the student was allowed to select the pace at which he proceeded toward them.² Dr. Marshall thought, Ruffner says, that college discipline in the ordinary sense was "mere medieval humbuggery, which made boys worse instead of better. All the boys wanted was kind treatment. . . Bear with them, coax them, pet them, and you can bring the most obdurate cases to repentance."³

This theory of education was not so progressive for that day as it might be considered. It was to a

1. Ibid.

2. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 3.

3. Ibid., p. 5.

certain extent reactionary, tending in the direction of the old field schools and private academies, with which Marshall was familiar, where the number of students was small, could be dealt with directly by the teacher, and where their ages were scattered, and classification nonexistent.

To some extent it was an experiment even on Marshall's part, for according to Paxton his scholars at Buckpond feared him. "He was a strict disciplinarian--severe and dogmatic in his style. He treated his scholars often with rudeness, encouraged a combatative style of argumentation, and instilled self-reliance."¹

The Marshall plan of government was not put into effect immediately. The first clash occurred when the faculty undertook, under the direction of the Board of Trustees, to incorporate these changes into the rules of the college. At a meeting on March 21, 1831, Marshall and Landon C. Garland, professor of chemistry, convinced the board of its practicability, while Ruffner presented a minority report, giving his reasons for "considering it unwise to abolish suddenly those methods of instruction and government which were the outgrowth of the world's experience in all ages."²

He was ready to resign, but after an appeal by one of the members of the board he finally agreed to

1. Paxton, op. cit., p. 69.
2. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 5.

submit for the sake of peace, "and carry out his part of the scheme to the best of his ability; but at the same time he ventured to predict that the experiment would not last long. He kept his promise, and his prediction was fulfilled."¹

At first the scheme seemed to be quite successful. Dr. Marshall had achieved considerable popularity with the student body before it was initiated. William Henry Ruffner, a boy in the College's grammar school at the time, gives a vivid account of his dealings with them:

Strangely enough the president with all his accredited bluntness in dealing with his Buckpond scholars, now took the ground that college discipline should be wholly persuasive. This he had already illustrated by mingling with the students on terms of the utmost familiarity; joking with them, taking part in their games, representing nothing, and in every way acting the boy among boys. . . I thought it mean in the boys to shoot so hard as they did at the old gentleman's "knucks," but he refused to accept any privilege, and would do his best to give them as good as they sent: and so I wondered that boys would use such freedom of speech with a superior officer, but I soon discovered that he did not allow himself to be outdone on this line either.²

Dr. Marshall was apparently more diplomatic with the students than with the faculty. When his report on his proposed changes met with opposition on the

1. Ibid., p. 7.

2. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 4.

part of Ruffner he was "severe and contemptuous. He ridiculed the common methods of teaching and government, and those who practiced them. He declared that nothing, and especially the languages, had ever been properly taught in Washington College." He claimed the professors were not scholars, and were too lazy to give their students individual attention.¹

Perhaps it was this last claim which made him so popular for the moment with the trustees, who are said to have been guilty of a fallacy, common then, of judging academic efficiency by the amount of time spent in instruction.

Before Marshall had time to put his design into effect there had been another conflict with Ruffner. To achieve absolute impartiality in examining students, the president arranged at the end of his first semester to have each professor examine another's class. The marks to be given were either approved, disapproved, or distinguished.

According to Ruffner's narrative, Professor Garland examined the former's class in Euclid, and sent the members to the blackboard in front of the trustees. The slightest variation from the printed diagram was corrected instantly, so that the trustees, judging from the apparent quantity of errors, voted to disapprove the entire class, although Garland later admitted

1. Ibid.

to Ruffner that they were all exceptional scholars--
"a fine commentary upon this whole style of examina-
tion! And the truthfulness of history is further il-
lustrated by the fact that in the examination book
this very mathematical class is put down as 'disting-
guished'."¹ The president then examined his own clas-
ses, and Garland his.

The examination book bears him out in most of
this story. Beginning March 21, 1831, the classes
in Latin and Greek were examined, although it is not
specified by whom, and all were approved, except the
students of Graeca Majora Media, who were first checked
as approved, but the records were erased, and altered
to disapproved.

Then Garland's chemistry class was examined, not
by their instructor, but by Dr. Marshall, and all were
passed.

On the 24th, Professor Ruffner's classes in geo-
metry and Euclid were examined, and the entire class
marked disapproved, but at some later time, perhaps
the following day, the marks were erased, and the en-
tire class were given the distinguished rating.²

The new system of classification and instruction
went into effect in the fall of 1831, as scheduled.

1. Ibid., p. 8.

2. Examination Records, March 1831, in Registrar's Of-
fice, Washington and Lee University.

From the beginning Professor Garland adapted it to the requirements of his own department, and apparently encountered no important objections from his superiors.¹ It was obvious to everyone concerned that chemistry or physics experiments and demonstrations could not be drummed up on a moment's notice at the whim of a student.

Ruffner, evidently determined to make himself a martyr in order to prove his point, carried out the plan to its letter.

He took his stand at a high desk in his class room at five o'clock in the morning, and there he stood until night, and sometimes until bedtime with only brief necessary absences, placing himself unreservedly at the service of every one of his ten or twelve students: who came singly or in pairs at any hour to receive assistance, or to recite, one in this branch of mathematics, and another in that--an unorganized lot of irregulars that had neither the advantages of tutorship on one hand nor of classification on the other. The professor was simply the servant of all, spending a large part of his time in saving his students the labor of solving their problems by solving their problems for them, and hearing them recite.²

In the spring semester of 1832 the attendance increased to thirty-nine, in addition to fourteen grammar school students. Many were in different classes, some in arithmetic, some in algebra, some in geometry,

1. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 8.

2. Ibid.

and others in conic sections, dialling, projections, or nautical astronomy.

The consequence was that with a mind fatigued and harrassed, the professor could not possibly do justice to the subjects or to himself. Every day's work afforded a painful illustration of what he declared before the board in advance, namely that under this scheme good teaching was impossible at least in mathematics, and good scholarship equally so.¹

Dr. Marshall, according to the outraged Ruffner, blamed all this difficulty on "the unfaithfulness and incompetence of the mathematical professor."² The trustees were even persuaded to investigate the conduct of this department, Ruffner says, but they arrived at no conclusions. There is no record of this action in the minutes of the trustees, unless Ruffner refers to a committee of four appointed on September 21, 1832 to "enquire into the condition of the college generally, but with a more special reference to its operations during the present session, and further to enquire whether any change in the course of Study can be adopted with advantage to the institution."³

Marshall, in the meantime, was breezing along in fine style with his classes in Greek and Latin, for:

-
1. Ibid., p. 9.
 2. Ibid., p. 10.
 3. Trustees' Minutes, p. 210.

The president had an important advantage over his colleagues in that he was teaching his special branch in which he had been drilling his Buckpond boys with endless reiteration for many, many years. Listening to rule of syntax and the music of inflections had ceased to be tiresome, and like a beloved liturgy became sweeter with each repetition. At this period he had no fondness for study, and writing was his abomination. Moreover, the weight of nearly three-score years and the bulkiness of his physique were naturally inclining him to sedentary habits and easy postures. His class room was furnished with a large arm chair and also a bed, which enabled him to assume a great variety of postures! As likely as not the visitor would find him during recitation lolling on his bed, pipe in mouth, spectacles on nose, and book in hand, drilling some boys on Latin forms and constructions, less frequently in Greek, the tobacco smoke in the room rivaling in density a London fog. Perhaps the four o'clock horn has sounded for dismissal, but the old gentleman was not an observer of times and seasons; he was a law unto himself; and he had a determined way of working out the lesson to the end, horn or no horn.¹

The first hint of a rift in the relations between Marshall and the Board of Trustees was recorded at the September 21, 1832, meeting when it was ordered that the President thereafter be directed to present to them twice a year "a detailed written view of the State of the College, including as well an account of its prosperity and internal operations as of its fiscal operations," and also provided that "the proceedings of the Board shall be entered at large upon the minutes

1. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 10.

when any two members of the Board require it."¹

This bears out the testimony that writing was an "abomination" to the old man, for the President kept minutes of the meetings, which after the first year grew steadily more abbreviated and illegible.

At the same time Dr. Joseph W. Farnham (or Farnum) of Charleston, South Carolina, was elected to the position of chemistry professor to succeed (at an increase of \$200 in salary) Professor Garland, who, after having arranged for the construction of the new laboratory and chemistry lecture room, had transferred to Randolph-Macon. Ruffner gives as his reason an estrangement from Dr. Marshall, and has him leaving "a soberer and a wiser man!"²

So far as the minutes indicate, neither the faculty committee's report on possible changes of study, nor any of the president's semester summaries of "the State of the College" were ever presented.

Ruffner sets the autumn of 1832 as the beginning of the ebb-tide of the administration. A diminished number of students appeared that year, and after "disorder. . .broke out as fiercely as at any time in the history of the institution" some of them withdrew.³ But beyond this he devotes no space to the last two years of the Marshall regime.

1. Trustees' Minutes, p. 120.

2. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 10.

3. Ibid., p. 12.

It is again the examination book that tells the story. The March, 1832, examiners approved all the language students, with four entire classes marked distinguished. In the mathematics and chemistry departments six students were marked distinguished, three were approved, ten were absent without leave and three were not examined for lack of trustees.

In September of the same year the grammar school, including some classes of Dr. Marshall's, was examined, but one whole class, comprising four students, had either withdrawn or been dismissed. Out of nineteen students in Professor Ruffner's mathematics classes, one was distinguished, one approved, three were absent for the exams, eleven had withdrawn from the classes, and three had blanks in the space left for their grades.

For the rest of his administration, the examination records are not unusual, although the number of students was obviously not large.

The trustees did not meet from September 25, 1833, until July 2, 1834, and no records were kept, except matriculation and examination lists.

The two literary societies, which had been the source of almost all disciplinary difficulties for years, gave trouble again in the spring of 1834.

The presence of town boys in the societies, and their disturbances when on their way home after adjournment on Friday nights, had caused Ruffner diffi-

culty in 1830. He had ruled that meetings must thereafter be held on Saturday afternoons, and membership be confined to college students, but the societies issued a declaration of independence, and held their discussions off the campus at the interdicted hour.

The matter at that time was compromised, with the societies holding their meetings on Saturdays and recognizing the authority of the faculty, while the trustees abolished Saturday classes to provide time for the meetings, and repealed the membership requirement.

However, at some time in the interim the meeting time was shifted back to Friday night, and after some disorders (as well as can be made out from the minutes of the Washington society they were due to the ungentlemanly behaviour of one Higginbotham) the following strained relations are recorded in their minutes:

Friday, May 2, 1834

P. D. Ewing gave notice that the faculty of W. College had ordered the two Literary Societies in College to change the time of their meetings from Friday night to Saturday.

Mr. Claiborne moved that Society disregard the order of the Faculty which was withdrawn. Mr. White made that Society meet on next Friday night which motion was amended to next Thursday night.

On the following Thursday a member moved that the society co-operate with the faculty, but the motion was indefinitely postponed.

Friday, May 9, 1834

The following is a letter from the Faculty of W. C. to the pres't of this society.

from the faculty to the pres't of W. L. Society

In consequence of the irregularities thought to have been committed on the night of the Society the Faculty think it their duty to withdraw the leave granted to the Society to hold their meeting by night. You will therefore please to take steps in this respect conformable to law.

May 9th 1834

By order of faculty

yrs &c

Louis Marshall

Pr. W. C.

A committee was appointed to discuss the matter with the faculty, and from then on the meetings were held on Saturdays.

Apparently the triumph was a minor one. When the Board of Trustees met on July 2, Marshall was not present.

When they had their opening meeting for the next semester on September 15, they adopted the following resolution:

This being the 15th day of the present session & Doctor Marshall not having appeared, & the Board being satisfied, from the conduct & declarations of Doctor Marshall, when about to leave College, at the close of the last session, & from a letter received from him by Doctor Farnham, one of the professors of the College, that Doctor Marshall does not intend to return: and being moreover satisfied that the connexion between him & this Board ought, at all events, to be dissolved: do therefore declare the office of president of Washington College vacant.¹

1. Trustees' Minutes, p. 216.

On March 18, of the following year the trustees voted him \$800 for salary in full.¹

"No doubt," says Ruffner, "the rich pastures and beautiful parks of Buckpond seemed more lovely than ever to the harried soul of the worthy old gentleman. The only wonder is that he should ever have exchanged blue grass and mules for syntax and mischievous boys."²

An indication of the state of the college at the time Marshall left it is revealed in the contents of a number of letters which appeared in the Lexington Union, a weekly newspaper, during the fall of 1834. They are published over non-de-plumes, but the bound copies in the Washington and Lee Library have their authors' names pencilled beside them.

The first was written by Fuscus, who was Philander Davidson Ewing, a graduate of Washington College the year before, and the son of the Rev. J. D. Ewing, member of the Board of Trustees.³

Fuscus appeals to the citizens of Lexington for support of the college on the grounds that the maximum number of students, a hundred, each spending around \$300 a year, would be of considerable financial value to the community. He recites all the advantages of location and climate, but finds that "young men never like to come more than one or two sessions, if they

1. Ibid., p. 221.

2. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 12-13.

3. W. D. Hoyt, A Crisis in Education (Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. 40, No. 1) p. 3.

can possibly get to any other institution," which fact he blames largely on the dilapidated state of the buildings.

In the same issue of The Union, September 13, 1834, appears another complaint by Hampden, Dr. James Reid Jordan, an alumnus and prominent Lexington physician.¹ He mentions that only four or five men are enrolled in the college, with less than a dozen town boys in the grammar school. He, too, attributes the difficulties of the college to inadequacy of equipment, giving the following description of Washington Hall:

The main edifice (is) a huge building of brick 100 feet by 50 or 60, without the slightest touch of architectural taste or design, placed in a hole dug out of the top of the hill, half buried, with the end to the front, and resembling more (except in neatness of arrangement) a Dutchman's barn, than anything else that can be conceived of. May Heaven forgive the man who furnished the plan for this unseemly pile! and may his name live until the Tuscan, Doric, Ionic, Composite, and all other orders of architecture have sunk into oblivion, and still be handed down to the remotest period of time, when 'chaos shall come again'!

The building second in size is "neat, commodious, and if it stood alone would be considered a beautiful edifice." The two other buildings are "now crumbling to ruins and are wholly useless, and have long ceased

1. Ibid.

to be occupied by any one who had regard either to comfort or safety," and are quite evidently "appropriated to baser means than were intended by those who erected them."

Of the library, "not indeed very large, but well selected" only a few books remain, due "to" sheer neglect."

Thousands of dollars worth of chemical and physical apparatus bought between 1828 and 1830 has been destroyed by men "if not ignorant of their use, to say the least, careless and without responsibility for their preservation." And "not one of the Alumni of the institution was ever properly taught their uses, or was at all benefitted thereby."

He lays the blame on mismanagement, "gross mismanagement,--wilful, foul, inexcusable mismanagement," and tells how the friends of the college

witnessed the agonizing throes of the institution at the close of the last session. They saw the President and Trustees separate with feelings of mutual disgust, and even hostility--the former charging the latter with having unjustly retained a considerable portion of his salary. They ask in vain, who is now President? and not one can answer. Dr. Marshall is yet in Kentucky--he has never formally resigned the chair, and perhaps does not design to notice the board as worthy of the least respect or deference. The board on their part stand over the remains of this hall of science, so well endowed, and so dear to that great and good man who gave it birth and name.

His solution is to request the Legislature to take over the college, and he urges that the people of Lexington and friends of the college sign petitions to this effect.

Ewing replied on September 20, charging that Hampden's statements are exaggerated. While the library, he says "consists of only 30 or 40 law books, a pile of political documents, some tattered portions of historical works, a musty folio or two, and 3 or 4 antiquated Hebrew authors," the chemical apparatus "so far as it extends, is not inferior to any in the state, and perhaps it would not be an egregious mistake to say nearly as extensive." The rest of the equipment is serviceable, if not plentiful. He protests at the charge that alumni are deficient in scholarship.

Rather than turn the college over to the State, he suggests that the trustees "be aroused from this dreary Rip Van Winkle slumber of theirs," and that they take measures to inform citizens of the opening of the terms, and insert more adequate announcements in the newspapers, particularly The Union.

Signing his letter Q, Dr. Ruffner entered the lists in the same issue, pointing out that the number of students had reached fourteen or fifteen, besides those in grammar school, and contests most of the other statements made in regard to the disrepair of

the buildings, laboratory equipment and library.

Hampden's retort the next week was more rhetorical than enlightening, and he mentions that the trustees have appointed a committee to go into recommendations.

On September 27 one Elliot Alexander contributes his explanation of the faults--that "the faculty have gradually relaxed in their discipline, and the board of trustees have become more and more indifferent about its affairs."

Recently the former system of education has been altered. Whether with a good or bad effect sufficient time has not in my opinion been afforded for deciding. But from the time that has elapsed since the new system went into operation, the beneficial tendency of it seems to be less than that resulting from the old system.

He recommends that the power of the president be reduced, and suggests the employment of a minister of the gospel as president.

In this letter and his next, he goes into detail about the "new system," apparently Dr. Marshall's plan, although he gives the date of its initiation as 1833.

He is in favor of the ten-month session as practiced under the new regime, instead of two five-month terms with a vacation twice a year.

Since he is Marshall's only defender, his testimony is important:

Under the old system the studies which the student had to pursue were too many for him to become perfectly master of in the time allotted for this purpose, and without any respect being paid to his capacity, habits or disposition, he was hurried over his studies, without sufficient reflection--not having derived any lasting benefit from them. On this account I have frequently heard students ask what advantage was there in pursuing such and such a study? and frequently they abandon them altogether. Classes were instituted, not according to the talents, capacity, habits or disposition of the student, but to suit the convenience of the teacher. Such being the state of the case, the student had little or no interest in his studies--he pursued them reluctantly as a task imposed upon him, and regarded them with aversion. The interest and affections of the student for his studies were so little conciliated by the measures adopted by the faculty that he spoke of the former with dislike, and of the latter with ridicule and disapprobation. What served to damp the ardour of the most enterprising was, that at the end of the session whole classes generally met with the same honorable award, or with the same mark of disapprobation.

Sufficient inducements were not set before those who were steady and industrious to continue so, nor were motives sufficiently strong presented, to reclaim the idle, and to spur the lethargic on to laudable exertion. Such were the ill effects proceeding from the old system. . . If the same measures are pursued under the new or under the old system; if a multiplicity of studies are engaged in and all are hurried over without the Student becoming thoroughly acquainted with any of them; the same evils that proceeded from the old system will continue to be produced. But if a few textbooks are employed, and these are not changed until the Student has become thoroughly imbued in all their important principles; if these text books are explained by suitable illustrations and lectures delivered by the professors; if discipline is strictly maintained and the laws strictly enforced; then the evils which were produced from the old system will cease

to exist, and Washington College will rise once more to its former pre-eminence in Virginia.

From this it is apparent that, while lack of discipline was one of the faults of the Marshall administration, it was not a fault exclusive to it, and that Marshall was not alone in his theories.

The next letter on October 4, was from Henry Ruffner, who was quibbling again with his old enemy, Hampden, over the number of books that had been lost from the library, the condition of the "philosophical equipment" and the amount of work done by the faculty. It is obvious from the letters that Dr. Jordan knew what he was talking about only in generalities, while Ruffner had the records of the college at hand. But as long as the former could find some small point on which to hang his adjectives Hampden was still in the fight, and Ruffner apparently had not enough sense of humor to restrain himself from replying. In some of the later exchanges there are indications that the two combatants knew each other's identities, and there is a hint that Ruffner's leg is being pulled.

The next letter, on October 11, was from Fuscus, the voice of moderation, who defended the trustees on the charges of mismanagement, but called attention to the fact that they had been lax in their attendance at meetings and examinations. Marshall must bear most of the blame.

When Dr. Marshall was elected President, and had assumed the reins of 'sage discipline,' 'mighty works were soon to show forth themselves' in Washington College. The trustees were on the tiptoe of expectancy, all alive to their duty, and in the commotion about what had best be done, as '---Ocean into tempest wrought, To waft a feather or to drown a fly,' they consigned (as some hoped) to everlasting oblivion an ancient and venerable code of laws which had long governed the institution in equity. And what have they substituted in its stead? A few pages regulating the conduct of the faculty, and this six days examination. --The labour of a mountain surely is a mouse! But this ardent zeal was all smoke: 'like the morning vapor or the early dew,' 'it's gone, and none knows how or where,' without a monument worthy to perpetuate its remembrance.

He deprecates An Observer's suggestion as to the employment of a minister for the position of president, and proposes instead that the college be turned into a military school.

The other letter published on the same day was written September 28, by William Alexander Carruthers, who attended the college in 1819-20, and practiced medicine in Savannah and in New York, where the letters were written.¹

He points out the fallacy of blaming the decline of the college on the buildings, and shows that the library had never been larger "than would have been thought necessary for many a private gentleman even in this country."

1. Ibid.

He blames the trouble on lack of tact and consciousness of public relations, and tells how Princeton attracts prominent men to its commencement, invites alumni to return for graduation exercises, arranges for speeches by prominent graduates, then prints them and sends them to newspaper editors throughout the country, and confers honorary degrees on rising men. "What I have already said will suffice to show that the Managers of a College are as much bound to work for effect as the managers of a Theatre.--And they all do it too, but the trustees and alumni of yours." He advises employing professors with an eye to their reputation, and suggests that Colonel Thayer, recently superintendent of West Point, be elected president to succeed Marshall.

In the interim Hampden taunted Q once again, and on November 8, Carruther's second letter was published. It tells where Colonel Thayer may be reached, and suggests as possible substitutes, if he is not satisfactory, Professor Wayland of Hamilton College, or Dr. Vethake of the University of New York, who was later selected. Carruthers shows the evil effects of allowing a Legislature to get control of a school, suggests that three absences force the resignation of a trustee, and proposes a rule that no one over thirty-five years of age be elected to the board. He calls attention to the new ruling of Congress enabling college

presidents to buy books from abroad duty-free as an agency through which the library could be improved. He makes some financing suggestions, and tells an entertaining story of how a college was salvaged by word-of-mouth publicity, hazarding a guess that one of the faults of this college's would-be saviours is that their doleful wails do more harm than the action they inspire can overcome.

Continuing in the same vein in the November 15 issue of The Union he calculates how much business the shopkeepers of Lexington are losing by their condemnatory tactics.

Perhaps the President or Professors may be unpopular. If so, it is very lamentable, but should by no means be mentioned to any one, because should it get to the ears of any parent about to send his son he would abandon the idea at once. No one of your business men is ever seen or heard going among his customers and telling him with long countenance and dolorous whine--'Have nothing to do with that head clerk of mine, nor indeed with any of them. They are a sad set of lazy rascals, have good fat salaries and do nothing. The former especially is a Tom fool of an eccentric fellow, and full of all sorts of odds and ends. He's everything by turns and nothing long,' (as Dryden said of Lord Shaftesbury). People would stare certainly to see a man abuse those in his own employ; but however strange they might think it, every one would take him at his word, and forthwith abandon his store.

He inveighed against their tactics in attempting to get students to pay their tuition before hiring professors with the money. Again he draws the parallel

with the merchant and the goods on his shelves.

Many of his suggestions were carried out to varying extents, and probably because of his advice the attendance at the College began to pick up.

Louis Marshall has been hailed as an experimenter, a man before his time, but if there was any man interested in the College at that time who really had an insight into modern methods of administering a university, it was Carruthers, with his high-pressure advertising and businesslike methods.

At any rate, the correspondence shows that the evils which assailed the college were not all the fault of Louis Marshall's methods, as one would gather from Ruffner's account of his administration.

A report to the trustees in December of 1834 recommended the repeal of almost all the measures introduced by Marshall.

The committee recorded their opinion that the school should attempt to draw its students from the "Western counties," whose inhabitants cannot afford to send their sons to the more expensive Eastern colleges, and also from the southern and southwestern states. The report advised reorganization of the school, strict discipline, the hiring of good "literary and scientific" professors, and recommended the "plan of classification used in our most approved

colleges and formerly adopted in this."

This report is the most rational and unhysterical summary of the defects in the Marshall method of instruction, and expresses in general the opinion of the trustees after his departure.

We think the plan of departments or of independent schools must in a considerable degree defeat these objects under that system. We understand that each student may select his department. The process must establish a sufficient number of classes to suit the attainments of the students. Students may enter the department at any time during the session and that (then?) a separate class must be formed to suit his attainments and again the classes must be subdivided to suit the advancement of the students. And a student may receive the testimonials of his proficiency in one department alone without attention to others. This system in a great measure makes the student the judge of his own studies and must produce much confusion and irregularity in studies and discipline. Your (sic) doubt whether it be practicable in to carry on the system in the Mathematical, Philosophical & Chemical departments. If it could be accomplished it is obvious it must be compelling the professor to submit to an unbroken round of drudgery in elementary instruction. No man going through drudgery can have time to make such attainments in literature and science as are absolutely necessary to keep up the character he ought to sustain. . . .

The experience of this institution has proved that the system is unfavorable to regularity in studies & discipline. A student who is master of his own course of studies will exercise his powers capriciously. In this system the connexion of the student is with the professor of the department he enters and he is in a considerable degree irresponsible to the other professors. It is much more difficult for them to exercise the requisite discipline over them than in the system of

classes.

The greatest difficulty presented by this system is the scholarship of the young men. A well organized college ought not only to afford its students an opportunity of being good scholars, but it ought to enforce such a course of study as will make good scholars of all who remain the requisite time. This the classification system will do, but in the apprehension of the committee (the) department system will not. In the first system a young man entering college must pursue its course and go through a regular education. In the latter he may at his own discretion take a rambling and imperfect course and at the end of the usual collegiate course may not have pursued a thorough course in anything.¹

A return to the old system, the committee believed would go far toward assuring the parents that their sons are being well educated.

The report also extended to the evils of the boarding method then employed, whereby students ate at homes in Lexington. They left the college three times a day "and of course are then withdrawn from the superintendence of the College officers and in a great measure free from College discipline," and "exposed to extravagance and dissipation." It recommended that they be compelled to board with the steward of the College, so that "the regulations (regulations which are now dead ^e letters in our laws) for compelling attendance to studies and prohibiting absence from the grounds of the college &c might be enforced."

Among other suggestions were that parents be advised not to pay bills acquired by their sons for non-necessities.

1. Papers of the Board of Trustees, 1818-1835 (Treasurer's Office)

They urged that the faculty be increased to include a "professor of Belles Lettres and Rhetoric," who would also teach courses in "Mental and Moral Philosophy," and if possible the addition of courses in military fortifications and modern languages.

Dr. Vethake in his inaugural address February 21, 1835, touched inferentially on what had gone before in the statement of his proposed policy in governing the school, leaving no doubt on which side of the question he stood. Speaking of systems of education, he said:

The differences of opinion, likewise, which continue to prevail in respect to them, among those who are best qualified to judge, constitute a sufficient reason for us to infer that the subject of education is a difficult one, and one, consequently, in which improvements are not likely to be made very rapidly, or by any person whose attention has not been long and carefully directed to it. He who undertakes to prescribe new modes of instructing and governing the youth of a country should have reflected much on the laws of human thought and feeling, and have had besides a practical acquaintance with his subject. As well might the teacher,--I mean the mere teacher of some branch of science or letters,--presume to reform the laws of the land, or the modes of medical practice, with which he is wholly unacquainted. . . Nor is every teacher qualified to make improvements in his art. As there are quack physicians, quack lawyers, and quack statesmen too, so there are many, very many, quack teachers, who, almost entirely ignorant of the principles on which education should be conducted, have no other guide to direct them in their labours but a routine to which they were accustomed when they themselves were pupils, or which they have borrowed with little or

no alteration from other teachers who have preceded them. Take them out of this routine, and they are wholly at a loss; and such men are, moreover, even worse qualified to decide on the merits of any proposed improvement in education than thinking men generally are; since a partial knowledge of a subject, long possessed, is often a greater hindrance to a more thorough and comprehensive knowledge of it, than an entire ignorance of the subject would be. . . The most beneficial changes, here as elsewhere, are such as take place slowly and cautiously, and that great and rapid changes, or revolutions, are seldom desirable or necessary.

The quality of teaching becomes vastly more important than the quantity of it. And quality and quantity are here to a certain extent not compatible with each other. The amount of instruction rendered may be unquestionably too little; but it may be, and in one or two institutions with which I am acquainted is, too great. In the zeal of their governors, that the professors should be "working men," and should thus make an impression on the unthinking portion of the community, with the design of thereby obtaining students, those professors are made to "hear recitations" during so many hours of the day, as to preclude almost the possibility of adequate preparation by them even for commentary on the matter recited, omitting altogether the preparation of lectures.¹

Dr. Vethake also made several comments on the methods of teaching languages, especially Latin and Greek, which could easily be interpreted as a deprecation of Dr. Marshall's methods. He first advocated these languages as a basic study, rather than as an end in themselves. He told of certain men who, though

1. Henry Vethake, An Address Delivered at his Inauguration as President of Washington College (Lexington, Va., C. C. Baldwin, 1836) pp. 5-6.

outstanding in their knowledge of the classics, "scarcely attained the ability of putting together, with propriety, half a dozen sentences in English." Though it is hard to believe that Dr. Marshall could not write, spell and punctuate English correctly, his few letters are testimony to the fact that he seldom did. Vethake stressed the value of translating classic passages with refinement and elegance, which inability Ruffner finds is the one flaw in Marshall's scholarship.¹

1. Ibid., p. 11.

CHAPTER III

1834 - 1866

After leaving Washington College, Dr. Marshall went back to Buckpond, and probably continued teaching his academy there. He spent much time visiting among his relatives, and it was during a visit to his favorite niece, Mary K. Green, that Paxton met him, and the following typical incident took place.

I had often heard of his peculiarities, and of his bluff and dictatorial manner, and was prepared for a rebuff. I spoke to him cordially, called him Uncle Louis, and offered him my hand. He threw himself back, folded his arms and exclaimed: "Who the d---l are you, presuming to call me uncle!" I explained my relationship, and told my name. He thereupon became gracious, enquired into my studies, and ordered me to bring my Caesar, that he might see if I had any sense. Fortunately, he selected a passage with which I was familiar. I translated it correctly; but he said otherwise; and pronounced me a fool. I was then ordered to parse a passage. He laughed at me and asked what sort of teachers I was under. Knowing his disposition I turned on him, and expressed my surprise at his want of scholarship and good breeding. This impertinence pleased him, and he always treated me kindly afterward.¹

In the next few years he became Morrison Professor of Languages at Transylvania University and was president pro tem of that institution from 1838 until 1840. There are no records of any experiments in discipline

1. Paxton, op. cit., p. 70.

or curriculum during his term of office there. His salary there was \$2000 a year, unless it was different from that of his predecessor.¹

He was in Louisville sometime before 1842, for a letter addressed to him there from one J. Steele implores him to use his influence to avert a duel between his son, Thomas L. Marshall, and Judge Rowan of Nelson County, Kentucky.²

A letter from Marshall in Covington, Ky., to his son John C. Marshall is dated February 14, 1846.³ In it he complains of not hearing from his family, reminds them to manure the garden, "particularly the asparagus beds," to turn the grape vine before it is too late, to get some cuttings from Colonel Payne's prior and pippin apples and graft them on the trees near the yard, apply tar to the peach trees in the garden. "I am very anxious to be at home and think of my colts every day and feel mortified I do not dream of them you cannot believe how much pleasure I anticipate from the sight of your lambs, I hope a hundred, playing for the amusement of little Ag." He repeats his request for either John or Agatha to write him. "Edward has not been to see me for two weeks but I heard from him and what was agreeable he had several clients in his office he thinks he will

-
1. Robert and Johanna Peters, The History of Transylvania University (Louisville, 1896) p. 59.
 2. Register of the Kentucky Historical Society, Vol. IV, No. 10, p. 23.
 3. Property of William Marshall Bullitt, Louisville, Ky.

succeed and is in good spirits I have as yet kept him out of debt but with hard scrambling as he takes every cent I can make." With more instruction about the care of the estate he closes.

The Agatha he mentioned is his daughter, who married C. W. Logan, and the "little Ag" is her daughter. The phrasing and lack of punctuation is typical of all Marshall's letters.

He continued teaching, though probably more in the capacity of a tutor than a schoolmaster, and was teaching some of the children of the neighborhood at the time of the Shane interview.

Dr. Barbour quoted Dr. Robert Breckinridge, one of his students, to the effect that Dr. Marshall was one of the most honest men in money matters that he had ever known.

Living to beyond 90, he was uncommonly vigorous in both mind and body. When about 90 he remarked playfully to me at a dinner table in the Pisgah parsonage, "My son Tom said to me not long ago, 'Father, you argue as well as you ever did.'"

I endeavored to learn from him the secret of his success as a teacher. All that he would say was this: "I made scholars of my pupils." This was said with great emphasis on the word scholars. He reiterated: "I made scholars of them."¹

His interest in the classics was apparently well known, for in 1863 he was presented by Dr. Davis, father

1. Shewmaker, op. cit., p. 149.

of Jefferson Davis, with a A Cornucopia of Ancient History, autographed by the giver, printed in Latin in 1526, and bound in vellum.¹

Before his wife's death in 1844 Dr. Marshall visited among his relatives frequently, but after that time he was in almost constant travel from one home to another, tutoring the younger generation at each stop. His especial favorite was his niece, Mrs. Green, for she had never allowed herself to give in to his domineering, and he admired spirit.²

As he grew older his interest in religion became deeper, and, as was to be expected, took an extreme and unexpected turn under his novel reasoning. Even at Washington College, though he never bothered to transfer his membership, and did not take an active part in church affairs, he was what Ruffner terms a "propagandist."³

His favorite biblical study was prophecy, and he had, of course, his own mode of interpretation. Probably owing to his interest in this subject he took the Sunday morning lecture to the students, which would naturally have fallen to the clerical member of the faculty. The Doctor wished to expound the prophecies to the students, and to this he gave most of each session. The climax which he reached in his interpretation was that the earth was to be destroyed at some early day, the date of which he fixed.⁴

1. Kentucky Historical Society Register, op. cit.

2. Ruffner, No. VI, op. cit., p. 95.

3. Ibid., p. 11.

4. Ibid.

C. W. Logan, his son-in-law wrote his wife in July, 1858:

I have been reading the "Theological and Literary journal" edited by David H. Lord--the man whose writings the old Doctor admired so much. The Journal contains an article on the "Prophetic Periods of the Apocalypse and Daniel" which would be peculiarly interesting to the old man in relation to the termination of this dispensation 1866 &c.¹

This was the date at which Marshall expected the world to end, but instead was the year of his death.

He carried this same imaginative reasoning into his scholarship. Shane says that he professed to find "religious instruction conveyed in the myths of the ancient Greeks." Andromeda, for instance, was supposed to have been constructed from *ανηρ* meaning man, and *μεδομαρ*--to reconcile.²

According to Dr. H. V. Shelley, the latter word does not mean "to reconcile," but rather, "to be considerate of, to hold one's interests at heart, to think on." It is not easy to suppose that any scholar as thoroughly versed in forms and construction as Dr. Marshall would have made this error in definition, and it is likely that the discrepancy is due to Shane's translation of the word, rather than his. The correct definition had, moreover, a more lucid religious significance.

1. From a letter, property of W. M. Bullitt.
2. Shane, op. cit., 1600245.

However, the conclusion is far-fetched, especially when considered in the light of the character of Andromeda, who was a helpless victim of her mother, Casseopia, who chained her to a rock, from which she was rescued by Perseus. She had nothing to do with either reconciling or being considerate of man. According to Dr. Shelley, it is not always possible to trace down the names of the gods, although some of them will bear interpretation.

A photostatic copy¹ from some undesignated newspaper says he favored the Union during the War Between the States, but "had no love for Yankees." In speaking of the invasion of Virginia he is quoted as having said:

These infernal, sacrilegious, godless hounds have invaded old Virginia. I hope every mother's son of them will leave his bones there. I am told Robert Lee, son of my old friend General Harry Lee, is commanding the Virginians. I never met the young man myself, but I am told he is a worthy son of his father, and I hope he'll teach those infernal scoundrels that Virginia is not to be insulted with impunity.

Marshall had six children. The eldest was Thomas F. Marshall, famous in Kentucky as an orator, duellist, and United States Congressman. He was brilliant, eccentric, intemperate, and sarcastic.²

-
1. An account of the presentation of a protrait of Marshall to Washington and Lee University, property of W. M. Bullitt.
 2. The Speeches and Writings of Thomas F. Marshall, ed. by W. L. Barre, (Cincinnati, Applegate & Co., 1858) pp. 6-12.

His second son, William Louis Marshall, minister and lawyer, was "the most intellectual, as well as the most moral and unimpeachable member of the family."¹

Dr. Alexander Keith Marshall, physician, politician and professor of medicine, was "a handsome gentleman and a chaste and forcible speaker."²

John Campbell Marshall, a farmer, was "a plain, sensible and agreeable man, devoid of ambition."³

Charles Marshall studied law but died before he had a chance to go into practice.⁴

Agatha Marshall, the only daughter, married Caleb W. Logan, a lawyer and judge in Louisville.⁵

Edward Colston Marshall, the only son to be educated at Washington College, was a lawyer, duelist, captain in the Mexican campaign, emigrant to California, United States Congressman, publisher, and Attorney General of California.⁶

Marshall died in 1866, and was buried at Buckpond, but his body was later moved to Frankfort.

1. Paxton, op. cit., p. 167.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 168.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 169.

6. Ibid.

APPENDIX

PARTIAL LIST OF STUDENTS OF DR. LOUIS MARSHALL
AT BUCKPOND AND PISGAH*

William T. Barry
F. Blackburn
Cabell Breckinridge
Dr. R. J. Breckinridge
John C. Breckinridge, U. S. Senator, Secretary of War,
C. S. A.

Abram Buford
Basil Buford
Charles Buford
Alexander Campbell, U. S. Senator, Governor of Kentucky
James Clark, Governor of Kentucky
George B. Crittenden
J. J. Crittenden, U. S. Senator, Governor of Kentucky,
Attorney General of Kentucky

Basil Duke (of St. Louis)
Gen. Basil W. Duke
James K. Duke
Dr. John M. Duke
Capt. N. W. Duke
William Duke
George Dunlap
Charles W. Forman, D.D.
W. W. Forman
Lewis W. Green, D.D.
Col. John J. Hardin
Col. John A. Hardin (perhaps the same)
Gen. John Hardin (who fell at Buena Vista)
James Hardin
Rowan Hardin
George B. Kincaid
W. B. Kincaid
Alexander McClung
Col. Alexander McClung
John A. McClung, D.D.
Col. Charles A. Marshall
Charles Marshall
Gen. Humphrey Marshall
Louis Marshall
Robert M. Marshall
Thomas F. Marshall
George Madison
Joseph Perry
Robert Trimble, Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court
Allen Trimble, Governor of Ohio
Christopher Tompkins
Charles Walker

Samuel Walker
Henry Walker

* Where two names here are similar, it may be the same man, initialled differently in two of the sources. Some of the men may have been students of Steele at Pisgah, since it is uncertain whether he taught there as Marshall's associate or successor.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARRE, W. L., ed., The Speeches and Writings of Thomas F. Marshall. Cincinnati: Applegate & Co., 1858
- BEVERIDGE, A. J., The Life of John Marshall, Vo. II, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916
- BLANTON, W. B., Medicine in Virginia in the Eighteenth Century, Richmond, Va.; Garrett & Massie, Inc. 1931
- CLARK, T. D., A History of Kentucky, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- CLIFT, G. G., History of Maysville and Mason County, Lexington, Ky.; Transylvania Printing Co., 1936
- COLEMAN, J. W., Masonry in the Blue Grass, Lexington, Ky.; Transylvania Press, 1933
- The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., Oct. 25, 1936
- GARLAND, H. A., The Life of John Randolph of Roanoke, New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1850
- HOYT, W. D., A Crisis in Education, Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, Vol. 40, No. 1
- MATTHEWS, S., The French Revolution, London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1901
- MCKNIGHT, M. M., The Marshalls of Kentucky, Kentucky Progress Magazine, Mar. 1931
- PAXTON, W. M., The Marshall Family, Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co., 1885
- PEARSON, H., Tom Paine, Friend of Mankind, New York: Harper & Bros., 1937
- PETERS, ROBERT & JOHANNA, The History of Transylvania University, Louisville, Ky., 1896
- QUISENBERRY, A.C., The Life and Times of Hon. Humphrey Marshall, 1892
- Register of the Kentucky Historical Society, Vol. IV, No. 10

SHEWMAKER, W. O., Pisgah and Her People, 1784-1934,
Lexington, Ky.; Commercial Printing Co. 1935

STAPLES, C. R., The History of Pioneer Lexington,
Lexington, Ky., 1939

The Union, Lexington, Va., Vol. II, 1834

VETHAKE, H., An Address Delivered at His Inauguration
as President of Washington College, Lexington,
Va., C.C.Baldwin, 1836

Washington and Lee Historical Papers

Vol. IV, Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1893
RUFFNER, W. H. The History of Washington College,
1799-1829

Vol. V. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1895
RUFFNER, W. H., The History of Washington College,
1829-1830

MILLER, MRS. S. C. P. The Life of James McDowell

Vol. VI, Lynchburg, Va., J.P.Bell Co., 1904
RUFFNER, W. H. The History of Washington College,
1830-1845

Washington and Lee University

Examination and Matriculation Records (Registrar's
Office)

Minutes of the Board of Trustees (Treasurer's
Office)

Papers of the Board of Trustees, 1818-1835 (Treasurer's
Office)

Records of the Franklin Society (Library)

Minutes of the Washington Literary Society (Library)

University of Wisconsin

Draper Manuscripts

Letters and Manuscripts owned by William Marshall Bullitt
of Louisville, Ky.

Bonds in the University of Virginia Library

Records of the First Presbyterian Church, Lexington, Va.