

Summer 1991

The Parties Quarrae

Michael E. Malone
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/humanities_etds

 Part of the [American Literature Commons](#), and the [Creative Writing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Malone, Michael E.. "The Parties Quarrae" (1991). Master of Arts (MA), thesis, Humanities, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/xcd4-4g66
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/humanities_etds/26

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for the Humanities at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Institute for the Humanities Theses by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

THE PARTIES QUARRAE

by

Dr. Michael E. Malone
B.A., May 1969, University of Montevallo
M.A., May 1972, University of Alabama - Birmingham
Ph.D., June 1976, University of Alabama

**A Creative Project Submitted to the
Faculty of Old Dominion University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of**

MASTER OF ARTS

HUMANITIES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY
August, 1991

Approved by: |

Dr. Douglas G. Greene (Director)

**Copyright by Michael E. Malone 1991
All Rights Reserved**

ABSTRACT

THE PARTIES QUARRAE

**Dr. Michael E. Malone
Old Dominion University, 1991
Director: Dr. Douglas G. Greene**

During Thomas Jefferson's educational days in Williamsburg, Virginia, he was fortunate to have the association with three learned men, William Small, George Wythe, and Lt. Governor Francis Fauquier. The men met often at the governor's palace during the years 1760-64. Jefferson referred to their association as the "parties quarrae."

Most historians agree that the time spent with Small, Wythe, and Fauquier had profound influence on the establishment of Jefferson's "enlightenment" philosophy. Little, however, is known about the details of the regular meetings in the palace. Through examination of the social and political milieu of Fauquier's administration (and selected other governors) and through investigation of the social and political predilections of the members of the parties, inferences may be drawn as to the subject matter, opinions and ideas addressed by the men during their short time together.

The focus of this creative project is the fictional discovery of Jefferson's "lost" Autobiography, finished just prior to his death in 1826. The autobiography elaborates about areas of his life that had puzzled historians for decades, e.g., reflections on his mother as well as his early schooling, particularly his days studying with Mr. Small and Mr. Wythe.

With characteristic eye to detail Jefferson described his Williamsburg

experiences in graphic language. His references to Small, Wythe, and Fauquier were lucid descriptions of the colossal respect and admiration he held for his mentors.

This creative project is divided into sections describing Jefferson's view of the governor's palace and his recollections of the "genteel" conversations. The sections on the palace described the social milieu that was both English and colonial Virginian. The conversations covered subjects pertaining to natural and moral philosophy. The final chapter of the creative project examines the theme of influence.

Jefferson was influenced by the manner and expertise of Small, Wythe, and Fauquier. Each member of the parities was influenced by the prevalent thinking of their time, i.e., the Age of the Enlightenment. Jefferson has been called "America's first Enlightened man." How much did association with Small, Wythe, and Fauquier influence Jefferson's enlightened views? This creative project attempts to assess the extent of the influence on young Thomas Jefferson.

DEDICATION

**TO: The Memory of Professor Van Tuyl, Th.D., Ph.D.
(My Mr. Small)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
CREATIVE PROJECT STATEMENT.....	1
1. INTRODUCTION.....	13
2. THE PARTIES OF WILLIAMSBURG.....	16
INTRODUCTION.....	16
THE PALACE.....	20
GENTEEL CONVERSATION.....	33
3. BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY.....	49
BACKGROUND.....	49
INFLUENCE: THE PARTIES.....	53
INFLUENCE: THE ENLIGHTENMENT.....	55
EPILOGUE.....	60
REFERENCES.....	62
SOURCES CONSULTED FOR CHAPTER 2.....	62
SOURCES CITED IN CHAPTER 3.....	64

CREATIVE PROJECT STATEMENT

The Parties Quarrae

This creative project submitted as the final requirement in pursuit of the Masters of Arts in Humanities from Old Dominion University is the culmination of an extended journey. The length of the journey is directly related to the significance of the quest. And toward understanding of this significance, some autobiographical digression is required to explain how important this discipline, this subject matter, indeed this program was to me.

I spent a lot of time during my youth at Gulf Shores, Alabama, a remote area across the bay from Mobile. This wonderful, pristine area remains to this day largely undiscovered by tourists and teeny-boppers. However, this area received a lot of publicity in the 1960's and 1970's when Kenny Stabler was the quarterback, bad-boy hero of the Crimson Tide and later the Oakland Raiders. Gulf Shores was Stabler's hang-out and the press later dubbed the area the "Redneck Riviera."

Because my father and four previous Malone generations hailed from Mobile, Alabama, my family spent many a lazy day swimming, crabbing, and fishing in the Gulf of Mexico and Mobile Bay. It was during these trips to the bay that my life was probably changed forever. During these trips at age three to ten, I became fascinated, better said, consumed with the desire to know more about history and why events happened as they did.

Mobile Bay had always been a strategic site for military and trade activities. The Spanish were the first to recognize this. In the 1500's, they created an outpost on the Gulf Shores side. Early in the seventeenth century, the French built a fortification across the bay on a gulf island later named Daufin Island. Eventually, both outposts were expanded to serve as forts guarding the entrance way to the bay. During the French and Indian War, the forts were taken by the British and remained part of the southern defenses when the new nation inherited them after the Revolutionary War.

Fort Morgan, on the Gulf Shores side, and Fort Gaines, on the Mobile side, were reinforced during the War of 1812 and were major strategic defense bastions during the Civil War. Admiral Farragutt uttered his immortal words to "damn the torpedoes" near Fort Morgan during the Battle for Mobile Bay in 1865.

As a youth, my earliest and fondest recollections related to days spent transfixed on the bay while standing on the ruins of Fort Morgan replaying the spectacle that was the Battle of Mobile Bay. I have this same reaction today--and my reverie includes visions of Spanish galleons and French corsairs.

Suffice it to say, I cannot remember a time in my life that I have not been captured by the "sense of history" that Toynbee or Durrant articulated so well. This sense of history has its genesis in this formative period of my young life.

Throughout grade school, I could not read enough history and geography. Once my sixth grade teacher remarked that I would probably become a "history professor and make a living by studying history." No one in either side of my family had been to college, so I had no idea what my teacher meant, but the thought of getting paid to study history greatly appealed to me. My interest in history, really U.S. history, continued through high school and this interest led

me as much as anything to consider going on to college.

Unlike most freshmen, I never changed my declared major. I attended a college known for its liberal arts and this, too, turned out to be a good decision because during my years as an undergraduate, I came in contact with a mentor who opened my eyes to the world of thinking, reasoning, and expressing. Baron H. Van Tuyll, Ph.D., Th.D., Eminent Professor of Philosophy and Religion, was my William Small.

I learned to appreciate history, particularly Western Civilization, in a larger, more profound context. I was introduced to history not only as a chronicle of events, but history as a coalescence of ideas.

With Professor Van Tuyll's assistance, I secured a graduate fellowship to The University of Tennessee. However, even though the dynamic sixties were a wonderful time to be in college and to study the history of ideas, a war was also raging. And as that ogre with the bee-hive hairdo at the draft board informed me, I had "completed my education" and it was time for me to swap places with the boys who didn't get deferments. Suffice it to say, we had a fundamental disagreement over my future.

Unlike the majority of my peers, I appealed directly to the draft board and a compromise was reached whereby I was given a teaching deferment provided I not go to graduate school (after all, I had "completed my education"). This teaching deferment allowed my wife and me the opportunity to teach grades seven through twelve in a rural Appalachian Alabama school. This teaching deferment kept me out of Viet Nam. More importantly, this teaching deferment opened the door for my career in education.

I taught history and social studies, and because I had a minor in English, I taught four classes of English including the senior class. I knew nothing about

foundations or philosophies of pedagogy. My wife was the education major. But I followed a maxim that served me well those years fresh out of college--I would teach using methods I appreciated in my former teachers. Likewise, I would not teach using rote/recitation methods I abhorred as a student.

Some of my methods proved somewhat unorthodox by Alabama standards, but the students responded. And when they responded positively, I was reinforced to try even bolder (and creative) teaching methods. Years later when I studied education psychology, I found that I was following some pedagogically sound techniques of teaching-learning.

Those years in rural Alabama solidified two perspectives with the Malone family--I was cut out for a life in education (my liberal arts training had served me well) and my education major wife discovered she should seek other career pursuits.

When Selective Service changed their draft procedure to the lottery, I drew a number that meant I would be called just before the women, children, and infirm received their notices. I wanted to teach but my emergency certificate was no longer valid. We had to face the dilemma--I was no longer able to teach in public school unless I went back to get those education courses which had served my wife so well. If I went back to school at all, it would definitely be to pursue an advanced degree in history or philosophy. We also had no money. I took a position at the Birmingham City Jail as a social worker and education specialist.

This position enabled me to use some law enforcement grants to get my Masters in Counseling Psychology. History was still my love but the grant would pay only for a program in the social sciences. Once again, my desire to pursue advanced work in the history of ideas had been thwarted.

My Master's enabled me to take a position in junior college administration.

While working at a two-year school in Birmingham, I started a doctoral program in extension at the University of Alabama in higher education administration. I hated it and quickly switched to behavioral studies. Again the opportunity was not there for advanced study in history.

I took a position in admissions at the University of Alabama which allowed me to earn my Ph.D. in three years. I promised my wife that I would stay out of the classroom as a student for five or more years so she could pursue an advance degree. I was almost true to my word.

I made good use of my classroom break. During this time, I became intensely interested in colonial history and read Dumas Malone's mammoth volumes on Thomas Jefferson. We also visited Charlottesville, Williamsburg, and Norfolk during this time. Similar to those days in my youth when I became captivated with the Civil War, I found myself totally focused on the colonial period in our history. But unlike my youthful focus, my excitement emanated from contemplation of ideas more than events. The more I read about social contracts and consent of the governed, the more I had to know.

I realized that my interest in colonial history went beyond even intellectual history. And having been trained as a social scientist in my graduate program, I was anxious to learn more about colonial social history, more about contributions of women and minorities; more about areas that I would later lump under the rubric of decorative arts. But foremost, I was interested in the specific history of ideas that culminated in the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution.

Eventually I framed the following questions which better focused my readings: How much of early American democratic thought was derived from European systems? How much influence did the exploration and adaptation of

the New World influence American ideas and ideals (i.e., how much credence did Turner's thesis really have)? Why was the Declaration of Independence written in America and not in France or England?

I found that I could pursue my interests through the American Studies program at the University of Alabama. I was looking for an interdisciplinary approach to my study that I could not get from the traditional M.A. program in history. In my required Statement Concerning My Self Designed Program (for the American Studies program, 1980) I noted:

In keeping with the disciplinary approach of American Studies, I wish to focus on extra dimensions of this (colonial) period, e.g. the flavor and culture, the philosophy, the intellectual contributions, and the technology. Given these extra dimensions, I am particularly interested in the intellectual history of this period.

It has been more than ten years since I wrote the words above. I have maintained an interest in these areas to the present day.

In 1981, we left Alabama for Virginia. One of the first inquiries I made at Old Dominion University was about the graduate program in Humanities. This program seemed to encompass the strengths and flexibility that made up my previous interdisciplinary program. I was correct indeed.

Entering the program in 1984, I listed my disciplinary foci as intellectual history, philosophy, and later an interest area in the arts (e.g. decorative arts, architecture, music). I have maintained my interest (infatuation) in colonial history but my focus has been narrowed to the colony of Virginia. I have maintained my interest in Thomas Jefferson and most all of my papers in my courses at Old Dominion University pertain to him.

I have also narrowed my study of Jefferson to the time when he was a college student. As a college graduate and a college educator, I feel a special kinship with him during his days at William and Mary. And having fallen madly in love

with the sights, smells, and sounds of Colonial Williamsburg, I have had a genuine good time researching my fascinating subject in an ever stimulating environment--literally the best of all worlds for the researcher.

The Parties: An Interdisciplinary Focus

As reflected in my preceding "autobiography," I probably could not have written *The Parties* from any approach other than an interdisciplinary one. Quite honestly, I did not enjoy writing Chapter three, the bibliographic essay. I enjoyed writing Chapter two, particularly the section on the social arts.

I had read a great deal of biographical information about the parties themselves. However, the social scientist in me wanted to know more about the men in relationship to their surroundings, their environment. This environment was of course shaped by the historical events of the day. But the environment also included other elements, e.g., architecture, decorative arts, and music to name a few.

Mr. Graham Hood, Chief Curator at Colonial Williamsburg, said to me in an interview in June, 1989, that even though we know very little about Fauquier and Small, we can learn much about them by studying how men of their social and educational stature would have lived in the mid 1700's in a place dominated by British values, customs, and law. Mr. Hood suggested that I use Colonial Williamsburg as a living laboratory (tourist attractions notwithstanding). I should seek to create a visual collage of Williamsburg in 1760 through study and observation of the restored village itself. The Governor's Palace, the Capitol, the Wren building, Carter's Grove Plantation were invaluable sources as I sought to create this visual collage from the living laboratory.

The most important contribution to this objective came about through two courses with Dr. Betsy Falhman. Betsy's course in American Architecture was

the best graduate course I have ever taken. She taught those of us who had no formal training in this area, and some of us who thought they had no eye for this work, how to recognize the major features in buildings and houses, and classify them according to period and place. From Betsy's course, I also became an unabashed fan of Georgian architecture.

The other course which helped me better obtain a visual collage of Williamsburg in 1760 was an independent study course I took from Betsy on Colonial Decorative Arts. This course did two things for me. I developed an appreciation for the differences in styles, e.g. between the baroque and rococo and the rococo and the romantic styles, and more importantly, I was introduced to that wonderful museum/library dedicated to the decorative arts, the DeWitt Wallace Gallery.

After Betsy's courses, I could visit restored colonial houses and buildings in the Carolinas and Virginia and do as Mr. Hood also advised, that is, learn about the people of the area from how they lived. He also advised that until I have done this properly, I should not write the first word of my thesis. This turned out to be sound advice even though it extended my writing of the parties by almost two years.

I applaud Colonial Williamsburg for remaining true to its rigid standards of restoring eighteenth century buildings with period furnishings and eye to detail down to the paint applied. This exactitude makes the visual collage possible. I also must admit that I continue to be amazed and disappointed as to how many ersatz colonial houses are furnished with federal period items. Education can be a dangerous thing.

Another course that was helpful to the writing of the parties was Lee Tepley's "Music of the Classical Period." Lee encouraged us to research the period of the

music thus helping us appreciate the derivation of the music. He did not have to encourage me because this is why I took the course. Even though I had studied music most all of my young life, I knew more about the historical events surrounding the classical period than I did the music itself. This proved to be a very valuable course in helping me put the composers, events, and the changing styles of music in relationship to the period of focus in my project, i.e., 1760-64.

This perspective comes out in my creative project in several ways. I often made the point that Jefferson lived through three major traditions in music, i.e., baroque, classical, and romantic. Fauquier's influence was significant as he certainly impressed upon young Jefferson the importance of being open to new thinking, new styles, new traditions, new values. Also having this historical and social perspective I was able to better speculate on the occurrences in the palace based on composites of actual and perceived events.

I said earlier that I did not enjoy writing Chapter three, the bibliographic essay. This is a relative statement, one of predilection, not a swipe against the subject matter. Chapter two was a real joy to write. Chapter three had to be written to put Chapter two in context. I am glad I wrote this chapter first because the activity reacquainted me with the scholarship regarding the Enlightenment, particularly the Scottish Enlightenment. The period of the Enlightenment has long held my fascination. And because Jefferson was a product of this period I was very anxious to understand more about the influence of the period on him.

Chapter three provides a survey of intellectual and philosophical elements that united the parties as collective products of the Enlightenment. The central theme in Chapter three is the theme of influence--influence of ideas over men and the influence of men over men. William Small was a key player in this study.

Picking up on Gary Wills' somewhat controversial statement that the real "lost world" of Thomas Jefferson was centered around Aberdeen (Scotland), I researched Small's own education for clues to ascertain if Small did as I did, i.e., "teach as he was taught." This proved to be helpful particularly when I wrote the section "Genteel Conversation" in Chapter two. Even though each of the parties was a product of the Enlightenment, I felt (and feel) that Small, because of his ties to the university environment, was more the personification of the period than any of the other parties.

In writing the "Genteel Conversations," I had some trepidation about the scientific discussions. Dr. John L. McKnight, professor of physics at the College of William and Mary helped me understand the importance of the parties' interest in mechanics. I examined some of the instruments of the period on display in the physics department at William and Mary and was amazed at their combination of simplicity and sophistication. According to Dr. McKnight, some of the best instruments were created during the period with the purpose of creating other new and better instruments. I am convinced that Small, and probably Wythe, could fix (and design) anything mechanical. I still find it ironic that Small's design for the turning plow was considered the industry standard until it was replaced by one designed by Jefferson. I firmly believe that Jefferson was totally, hopelessly enthralled with the discussions and minor experimentation regarding natural philosophy. He had to be because his mentors were equally enthralled.

History will probably best remember the meetings of the parties quarrae for their influence on Jefferson in the areas of moral philosophy. Whether the Declaration of Independence was influenced most by Locke or Hutcheson begs the question. The important point is the fact that Jefferson sincerely believed in the tenets embodied in this brilliant work and the other important documents he

produced in the 1770's. I believe that once again William Small was the key player who influenced Jefferson the most in the area of moral philosophy. I concur totally with Wills when he speaks of the influence of Aberdeen on Jefferson.

One has to believe (I do) that in the course of genteel conversations at the palace, Jefferson filed away many thoughts, ideas, and insights that later would be researched in Wythe's office and later still, tested in full debate with peers. I have to believe that his abhorrence of slavery had its genesis in this period. Enlightened men would think this way. I also believe that his repugnance of religious intolerance can be traced to this time in his moral development. Fauquier deserves major credit for much of this influence.

The conversations were genteel, but they were also substantial and stimulating. It would be a mistake to think that the conversations were carried on strictly in the past tense. Even though they were products of their past, they were interested, even enthused, about the future. And the future would be a better place because these brilliant men got together for some "genteel conversation" and "making of pleasing music."

Summary

The Parties Quarrae culminates a labor of love, a labor that goes back many years. The Master of Arts in Humanities is not a professional degree for me--I have three of those. But this degree enables me to indulge my love (as did the parties) of learning in several areas important to me. These areas include:

- 1. The study of Thomas Jefferson, who he was and his significance to the period in which he lived;**
- 2. The study of the social and intellectual milieu of Colonial Williamsburg prior to the American Revolution;**
- 3. The study of the Enlightenment and its influence on the men and ideas of colonial Virginia, prior to the American Revolution.**

My foremost discipline of study has long been American History, and more recently, Colonial History. In the 1960's, my William Small taught me to think, reason, and explain. Today, my favorite spot on earth is Williamsburg. By taking advantage of the interdisciplinary nature of the Humanities program at Old Dominion University, I have had the opportunity to read, write, and interact with esteemed professors and colleagues and indulge in the pleasures noted above. The end result will be a receipt of a respected degree from a respected discipline. This has been a labor of love.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Through Thomas Jefferson's own observations, and the observations of contemporaries, one can conclude that his days as a student in Williamsburg grounded his understanding and appreciation for moral and natural philosophy. His days in Williamsburg also laid the foundation for much of his social and esthetic development.

Most Jeffersonian historians agree that the association with William Small, George Wythe and Francis Fauquier had profound influence on the establishment of Jefferson's "enlightenment" philosophy. However, little is known about the details of the regular meetings in Lt. Gov. Fauquier's palace. Of the significant Jeffersonian biographers, only Chinard conjectures about the content of the meetings.

Through the examination of the social and political milieu of Fauquier's administration (and selected other governors), and through investigation of the social and political predilections of the individuals making up the "parties quarrae," inferences may be drawn as to the subject matter, opinions and ideas addressed by the men during their short time together.

Because there are little, if any, primary materials describing these meetings, great care must be given in recreating the setting and more importantly the subject matter and dialogue. However, from primary sources, educated

assumptions may be made about the social milieu. And extracting from some of the writings of the men themselves, it is possible to speculate as to the nature of their discussions and actions based on comparisons and contrasts of views on specific subjects.

Some questions to be considered--What was unique about the meetings of the "parties quarrae"? What was young Jefferson's role in the meetings of the four men? How would one describe the social milieu of the Fauquier palace? What are the opinions and philosophies which were common to the four parties? Were there points of view not shared by one or more of the group? How important was the performance of music to the bonding of the relationship between and among the four?

Using the questions above, the purpose of my study will be to make inferences as to the setting and content of the meetings among the "parties quarrae." The description will be in the third person.

As I create the fiction surrounding the meetings of the parties, I will strictly adhere to authoritative historical research concerning the period. The stage of the fiction is set when a long suspected but long-lost section to Thomas Jefferson's Autobiography was discovered and subsequently edited. The discovery rocked the world of Jeffersonian scholarship. Perceptions and theories developed over a century were now repudiated or validated. Jefferson as an ailing man spoke lucidly about his usual favorite subjects--farming, music, moral philosophy and education--but for the first time in history Jefferson described with pride and often times exaltation his younger days. As with most mental reflections that are filtered by the healing powers of time, the pain, the conflicts, the complexities of his youth were reduced to simple lackluster phrases. The most descriptive and exciting passages of his new found writings had to do with

his reflections on his mother, and his early schooling; particularly his days of "unbounded freedom and discovery" at The College of William and Mary and later with his law tutor, Wythe. The proceeding chapter chronicles this period--the period he became one quarter of the parties quarrae.

Fact and fiction are combined in this chapter. The two are structurally juxtaposed through the use of Jefferson's quotations from recognized works of his and quotations from the newly discovered section of his Autobiography. Quotations in this text which are taken from the "lost" Autobiography will be designated (L.A.). Through third person narrative, the idea and/or event is developed with the ultimate intent to address the questions raised previously in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2

The Parties of Williamsburg

"My real joy of learning was fixed during my associations with learned men at the palace."

from the "lost" Autobiography

Introduction

Until recently, it was thought that Jefferson's Autobiography ended with an oblique reference to his return to this continent (New York) on March 21, 1790. Randolph family tradition had long held the notion that Jefferson, the octogenarian, wrote feverishly the last few years of his life.

The academic world is still reeling from the incredible find. Once again a dusty locker in an even dustier attic yielded prizes more valuable than money. It did not take Jefferson scholars long to dig into the newly-found wealth of Jefferson's complete Autobiography, finished just six months before his death.

The narrative in this chapter examines those passages taken from recollections of his time spent in study in Williamsburg. These recollections expand greatly on the passages found in his earlier version. Most fascinating of all is the way the old and dying Jefferson captures the youthful enthusiasm surrounding his school days. And more remarkable is his keen recollection and unbridled expression of respect for the three men who shaped his thinking and ideas which in turn helped guide historical events for a half century.

Long before the discovery of the "lost Autobiography," Jefferson made known the significance of the meetings of the parties on his life. The writings of his later years shed greater light not only on the significance of the meetings but on the meetings themselves.

With characteristic eye to detail (although filtered through the lenses of time), Jefferson described his Williamsburg experiences in graphic language. His references to the parties were lucid descriptions of his colossal respect and admiration for his mentors.

Fauquier, Small, and Wythe were Jefferson's mentors; they were his early heroes; and in today's vernacular—they were his role models. But when Jefferson spoke about "a familiarity among gentlemen that transcended age and standing," (L. A.) he was talking about friendship. The parties were indeed friends and colleagues. Friends and colleagues enjoy each other's company. Friends and colleagues respect each other's aptitudes and abilities and each benefits from the association.

History has yet to record how any of the other parties viewed their association. However, it must be assumed that the affection and respect among the four was mutual affection. Each saw the other as colleague and friend. This relationship existed even between a royal Lt. Governor and a bright undergraduate from Albemarle county, Virginia.

Jefferson's depiction of the milieu of the governor's palace as it existed in 1760 was basically matter of fact, embellished with only occasional hyperbole. Even for a laconic Jefferson, this is somewhat surprising because one would think that the grace and opulence of the palace would have left a greater impression on him. It could be, however, that the passing of time had also quieted the passions of youthful impressions. Nevertheless, Jefferson's

descriptions of the palace filled in many gaps that history overlooked in Fauquier's tenure.

Jefferson's recollections of the social gatherings among the parties also provide history with a graphic depiction of life among the genteel of eighteenth century Virginia society. Neither Jefferson, Wythe, nor Small represented the wealthy upper tier of the Virginia class structure. Nevertheless, collectively, they were privy to most of the best social opportunities of their day. Fauquier set the tone as well as the calendar of Williamsburg society. And Fauquier's desire to promulgate good will among his constituents, and his personal predilection for frequent conviviality among close friends offered Jefferson, Wythe, and Small many opportunities for close social interaction with Fauquier.

Jefferson remembered most fondly these social interactions. He recalled that conversations before, during, and after dinner "never left a subject undone" (L. A.). His favorite table conversations were in the area of natural science. He occasionally made cogent points during these discourses--a fact that gave him great satisfaction. On numerous occasions, discussion topics during dinner led to actual experimentation on various scientific apparatus later in the week. He also remembered being a studious listener when Fauquier and Small talked of places, people, and events beyond the Atlantic Ocean.

Second to his fond reminiscences of the conversation among the parties, were his recollections of the music they played and enjoyed together. He later played with better musicians than the parties, but he rarely enjoyed himself as much. Fauquier introduced him to the "new music" of eighteenth century Europe. Some of this music, he did not care for until later in his life.

The "lost" Autobiography offers a snapshot of life in the colonial capital of the first colony. Jefferson's snapshot of life in colonial Williamsburg focused on

the best of things--his education, his social activities, his relationships with mentors who were also friends and colleagues. If he focused on the harsher realities of colonial Williamsburg in 1760, he failed to snap the shutter. Poverty, disease, and bigotry were all around him. However, it is hard to fault him for his seeming lack of concern. After all, he was a country squire; an undergraduate at the College of William and Mary; and a frequent visitor at the governor's palace. But lest it be forgotten, he was also only seventeen years old. Even though the written recollections of the time spent with the parties were recollections of an old man--the original snapshot was taken by a seventeen year old--a seventeen year old who had an incredible opportunity to learn and grow, and ultimately become America's first "Enlightenment Man."

The Palace

"Many of my friends, like John Page, were invited to the palace for conversation and playing of instruments. Sometimes, I went to the palace with other students from the College. . .but I never enjoyed myself so much as the time spent with Mr. Wythe and Mr. Small. The conversation challenged me to think as a man of the planet, not a student of the College. Days after a visit with the parties, I remained inspired to question."

from the "lost" Autobiography

Jefferson's first impression of Williamsburg is not untypical of a seventeen year old arriving from the country. Anticipating new sights and sounds he was, as he said years later, "intrigued by it all" (L.A.). Better said, he had mixed emotions--the same mixed emotions college freshmen have today. He felt anxious yet eager to test his intellect against peers as he learned from tutors. He felt a sense of urgency to get this phase of his life on and over. These years in Williamsburg were to be the stepping stones to the life he would assume. This was a life--inherited from his parents, albeit more of a Randolph life than a Jefferson life.

His sense of urgency was tempered by a nagging sense of foreboding. Did he really have the capability to succeed? Was his preparation with Rev. Maury really adequate? Could he be spending his time more profitably, i.e., taking care

of the estates he had inherited at such a young age? And the other "very--freshman" question--did he really want to be here rather than his home?

His one pistole entrance fee bought a rather austere existence--a dormitory room in the Wren building, equipped with a desk, a chair, and a bed. This was a stark contrast to his life in Albemarle county. Nevertheless, typical of most first year college students, he brought from home things of value and solace. Of utilitarian value he brought his horse, and of emotional value, he brought his fiddle. These two possessions helped him through that long and challenging first spring in Williamsburg.

There were other freshman emotions--unavoidable emotions associated with his presence in the capital of colonial Virginia. He felt a sense of wonderment and awe as he viewed the capital building where the Burgesses and General Court met. He felt overwhelmed as he viewed for the first time the home of the Lt. Governor of the colony of Virginia.

To young Jefferson the governor's palace was what he had always heard it to be--the manifestation of the might and power of Mother England. He admired the relatively simple lines of the Georgian structure (an opinion he was to change in later years). The commodious surroundings, particularly the landscaping of the vast acreage, added to the "Englishness" of the palace. He remarked later, "pride swelled throughout me the first time I gazed at Governor Fauquier's residence. I understood what it meant to be a (English) subject and was humbled beyond words" (L.A.).

Later as a frequent guest at the palace, Jefferson still experienced feelings of exhilaration and pride knowing that Virginia was part of the larger sphere based in London. The palace always did this to him. He could not possibly have entertained the notion that in a different day, different epoch, he would reside in

this estate as master.

The palace served as a center for a multitude of activities. It was the social center of the colonial capital. It was also the center for all business transactions between colonists and sovereign. But for young Jefferson, the palace was a classroom, just as much a classroom as any in the Wren building at the college. At the palace, he learned and had validated many accepted truths about natural and moral philosophy. He learned about subjects outside the curriculum of the college, namely, literature, art, music, and world travel. And probably more importantly, the palace as classroom afforded this upstart the opportunity to exercise an expanding curiosity--some would say, an insatiable inquisitiveness--about the world and how it was put together.

Shortly after Jefferson began his classes, the General Court came into session. If his many young emotions had not been piqued prior to the opening of court, they definitely were about to be. During Public Times, the otherwise sleepy-little village of Williamsburg literally came alive with activity.

People with business with the Court and people who had business with people who had business with the Court transformed the village into a cacophony of sounds and varied sights. It was during this period that William Small first introduced Jefferson to Lt. Governor Francis Fauquier.

The first meeting was not in the palace but rather at the Capital. Small and Jefferson were visiting Wythe, who was pleading one of his many civil cases before the Court. By chance, Small and Jefferson met the Governor as he was exiting the north side of the capital. The Governor was alone, not uncommon for him as he was not intimidated by public attention.

Jefferson fondly recalled that this chance meeting may not have been chance at all but pre-arranged by Small and Wythe (L.A.). Nonetheless, Jefferson was

impressed by the Governor's cordiality and particularly his prior knowledge about young Jefferson himself. It was very clear to Jefferson that Small had a special relationship with Governor Fauquier, a perception that would be later validated many times. Jefferson was distinctly impressed by the Governor's personable demeanor and genuine concern for his health and happiness. This concern led to Jefferson's first invitation to the palace.

The Governor expressed an interest in having Jefferson and his young friend John Page come to the palace. Page was under the personal tutelage of President Dawson. Page had, thereby, several occasions to visit the palace. However, when the invitation came to Jefferson, the other palace guests were to be Mr. Small and Mr. Wythe. Young John Page was not slighted as he, Jefferson, and other students, namely Carr and Walker, were invited as a group after the General Court ended its session. The first gathering of the parties quarrae was significant for many reasons, not the least of which was because it was on April 13, 1760, Jefferson's first birthday away from home (L.A.).

As any first time visitor would feel prior to honoring an invitation to visit royalty, Jefferson felt more anxious about the unknowns of such an occasion. As would any young person of the landed gentry, Jefferson was schooled in the social graces. His mother saw to his training at an early age. However, it was the unknowns that bothered him. And as would be expected, he turned to the man who was rapidly becoming his mentor and friend, William Small.

Small, though eight and a half years Jefferson's senior, could empathize with Jefferson's anxiety. Small too was still somewhat of a newcomer to Williamsburg. Small was also still young enough to remember his own days as an undergraduate in Aberdeen. This empathy easily gave way later to real affection and admiration for the young Jefferson. Small also had the good sense to seek

the advice of the wise counselor, Wythe. Together, Wythe and Small coached Jefferson on what to expect and what was expected of him as a visitor to the palace. Jefferson always reflected on this "social tutoring" (L.A.) as the event that later solidified their mutual friendship.

The first visit to the palace was eventful in two respects--one because it was the first visit (and on his birthday nonetheless), and two because it reinforced further in his mind the impressions of England's might and majesty. Recalling how he felt as he entered the palace gates at the appointed time of 3:00 p.m., he said he felt "equally tall and insignificant" (L.A.). He was a part of this, but was he deserving? It seems that he continued to deal with this personal dichotomy for many years to come.

Fauquier had made many improvements to the palace, particularly to the surrounding grounds. His major improvements came in the way the palace was used. Fauquier wanted the colonists to associate the palace [and him] with the mother country. In previous administrations only those people having immediate business with the governor or the wealthy colonial elite had much access to the palace and its grounds. Fauquier advanced a new, more open approach to palace accessibility. The palace was of particular utility when the General Assembly met. Fauquier used this social setting to create and cement alliances with men of power in Virginia. He also used the palace well in creating loyalties and impressions with future Burgesses such as those young men attending William and Mary.

Jefferson even then had an eye for detail; an eye for symmetry; an eye for texture and contrast. As stated earlier, the palace was a power center, but as Jefferson recognized immediately, it was also a working estate. The estate was built on the model of an English country manor house. In today's parlance, it

was a stand-alone, functional unit. But it was a unit made up of countless smaller units, each operating for the good of the whole. Jefferson's background made him admire this efficient operation. His admiration for Fauquier's managerial prowess increased steadily.

Suffice it to say, Jefferson had never seen furnishings like the ones that adorned the eleven rooms of the palace. Like most invited guests who did not stay overnight, he was privy to only five of the rooms. But he came away from the palace that momentous day with a new understanding of the word, elegance. He had long admired what he termed "functional elegance" (L.A.)--and likewise, so was the palace. Yet he had never seen house furnishings and decorations that were in and of themselves elegant.

When Fauquier's "man" met them at the door, Jefferson was completely taken with the gleaming marble floor and the plethora of shiny muskets with bayonets arrayed in a perfect circle overhead. Only the governor could possess such an excellent arsenal. He could not possibly be prepared for the seemingly unending supply of mahogany used on the walls and furniture. Jefferson later remembered that only in such an opulent setting would you find elegant crimson damask chair coverings, themselves covered with a rather plain cotton, red plaid material from India (L.A.).

Jefferson, Wythe, and Small were received by the Governor in a room which would also serve as the dining room. Again, Jefferson admired this multi-functional use of space. Jefferson admitted that ironically he remembered very little of the conversation that day. He was much too enamored with the gold wall mirrors and thirteen wax portraits affixed to the south wall. However, in subsequent visits, the conversations were the "illuminating" (L.A.) events that he would cherish all of his life.

He was somewhat disappointed in the dinner; disappointed not with the quantity of the food but with the bill of fare. The menu was very Virginian--meats, vegetables, jellies, and sauces that he was used to eating. In a way however, he was pleased to know that the king's highest colonial representative could indeed appreciate the local cuisine. To young Jefferson's credit, he was able to admire the Governor's more subtle attributes as well as the obvious ones (L.A.).

After the meal the group retired upstairs to the Governor's special meeting room known as the upper middle room. Here the Governor typically discussed official state business and held private audiences. Jefferson was immediately impressed by the gold looking glasses and crimson damask chairs. But the one item that always stood out in his mind about this room was the wall covering. The walls looked of wood but closer inspection showed that they were really hammered leather. Jefferson asked if he could see the Governor's library. Fauquier refused permission because this visit was social not educational. Jefferson was given a tour of the grounds instead. The group passed through the great ballroom as they exited the palace on the north side. Later events in this ballroom were to affect Jefferson's personal and cultural life significantly.

Whether it was the extra glass of port he had after dinner or not, he recalled being overwhelmed by the sight and smell of the grounds (L.A.). There was just enough light left on that lovely April day to accent the magnificent colors abounding as in a prism. On closer scrutiny, Jefferson could see the grand scheme used in the nearby gardens. Straight lines of red and yellow Dutch tulips were starting to give way to purple irises. The courtyard and garden stretched for at least two hundred and fifty feet. Meandering paths were angled and bordered by endless plantings of boxwoods, some cut low and others cut high in

cylindrical shapes. The pond and surrounding weeping willows were barely visible in the east. He thought he could make out the shapes of large white fowl--he later learned that these were the royal swans. He could barely make out the bountiful vegetable garden in the distant shadows.

Jefferson greatly admired the contrast between beauty and symmetry of the palace gardens. He remembered this layout and tried to copy it in later years, without the willows and swans. Governor Fauquier was quick to give his predecessor Spotswood the credit for the design of the grounds. Jefferson appreciated the Governor's willingness to defer praise to another governor. Fauquier again unwittingly gained stature in Jefferson's young eyes.

Jefferson's initial visit ended about 9:00 p.m. This was an early ending to the evening by usual palace social standards. But alas, it was a school night! Jefferson bade his host and friends an adieu and took the long way back to campus by way of the capital. It had been a night (a birthday) he would always remember and write about affectionately many years later. He wrote:

That night introduced me to my real world, a world of larger magnitude and immensity that I ever imagined could exist. I had good guides, men of experience and wisdom who understood the world. I knew I would learn much more about my world from them (L.A.).

Also in later years Jefferson would admonish his fifteen year old daughter, Patsy, that music, drawing, books, inventions, and exercise will be of many resources to guard you against "ennui". Jefferson probably held this view before he enrolled at William and Mary. Nevertheless, when he left Williamsburg in 1767, after many visits to the palace, Jefferson was practically incapable of experiencing the ennui about which he cautioned Patsy.

Concerning the Social Arts

As a gentleman, he was expected to master many of the social arts. He learned dancing at an early age and had plenty of practice with his sisters,

particularly with his sister, Jane. He learned the obligatory minuet, required of all gentlemen. He also mastered the popular reels as well as some of the local country dances. This training served him well in the Apollo room and the ballroom at the palace.

As mentioned earlier, he brought his violin to Williamsburg. The violin served as a link to his recent past--a past for the most part filled with fun and family support. Coming to Williamsburg, he expected to have none of the former and little of the latter. Both of these assumptions, of course, proved wrong. But only after his first few visits to the palace was he convinced that fun and support could be mutually inclusive.

It was during dinner conversation at the first palace visit that Jefferson's "other" talents became known. The one common element that linked all Virginia gentlemen was the love of horses--riding horses, breeding horses, trading horses, racing horses. Fauquier owned an impressive stable, and enjoyed talking about their racing and breeding prowess. Jefferson and Wythe could easily identify with their host's enthusiasm. Small always demurred politely when this subject came up. He appreciated the utility of the animals and greatly admired their natural ability and grace, but he could never work up the passion that Virginians had for the animal. Fauquier, always the consummate host, would eventually steer the conversation away from horses to that of a more genteel subject, usually music (L.A.).

Each of the parties had some schooling in theory and to a lesser degree in composition. Fauquier had the highest knowledge in all musical areas. He played the violin, cello, harpsichord, English guitar, and flute. Small and Wythe were probably the least talented of the group although Wythe could play the harpsichord reasonably well. Jefferson eventually took up the cello which he

played more frequently, particularly when he would be invited to play with other, more talented students.

Next to playing music, the parties enjoyed talking about music. It was during these conversations that Jefferson was introduced to the "new styles" of music emanating from Europe.

Jefferson could not boast a classical training in music as could some of his peers. But he did have a high respect for the work of Bach, Handel, Scarlatti, Corelli, Vivaldi, and Tartini. But through the association of the parties, Jefferson was introduced to the works of Stamitz, C.P.E. Bach, Haydn, and Mozart. Jefferson owed this early introduction to the new classical style to Fauquier. Sheet music was almost as valuable as the local currency. And in some cases, such as later works by Mozart, sheet music was more valuable.

By his position, Fauquier had access to the latest compositions from the continent. The palace was a conservatory for the traditional baroque and the new classical sound. Jefferson benefited greatly from this early introduction to the changing music styles. He was on the threshold of the radical change away from the baroque to the more melodious, homophonic, "gallant" style. He remarked in later years, "The energetic and wonderful organized music I heard in France and Italy, I first heard in my years as a student" (L.A.).

Eventually, Jefferson observed another musical revolution as the classical period gave way to the so-called Romantic period. The training he received during his brief time with the parties prepared him well for change. As a matter of fact, it can be said that this was one of the major contributions the parties gave to Jefferson, i.e., the courage to seek change and the ability to cope with it.

As noted earlier, the conversation often out-distanced the actual performance. This was partially true when dinner conversation shifted to

musical instruments. When this shift occurred (as it invariably did), Small and, to a lesser degree, Wythe would take the lead. Small understood pitch and harmony and their founding in physical laws. He often cited Lord Kames in his pronouncements about this subject. Wythe, in affirming this observation, stressed the need for the instrument maker to better appreciate the physics of the sound when he crafted the instrument. The notion that craftsmanship of the instrument could be enhanced by a higher knowledge of physical laws was highly but not overwhelming to young Jefferson. After all, this was as it should be, i.e., it made common sense. Jefferson's later critical eye to detail for ordering instruments for his family, can be traced back to this time. When he ordered the pianoforte for his wife Martha and when he ordered the harpsichords for both of his daughters, he reflected on these marvelous discussions about the relationship between craftsmanship and mechanics (L.A.).

Jefferson was always captivated by these discussions. The discussions did not make him a better musician, only practice did that, but these topics did give him a greater appreciation for the structure and design of instruments. When Jefferson later noted that music was his life's "passion," this passion also included the physics of music and musical instruments.

Jefferson was convinced that Small could design anything, to wit, a better musical instrument. When asked why he did not design instruments, Small replied that just as the "craftsman should understand the physical laws of the instrument so too should he be able to make music from the damn thing" (L.A.). Small often underestimated his own musical talent, a talent that Jefferson always found most proficient.

It was during those weekly concerts at the palace that Jefferson was able to indulge the passion of his life. The evening at the palace was usually the

same--arrive at 3:00 p.m., dinner at 4:00 p.m., music usually at 7:00 p.m. until midnight, and often later. Jefferson learned that these "little concerts" (L.A.) were for everybody--both the entertainers and the audience. Although there were always guests present who did not play in these "little concerts," all understood that the opportunity to make music was the important thing. This was the way the governor wanted it; therefore, that was the way it was. Amateurs routinely played with professionals. The exceptions to this were special occasions when only professionals and selected guests were invited to play.

At the "little" concerts Jefferson preferred to play the second violin or the cello. However, Jefferson fondly remembered a time when the governor insisted that he play first violin because Fauquier knew that Jefferson particularly admired a particular piece (L.A.). Jefferson always thought that Fauquier learned from Mr. Pelham, the organist at Bruton Parish, that he (Jefferson) especially admired Wodiezka's sonata. *The Sonata, Opus I for Violin Solo and Bass* was written by Wenzeslaus Wodiezka, violinist and concert master at the court chapel in Munich, Germany. Jefferson later obtained an English copy of this music and instructed his daughter, Patsy, how to play the cello part with the left hand while improvising the harmony with her right.

Jefferson did not indicate how this little concert went for him personally, but this piece did stay in his collection as long as he lived. Fauquier's insistence that Jefferson play the first violin when more able talent was available, and play first violin on a piece by an obscure, relatively modern composer, again speaks to the Governor's concern for Jefferson's maturation. This also speaks well of the Governor's willingness to champion new and progressive ideas within his residence.

Jefferson's other memorable concerts were those when he was part of the audience. These concerts usually occurred during the Public Times and on the King's birthday. Probably the most memorable was the concert on February 12, 1761, the day of the coronation of George III.

Governor Fauquier assembled the first musicians in the colony for a command performance at the palace. Jefferson was one of only three students from the college extended an invitation. Small and Wythe were also invited to this significant event. Even though Handel and Bach were featured quite prominently that evening, Jefferson's most vivid memories center around the new Hayden piece performed that night. *Hayden's String Quartet in B-flat Major* moved him as never before. He particularly remembers the adagio movement when the first violin had the thematic lead. Typically he identified with the sound, the technique, and especially the control. In this movement, he felt all the things he had learned in his time at Williamsburg. He wanted his life to be well ordered, systematic, harmonious, and effective. Yet he detected a lyrical, almost folksy character to this piece that stirred his plebeian emotions. Music did this to him--it was his passion (L.A.). And as a maturing Hayden later built upon the *String Quartet in B-flat Major*, so did Jefferson as he sought to apply the values of reason and harmony to more fundamental human conditions.

Genteel Conversation

"I learned to appreciate the beauty of conversation from men who were well-versed in this genteel art."

from the "lost" Autobiography

The dining and upper middle rooms of the palace were indeed extensions of Jefferson's Williamsburg classrooms and Mr. Wythe's law office. Jefferson had the privilege, rare by today's educational standards, to have tutors, mentors, and friends all in the same two persons, i.e., Small and Wythe. Fauquier shared some or all three attributes named above. Fauquier's role in the education of young Jefferson was that of facilitator. He was the catalyst through which learning was made possible. Fauquier supplied the place and organized the events which facilitated learning for Jefferson. It should be pointed out as Jefferson recognized years later, Small, Wythe, and Fauquier had no preconceived plan or Pygmalion-like educational agenda for young Jefferson. They recognized very early Jefferson's vast potential, and they truly cared about him. But all three shared the same values that championed the notion of learning for learning's sake. Reason could prevail. Sound judgment could be based on reasonable deduction. This was the enlightenment view and the parties were each enlightened men.

When Jefferson later noted that during the dinners at the palace he heard more good sense, more rational and philosophical conversations than any other

time in his life he paid the appropriate tribute to this extension of classroom learning. Indeed in some universities today, Jefferson would have received substantial college credit for his "experiential life studies." And he could easily validate such credit.

The metaphor of "palace as classroom" can be further refined to include "palace as laboratory." The good sense and rational, philosophical conversations, Jefferson spoke about were extensions and often applications of subject matter discussed in Small's classes in natural or moral philosophy. Dinner conversation almost always included discussion involving mathematics, science, rhetoric, logic, ethics, or belles-lettres.

Even when conversation turned to areas of social conviviality or politics, or religion the discussions were always presented in a structured, well-ordered, and always cordial manner. Jefferson reflecting further on these dinner conversations remarked, "Mr. Wythe had little to teach me about argumentation--I learned to defend my points of argument around the (Fauquier's) table" (L.A.). Jefferson also learned the valuable art of listening. Listening, he observed, was an essential element in effective argumentation (L.A.). He definitely learned this at the Governor's table.

As would be expected, the young undergraduate had much to hear and very little to say. Under Small's primary tutelage, however, Jefferson used his insatiable curiosity and limitless energy to achieve well past the required criteria in his subject matter. He later characterized himself as a "hard student" (L.A.). The ten to fifteen hours he put in a day served him well. His particular strengths and interests were in mathematics and science. As he mastered his subject matter, he became more confident of his ability to enter the dinner conversations.

Concerning Natural Philosophy

His most memorable recollections about the conversations centered around scientific topics. Because of Maury's and Small's training, Jefferson had a strong background in science, most notably in the "useful sciences" as he described them. He was particularly well schooled in the area of observation and experimentation. Small coached Jefferson in the techniques of observation and questioning. Small directed Jefferson to the writings of Francis Bacon, whose works were often discussed at dinner.

Using the then controversial lecture method, Small entered into direct dialogue with his students, encouraging, cajoling, demanding active participation from them. Jefferson definitely benefited from this approach. Small also encouraged his students to test classroom and textbook skills in the larger classroom that nature provided. In the "lost" Autobiography, Jefferson fondly recalled the many walk-about he and Small took investigating Nature's classroom. Even on the pleasurable jaunts, Small would question incessantly--most of the time to Jefferson yet sometimes to himself. Cause and effect became part of Jefferson's thought process--this pleased Small greatly.

Small also believed that mathematics is the "queen of sciences" to which all other sciences are related. Small expected his students to handle a wide range of subjects at the same time. Mathematics served as the anchor, the foundation of all scientific inquiry. Today this would be called the integrated approach to learning. Small brought this system with him from Scotland. Jefferson responded well to this system. There is no doubt that Jefferson's later interest in such diverse scientific areas as paleontology, agronomy and mechanics emanated from this early influence.

Seldom did a dinner pass without serious consideration given to the work of

Sir Isaac Newton. And often Newton's laws were discussed in concert with Bacon's assertions on observation and inquiry. Among the parties, Newton's Principia was the standard text used in the palace classroom. Fauquier often remarked that the Bishop of London would "reset all of their clocks" (L.A.) if he knew that students at William and Mary were having exposure to Newton's powerful work. This is particularly amusing in the light of the endless conflicts the Governor had had with the clergy over control of the college and other matters pertaining to power and management. They all laughed at their host's play on words, but each recognized the degree of truth embodied in this assertion. Years later, Jefferson was better able to appreciate the profound significance of Newton's (and Bacon's) bold and enlightened thinking on the scientific world. When he pondered this significance, his affection for his three mentors often swelled to overflowing (L.A.).

Wythe constantly impressed Jefferson with his scientific knowledge. Largely self-taught in his youth, Wythe became somewhat of a scholar in the classics. He often quoted literally from the great classics in his law briefs. However, if music was Jefferson's passion, science and scientific experimentation were Wythe's. Jefferson's expertise in the classics was second only to Wythe's. During some dinner conversations, Wythe and Jefferson could carry on entire discussions in Greek. And often to Fauquier's and Small's chagrin, Wythe and Jefferson would speak in classical shorthand, a code that only the lawyer and lawyer-to-be could comprehend. In later life, Jefferson would devise classical codes that were practically indecipherable. Lewis and Clark carried such a code with them while on assignment for the future-President Jefferson.

Wythe approached his chosen vocation using techniques learned from his avocation. Wythe was a systematic man; he scheduled his time wisely and

practiced an orderly life style. Later as Jefferson's law mentor, Wythe stressed to Jefferson the importance of practicing the craft of law as one would perform scientific experiments. This advice proved helpful when Jefferson undertook the study of Sir Edward Coke's Coke Upon Littleton. "Old Coke" afforded Jefferson the opportunity to apply Wythe's principals of well regulated study with Small's principals of analysis and inquiry. These coupled with Jefferson's innate curiosity and eagerness to learn enabled him to master "Old Coke's" formidable works.

Wythe, Small, and Fauquier each were mechanically inclined. Not only could they quote at will passages from the Principia, but they designed, assembled, and repaired the most complex clocks in the city (L.A.). Small always lamented how little the college owned in the way of scientific instruments. Eventually, he would obtain for the college some very fine instruments. Small could build a barometer or plow as well as he could build a cello. Wythe often commented that Small could have been master smith of any trade. Small returned the compliment when he remarked that such an occupation would be enjoyable if he received commissions from knowledgeable technologists such as Wythe who would challenge one's technical abilities (L.A.).

Wythe and Fauquier possessed refracting telescopes, barometers, orreries, solar microscopes, and numerous drafting tools, including a perambulator. Jefferson, by virtue of his relationship with the other parties, had access to these and other instruments. Governor Fauquier enjoyed having Jefferson and Page come to the palace to conduct experiments. Jefferson became particularly adept at using the survey tools to measure distance and height. Jefferson recollected a remark his good friend John Page once made. Young Page observed that Jefferson came about this prowess (of using instruments) through some inherited

trait from Peter Jefferson. Young Jefferson did not acknowledge the comment but later admitted that he felt inwardly proud when comparisons were made between his father and him (L.A.).

Fauquier often boasted that his thermometer was accurate to the hundredth degree. No one argued with him about this. Fauquier's diligence in recording the daily atmospheric conditions impressed Jefferson greatly. He eventually emulated Fauquier's daily meteorological ritual. Jefferson also admired Fauquier for his accounting of the great hailstorm of July 9, 1758, that brought Fauquier a seat in the Royal Society (L.A.).

To Jefferson, the careful accounting of the hailstorm further indicated Fauquier's commitment to reasoned judgment and orderly inquiry. The hailstorm was not an uncommon event for summers in Virginia. It was a natural event. And according to Small, natural events should be accepted not totally as acts of God, but rather as events which have causes as well as effects.

Fauquier in his submission to the Royal Society in London reported the event in copious detail including measurements of several hundred stones. The fact that the account was published in the Philosophical Transactions of the Society gave testimony to Fauquier's more than casual interest in science. Jefferson also admired Fauquier for having the common sense to use the hailstorm to cool his wine and make a freezing creme from milk. Jefferson often thought that the practical use of the hailstorm was as eventful as the scholarly paper presented to the Society (L.A.).

An impending event in 1761 was to have profound influence on Jefferson's perspective on the universe. Jefferson knew not to get his hopes up about the potential transit of Venus. But he did nevertheless. And long after June 5, 1761, he expressed disappointment (L.A.).

There was a chance that this celestial phenomenon would be visible at certain areas on the eastern coast. Word about the transit had been received from Philadelphia several years before 1761. Fauquier and Small were excited about potential prospects of observing Venus as it transversed the face of the sun. They also were excited about the anticipated phenomenon happening again in 1769. Only Wythe seemed to conceal his enthusiasm over the impending events. If measured accurately, the transit would yield exact information on the mean distance of the earth from the sun. Cooperation would be needed world-wide to obtain accurate data. The parties wanted to do their part--as scientists and as citizens of the world (L.A.).

Small and Jefferson worked on the multitude of calculations required of the project. Fauquier and Wythe worked diligently on their four telescopes readying them for the observation, possibly the greatest scientific observation of their lives. Fauquier remained in communication with Rev. John Ewing at the College of Philadelphia and David Ritterhouse, surveyor-general of Pennsylvania. Each of these men was closely associated with the observation of the transit of Venus through the newly established American Philosophical Society (L.A.).

As the appointed time grew closer, the parties' dinner conversations included no talk of music, politics, or the clergy. The transit of Venus was referred to simply as the "event." And the event had excited the imagination of the parties as only a celestial phenomena could (L.A.).

The event went unobserved by anyone in the American colonies. The weather did not cooperate. At places where the weather did cooperate, instruments proved unsuitable to observe the transit with any proficiency. Disappointment was felt in Philadelphia and in Williamsburg. But there would be another transit on June 3, 1769 and the parties were somewhat consoled that

they would have another chance to observe the event.

Jefferson learned much from the event. Technically he participated in a major scientific undertaking. He gained a great deal of experience as he aided Small. Personally, he learned valuable lessons that all scientists experience; lessons that emanate from failure. The failure to observe the event was not of his doing; it resulted from natural causes. And because he had been taught to observe and inquire about natural causes, he was better able to live with the natural causes that made observation of the event impossible. Small did not need to explain this to him again--he knew it, but he was still disappointed (L.A.).

Dinner conversations were almost always positive and uplifting. To his credit, Fauquier seldom mentioned any unpleasantness associated with his high office. Suffice it to say, he definitely had other occasions to dwell on state problems. Dinners were reserved for discussion of more lofty dimensions. Neither the plethora of disputes with the clergy, nor the Cherokee problem, nor the land use problems with the wealthy planters merited interrupting the dinner felicities. However, once Fauquier did raise a concern about Virginia's failure to utilize the abundant water resources to create power. This concern brought about some extraordinary discussion led by Small on the subject of steam power and its potential as a source of power (L.A.).

Small overwhelmed the parties' collective imagination when he talked about the potential for power generated by boiling water. Fauquier and Wythe knew of this potential but Jefferson heard about the application for the first time. Small explained that steam was an elastic fluid and, as such, if controlled properly it could activate cylinders and pistons to transfer energy into mechanical power. Small had been corresponding with Benjamin Franklin, in London, and Mathew Bouton, in Birmingham, regarding the development of steam power (L.A.).

These particular discussions stood out in Jefferson's mind because he sensed great anticipation in Small regarding the project, as well as unusual cynicism from Wythe. All agreed that steam once harnessed could indeed be a powerful source. But Wythe argued that much had yet to be learned about the rate of volatility of this power if indeed it were an elastic fluid. Current work in England and Scotland was not targeting this problem according to Wythe. Small acquiesced on this point noting that more attention needed to be given to the analysis of the fluid itself rather than the applied technology which interested many of his colleagues in England. Small lamented that many of his English and Scottish colleagues were more concerned with financial gains than scientific advancement (L.A.).

The parties followed this research even after Small left for England in 1764. Small's eventual work with Boulton and Watt (the Lunar Society), brought about the mechanical and technical successes the parties knew would eventually occur. Jefferson felt blessed that he had been present when these brilliant men discussed and built hypotheses regarding the nature and application for steam power; a power which soon ushered in a new epoch in scientific technology (L.A.).

Concerning Moral Philosophy

If Jefferson needed further reasons to elevate Small, Wythe, and Fauquier to higher levels of esteem, he found causes during palace discussions centered on the nature of mankind. This pertained to moral philosophy that Jefferson said he heard much about as he sat at Fauquier's table.

Once again, the classroom in the palace emulated the classroom in the Wren building. For the first time in his young life, he heard ideas presented which challenged the very nature of things he assumed would exist forever. Foremost, however, was the fact that these ideas were advanced by men he admired beyond

all others; men he respected; men he loved as a nephew would love an uncle.

Jefferson assumed that slavery as an institution would prevail as long as economic conditions dictated it should prevail. His slaves had always been well cared for; however, he did acknowledge that abuses to the system did frequently occur. Jefferson assumed that the established Church in England would remain established until the Bishop of London said otherwise. He acknowledged the increasing number of other sects and denominations that seemingly cropped up daily. But again he recognized that there was only one established church in his colony. Jefferson further assumed that the way men were governed was established as much as the church power was--delegated downward from the Sovereign to his subjects who made up the Parliament, the various Boards in England and eventually to the governor, his Council, and the General Assembly. How else could it work? Why would it work differently (L.A.)?

Jefferson would look back on these days and with little emotion note that his views on the subjects above were "reconsidered" (L.A.) during his time in Williamsburg. Again some would say that a benefit of college training is the opportunity to hear and challenge new ways of thinking and believing. This was certainly true in Jefferson's case but his mentors, or in today's parlance, his change agents, were men by training and position greatly different from what would be considered the norm then and now.

Small, trained in the Scottish schools at an exciting time for changing intellectual ideas and application, came to Williamsburg armed with the intellectual ammunition of Carmichael, Shaftesbury, Hume, and Hutcheson. Wythe, the self-taught classical scholar, read the law and understood its power to improve man's condition. Fauquier, the man holding the highest position of power in the largest colony in the New World, a man well educated and well

traveled, understood the values and traditions of Virginians as no governor before him. These were Jefferson's teachers. How could he not be challenged to re-think his view of the world, a world which provided such security for young Jefferson because of its established this and established that? As with most college students, this process of change for Jefferson had to have been traumatic. As mentioned earlier, his only mention of dissonance comes when he notes that many of his assumptions were "reconsidered". An understatement indeed.

Fauquier often waxed eloquently on the subject of slavery. In his view the practice was an abomination. Initially, the discussions on this subject made Jefferson uncomfortable. As manager of three households, he was personally responsible for the care and supervision of many black people. He also found it somewhat hypocritical that Fauquier could rail so strongly and eloquently about the institution while maintaining well over one hundred black slaves himself (L.A.).

Jefferson recalled vividly the time he worked up the courage to ask the governor about this apparent inconsistency. Jefferson recorded Fauquier's reply:

I hope I shall be found to have been a merciful master to them and that no one of them will rise up in judgment against me in that great day when all my actions will be exposed to public view. For with what face can I expect mercy from an offended God, if I have not myself shown mercy to those dependent on me (L.A.).

If these words were not sufficient to answer the question Jefferson posed, Fauquier later volunteered that he had left strict instructions in his will that his slaves be disposed of in a humane manner keeping women and children together and, he hoped, entire families. He would reduce his selling prices by one fourth to certain preferred customers--customers the slaves themselves had chosen.

Jefferson remembered thinking how magnanimous this gesture was. He would definitely not raise the issue again; but he did retain a nagging sense that

the governor should go the next step, i.e., manumission. He had learned more about this subject than he had realized. Were he given the same opportunity, he hoped at his own death he would free his slaves--but maybe this was too radical an idea.

Jefferson was a member of the Anglican Church. He attended Bruton Parish Church on a reasonably consistent basis. He enjoyed most of the music conducted by his friend, Peter Pelham. Occasionally, he heard something from the pulpit that challenged or even inspired him. However, he found himself growing more uncomfortable with the orthodoxy, the strictness that emanated from the pulpit. He was also becoming more and more intolerant of some classmates who had come to the college to train for their degrees in divinity. They seemed not to accept Mr. Small's classroom content and methods. He quickly equated their intolerance of Small with the intolerance he was seeing and hearing at Bruton Parish against the Baptist, Methodists, and particularly the Quakers (L.A.).

He had not met any of these so-called dissenters but certainly wanted to meet and listen to their views. Mr. Small commented often about the important role dissenters play in bringing about discussion of new ideas. Mr. Wythe usually pointed out that dissenters walked a narrow line with the law, civil and ecclesiastical. Small usually affirmed this pointing to the price Presbyterians paid in earning their ecclesiastical rights. During their discussions, Deism was rarely broached. Possibly, the parties were too closely aligned with diestic thought to see this as a subject worth pursuing. After all, how could one read Principia and not identify with Newton's postulates? This was definitely Fauquier's belief. During discussions about religion, he tended to be the most skeptical (L.A.).

During Jefferson's stay in Williamsburg, he developed an abhorrence to the religious bigotry he observed around him. As he studied the law, he realized that religion was firmly based in public policy. From such policy, clerical officials derived great power--power far beyond that of limited ecclesiastical power. At Wythe's encouragement, Jefferson researched how much the Bible had inadvertently become part of the common law of England and thus law in America. Following Small's brilliant instruction in observation and inquiry, Jefferson traced what he thought to be an author's error back through antiquity to the seventh century. The author's error (an ancient monk) had converted the words "ancient scripture" to "Holy Scripture." Finding these references and others, Jefferson later wrote that such "clerical connivery" (L.A.) became the basis for witches to be burned and labor to be forbidden on Sundays. The parties took great pleasure in discussing Jefferson's research. Fauquier was particularly pleased because it once again demonstrated how little the clergy could be trusted. Small was pleased with Jefferson's methodical, reasoned approach to the research. As he pointed out numerous times, "Truth could be known but it is known best when researched well" (L.A.). Wythe was pleased with his student because Jefferson had used the best of his [Wythe's] skills, namely good legal research techniques and conversance with antiquity through its languages.

During his study with Jefferson, Wythe was becoming more and more attuned to the structure of colonial governance. Public Times, in addition to being periods of great social activity, were times of high governmental and judicial drama. Jefferson listened with more and more interest to the reasoned debates in the House of Burgesses. He better understood their arguments. He helped Wythe prepare for endless civil cases in which Mr. Wythe performed exceedingly well. Part of Wythe's successes were attributable to Jefferson's

exhaustive research of the legal questions (L.A.).

Palace dinner conversations in the years 1763 and 1764 almost always included discussion of science and technology. And more and more, questions of human rights, (inseparable from politics) were consumed at the table in addition to the turkey, venison, fish, and oysters. Political discussions usually started with an observation of the day's or week's political events. The discussions turned quickly to the ramifications or effects on man's natural rights. The discussions almost always centered on whose rights should be protected (and at whose expense) (L.A.).

Of all the discussions in the extended classroom of the palace, Jefferson was influenced most by these exchanges. He said later that "at dinner we discussed great thinkers, ancient and recent, such as Plato, Cicero, Locke, Shaftsbury, Hume, Bolingbroke, Kames, and Hutcheson, and the next day with Mr. Wythe, I applied to the law what I had heard the night before" (L.A.).

The dinner conversations did as much to raise contradictions in Jefferson's mind as they did to validate established perspectives (L.A.). When Locke spoke of self-evident truths, how could he justify slavery? When Hutcheson spoke of the greatest good for the greatest number, did it make moral sense to persecute people who did not follow the rigid strictures of the Anglican Church? And when Hume spoke of moral principles, how did this coincide with the king's right to dissolve parliament or a governor's right to dissolve the House of Burgesses if the king or governor were despotic?

Intellectually, the parties were one in affirming that slavery in any form was not preordained. The parties were one in affirming the common sense of religious toleration. But, the notion that the sovereign required the government's consent was controversial. Jefferson in 1764 did not bow away from this

controversy as he would have done in 1760 (L.A.).

Years later, Jefferson would recall with pride how he and Fauquier had courteously disagreed over the matter of consent. Fauquier although well-versed in Hooker, Hobbes, Grotius, Pufendorf, and Montesquieu as well as Locke, Bolingbroke, Hume, and Hutcheson argued predictably that security and structure were absolutely essential in holding a colony, a country, indeed a civilization together. Remove structure and security and the result is chaos, Fauquier argued. Jefferson countered with a history lesson. Had not the history of England since the Magna Carta proved that decentralized authority could work without bringing on the chaos and calamities the Governor foresaw? Fauquier agreed but queried as to how far this consent should go. Should every governmental question be considered by every colonist? According to Fauquier, this was indeed chaotic (L.A.).

Jefferson raised a question which he later referred to as the "ultimate question" (L.A.). Looking the governor squarely in the eye, seeing not the sovereign's high appointee but rather a respected teacher and gracious host, Jefferson asked the "ultimate question." Writing in his "lost" Autobiography, Jefferson said "when I asked the ultimate question to my gracious governor, I felt no dishonor or disrespect toward him." 'Sir', I said, 'what rights do the governed have when their sovereign rules as a despot?' At that moment Jefferson relates that Mr. Small spoke up in a strong yet respectful voice, "Sirs," Small said, "Mr. Hume answered that in his Treatise of Human Nature when he said that when authority becomes so oppressive as to be intolerable that rebellion is possible and at that point men are no longer bound to submit to the civil magistrate."

Jefferson remembered vividly the seemingly interminable seconds of silence that followed Mr. Small's pronouncement. According to Jefferson, the Governor

acknowledged Mr. Small's statement with a nod of his head and with what surely appeared as a glimmer in his eye announced that the group would adjourn to the upper middle room "for further serious discussion among good friends" (L.A.). Jefferson, for whatever reason, chose not to tell history how this "serious discussion" concluded. But no doubt Jefferson learned much from the "serious discussion among good friends." Why not? He always did.

CHAPTER 3

Bibliographic Essay

As noted in the introductory chapter, the dearth of primary information about the meetings of the four great men comprising the parties quarrae provides ample opportunities to theorize and muse about the meetings' milieu and content. And as stated earlier, the purpose of this study was to speculate about the nature of the meetings.

Important to the study however is a more factually based examination of the men themselves as well as the significant events and thoughts which influenced them during the eighteenth century.

This essay is divided into two sections. The first section is a brief background on the four men. The second section investigates the theme of influence--the influence exerted by Jefferson's mentors on him, and as importantly, the influence of the period known as the Enlightenment on the parties as a group.

Background

Sixteen years prior to the writing of his apocalyptic denunciation of British authority, young Thomas Jefferson left the hills of Albemarle and the tutelage of James Maury to further his education at The College of William and Mary. Peter Jefferson and The Reverend N. Walker Maury had prepared Thomas well, solidifying early his appreciation for the classics as well as modern and ancient literature. Maury also made a distinctive contribution to the boy's appreciation of the English language (Malone, 1948).

In 1760, at The College of William and Mary, Jefferson continued with enthusiasm his study of the classics. Writing in Young Jefferson Bowers notes that Jefferson "thought more highly of the Greeks than of the Romans, found Demosthenes much greater as an orator than Cicero, but thought Cicero a greater philosopher than Socrates or Epictetus" (Bowers, 1945, p. 24).

In 1760, there were seven faculty members at The College of William and Mary. With the exception of William Small, professor of natural philosophy, the faculty was composed entirely of Anglican clergymen.

Fortunately for the studious Jefferson, Professor Small was given additional teaching responsibilities. The Reverend Jacob Rowe, then professor of moral philosophy, was forced to resign his professorship because of conduct unbecoming of his rank. Thus Professor Small assumed the Reverend Rowe's chair and Jefferson's contact with his future mentor expanded significantly. It is probable that Small was Jefferson's only teacher during this period (Malone, 1948).

Little is known about this man Small whom Jefferson later said probably fixed the destinies of his life. Born in 1734, Small came from an educated family. His brother was a mathematician. After having attended Marischal College, William Small later studied medicine with John Gregory in Aberdeen. Small came to The College of William and Mary in 1758--he was twenty-four years old. Small used the then controversial method of vernacular lecture, a method Francis Hutcheson had used in Scotland twenty-five years earlier (Wills, 1978).

In 1760, George Wythe, Esq., age thirty-four, was arguing cases before the Virginia General Court and representing Williamsburg in the lower house of the Burgesses. In this same year, he became a member of the vestry of Bruton Parish Church. Prior to 1760, Lt. Governor Dinwiddie had appointed Wythe Attorney

General in the House of Burgesses.

Wythe, like Small, had an affection for the classics as well as natural philosophy. Wythe developed an elaborate system (praxis) to compare Greek words from the Iliad with their Latin counterparts. And by 1760, Wythe had accumulated many scientific instruments. Some of his instruments included an allolipyle (a pneumatic gadget used to measure the force of steam released through a narrow vent), and a receiver and cup for a shower of mercury (Dill, 1979).

Wythe shared another common interest with Small. Wythe's maternal ancestors also descended from the area around Aberdeen Scotland and they, like Small, attended Marischal College.

In the year that young Jefferson entered The College of William and Mary, Virginia had a relatively new governor. Lt. Governor Francis Fauquier assumed his post in 1758 (the same year as Small's appointment) upon the resignation of Lt. Governor Dinwiddie. Early Virginia historian, John Burk described the conditions under which Fauquier received his appointment. According to Burk, Fauquier in a night's gaming lost his "patrimony" to one Admiral Anson. And "afterwards, being captivated at the striking grace of this gentlemen's person and conversation he (Anson) procured for him the Government of Virginia" (Burk, cited in Malone, 1948, p. 76). A less romantic view contends that Fauquier's appointment was heavily influenced by his patronage with the Earl of Halifax, a significant gentleman at court (Davis, 1968).

Francis Fauquier, of Huguenot descent, was the eldest son of the Dr. John F. Fauquier family in London who in his early life worked for Newton at the London mint. At the death of his father, Francis Fauquier inherited the estate which included stock in the Bank of England and the South Sea Company. Eventually,

he became director of the South Sea Company. Because of Fauquier's keen interest in science, he was elected a fellow in the Royal Society. During Fauquier's years in the Governor's Palace in Williamsburg, he impressed guests with his meteorological apparatus and obsession to chronicle the daily weather patterns.

Fauquier was also a very popular governor. At his death, the Virginia Gazette editorialized that he had earned the honor and respect of Williamsburg's inhabitants.

Fauquier was held in less favor by the clergy at The College of William and Mary. The governor opposed the Tory faculty of the college who represented the power of the established church. The rift was exacerbated with the controversial dismissal of Professor Rowe and his colleague, Goronwy Owen. Fauquier banished Owen to another parish and sided with the Board of Visitors (composed of political leaders rather than clerical) to dismiss Rowe.

By August 1760, the four individuals making up the parties quarrae were assembled in a tiny spot on the map for four distinctly different reasons. The four would be together only a short while. In 1764, Dr. Small left for Scotland, and later went to England where he studied and experimented with James Watt and Erasmus Darwin. Dr. Small died in Birmingham in 1775. Dr. Small was one year shy of having the opportunity to celebrate his young protege's great accomplishment, The Declaration of Independence.

Jefferson, Wythe, and Fauquier would continue the celebrated meetings through 1768, when on March 3, Governor Fauquier died at the age of sixty-four. George Wythe was named in Fauquier's will as a trustee and Wythe helped see to it that Fauquier's estate was properly divided among family and servants. As trustee, Wythe also carried through on Fauquier's wishes to be buried in Bruton

Parish cemetery. Not surprisingly, Virginia's most popular governor would choose to be buried in Virginia's soil rather than Britain's.

Jefferson's relationship with George Wythe remained strong until Wythe's tragic death by poisoning on June 8, 1806. Wythe was the only mentor of the three to see the young Jefferson assume stature as a significant proponent of enlightenment thought in America.

What was the individual influence of Small, Wythe, and Fauquier on Jefferson's intellectual and social development? To understand this better, attention should be given to the definitive biographies on Jefferson.

Influence: The Parties

Each member of the parties quarrae played a separate and significant part in influencing Jefferson's intellectual development. Malone says that Small's lessons taught Jefferson "delight in the exercise of the mind" (rather than) "obedience to authority" (Malone, 1948, p. 54). However, possibly Small's greatest contribution was to introduce young Jefferson to both Wythe and Fauquier.

Bowers indicates that Wythe's contribution to Jefferson's learning was more by example than pedagogy. Wythe stressed preparation and study. Grand oratory was the forte of Patrick Henry. But Jefferson learned from Wythe the power of written language, a language derived from antiquity and preserved in classical works. Malone observes:

That under Wythe [Jefferson] started with Coke, whose lore could not be abstracted, and he proceeded step by step until he finally reached maturity from his study of the cases. During his unhurried period of legal tutelage he formed enduring habits of study while . . . ideas germinated within his fertile mind (Malone, 1948, p. 73).

Randall and Mapp assert that Fauquier's chief influence was to teach young Jefferson refinement and social gentility. Mapp describes Fauquier as "a polished ornament of drawing room and salon . . ., a modern man of the world" (Mapp,

1987, p. 21). Jefferson's proficiency on the fiddle and appreciation of various musical styles was directly related to the time spent in Fauquier's court. Randall attributes Jefferson's polish of manner in later life to his "close contact" with Fauquier and others during the time in the governor's palace. Fauquier represented for young Jefferson the "enlightenment in its humanistic as well as its scientific aspects" (Malone, 1948, p. 102). Chinard speculates that Jefferson's obsession with travel in his later life is directly related to Fauquier. Fauquier was widely traveled and no doubt had many stories to tell a young, enthusiastic listener like Jefferson.

The best indication of the individual influences of Small, Wythe, and Fauquier on Jefferson can be discerned from Jefferson himself. Writing in his Autobiography Jefferson described William Small as:

A man profound in most of the useful branches of science, with a happy talent of communication; correct and gentlemanly manners, and an enlarged and liberal mind; and from his conversation I got my first views of the expanse of science and of the system of things in which we are placed (Jefferson, in Ford, I, 1892, p. 4).

Jefferson described Wythe as "The American Cato" and Fauquier as the "ablest man who had ever filled that office" (Ford, I, 1892, p. 4). Unfortunately, history does not record Small and Fauquier's opinions of Jefferson. However, Wythe's correspondence with Jefferson reveals a relationship built upon mutual affection and professional admiration.

The collective influence of Small, Wythe, and Fauquier has been well chronicled. Chinard describes the three gentlemen as "true masters of Thomas Jefferson and from their conversations around the table, after bottles of port had been brought, he learned more than any student at William and Mary ever acquired in college" (Chinard, 1929, p. 12). Randall says that young Jefferson came of age in 1764. Mapp summarizes this collective influence when he states,

"He [Jefferson] was not simply collecting facts to satisfy either his teachers . . . he was enlarging his view of the universe" (Mapp, 1987, p. 22).

This enlargement was coming about through examination of Newton's laws, Bacon's empiricism, and Locke's views on the consent of the governed. According to friend and fellow student, John Page, the impetus to study was Jefferson's own. Describing the days spent with his three mentors, Jefferson said, "At these dinners (in the palace) I have heard more good sense more rational and philosophical conversation than in all my life besides" (Jefferson in Lipsomb and Bergh, XIV, 1903, p. 231).

Influence: The Enlightenment

A common bond irrevocably linked the parties. The bond was one probably never acknowledged by them. It seemed as much a part of them as their race, gender and social standing. The men were products of the Enlightenment, a period long recognized by scholars as a time of great intellectual and artistic vitality. This was time when man's search for reason and truth profoundly influenced the shape of future Western thought and values. To assert that Fauquier, Wythe, Small, and Jefferson were products of this time is a gross understatement. Nevertheless, as subsequent paragraphs will note, such was indeed the case.

The Enlightenment permeated the parties' educations, vocations, actions, demeanors, values and world views. So what was the power of the period? Why was it significantly different from other identifiable periods in history? How could the period have so much effect on the lives of the four men?

Henry Steele Commager, writing in his definitive work, Jefferson, Nationalism, and The Enlightenment advanced four common aspects of the period which profoundly affected and bonded enlightened thinkers.

First, men of the enlightenment generally adhered to a common body of shared ideas and laws. Commager says, "they were all natural philosophers--what we call scientists--and if they were not all trained in science, they were fascinated by it and dabbled in it" (Commager, 1975, p. 7). The second common denominator of the men had to do with the total acceptance of the sovereignty of reason. Reason could lead anyone to the mastery of the laws of nature.

According to Commager, the third uniting aspect related to the first two that is, an absolute commitment to freedom of the mind. Freedom of the mind was commensurate with freedom from tyranny of all sorts, be it the Church or the state. The fourth and final bond had to do with what Commager calls:

A humanitarianism which imagined and fought for the abolition of torture and amelioration of the barbarous penal code that still disgraced the statute books of even the most civilized nations; an end to the Inquisition; improvement in the lot of the peasants and the serfs; the abolition of the slave trade and even slavery itself (Commager, 1975, p. 7).

The Enlightenment took different forms, limited or encouraged by the social and political milieu of the European countries. Many men of the Enlightenment traveled extensively, thereby spreading about the common elements Commager described earlier.

Nowhere was the Enlightenment so prodigious as it was in Scotland in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Obviously, Small, and because of his ancestral connections, Wythe were definitely influenced by the Scottish version of the period.

The Scottish Enlightenment had its roots deep in the nation's historical institutions. These institutions included the Church, the law and the university. Writing in his definitive work, The Scottish Enlightenment, A Social History, Anand Chitnis observes:

The study of man as a social and sociable being was a central interest

of the philosophers of the Scottish Enlightenment. They were not only active in said institution's such as the Church, the legal profession, universities and clubs but they were interested in the mechanism whereby society operated and their analyses were historically based (Chitnis, 1976, p. 6).

As noted earlier, science and law were pre-eminent areas of concern to Enlightenment philosophers--such was indeed the case in Scottish universities in Edinburgh and Aberdeen. Science and law took their substance from a nature that was ordered. Order in turn demanded formation of laws and structure and as importantly, adherence to the law.

In his review of Wills' provocative Inventing America, J. David Hoeveler notes that the Scottish Enlightenment evolved from several sources. First, a new generation of moderates in the Church spoke up to "liberate the Church from its glacial age of Calvinism." Also modern curriculum in the Scottish universities enabled the institution's "to surpass Oxford and Cambridge in academic prestige" (Hoeveler, 1981, p. 275).

In the mid-eighteenth century, Scotland had, as Wills describes, "a constellation of original thinkers not to be equaled anywhere in Europe--not only Hume and Smith, Kames and Hutcheson, but Adam Ferguson, Thomas Reid and the young Dugald Stewart" (Wills, 1978, p. 176). The universities provided the men above the forum for development and testing of ideas. And thanks to the power of the written word, their books influenced enlightenment thought in France, England, the low countries and the new world colonies such as Virginia.

As previously cited by Chitnis, a central concern of Scottish philosophers in the mid-1700's was their preoccupation with an ordered society and man as a sociable being within the society. Scottish philosophers such as Kames and Hutcheson were most concerned as to why people associated with one another.

What common elements bound them together as well as bound them with

their social institutions (i.e. language, prosperity, government and law)? W. L. Taylor credits moral philosophers, Hutcheson, Hume and Smith, as men who "concerned themselves with the task of establishing an experimental basis for the study of man in relation to the customs and organizations of a civilized community" (Taylor, 1965, p. 5).

In the lexicon of the moral philosophers, common terms and themes may be discerned. These commonalities spoke to the sociability of man--his association with and integration into the society. And as importantly, a well ordered society was designed to enhance reason and virtue.

In this orderliness, men were also linked by economic ties. Robertson referred to this economic tie as subsistence. Kames spoke to the importance of appropriation. These terms are all synonymous with acquisition and ownership of property. Acquisition of property was a stimulus the establishment of law, order and government. Kames wrote in his Historical Law Tracts that government arose to protect property.

Gary Wills contends that no study of the eighteenth century Scottish philosophers' influence on colonial America could be complete without recognition of the "moral sense" doctrine. More specific to the theme of influence, Wills strongly asserts that in later years, Jefferson like Hume, spoke "with the voice of Hutcheson" (Wills, 1975, p. 180). In this regard Wills challenges the long-held view of Becker, Koch, Boorstin, et al, that the social contract and common sense doctrines' espoused by Locke was the chief influences on Jefferson's later writings. Koch does, however, acknowledge the Scottish influence as she noted that Jefferson "flirted" with Scottish intuitionist philosophy and he saw Scottish realism as a "minor intellectual enthusiasm" (Koch, 1957). It is significant that Koch never mentions Wythe or Small in her

book cited above.

Wills' detractors, namely Hamowy, Hoeveler, and Lynn challenge Wills' premise that Hutcheson, not Locke, was the "voice" of Jefferson. Nonetheless, even the most dissenting critic acknowledges the influence of the moral sense doctrine on Jefferson primarily because of the personal influence of William Small, professor of natural and moral philosophy from The College of William and Mary. Referring to the ideas encapsulated in the Declaration of Independence, Wills remarks, "those ideas were not derived, primarily from Philadelphia or Paris, but from Aberdeen and Edinburgh, and Glasgow." Wills concludes, "we have enough evidence of his [Jefferson's] reading, and of his conclusions from that reading, to establish that the real lost world of Thomas Jefferson (inference to Daniel Boorstien) was the world of William Small, the invigorating realm of the Scottish Enlightenment" (Wills, 1975, p. 180).

Small, Wythe, Fauquier, and Jefferson shared the Enlightenment bonds noted by Commager earlier in this paper. As scientists and lawyers, they saw inquiry and hypothesis building not only as challenging but also delightful endeavors. Nature was their laboratory; discourse, logic and exchange was their entertainment. Mysteries once solved and unknowns once deciphered brought real joy to the investigator. The new world provided the proteges of the enlightenment even greater opportunities for natural and moral inquiry. The parties in their short time together made full use of these opportunities and reveled in the results.

The parties were committed to freedom of the mind as well as the spirit. Reason could be trusted to yield positive and valued results. A civilized man, and indeed a civilized colony, should promote such ideas as well as ideals. The parties often debated the merits of these ideals but more important to this study, they lived these ideals and made contributions to history because of the ideals.

EPILOGUE

The preceding chapters feature a central theme--that of influence. The influence of a period of time, i.e., the Enlightenment on the parties quarrae, and the influence the parties exerted on young Thomas Jefferson. Some would argue that this seventeen year old from the mountains of Albemarle, Virginia would have been influenced by anyone of significance during this period in his life. There is merit to that argument. Some would also argue that destiny brought the four together in this small Tidewater village at the same time. It may be hyperbole to contend that the world as we know it today was influenced by the convergence of these four men and this time in history. Yet the significance of what emerged from their time together cannot be understated.

When Jefferson wrote about having his destiny fixed for life, and while at Fauquier's table he heard more good sense than at any other time in his life, the measure of influence exerted on young Jefferson by these men of the Enlightenment must be considered immense.

If one were to rank the relative influence the parties exerted on Jefferson in order of influence, the order would be Small, Wythe, and Fauquier. There is little difference in the measure of influence between Small and Wythe. Small introduced Jefferson to the spirit and methodology of the Enlightenment. As Jefferson's only teacher, Small had a captive, indeed a captivated audience. He could assume the role of molder and shaper, a role he did so well.

Wythe gave Jefferson the practical experience he needed as an aspiring

barrister. Unlike his friend Patrick Henry, the orator, Jefferson learned and understood the law. Jefferson learned to appreciate and respect the history of law as well as its practical application to ensure an ordered society. To Jefferson, Fauquier represented another dimension altogether. Not only did Fauquier school Jefferson in the finer, social graces, but he encouraged Jefferson to think more broadly, indeed globally. Jefferson's later obsession with travel emanated from Fauquier's influence.

How much of this influence, during these four short years was translated into such monumental works such as, A Summary View of the Rights of British American, A Bill for Establishing Freedom (in Virginia), The Declaration of Independence, and Notes on Virginia? Because of the dearth of primary sources on this subject, only Jefferson scholars should speculate on how much of Jefferson's writings in the mid 1770's were influenced by classroom and indeed dinner conversations in 1760-1764. But until those "lost" chapters in his Autobiography do turn up, as a college educator, I find it refreshing to think that his mentors were directly involved in young Jefferson's later triumphs.

REFERENCES

Sources Consulted for Chapter 2

- Allan, Alfred K. (1955). The Music Lover of Monticello. Music Journal, 39, 58.
- Bedini, Silvio A. (1990). Thomas Jefferson: Statesman of Science. New York: Macmillan.
- Campbell, R.H., and Skinner, Andrew. (1978). The Origins and Nature of the Scottish Enlightenment. Edinburgh: Donald, LTD.
- Carson, Barbara. (1987). The Governor's Palace. Williamsburg: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.
- Cassara, Ernest. (1975). The Enlightenment in America. Boston: Twayne Publishing.
- Clarkin, William. (1970). Serene Patriot. Albany: Alan Pub.
- Cripe, Helen. (1974). Thomas Jefferson and Music. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Darling, J.S. (1977). A Jefferson Music Book. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Ganter, Herbert L. (1947). William Small, Jefferson's beloved Teacher. William and Mary Quarterly. 3rd series, 506-511.
- Hook, Andrew. (1975). Scotland and America. London: Blackie.
- Jones, Melville, W. (1961). A President and Six Masters. An address presented at Charter Day, May, 1961, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
- Kirtland, Robert B. (1985). George Wythe; Lawyer, Revolutionary Judge. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Klein, Randolph S. (1986). Science and Society in Early America: Essays in Honor of Whitfield J. Bell, Jr. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 426.
- Malone, Dumas. (1957). Jefferson Goes to School in Williamsburg. The Virginia Quarterly Review, 33 (4), 481-496.

- Mauer, Maurer. (1950). The Library of a Colonial Musician 1755. *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 39-52.
- McCash, James A. (1969). Dr. William Small, Note 4 on "Man of Little Showing". *The Quarterly Magazine*, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
- McCash, James A. (1968). The College Courant. *The Journal of the Glasgow University Graduate Association*, 20 (4) 21-28.
- McClellan, James E. III (1985). Science Reorganized: *Scientific Societies in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Morpurgo, J.E.. (1976). *Their Majesties' Royal College*. Williamsburg: Endowment Association of the College of William and Mary.
- Norkus, Nellie. (1954). *Francis Fauquier, Lt. Governor of Virginia, 1758-1768: A Study in Colonial Problems*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Page, John. (1850). Autobiography. *Virginia Historical Register*, 3, 142-151.
- Peterson, Merrill D. (Ed.). (1984). *Thomas Jefferson*. New York: The Library of Congress.
- Post, David, M. (1986). Jeffersonian Revisions of Locke: Education, Property, Rights and Liberty. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 147-157.
- Shoffield, Robert E. (1963). *The Lunar Society of Birmingham*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sloan, Douglas. (1971). *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American College Ideal*. Columbia: Teachers College Press.
- Stolba, K.M. (1976). Music in the Life of Thomas Jefferson. *American Music Teacher*, 25, 6-8.
- Tyler, Leon G. (1905). Early Courses and Professors at William and Mary College. *William and Mary Quarterly*, 14, 71-83.
- Thomson, Robert Polk. (1971). The Reform of the College of William and Mary. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 115 (3), 187-231.
- William Small Papers, Archives Account #, 1986. 11. Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.

Sources Cited in Chapter 3

- Boorstin, Daniel. (1948). The Lost World of Thomas Jefferson. New York: Henry Holt, Co.
- Bowers, C.G. (1945). Young Jefferson. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Co.
- Chinard, Gilbert. (1929). Thomas Jefferson: The Apostle of Americanism. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Chitnis, Anand. (1976). The Scottish Enlightenment. London: Croom Helm.
- Commager, Henry Steele. (1975). Jefferson, Nationalism, And The Enlightenment. New York: Braziller.
- Davis, Burke. (1968). A Williamsburg Galaxy. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Dill, Alonzo T. (1979). George Wythe, Teacher of Liberty. Williamsburg: Virginia Independence Bicentennial Commission.
- Ford, Paul L. (Ed.) (1892). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson (Vol. I). New York: Putnam and Sons.
- Hamowy, Ronald. (1979). Jefferson and the Scottish Enlightenment. William and Mary Quarterly, Series 3, 36 (4), 504-523.
- Hoeverler, David J. (1981). Thomas Jefferson and the American Provincial Mind. Modern Age, 2, 271-280.
- Koch, Adrienne. (1957). The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. Gloucester: Peter Smith.
- Lipscomb, A.A. and Bergh, A.E. (1903). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, (Vol. XIV). New York.
- Lynn, Kenneth S. (1978). Falsifying Jefferson (Review of Inventing America). Commentary, 20, 66-71.
- Malone, Dumas. (1948). Jefferson and His Time. Vol. 1. Boston: Little Brown and Co.
- Mapp, Alf J., Jr. (1987). Thomas Jefferson: A Strange Case of Mistaken Identity. New York: Madison Books.
- Randall, Henry S. (1865). The Life of Thomas Jefferson. Philadelphia.
- Taylor, W.L. (1965). Francis Hutcheson and David Hume as Predecessors of Adam Smith. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Wills, Gary. (1978). Inventing America. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc.