

Capt Philip Taylor - p. 280

Vol. XXXIII

SEPTEMBER, 1938

No. 3

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

150 ✓



PUBLISHED BY
THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

ISSUED QUARTERLY
ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00-SINGLE NUMBERS, 75 cts.

BALTIMORE

THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

INCORPORATED 1843.

H. IRVINE KEYSER MEMORIAL BUILDING,
201 W. MONUMENT STREET,
BALTIMORE

OFFICERS.

President,

CLINTON L. RIGGS,

Vice-Presidents

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE, J. HALL PLEASANTS.
SAMUEL K. DENNIS.

Corresponding Secretary,

WILLIAM B. MARYE.

Recording Secretary,

JAMES E. HANCOCK.

Treasurer,

HEYWARD E. BOYCE.

THE COUNCIL.

THE GENERAL OFFICERS

AND REPRESENTATIVES OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

G. CORNER FENHAGEN,	Representing the Trustees of the Athenaeum.
W. STULL HOLT,	“ Committee on Publication.
L. H. DIELMAN,	“ Committee on the Library.
WILLIAM INGLE,	“ Committee on Finance.
MRS. ROBERT F. BRENT,	“ Committee on Membership.
LAURENCE H. FOWLER,	“ Committee on the Gallery.
KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD,	“ Committee on Addresses.



ALFRED JACOB MILLER, 1810-1874

From a self-portrait in possession of his great nephew,
Mr. Alfred J. Miller of Baltimore.

*Photo Frick Art Reference Library
courtesy Baltimore Municipal Museum*

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

VOL. XXXIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1938.

No. 3.

ART AND ARTISTS IN BALTIMORE.

By LATROBE WESTON.

In this industrial and utilitarian age, it is encouraging to observe in Maryland a revival of interest in things historical and literary. Statesmen and generals of the early days have become familiar figures. Information concerning the poets, Poe and Lanier and Francis Scott Key, is eagerly welcomed, and John P. Kennedy has come into his own as a writer of romances. An account, therefore, of the artists of Baltimore and, in part, of Maryland may not be out of place.

The story begins, naturally, with Rembrandt Peale, whose importance is emphasized today by the restoration of the Peale Museum on Holliday Street. His long life began while the Revolution was still in progress and extended to the verge of the Civil War, covering the period from 1778 to 1860. Following the example of his father, Charles Willson Peale, who painted Washington seven times, he procured at seventeen years of age the honor of painting the General's portrait. This portrait was purchased by Congress in 1832, the centenary of Washington's birth. Like his father Peale was a versatile genius, comprehending in his activities the spheres of painter, inventor and showman. At a cost of \$40,000 he completed in Baltimore in 1814 the Gallery of Fine Arts on Holliday Street, recently restored to its original state and maintained as the Municipal Museum. Here he exhibited during a period of

thirteen or fourteen years not only paintings, but stuffed birds and beasts, amphibious animals, fishes, wax figures, and Indian ornaments and utensils. Located in what was at that time the very center of the life of the city, the Gallery was described in its day, as "an elegant rendezvous of taste, curiosity and leisure." In it, painted by Peale himself, were no less than sixty-four portraits of illustrious men, distinguished in the Revolutionary War. The fee to visit the museum throughout the year was ten dollars per family, and to pay expenses Peale was driven to more and more spectacular attractions—Egyptian mummies, war-whooping Indians and, during one season, an armless woman, who performed incredible stunts with implements, held between her teeth. In the Maryland Historical Society are preserved Peale's account books, which show an annual deficit that finally amounted to approximately \$14,000 and came near reducing the exhibitor to bankruptcy.

Artists from the days of Leonardo da Vinci have been devotees of science. The striking example in American art was F. B. Morse, a painter of distinction and the inventor of the telegraph. Robert Fulton, the inventor of the steamboat, was also a skillful miniature-painter. In company with these, Rembrandt Peale is distinguished as the first in the City of Baltimore to introduce illuminating gas. In the year 1816 he lighted his gallery by means of gas, announcing beforehand in the *American and Commercial Advertiser* that such illumination would be "without oil, tallow, wick or smoke." He afterwards organized in Baltimore the first gas company in America, receiving in recognition of his services one hundred shares of the company's stock. Like most originators Peale was poorly compensated for the benefits which he conferred.

The early nineteenth century introduces to us an artist whose career reflected honor upon his native city. Alfred J. Miller was born in Baltimore in 1810, and, during the later years of his life, up to his death in 1874, resided continuously in the city. He took his first lessons in painting from Sully and afterwards studied in Europe from 1833 to 1837, passing

time in Paris and in Florence and Rome. In New Orleans in 1837 he met Sir William Drummond Stewart of Scotland, and visited with him the Rocky Mountains. It was in this journey that he made sketches for the paintings which were his best accomplishments—a series of studies of the life of the American Indians; these sketches being numbered and referred to with considerable detail in a diary or note book which (together with many of the sketches themselves) is in the possession of the heirs of the late Decatur H. Miller, brother of the artist. Mr. Miller afterwards resided for several years with Sir Drummond Stewart in his castle in Scotland, and was under contract to execute each year one or more paintings of large dimensions, depicting Indian life from the material assembled in his sketch-books. The dress and customs of tribes that, so far as their former manner of life is concerned, have now passed utterly away, are graphically depicted in these sketches. From the point of view both of art and history, they are of inestimable value.

During his residence abroad Mr. Miller was a correspondent of William T. Walters, and was of assistance to him in the acquisition of some of the paintings that adorned his gallery.

Mr. Miller was also a skilled portrait painter and maintained himself comfortably by painting portraits, as is clearly shown by Mr. Miller's account books, now owned by his great nephew, Alfred J. Miller, which contain the names of many distinguished sitters. In his residence on Cold Spring Lane, Guilford, another great nephew, L. Vernon Miller, possesses one of the finest of these—a portrait of his grandfather, the brother of the artist. It is interesting to relate that there was held in the Peale Museum in November of 1933 an exhibition of Mr. Miller's work, consisting principally of his Indian water-colors and drawings.

In addition to his own work Mr. Miller's life is important because in conjunction with Ernest Fisher, a graduate of the schools of Paris, Dresden and Antwerp, he was the instructor of a number of younger artists. Among others A. J. H. Way, J. Craig Jones, W. J. Tiffany and Frank B. Mayer were his pupils.

Mention of the last of these, Frank B. Mayer, brings a personal reminiscence; for, a number of years ago, I spent several days with a pair of artist friends who had rented the painter's former studio in Annapolis. The building, once a fine mansion, had fallen from its high estate and, lacking its original frontage, was involved in a maze of back streets and alleys. The studio, however, in the upper story preserved its ample size and favorable lighting. Here for the last twenty years of his life the artist labored, producing a number of paintings which exhibit in all its phases the life of Annapolis, when the town was characterized as the Athens of America. The best known of these, "My Lady's Visit," may be seen today in the gallery of the Maryland Historical Society.

Mr. Mayer visited Europe in the sixties and studied under Gleyre in Paris. He was in the city during the siege in 1870, escaping with difficulty before the capitulation. He exhibited a practical ability, not always present in artists, by chartering the vessel in which he sailed and carrying to Holland a liberal consignment of tobacco. This he sold to advantage, and thereby secured funds which enabled him to travel and study.

Mr. Mayer's life covered the years from 1827 to 1899 and he has a recognized place as a historical painter in the story of American Art. In the board room of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad is on permanent exhibition his panel delineating the founders of the enterprise, and, in the State House in Annapolis, are his paintings, "The Burning of the Peggy Stewart," and "The Founding of Maryland." At the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia in 1876, he received the gold medal for figure painting, winning the award by his picture, "Michael the Fiddler."

Baltimore may rightly claim as her own the sculptor, William H. Rinehart. Born on a farm in Carroll County, Maryland, he was apprenticed to a marble-cutter in Baltimore in 1846, when he was twenty-one years old, and received his education in the night schools of the Maryland Institute. It was during his apprenticeship that he laid with his own hands

the mosaic pavement in the chancel of St. Anne's Church in Annapolis. After his first stay in Europe he spent the year 1857 in Baltimore, where his talent was recognized and he obtained numerous commissions. The statue of Chief Justice Taney in his robes of office, in Washington Place, one of the masterpieces of sculpture, is a perpetual reminder of Rinehart's genius. Baltimore is also fortunate in possessing, in the reading room of the Peabody Institute, the original of his marble statue of Clytie, enamoured of Apollo, sun-flower in hand. This figure in its appealing grace and charm is acknowledged to be one of Rinehart's most perfect productions. Another memorial is the bust of Teackle Wallis within the St. Paul Street entrance to the Court House.

At a turn of the road in Greenmount Cemetery, beautifully situated at the summit of a rising ground, is the grave of Rinehart. Above it, cast in bronze, is appropriately placed his own sleeping Endymion, most perfectly revealing the delicacy of his art.

At his early death in 1874 Rinehart bequeathed to Baltimore a trust fund of \$45,000. The trustees named were at the same time representatives of the Peabody Institute; and it has thus come about that the Peabody has administered the fund which, in the course of years, has been increased far beyond the original bequest of \$45,000. By this means has been established and maintained at the Maryland Institute the Rinehart School of Sculpture, for which Baltimoreans cannot be sufficiently grateful.

A worthy successor of Rinehart was the sculptor Ephraim Keyser, who was born in Baltimore in 1852. After his return from Europe in the early seventies, Mr. Keyser lived and worked in Baltimore to the end of his life of over eighty years. Many memorials of his genius are to be seen in Baltimore—the romantic figure of the serenader, designated "The Rose," in the Maryland Institute; the bronze portrait bust of Lanier in Gilman Hall, Johns Hopkins University; and the numerous mortuary monuments in the Hebrew Cemetery on Gay Street,

beyond North Avenue. Of these, the most notable is the Stein Memorial, in bronze; showing a veiled angel bowed in grief, encompassed by over-shadowing wings. In Annapolis is the vigorous bronze statue of DeKalb, in the grounds of the State House. In addition to these must be mentioned Mr. Keyser's best known work—the bronze angel guarding the tomb of President Arthur, in Albany Rural Cemetery.

The Maryland Institute, to which Rinehart owed the beginnings of his education in sculpture, has been prominent in the story of art in Baltimore. Established in 1825 the Institute, after some changes in location, was finally housed in 1851 in a building adequate to its needs on Marsh Market Space. Here instruction in art was given during the long period ending in 1904, when the building was destroyed in Baltimore's great fire. A tablet in the new building, erected in 1907 on Mt. Royal Avenue, commemorates the service of Prof. Otto Fuchs as principal, during the twenty-three years from 1883 to 1906. A former principal was Prof. Hugh Newell, a native of Ireland, who settled in Baltimore about the year 1861, after studying in the art schools of Antwerp, Paris and London. Some of his out-door compositions with figures may be found in Baltimore homes, and are of decided merit. Special interest attaches to Prof. D. A. Woodward, who was principal in the late seventies. Exemplifying again the inventive ability that has frequently distinguished artists, Prof. Woodward devised the solar camera; by means of which a life-sized impression on a prepared canvas may be obtained from a small photographic negative, by the direct light of the sun reflected from a mirror. The invention has been a great aid to artists lacking skill in draftsmanship, and has had other uses.

The Maryland Historical Society, which was founded in 1844, was also an influence in the field of art. Among the charter members were S. Teackle Wallis, Brantz Mayer, John H. B. Latrobe, Robert Gilmore, and others who were acknowledged patrons and lovers of art. From the beginning the art gallery was a prominent feature—the first exhibition

was in 1848, and thereafter there were exhibits at regular intervals. The collection was in the main a loan-collection, and copies of the old masters predominated; but, nevertheless, the occasions that drew art lovers together were a stimulus to contemporary artists. A stronger and more enduring influence was the opening of Mr. Walters' gallery to the public, which began in the sixties. Here were displayed to many for the first time the masterpieces of the Barbizon school, which amazed by their perfection. The collection was housed for long years in Mr. Walters' home on Mt. Vernon Place; it was only after it was immensely enlarged by the purchase of the Massarenti collection by Italian masters, that the present gallery was built in 1907 to accommodate it.

Private collections in the homes of men of wealth and culture were, in fact, an important factor in the progress of art in Baltimore. The earliest of these was the collection of Robert Gilmore, the last representative of a successful mercantile house, who died in the year 1848. Mr. Gilmore's residence was first on Water Street and afterwards on Lombard Street, in what was then the residential center—the Washington Monument was erected in Howard's woods, outside the city limits. Mr. Gilmore not only collected the works of the old masters, but also gave orders to the prominent American artists of his day: Allston, Newton, Mount, Cole, Durand, Doughty. He was a man of wide sympathies, embracing all the fields of science, literature and art. He visited artists, encouraged them, bought their pictures, and helped to arrange exhibitions and to mediate between the artists and the public.

During a trip abroad Mr. Gilmore visited Sir Walter Scott at Abbotsford and spent several days with him. Sir Walter presented him with a cane, one of his own walking-sticks, which was highly prized and afterwards descended to his great-nephew, Judge Robert Gilmore. The castle of Glen Ellen, which adjoined Hampton, the Ridgely estate, north of Towson, was built by William Gilmore, a nephew of Robert Gilmore. The castle was modeled after Scott's home at Abbotsford.

Later patrons of art in Baltimore were Dr. Thomas Edmondson, Granville S. Oldfield, J. Collins Lee and John H. B. Latrobe. More prominent still as a collector and patron was Charles James Madison Eaton; who lived from 1808 to 1893, and who was engaged in business for many years in Baltimore. In the course of frequent trips to Europe he purchased many pictures and other works of art, the greater part of which he finally bequeathed to the Peabody Institute, of which he was a trustee from 1878 to the date of his death. Mr. Eaton acquired by purchase some of the art objects of the collection of Robert Gilmor. The Misses Eaton, who still inhabit the family mansion at the south-east corner of Franklin Street and Park Avenue, are nieces of the collector.

The late J. Latimer Hoffman was a grand-nephew of Robert Gilmor and inherited the latter's passion for collecting. There had descended to him as valued possessions from the collection of Robert Gilmor, a small landscape by Ruysdael and others by Koek-koek and Jacobs of the famous Dutch school; also a landscape by the American painter Thomas Doughty, and the portrait of his grandmother by John Wesley Jarvis. In his home on Franklin Street he maintained for years a notable display of paintings and prints. One picture which he particularly prized was a *selbst-bild* of the artist, Angelica Kauffman, presented by her to Charles Willson Peale while the latter was in England. As romance has it Peale was in love with the artist, but was unsuccessful in his suit. He treasured the portrait, which was handed down in his family for several generations, but finally disappeared and was recovered by Mr. Hoffman from a dealer. It is worthy of note that the picture was at one time owned by Mrs. Angelica Boteler Didier, herself a descendant of the Peale family, and bearing the name Angelica, Charles Willson Peale's daughter.

Mr. Hoffman's ambition in life was to emulate the taste and style of living of his collector grand-uncle, Robert Gilmor.

The life of A. J. H. Way, from his birth in 1826 to his death in 1888, was passed wholly in Baltimore, except for years

as a student in Paris. As in the early days of American art the artist Dunlop was the historian of the artists, so, at a later period, Mr. Way constituted himself the recorder of happenings in the art world of Baltimore City. A book of newspaper clippings kept by him is devoted to auction sales, exhibitions, receptions and the general gossip about artists and their doings. Mr. Way himself established a reputation as an artist of still life. He painted grapes so luscious as to tempt the appetite of the beholder; for many years no exhibit of pictures was complete without a specimen of his work. From time to time he contributed newspaper articles, descriptive of the art life of Paris while he was a student in the Latin quarter. Mr. Way was a man of genial personality and had a wide circle of acquaintance. He delighted in his office of recorder, and it is in his succession of newspaper notices that the art world of Baltimore lives again in the decades between 1860 and 1890. In the exhibitions he enumerated the artists who had obtained recognition, many of whom lived in Baltimore for a longer or shorter period: H. Bolton Jones, his brother Francis Jones, Thomas Hovenden, Frank B. Mayer, A. J. Volck, Arthur Quartley, Hugh Newell, Charles Sauerwein, James K. Harley, J. Hopkinson Smith, Wordsworth Thompson, John R. Tait, Allen Redwood, Louis Dieterich, Frederick Dielman, the Volkmar, Charles senior and Charles junior, Mr. Way himself and his son George Way. A fair proportion of these carried the honor of membership in the National Academy of Design.

Charles Volkmar junior of this group was a landscape painter—a disciple of the school of Düsseldorf, Germany. Many of his canvasses were of very considerable dimensions and some of them are owned in Baltimore. His father, Charles Volkmar senior, supplemented his activities as an artist by restoring pictures. In narrow quarters on Frederick Street he labored to the end of a long life. The neighborhood underwent change, but not so Mr. Volkmar. In surroundings that had progressively deteriorated he persisted in business at the old stand, and, at his death prior to 1890, left his son a considerable

sum of money. The latter conceived the idea of establishing a foundation for the manufacture of ceramics which, he hoped, would be recognized as a peculiarly American product, after the manner of the Sèvres porcelain. He invested extensively out of his inheritance in a plant in Corona, Long Island. The enterprise was tragically unsuccessful; he failed to receive support which he anticipated, and was ultimately obliged to wind up the business with a large figure of loss.

The death of the genial and popular Mr. Way was an event deeply lamented in the art circles of Baltimore. His coffin was borne by six of his friends and associates: Dr. A. J. Volck, John R. Tait, Prof. Otto Fuchs, William Robinson, William Meyers, and John G. Hopkins. The last of these, John G. Hopkins, was a capable restorer of paintings and a man of versatile ability in many directions. In addition he was gifted with a rare social talent, and his home at Pleasant and St. Paul Streets was, during many years, a meeting place where artists loved to gather. Here, previous to Mr. Way's death, might be seen, as constant visitors: Mr. Way himself, Frank Mayer, Dr. A. J. Volck, John R. Tait, Ephraim Keyser and Reuben Legrand Johnston. A rare atmosphere of sociability prevailed; the supply of good wines was unstinted, and conversation was diversified and brilliant.

John R. Tait, of this inner circle, was born in Cincinnati in 1834. He went abroad in 1852 and studied painting and literature in Florence and Rome. The travels and poems which he afterwards published gave him a recognized place in literature. In a subsequent sojourn in Europe he spent twelve years in Düsseldorf, Germany, where he won an established reputation as a landscape painter. Some of his canvasses were bought by the German government and placed on permanent exhibition in art museums.

Reuben Legrand Johnston was a grandson of Judge Legrand of Virginia, a prominent jurist, and was highly connected socially in Baltimore. Of handsome presence he was in dress and manners pre-eminently the fine gentleman, and possessed

unusual personal charm. He had studied and painted extensively in France, choosing as subjects landscapes in Normandy and Brittany, with characteristic figures.

The late Meredith Janvier has suggested that Adelbert J. Volck and Benvenuto Cellini must have been born under the same star, so similar were their activities in various fields of art. Dr. Volck's work cannot of course be ranked with the achievement of the great Italian, but his versatility was remarkable. The Charcoal Club of Baltimore is the possessor of a copper and silver tankard, beaten out and engraved by Dr. Volck. A more striking exhibition of his craftsmanship was a number of shields, wrought in metal, with figures in relief representing the Norse heroes of the *Nibelungen Lied*. In evidence of his quality as an etcher, I was fortunate enough to see very lately a series of drawings executed by him, illustrating the meetings of the Wednesday Club. This was an organization beginning among artists and musicians, and extended ultimately to include persons of social prominence who were interested in dramatic representation. For twelve years succeeding 1875, six plays and six concerts were given annually. After meeting in various places the Club finally established itself in a building on Charles Street, which was subsequently remodeled into the Lyceum Theater. Dr. Volck's etchings of the meetings depict the assembled members, each of the figures being a likeness easily recognizable. The drawings are remarkable in their minute elaboration of detail.

Dr. Volck also painted in oil, choosing as subjects romantic episodes.

A brother of Dr. Volck was Frederick Volck, a sculptor of ability, who lived in Baltimore many years in the practice of his art. He finally went abroad and resorted to Munich, where he remained for the rest of his life.

The artist Louis Dieterich painted portraits in Baltimore during a lifetime continued beyond the usual limit. He came to America from Germany in 1853, a boy of eleven, and afterwards established himself as a portrait painter in Baltimore,

where he continued in active practice up to his death in 1924. Mr. Dieterich had as sitters many persons of distinction, and his portraits are to be found in numerous Baltimore homes. His work is continued by his son, Waldemar Dieterich, who occupies today the same studio in the building at Charles and Mulberry Streets in which he and his father painted for a dozen or more years previous to the latter's death.

A capable artist of the period was John Dabour, born in Smyrna, Asia, in 1837. He was a pupil of the Academy of Fine Arts in Paris, and later found his way to Baltimore, where he painted portraits during a residence of about ten years in the seventies and eighties. Dabour married in Baltimore and afterwards removed to New York, but retained his connection with Baltimore, making frequent visits to paint portraits. In the Librarian's office in the Pratt Library is hung a large portrait of the founder, Enoch Pratt, painted by Dabour; and in the Masonic Temple is his portrait of Thomas Shryock, Grand Master. Still another portrait by his hand is that of Jerome Bonaparte second, son of Jerome Bonaparte and Betsy Patterson, which may be seen in the rooms of the Maryland Club, of which Bonaparte was one of the original directors. In addition to these Dabour's work in Baltimore included many portraits which adorn private homes.

In his life of Enoch Pratt, recently published, Mr. Richard Hart narrates that, when the City of Baltimore proposed to have the philanthropist's portrait painted, Mr. Pratt was asked to name an artist. He suggested Paul Hallwig, but added the caution not to offer him more than \$350, since, in his opinion, that was sufficient remuneration. The artist ultimately received \$500, the city's usual allowance for a portrait; but the knowledge was carefully kept from Mr. Pratt, who continued under the gratifying impression that he had saved the public purse \$150.

Oscar Hallwig and Paul Hallwig, father and son, were associated as artists and painted portraits in Baltimore over a long period of years. The father lived to old age and the son did not long survive him, dying in 1925.

A Baltimore artist in whose career the picturesque element played an unusual part was Richard Curzon Poultney, a brother of Arthur E. Poultney, and a nephew of Walter de Curzon Poultney. Richard Poultney was born in 1861 and, after his education and early practice of art in Baltimore, he sailed for England when about thirty years old. In England he was able to obtain the powerful patronage of Lord Frederick Hamilton, and was introduced by him into the charmed circle of the English aristocracy. For the following six or seven years he passed his time in going from country house to country house, painting miniatures of women, the prominent social beauties of the day. He died before the expiration of the century and, having become to all intents and purposes an Englishman, was buried in Kirtland Abbey, the private burying-ground of Lord North.

The artist Harper Pennington belonged to a prominent Baltimore family. Born in 1854, he went abroad after his early education for study in Paris and London. During his stay in London he became acquainted with Whistler and his group, and formed an enduring admiration for Whistler's genius. After his return he painted portraits during some years in Baltimore, but after his marriage removed to New York, where he established himself as a portrait painter. While in Baltimore he was a member of the Wednesday Club, and on one occasion an exhibition of his portraits was given in the rooms of the organization.

There was, in fact, in Baltimore between 1870 and 1890, an activity and general interest in art and artists that has never since obtained. Men of wealth of that period, traveling in Europe, took pride in purchasing and bringing home with them valuable paintings to adorn their residences. They frequented art-loan exhibitions and auction sales of paintings. In the clippings assembled by Mr. Way are mentioned the prominent art dealers: Perrigo and Way, Perrigo and Kohl, Meyers and Hedian, Wm. B. Norman and Company, and David Bendann. Exhibitions or sales in the galleries of these firms were notable

events, attracting crowds of persons of social prominence. The Maryland Academy of Fine Arts was organized in 1870, with John H. B. Latrobe as president, and S. Teackle Wallis, George B. Coale, Louis McLane and others as directors. This was immediately successful and gave an important stimulus to things in the local art world. There were loan exhibits at the Academy of Music, the Fifth Regiment Armory and the Peabody Institute. Paintings were on view from the collections of James A. Gary, W. W. Spence, William Marburg, George B. Coale, Charles D. Fisher, Blanchard Randall and other prominent citizens. At an exhibit at the Fifth Regiment Armory Whistler's pictures, "Woman in White" and "Wapping," excited universal interest.

As memorials of this period there were hung until recently in the lobby of Ford's Opera House: portrait of John T. Ford by Hovenden, portrait of Joseph Jefferson by Allen Redwood, and one or two other portraits. It is much to be regretted that these have disappeared.

The artist Charles Yardley Turner, whose mural paintings depicting Calvert's treaty with the Indians and the burning of the Peggy Stewart are amongst those that adorn the Baltimore Court House, was intimately associated with Baltimore, although his professional life was passed for the most part in New York. One of the large Turner family of Quaker origin, he was born in Baltimore in 1850 and received his early education in the city. In 1872 he went to New York for study in the National Academy of Design, and afterwards pursued his studies abroad in the art studios of Paris and Holland. One of his sisters married John T. Graham, a prominent real-estate operator; who settled in Mt. Washington and built in 1868 the large mansion, now known as The Oaks, but originally called Hillside. To the home of his sister Mr. Turner was a frequent visitor. In company with the brothers Bolton and Francis Jones and other artists of the Baltimore group, he participated in sketching parties in the picturesque neighborhood of Mt. Washington, and all gathered for a social lunch served by Mrs. Graham at Hillside.

Mr. Turner was the principal assistant of the artist Francis D. Millet in the decoration of the buildings of the World's Fair at Chicago in 1893. So enormous were the spaces to be covered, and so limited the time, that the painting of the walls was only made possible by a method of spraying the paint, the invention of Thomas Turner, a brother of the artist.

The following is an amusing anecdote of the community of artists of the period. The artist Reuben Legrand Johnston occupied a studio in the building at the south-east corner of Charles and Mulberry Streets. The inmates were conscious during several days of a peculiar and offensive odor, which increased continually in intensity. So disagreeable did it finally become that investigation was undertaken, and the odor was traced to the door of Johnston's studio, which was found locked. A terrible suspicion ensued—had the occupant committed suicide, and was his body decomposing in the interior? The door was finally forced open and there was evident—not the decomposing body of the artist, but the suspended forms of a pair of ducks far gone in putrefaction. Johnston was fond of painting still life and, having secured the ducks as subjects, had with characteristic forgetfulness departed on an excursion of several days, informing no one, and leaving natural processes to their legitimate and inevitable development.

STATE OF THE PROVINCE OF MARYLAND IN 1758.

Introductory Note.

A series of questions and answers concerning the political situation in the Province of Maryland in 1758, with particular reference to the supply of troops for the western campaign, the revenues of the Proprietary and the bitter feud that developed between the upper and lower houses of Assembly, has been turned over to the *Magazine* for publication by the editor of the *Archives of Maryland*. The manuscript sheets containing the answers have long been stored in a portfolio of official papers, nearly a century ago placed in the care of the Historical Society and recently returned to State custody. Prepared presumably with a view to publication, they have not, so far as is known, appeared in print. The questions, published in the *London Chronicle* for September 16-19, 1758, have been taken from the file of that journal in the Library of Congress.

The authorship of both questions and answers seems not to have been established, but the former were attributed by Lord Baltimore's secretary, Mr. Cecilius Calvert, in a letter to Governor Sharpe, to "Mr. Franklyn," meaning, of course, Benjamin Franklin, then in England.* The answers were prepared, it now appears certain, by Governor Sharpe himself as indicated by the handwriting on comparison with known manuscripts of the Governor. Doubtless upon hearing from Mr. Calvert that the queries were considered "impertinent & ridiculous not worthy ans^r tho' easy of confute," it was determined to withhold the answers from publication.

Further light on the subject is shed in the volumes of the *Archives* that contain the Sharpe correspondence (VI, IX, and XIV) and those containing the Proceedings of the Council of the time (XXXI), and of the General Assembly (LII), especially the introductory letter to the last. Volume LV of the *Archives*, now in press, will continue the Assembly Proceedings

* *Archives*, XXXI: 507.

for the years 1757-1758. To the official material set forth in these volumes the two-part discussion that follows is an illuminating accompaniment.

[From the *London Chronicle*, dated Sept. 16-19, 1758,
pp. 271-272.]

POSTSCRIPT.

To the PRINTER, &c.

SIR,

I HAVE seen in the papers lately, the following article of news, viz.

‘They write from Maryland, that their Assembly had passed a bill for raising 1000 men, and 45,000 l. to pay them, as the quota of that Province towards the expedition against Fort Duquesne, in obedience to his Majesty’s Commands signified in a letter from Mr. Secretary Pitt; but that the said bill had unfortunately miscarried, having received a negative, chiefly on account of its proposing to tax the Proprietary Estate as well as the other Estates of the Province; which the Government there will not permit. That two other bills for raising considerable sums for his Majesty’s service, had miscarried on the same account within this last year; and so the Virginia and Pennsylvania forces are gone by themselves, without the expected assistance from Maryland. It is hoped, however, that they may be strong enough to effect the service: though, since General Abercrombie’s repulse, people are in some pain for them, lest the French should spare a force sufficient to intercept and defeat them.’

And afterwards in the *Public Advertiser* of Monday, Sept. 11, the following paragraph, viz.

‘The paragraph inserted in the *Chronicle* of the 6th instant, and from thence published in other News Papers, throwing a reflection on the Proprietor of Maryland, and the Government of that Province, as if a negative had been put on some supply bills for his Majesty’s service, chiefly because the Government

‘ there would not permit the Proprietary Estate to be taxed ; we
 ‘ are assured is a malicious insinuation, void of truth, and it
 ‘ is well known the Proprietary Estates are already taxed
 ‘ equally with the Estates of any of the inhabitants in Maryland ;
 ‘ and that the Proprietor has no objection thereto.’

When I read the first, I had not the least doubt of the truth of it, as it agreed perfectly with letters I myself had received from correspondents of credit in that Province. I was therefore surprized to find the facts flatly contradicted in the second, and with that air of confidence that is usually inspired by a good cause, and a clear knowledge of the truth. So I recurred again to my letters ; and as I have a respect for the Proprietor, and would be far from joining with any malicious person, in throwing reflections void of truth, I shall rather give an opportunity to his Lordship’s friend to remove them, by letting him know in what light things are seen and represented here by the people of that Province to their correspondents, of which, perhaps, he may not be fully apprized. This I shall do in the following Queries, which the gentleman may answer if he thinks proper.

1. Whether the only tax in Maryland, of which his Lordship pays any part, be not the tax of *One Shilling* only, for every hundred acres of surveyed or occupied land ?

2. Whether the tax of one shilling per hundred acres on all the surveyed lands in Maryland, subject to that tax, is any considerable sum ; as, whether it amounts to 1500 or 2000 l. per annum, more or less, paid by the whole Estates of the Province, including the Proprietor’s.

3. Whether the Proprietor’s share of this small sum, be not very small, as he only pays for his manor lands, and they but a small part of the Province ?

4. Whether the Proprietor has not other ways very large incomes or revenues from the Province ?

5. Whether his share of the said one shilling tax be a penny, a farthing, or even half a farthing per pound, more or less, per ann. on those revenues ?

6. Whether the act of 1756, by which that tax was laid, does

not, for raising the supply of forty thousand pounds thereby granted, lay several heavy taxes on the people, of which the Proprietor, by his residence in England, can pay little or no part; such as an excise on liquors; a particular tax on batchelors, proportioned to their estates; a duty on horses; a duty on writs, conveyances, leases, and other instruments and law proceedings; a duty on negroes; a duty on pitch, tar, turpentine, &c. And whether, this being the case, it can properly and *truly* be said, that “that the Proprietary Estates are already taxed *equally* “with the Estates of any of the inhabitants of Maryland?”

7. Whether the sum granted by the said act and struck in paper bills, has not been, some time since, totally expended, and the said funds mortgaged for years to come, to sink the bills and discharge the debt?

8. Whether it did not become necessary last year to pass a new bill for raising more money, and providing additional funds; which being accordingly done by the Assembly, the same received a flat negative?

9. Whether the Assembly did not then pass another bill to raise 25,000 l. by an equal assessment on all estates, faculties, and incomes, the Proprietary's not excepted?

10. Whether this bill did not, during the debates upon it in the House, receive all the opposition the influence of the government could give it, both within and without doors; notwithstanding which it passed by a majority of forty to ten?

11. Whether this bill did not also receive, when it came up, a flat negative?

12. Whether on Mr. Pitt's letter, recommending vigorous measures against the enemy, the House did not last winter resolve on a grant of 45,000 l. for the current year, and to raise 1000 men, and send up a third bill for that purpose on the same equitable plan?

13. Whether this third bill did not also receive a flat negative?

14. Whether about this time the militia were not forced out from their homes to the frontiers in a very severe season?

15. Whether it is not a prevailing opinion in Maryland, that this was done to distress the people, and cause them to urge their representatives to come into any terms of raising money, rather than they should be obliged to leave their stocks of cattle perishing for want of care, and have no opportunity of making preparation for another crop?

16. Whether the Assembly did not resolve, that this unnecessary measure was *without Law to warrant it*?

17. Whether they were not, however, prevailed on to depart from the usual forms, and agree to a conference on the latter bill, though a money bill?

18. Whether one of the principal points of conference was not, *the taxation of the Proprietary estate*?

19. Whether the Council did not particularly and zealously contend for the Proprietor against that taxation?

20. Whether the Council of Maryland are not appointed, without the least concurrence of the Crown, *solely by the Proprietor*, and removeable at his will?

21. Whether most of its members or their families, do not enjoy posts, not only of honour, but of *great profit*, under the Proprietor, and during his pleasure?

22. Whether therefore it is not probable—they have never been well informed “That the Proprietor had no objection to “being taxed equally with any of the inhabitants of the Province for its defence:” or otherwise they would not have dared to act a part so prejudicial to his honour?

23. Whether if the taxing of their offices was the principal thing they were averse to, and they presumed to use his Lordship’s name and concerns as a screen for their own selfishness, and thereby defeated a bill so necessary for the King’s service, they do not deserve some mark of his Lordship’s displeasure?

24. Whether the people of Maryland do not at present stand in an unfavourable light, as not having contributed to this year’s service?

25. Whether they have any agent here to present their complaints and justify their conduct?

26. Whether the Assembly did not, in the last session, present a bill to raise money for the payment of an Agent, which received a negative, as other bills of the like kind have heretofore done?

27. Whether a negative to such a bill was a measure as honest as it was politic?

28. Whether this may not justify any friend of that Province, though only a trader thither, in laying a true state of their affairs before the Publick, as far as they come to his knowledge?

My last query is more general, viz.

Whether the frequent clashings of interests between the Proprietors and people of our colonies, which of late have been so prejudicial to his Majesty's service, and the defence of his dominions, do not at length make it necessary for this nation to enquire into the nature and conduct of these Proprietary Governments, and put them on a better footing?

I am, Sir, yours, etc.,

A. B.

[From a manuscript, item no. 7, in Portfolio 2, Hall of Records, Annapolis.]

Answers to the Queries published in the *London Chronicle* dated Sept^r 16-19—1758—

1. The Only Tax in Maryland of which the Ld pr^{ery} pays any part towards Sinking the money which hath been granted by the Legislature of that Province for the immediate Defence of the same & for His Majesty's Service is the Tax of one Shilling for every 100 Acres of Surveyed or occupied Land yet even this Tax is much more in proportion to His Ldp's Revenue from the province than the Inhabitants of Maryland pay, notwithstanding the Ld proprietary by an express Act of Assembly made several Years ago (& on Consideration whereof the then Ld pr^{ery} consented to Repeal an Act which granted Him & his Heirs a very large Duty on all Tob^o exported) is exempted

from the payment of any Tax whatever towards the Defence of the province.

It may not be improper to inform those who having never been in the province are ignorant of the Numbers & Circumstances of the Inhabitants that by a particular & exact Account taken in the Year 1754 their Number was found to be 107963 white people, & 46225 Negroes who are Slaves; & that the Value of the Produce which the Inhabitants exported in the preceeding Year (consisting as appeared by the Custom House Books of 30634 Hhds of Tob^o 110567 Bushels of Wheat, 154741 Bushels of Indian Corn, 2500 Tuns of Pigg & 600 Tuns of Bar Iron, 6327 Barrels of Bread & Flour, 430 Barrels of Pork, 420 Bush^s of Pease & Beans, 100 Hhds & 100 Bags of Flaxseed, 170 Barrels of Herrings, 1095500 Staves & Heading, 200000 Shingles, a large Quantity of Walnut & other Plank together with several Ships which having been built in the province were sent to G Britain loaded with Tob^o & there sold) amounted on a very moderate Calculation to the Sum of £350,000 Cur^{cy}. If we add to this Sum £703,480 (w^{ch} considering the Number of the Inhabitants & after what manner the planters in general live is a very low Calculation being not quite 3^d Cur^{cy} or 2^d Stg a Day for each) for the Value of the Commodities raised & consumed in the Country every Year, & take no Notice of the *great Quantity** of *Wheat, Corn, Shingles* & other produce carried to pens^a of which no Acco^t is given to the Officers of the Customs nor of the daily Encrease of the Wealth of the Inhabitants, by their Lands rising in Value, their Negroes & Stock of Cattle increasing, the whole Produce of Maryland Yearly might be called at least £1,053,480—Now the Lord Proprietary's Income or Revenue from the Province (& this not in-

* Tis supposed that there are carried from Kent City alone in a year to Duck Creek ab 200,000 Bush Wheat 3,000 Bush Barley & 1000 Bush Flaxseed from Queen Anns half as much & from Cecil as much as from both Kent & Q. A. in all 606,000 Bush at 41 d p Bush = £136,350—& 160,000 Staves = £800 & from the Seaboard side or Worcester Cty Corn pork shingles &c [of the value of] Now 300 hhds Tobo to be . . . Eastern Shore = £2250.

creasing) is about £11,000 Stg or £16500 Cur^{cy} p ann. Consequently as the whole Tax (imposed in 1756) to be paid by him & the Inhabitants of the province is £40,000 His share thereof is £616..16..8½, for as the whole produce of Maryland & His Ldp's Annual Revenue together viz. 1,069,980:£40000 ::£16,500:£616..16..8½.

According to a Calculation made by the Commissioners of the Loan Office there must in Order to Sink the £40,000 be £20680 raised by the Land Tax, it being provided & directed by the Act that That Tax shall be increased or augmented in 1760 in such manner as to make good all Deficiencies of the other Funds.

3. Of the £20,680 to be raised by the Land Tax it is expected that the proprietary will pay £1006..17.4 which is £390.0.7½ more than his equal Share or proportion. The greatest part of the Land for which he pays Tax either cannot be Leased at all or is Leased out to Tenants on Lives or for long Terms & some for ever at a low Rent, part of it at 10/Stg the 100 Ac^{rs} some at 20/, other part at £3—& a very small Quantity at £5 the 100 Ac^{rs}, while the Inhabitants Lands in general are either Leased at a higher Rent or being Cultivated by the Owners turn to much better Acco^t.

4. What the Ld proprietary's Revenue altogether amounts to hath been already declared, the greatest part of it arises from a small quit Rent reserved on most of the Land that hath been granted since the Settlement of the province.

5. From what hath been already observed it appears that the Tax which the Lord proprietary will pay annually on an Average for five Years will be almost Threepence in the pound on his Annual Income.

6. The Act of 1756 by which that Tax was imposed does lay several Duties & Taxes on the People of w^{ch} the Ld pr^{ery} by his Residing in England can pay no part: but that the Reader may be enabled to judge whether those Taxes are heavy Ones considering the Number & Wealth of the people, I will enumerate them & specify what each of them appear by the Books in the Loan Office to have produced in One Year. The Excise on

Liquors £1950..14..3½, Tax on Batchelors £416..2.0½, Tax on Billiard Tables £32..3..6, Duty on Writts &c £467..8..9½, Duty on Horses £23.8, Duty on Negroes £4.2..10½. On Pitch Tar & Turpentine £17..12.7½ in all £2911..12..1 which according to the Account above given is less than a 360^t part of the Annual Income of the Inhabitants. Tis expected indeed that some of the Duties particularly that on Negroes imported will produce a larger Sum in the subsequent Years otherwise a heavier Tax will fall on the Land the last Year of the Continuance of the Act than is above calculated & allowed for. Is then a 360^t part being only two thirds of a penny in the pound on the Annual Income so heavy a Tax & so great a Burthen as to afford Room for Complaint & Repining? Would it be thought so in the Mother Country? & Does not His Ldp by Residing in England pay a much greater Tax on *all* he consumes than he would was he to reside in the province of Maryland, beside the levies on his plate, windows &c. ? If this then be the Case it is submitted to the Querist whether it cannot be properly & truly said that the proprietary Estates are already Taxed more than equally with the Estates of the Inhabitants of Maryland.

7. The Sum granted by the said Act made in 1756 & struck in Paper Bills hath been some time since totally expended & the said Funds are Mortgaged to Sink the Bills & Discharge the Debt which however will be done in June 1761, a Period not far distant. What Reason would Others of His Majesty's Subjects have to Congratulate Themselves had they a certain Prospect of seeing their publick Debts discharged so speedily.

8. It certainly was thought necessary last Year by His Majesty's Ministers, & his General in America¹ that more Supplies should be granted by the Province of Maryland for His Majesty's Service, the Governor recommended it to both Houses of Assembly who acknowledged the Expediency thereof, & the Upper House professed the utmost Readiness on their Part to pass any reasonable & equitable Bill that should be offered

¹ Following the words "& his General in America" the original had "& by the Lieutt Governor" but they have been struck out with a pen.

them, but as they Conceived that the Bill for Raising £20,000 which the Lower House framed with respect to the military part (as the Earl of Loudoun express'd himself on it) a direct Infringement of the Things undoubted prerogative, & with respect to many other parts perplexed impracticable & unjust they did return it with a Negative.

9. The Lower House of Assembly did not offer any other Supply Bill that Session, but on the 4th of March being then again Convened They sent the Upper House a Bill for granting £30,000 for His Majesty's Service, but then this Bill as to all the exceptionable Clauses except some in the Military part, was just the same that had been before offered & therefore was Rejected by the Upper House. Upon this a Motion was made in the Lower House for bringing in a Bill on a different Plan for Raising £30,000 *vz* By a Tax on Ferriages, on Pilots, on all Taxables with an Additional Tax on Negro Taxables, a Tax of a certain Sum on Land by the hundred, a Tax upon all Lucrative Offices & Places of Profit Benefices & Professions a Tax upon all the Proprietarys Mannours &c. but it was Resolved by all the Members present except Five that no such Bill should be brought in.

10. That the above mentioned Bill (which the Upper House rejected) was Condemned by Those who were Friends to the Government & That the Lower House was blamed for sending it up after it was rejected by All who wished to see Money granted & Troops raised & supported, is certain, & They who framed it were pleased to Stile the few that presumed to oppose it's passage thro the Lower House the Government Party.

11. The Bill for £30,000 (there was No Bill ever offered for £25,000) was rejected by the Upper House as hath been already observed.

12. M^r Secretary Pitts Letter Recommending vigorous Measures was communicated to the Assembly by the Governor the 28th of March, 1758 & on the 31st of that Month the Lower House of Assembly Resolved that the Sum of £40,000 should be raised for His Majesty's Service & the immediate Protection

& Defence of the Province by just the same Mode of Taxation & in fact the same Bill that had been offered to the Upper House at the two preceeding Sessions; how equitable the Plan was must be submitted to the Judgment of Those who will give themselves the Trouble to peruse it or the Messages that passed between the two Houses thereupon; Let it suffice here to say that His Majesty's Attorney General Mr Pratt thinks it unjust & unreasonable & hath given it as his opinion that the Bill was such a One as could not have been enacted into a Law without a Breach of Publick Faith & a Violation of the Maryland Constitution.

13. This Bill for Raising £40,000 did receive a flat Negative.

14. Some Detachments of Militia had been ordered out to the Frontiers during the Winter for the Protection of the Inhabitants.

15. Many of the Members of the Lower House of Assembly were very industrious to propagate such an Opinion, & a great many Falshoods were roundly asserted by them on that Occasion in order to make the people think that the Governor had no command or power over the Militia & that his proceedings with respect to that Matter had been illegal & unjustifiable.

16. The Assembly did enter into such a Resolve & in Consequence thereof on the 17th of April 1758 sent the Governor a Remonstrance purposely calculated to render him & the Council odious to the people, & to incline the Militia to disregard his orders for the future, but which happily gave him an Opportunity by his Message in Answer to it dated the 5th of May following to satisfy the reasonable or moderate part of the Inhabitants that his Proceedings had been both legal & necessary, & that if any of the Inhabitants had Cause of Complaint they could not with the least Appearance of Justice lay the Blame at his Door; Nay so little Effect had the Remonstrance that when the Governor soon afterwards signified to the Militia of Frederick County that General Forbes had desired him to Garrison Fort Cumberland & Fort Frederick with Militia as well as to protect the Frontier Inhabitants, so (that the General

might be then at Liberty to draw all the Troops from those posts & with them strengthen his Army then marching towards Fort Du Quesne) several hundred of the Militia readily marched & served under the Governor's Command at those Forts for several Months.

17. The Querist seems to be but little acquainted with the Constitution or political History of Maryland to suggest that it hath been *unusual* there for the two Houses of Assembly to confer on Money Bills,² or if he is acquainted with what hath heretofore passed between the two Houses he Suggests what he knows is absolutely false. For It hath on former Occasions when Supplies for the publick Service have been wanted been the Practice (as the Records shew) sometimes for the two Houses to appoint some Members from each as a Committee to meet to consider of & agree on Ways & Means, sometimes such Bills have been framed in the Upper House & sent down for the Concurrence of the Lower, & sometimes such Bills have been prepared in the Lower House & sent to the Upper, but never till very lately did the Lower House think of insisting that the Upper had no Right but either to pass or reject Money Bills w^{ch} point has never been yielded up to them nor was the agreeing to a Conference on the Bill in question deemed a Concession.³

18. As among many others an objection had been made by the Upper House to the Taxing the Proprietary's Estate in the *manner* proposed by the Bill in Question (*which* will evidently appear to any One that will take the Trouble to consider it to be absurd & purposely calculated to produce Confusion & Disputes between the Collectors of His Ldp's Quit Rents & All the Rest of the People) *That* among several others was One of the Points which the Upper House desired to Confer on.

² Here the following seems to have been partially (or tentatively) struck out: "Nor did the Lower House of Assembly till within these few years ever think of asserting that the sole Right of granting Supplies was vested in them & that the Upper House had no Right but either to pass or Reject Money Bills."

³ Here follows a passage later stricken out by the writer: "made by the Lower House in agreeing to a Conference on the Bill in Question?"

19. Tho this was to have been One of the Points confer'd on Yet it never came under Debate, the Conference having broke up because the Lower House had instructed their Conferees not to Recede from the Sole Nomination of the Commissioners, as appears by the printed Journal of the Lower House (page 104) where it is said that the Conferees from both Houses being met on the 13th of May 1758 "It was agreed to proceed & to begin
" with the Objection relative to the Nomination & Appointment
" of the Commissioners; & the Conferees of the Upper House De-
" clare that they will not agree to the Nomination of Commis-
" sioners as the same is in the Bill, insisting that the Lower
" House cannot of Right demand the *Sole* Nomination of Com-
" missioners in a Bill imposing a Tax as the Bill under Con-
" sideration does; And propose

" That the Justices of the several & respective County
" Courts be Commissioners within the respective Counties.

" Or That a Number to be agreed upon by both Houses
" be appointed by the said Justices out of their Number
" to execute the Duty of Commissioners.

" Or That a Number of Commissioners in each County
" be agreed upon as aforesaid, One half to be appointed by
" the Governor & Council, the other half to be appointed
" by the Lower House, saving to Each Side the Right of
" making all just & reasonable Objections to the persons
" to be nominated in Lists to be exchanged on both Sides.

" Upon which the Conferees of the Lower House recur to their
" House to communicate the said Propositions & having returned
" Declare That the Lower House unanimously Refuse to Accept
" of them. Whereupon the Conferees of the Upper House say
" that They have no other or further Proposition to make upon
" this Head. The Conferees adjourned till 9 oClock Saturday
" Morning & met according to Adjournment. The Conferees
" of the Lower House acquaint those of the Upper House that
" if they have any thing further to offer upon this Conference
" they are ready to hear it. To which the Conferees of the Upper
" House say, They have Nothing further to propose, but are

“ ready to receive & consider any Proposals from them: To
 “ which the Conferees of the Lower House make Answer that the
 “ Conference was proposed by the Upper House & Opened by
 “ their Conferees & they are ready to receive any further propo-
 “ sitions the Conferees of the Upper House have to make. The
 “ Conferees of the Upper House making no further Proposals
 “ this Conference endeth.”

From what part of this Report doth it appear (w^{ch} the Querist insinuates) that the Council or Conferees from the Upper House did particularly & zealously contend for the Proprietor against a Taxation on his Estates? The only point that came under Debate was (as hath been already observed) whether the Lower House should or should not have the Sole Nomination of the Commissioners, on which Mr Attorney Gen^l Pratt hath given his Opinion in these words.

“ In my Opinion the Sole Nomination of the Commissioners
 “ who are New Officers appointed by this Bill belongs neither
 “ to the proprietary nor the Lower House stricto Jure, but
 “ like all other New Regulations must be assented to by Both,
 “ but can be claimed by Neither; The Proprietary’s Charter
 “ intitles him to Nominate all Constitutional Officers & all
 “ others which by the Laws are not otherwise provided for, But
 “ I do not conceive My Lord has any original Right to Nominate
 “ new Officers appointed for the Execution of a New Law with
 “ out the Consent of the two Houses, Nor on the other hand
 “ has the Lower House any such independent Authority, &
 “ therefore I think The Upper House are Right/ notwithstanding
 “ this Claim in which they ought to be supported by the Pro-
 “ prietary because it is unreasonable for One Branch of the
 “ Legislature to assume a Power of Taxing the other by Officers
 “ of their single Appointment.”

20. The Council of Maryland is appointed by the Lord Proprietary & in Case of demerit it is presumed that they may be removed by him, but unless the evil Life or unworthiness of a Councillor rendered such a Step highly expedient it would not be advisable for the Proprietary to remove any.

21. Several of the Gentlemen in the Council & Upper House of Assembly or some of their Relations do enjoy Posts of Honour & Profit under the Proprietary during Pleasure, & in the Neighbouring Colonies of Virg^a, the Carolinaes, New Jersies & New York particularly. Several of the Council & their Relations do enjoy Places of much greater Profit than any in the Disposal of the Proprietary of Maryland, nor is it imagined that such Gentlemen by holding those places are less qualified to Consult for the publick Good or serve His Majesty in the Station of Councillors.

22. Suppose the Proprietary after being taxed in 1756 (tho he might have insisted on his Right of Exemption) never Objected to the Payment of such Tax, but had moreover at his own private Expence sent a considerable Quantity of Ammunition from England to the provincial Magazine upon its being intimated to him that a Supply was wanted; Ought the Gentⁿ of the Council to have thence concluded that it was *his Desire & their Duty* to sacrifice the Constitution to the pleasure of the Lower House of Assembly, lest forsooth some evil minded discontented persons should take Occasion from the *Councillors* refusing their Consent to a measure which they thought unjust & inequitable to asperse *their* Characters or Calumniate the Proprietary!

23. Had the Point in Question been whether the Offices which some of the Gentlemen of the Upper House enjoyed should be Taxed or not & they had used His Ldps Name & Concerns as a Screen for their own Selfishness; & in order to secure themselves from the Payment of any Taxes & their Conduct from Censure had contrived to make the proprietary obnoxious to the Resentment of the People & answerable for the Miscarriage of an equitable Bill, Doubtless His Lordship would have had great reason to be much dissatisfied & displeas'd with their proceedings.

24. It cannot be denied that the People of Maryland do at present stand in an unfavourable Light owing to their not having contributed any thing towards carrying on the War since

April 1757, & indeed Some persons have been much to Blame in giving Occasion for the Distinction that is made to *their* Disadvantage between them & their Fellow Subjects in N America.

25. The Lower House of Assembly taken seperately from the other Branches of the Legislature have no Agent in England, but if the People are desirous of having an Agent there on the Footing that the Provincial Agent was when the Govern^t of Maryland was immediately in the Crown, the Upper House would not object to the proposal; but the Truth is that whatever they may pretend the Lower House want an Agent to serve themselves, only, to insert Queries in London Chronicles, misrepresent the proceedings of the other Branches of Legislature or to harrass the Proprietary whenever he may happen to disoblige a Leading Member, & that they under pretence of paying their Agent & supplying him with Money for necessary purposes may have the Treasury at their own sole Disposal, or at least as much Money without Account as they may be pleased to say is expedient for the Peoples Service.

26. The Lower House of Assembly did not when the £40,000 Bill was rejected, but they have at other times presented a Bill to raise Money for the Payment of an Agent, such a One as they alone should appoint to represent or misrepresent Matters to His Majestys Ministers or to the People of Great Britain according to y^e Instructions he might receive from that House or rather from the Leading Men in it; which Bill the Upper House conceiving the Design of it iniquitous refused to pass; But if the Lower House thought they had any just Cause of Complaint: if they were really concerned that their Supply Bill had miscarried, & were willing to contribute with the Rest of His Majesty's Subjects towards carrying on the War; Could they not as easily have represented their Case to His Majesty or his Ministers by an Address as (after having declined granting Supplies for his Service) They could present ⁴ a Petition to His

⁴ Here the original words "thro the Hands of the Lord proprietary" have been crossed out.

Majesty & a Representation to the Lords of Trade the purport whereof was to desire that the Act of Parliament which was made in 1757 to prohibit the Exportation of Grain & Provision from His Majesty's North American Colonies to any Foreign Port might be suspended in favour of that Province.

27. Whether the Conduct of the Upper House hath been politick or otherwise; & whether the Queries shew the Author of them to be a person of Candour or honesty is submitted to the Judgment of the Impartial.

28. It is conceived that Nothing can justify any Man whether Trader or other in Misrepresenting Facts, or suggesting Falshoods. As the Querist hath thought fit to conceal his Name the Answerer will not pretend to guess at it, but he is pretty sure that the Querist is no Trader to the province since the Merchants in Great Britain were much alarmed, & not without just Cause uneasy when they were informed by their Correspondents in Maryland that the Lower House had framed & seemed determined to adhere to the Bill above mentioned: for by this Bill all the Goods which such Merchants had already in the province or should thereafter import on their own Account were to be subjected to a Tax & moreover there was to have been a Deduction made out of all Sums of Money or Debts due to such Merchants from the Inhabitants of the province which proposal His Majesty's Attorney Gen^l M^r Pratt in his Opinion on the Bill declared to be very absurd, & with respect to the intended Tax on Goods imported he says "The Upper House are clearly
"right in that part of their Objection which relates to British
"Merchandize imported; for I am satisfied the Mother Country
"will never endure such an Impost on their Trade; The Pro-
"vince may by the same Rule prohibit the Importation as well
"as they may Tax the Merchandize imported, & it seems to be a
"very unreasonable Attempt to make the English Importer of
"Goods carried to Maryland in the way of Trade pay a Tax
"for the Defence of that province for no other Consideration
"but the Liberty of Trading there, to which they have an
"Original Right which cannot be invaded, diminished or even
"regulated by any thing this province can do."

To the last Query it might be in general answered that there is not the least Room to think that it is owing to the Government's being in the hands of the Lord Proprietary that Supplies have not at this time been granted in Maryland for His Majesty's Service the Dispute is not between the Proprietary & people but whether the Governor & Upper House of Assembly shall be stript of their Rights & Share in the Legislature & the Lower House of Assembly usurp all Authority & power; Did the People of Maryland when they were called on for Supplies during the Reigns of King William & Queen Ann of glorious & happy Memory when the Govern^t of that province (the then Lord Proprietary being a Papist) was immediately in the Crown shew a better or more generous Spirit than they have lately done? Did not Disputes arise during that period between the several Branches of the Legislature & were they not carried greater Lengths than they have lately been? in the Year 1698 particularly during the Administration of Governor Nicholson a Gentleman highly favoured by the King his Master (& who discharged the Offices of Governor both in New England & Virginia with Applause) the Lower House of Assembly chosen or returned by the same Class of People that determine all Elections at this time, countenanced in the most publick manner & would have screen'd from punishment some Reprobates one of them a Member of their House who being tried had been convicted of maliciously & advisedly contriving to Scandalize & defame His Excellency & of an Attempt to incite & procure a Hatred & Dislike, Contempt & Disobedience to His Majesty's Governor & the Government. During that period we find the Upper House charging the Lower with their having Designs under the Name of Priviledge to arraign prerogative & telling them that under the pretence of Serving their King & Country they were Managing base Designs against both, & that their Intention was to assume all power to themselves or place it in such hands as were under their Guidance & Direction, which Charge it is apprehended, might have been aptly enough applied to some Gentlemen who have lately distinguished them-

selves among the Representatives of the people of Maryland. In short Let the Government of the Province be in whose hands it will, either immediately in the Crown or in the Proprietary's T^will at least for many years⁵ be in the power of a few ill disposed persons of but common Abilities to render the good Intentions of those concerned in the Administration of Government fruitless. By far the greatest part of such people as the Inhabitants of Maryland consist of are always ready to think ill of their Superiours; & when those who being disgusted with y^e measures of Govern^t because they have not been taken extraordinary notice of, or because perhaps they have been dismissed from places of honour or profit on Account of Misfeazance, will submit to every kind of Meanness in Order to gratify their Resentment, will both in private & publick assert without the least Regard to Truth, what Wonder if the inferiour Class of People are imposed on; or can one be surprized if at Elections for Representatives their Choice falls for the most part on such as are fit Tools for Demagogues to work with? If the Querist has spent any considerable time in N America he cannot but know that Political Disputes & Contests⁶ are not peculiar to the proprietary Governments; And Can he point out a Remedy for the Evil without depriving the People of their Liberty & Priviledges? or will he insist that neither the People nor their Representatives can be ever in the wrong. The Variety of, or great Difference, there is between the Forms of Government or Constitutions of the several Colonies will probably be a Means of keeping them in a State of Dependance on the Mother Country much longer than it can be supposed they would remain was their Form of Government, their Laws, & their Religion the same; & tho all Occasions of Dispute between the Assemblys & the other Branches of the several Legislatures would not be thereby removed (nor perhaps is it to be wished they were) it is presumed that if it was to be determined & settled by an Act or Acts of Parliament what Sums the several Colonies in N

⁵ The word "always" was first used.

⁶ "A clashing of Interest" was the original term here.

America should contribute in proportion to each other towards supporting Troops in any future War (or in time of Peace if thought necessary) & by what Kind of Taxation (Regard being had to the Circumstances, Trade, & Modes of Taxation usually allowed in each Colony) such Sums should be raised in the respective Provinces; the greatest if not the only Inconvenience that follows from or is occasioned by their being independant of each other would be removed & their united Force may be at any time exerted ag^t a common Enemy. if in Order ⁷ to make any Regulation for the Good of the Colonies or the Benefit of the Mother Country the Parliament of Great Britain shall in their Wisdom think fit to make any Enquiry into the Nature & Conduct of the proprietary Governments as well as of the others it cannot be doubted but the proprietaries will be well satisfied therewith.

BENJAMIN HENRY LATROBE: DESCENT AND WORKS.

By FERDINAND C. LATROBE, II.

Actually, the Latrobes are the Bonneval de la Trobes, of whom Fénelon wrote to the Duke de Chevreuse (whose wife it was that said "Sir, *my* children are always dukes or duchesses. I am sorry *you* cannot say the same"): "The family of Bonneval is a most ancient one of Limousin where it possessed for four hundred years a large landed estate with 'seigneurie.' One of the family was a favorite of Charles VIII, and one of his nine chosen cavaliers. They have commanded French armies in Italy, have been governors of provinces—they have appeared throughout history" (Fénelon was a cousin).

About 1650, Henri, Count Bonneval, married Adelaide de Montmorenci. They had three sons (and probably some other

⁷ Here as in many other places in the manuscript a passage has been expunged by the writer.

children). The eldest, Caesar Phoebus Bonneval, remained in France. The second, Chevalier Claude Alexandre de Bonneval after having distinguished himself under Luxembourg, Catinat, Villeroy and Vendome (partially because of being in bad odor with Madame de Maintenon), left the French service and joined Prince Eugene of Savoy. He was named a member of the Aulic Council, and contributed to the victory of Peterwardein over the Turks, and the taking of Temeswar; becoming a Lieutenant Field Marshal.

Because of certain witty remarks about Prince Eugene and the Marchioness of Prie, wife of the General commanding in the Low Countries, Bonneval was condemned to a year in prison. After obtaining his liberty, he went to Venice (escaping the decree of decapitation set upon him by the Minister Chamillart). From Casanova we learn that, after having been caught poaching upon the preserves of a Cardinal, in Rome, he hurriedly left for Constantinople, with a letter of introduction to Osman Bonneval, Pacha of Caramania, a pacha of three tails, general of the Turkish artillery, and later Topigibachi. Of his presence in Constantinople, Bonneval said to Casanova: "I am certain that I shall die calmer and much happier than Prince Eugene. I have had to say that God is God, and that Mahomet is the prophet. I have said it, and the Turks care very little whether I believe it or not. I wear the turban as the soldier wears the uniform. I was nothing but a military man, and I made up my mind to become Lieutenant-General of the Grand Turk only when I found myself entirely at a loss how to earn my living. The pitcher had gone too often to the well, it was broken at last; and, if the Jews had offered me the command of an army of fifty thousand men, I would have gone and besieged Jerusalem!"

"The Pacha," continued Casanova, "observed that I ought to see his library. I followed him through the garden, and we entered a room furnished with grated cupboards. Taking a key out of his pocket, he opened one of them. Instead of folios, I saw long rows of flagons of the finest wines. In answer to my look of astonishment, the Pacha said: 'Here are my library and

my harem. I am old, women would only shorten my life, but good wine will prolong it; or, at least, make it more agreeable.' ”

The third son, Henri Bonneval, Marquis de la Trobe, too, followed a religious hero. Only, instead of Mohammed, he chose the Huguenot William of Holland; and, after fighting in the Battle of the Boyne, as General Bonneval de la Trobe, he was granted an estate near Waterford, Ireland. He married a Mrs. Thornton, a widow with four children; who produced for him seventeen more. His son James La Trobe did not do so well. He married, first, Rebecca Adams by whom he had four children; and, secondly, Miss O'Toole, of Wexford County, Ireland; the mother of Benjamin La Trobe.

The induction of the O'Toole blood perfected the family pedigree—as is to be seen, at the Peabody Library, Baltimore, in a fat green book, written by a Jesuit, that traces the O'Tooles through Mog and Magog to Adam (But makes no mention as to whether the maternal primogenitor was Eve or Lillith).

James was a Moravian minister, and his son Benjamin, who was “born in what is now the State of New York,” followed his footsteps (after serving as Captain in the British 45th Regiment); starting out, however, as a Baptist minister. Benjamin together with his intimate friend, James Hutton, joined in the sect called *Unitas Fratrum*, and founded the Moravian Mission at Labrador.

Benjamin married Anna Margaret Antes, daughter of Henry Antes, known in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, as “King of the Germans.” Again religious blood was infused into the Latrobes, because Antes' grandfather was Henry, Baron Von Blume, who, at an early age, entered the monastic life and became an ecclesiastic. But he became attached to his cousin, a Baroness Von Blume, the superior of a convent at Mayence. They became Protestants, were married and to escape persecution, changed their name from the German to the corresponding Greek—Antes. Of Anna Margaret Antes (whose uncle, Frederick Antes, cast the first cannon in this country), her son wrote: “I do not know an individual in whom the blood of the Antes flows

who has not mechanical talents; the women as well as the men. My mother was exceedingly ingenious, and my sister Louisa would have been a capital watchmaker."

The Reverend Benjamin Latrobe had five children, amongst them being Christian Ignatius, who became a Moravian Bishop, and whose music was considered in the category of Handel's; Benjamin Henry, born in Yorkshire, England, May 1, 1766, the subject of this memoir, and John Frederic, who became a physician and married and settled in Livonia. Madame D'Arblay wrote of the first two "sons of a Moravian Bishop, two tall thin black very good sort of young men . . . one . . . was here again the other evening, and was really entertaining enough by the singular simplicity of his conversation. He [Benjamin Henry] was brought up in Germany, and spent the greater part of his early youth in roving about from place to place and country to country . . . he is a native of Ireland. 'Not being used,' said he, 'to a family, when I was a boy, I always hated it. They seemed to me only as so many wasps, for one told me I was too silent, another wished I would not speak so much, and all of them found some fault or other. . . . Luckily for me, I have no occasion to speak till about 2 o'clock, when we dine, for that keeps me fresh. If I were to begin earlier, I should only be like skimmed milk the rest of the day.' What must be the sect, and where the travelling, that should un-irish an Irishman?"

Benjamin Henry Latrobe's education commenced at a school at Fulnec, near Leeds, where he remained until his "father so far evinced his attachment to the cause of his country [America], as to remove his children to Germany, and thereby secure to us, under the treaty of peace, the birthrights of American citizens." As a boy of 10 years he was sent to the Moravian Theological Seminary, at Barby, Saxony. Completing his studies there, he entered the University of Leipsic, where, at the age of seventeen, he had the good fortune "to become acquainted with the eminent hydraulic engineer, Tiedel, whose talents, activity and perseverance prevented the dreadful inundations of the Elbe and Oder rivers."

In 1784, Latrobe returned to London, and received an appointment to the Stamp Office, from the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury in consideration of the great esteem in which his father was held by the Government; rather, from the younger Pitt, whose supporter Henry Dundas' (later Lord Melville) cousin married Charles Middleton (later Lord Barham), an intimate friend of the Latrobes. A cause of much embarrassment to Latrobe, who in the course of a dinner party told of the King's distributor of stamps at Edinburgh who blamed an immense deficit in his returns to the rats having eaten the parchments, and had actually charged the maintenance of a cat to protect the stamp warehouse! Forgetting that Sir Charles Middleton was a Scotchman.

The Stamp Office not offering Latrobe the activity he desired, he entered the office of John Smeaton, the noted civil engineer, celebrated for the execution of the Eddystone Lighthouse. Under Smeaton's tutelage, Latrobe "made a tour of Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire, in 1788-89, to report upon the situation of the scouring works, on the unefficacy of which Smeaton had been consulted."

Latrobe's connection with Smeaton being interrupted by an accident in which he suffered a broken leg, to amuse himself he "published from the notes taken while on the continent, two books. One on the character of the late King of Prussia (Frederick the Great), the other on the affair of [Counts] Struensee and Brandt [and of the Revolution in Denmark in the year 1772]. . . . As large editions of both works were sold, 1500 of the latter, [I] called on Mr. Stocksdale (the bookseller) for his account, and he brought me £22, 5s, 10d in debt." Continuing his literary labors during his convalescence, he assisted "Mr. Bruce in the publications of his travels. The whole first volume of which, with the illustrations it contains, was published from my manuscript. The following volumes were, I believe, done into English by Fennel, the comedian. His [Bruce's] manuscript was written in an uncouth style . . . like his conversation . . . was that of a Scotchman who had left his

Highlands late in life" (*Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile, in the Years 1760-1773*. By James Bruce of Kinnard, F. R. S., London, 1790. At the Peabody Library, of course). "The Honorable Daines Barrington . . . proposed to me the revision of Mr. Bruce's papers. The arrival of my uncle John Antes [who had been propounding the Moravian faith in Cairo], and an arrangement of the papers of Mr. George Livius, a Canadian cousin, who had for many years been Military Storekeeper General in the East Indies, and afterwards the papers of Quinton Crawford, well known for his works on Indian subjects," all helped to fill Latrobe's time until 1789, when he commenced his study of architecture in the office of Samuel Pepys Cockerill, whose eminent talent was recognized by his selection to execute the rebuilding of the Church of St. Martin, Outwich, London.

In this connection, the fairy wand of Latrobe's patron, Sir Charles Middleton, now a Rear-Admiral, obviously guided the success of the architects, as in 1791-92, while "I conducted Mr. Cockerill's office, he was Surveyor to the Admiralty and built the long new range of buildings then carried-up while Lord Chatham was First Lord of the Admiralty . . . and . . . the great range of stores and slaughter houses belonging to the Victualling Board." This commission enabled Latrobe, in 1791, to marry Lydia Sellon, the daughter of the Reverend John Sellon, of French-Nova Scotian descent, Rector of St. James Church, Clerkenwell, London, and of the living of Portman Chapel. (When the reverend gentleman died Latrobe wrote a most amusing satire entitled "The Ingredients of My Wife's Family," depicting the opening of the will). The newly wedded pair "hired a house on Grafton street, Fitzroy square, London," where was born Henry Latrobe, who became a successful architect in New Orleans, and Lydia Sellon Latrobe, who married Nicholas I. Roosevelt, the American inventor of the use of vertical paddlewheels to propel vessels.

Leaving Cockerill's office in 1793, to hang out his own shingle, Latrobe received a commission to do the country house of Joseph

Sperling, near East Grinstead, called Hammerwood Lodge, followed by a country house for Trayton Fuller, Jr., at Ashdown Park. These works are mentioned in a letter of 1814: "I charged at first three guineas p day in attending Mr. Sperling's and Mr. Fuller's houses in Sussex. But five guineas p day in attending Parliament on the Marsden canal business, and I received one hundred guineas as a gratuity on the success of my evidence." In addition to his private practice, Latrobe was simultaneously appointed Surveyor to the Police Offices, and Surveyor to the Public Offices, both of the City of London, under John Reeves, Receiver General, later Chief Justice of Newfoundland. Also, scattered amongst his papers, and those of his relatives, are mentioned innumerable works—the Misses Hoissard's country house Tanton Hall, in Sussex, the Basingstoke Canal, etc. which indicate his meteoric rise in his profession until it was sadly halted in 1793 by the death of his devoted wife. A shock that caused Latrobe to refuse the Surveyorship to the Crown (carrying with it a salary of 1000 pounds per annum), and emigrate to America to establish himself in Philadelphia near his maternal relations, the Antes, and his patrimonial estate in Pennsylvania on the Susquehanna river.

On the 25th of November, 1795, Latrobe boarded the American brig *Eliza*, of Portsmouth, Virginia, Captain Noble, bound from London for Philadelphia. The seven first class passengers, plus a three months old baby, with the captain and his two mates, occupied a cabin 22 feet wide by 14 feet long as parlor, bedroom and bath; which Latrobe soon deserted for a hammock under the steerage hatch, where he was frequently awakened by the sudden descent of the fresh meat (hogs and sheep) from the deck above. There were also aboard three thoroughbred mares—the annual importation of Colonel Holmes, of Bowling Green, Virginia, the proprietor of the Richmond-Fredericksburg stage line. After a hectic voyage, during which the ship's sails and rigging were torn by storms, and the passengers and crew were constantly reduced to starvation (luckily being regularly relieved by opportune vessels), they reached Norfolk, Virginia, about March 12th, 1796.

Upon going ashore, as a stranger, Latrobe accidentally made the acquaintance of Captain William Pennock who invited him to his house and later introduced him to Judge Bushrod Washington, through whom Latrobe met General Washington, at Mt. Vernon, and was persuaded to enter upon the practice of his profession in Virginia.

Latrobe remained in Richmond until December 1799, when he removed to Philadelphia. (On May 1st 1800, Latrobe married Mary Hazlehurst, of Philadelphia, from whom the present American Latrobes are descended). Thereafter his place of residence became spasmodically Philadelphia, Newcastle and Wilmington, Delaware, and included a short sojourn atop of Iron Hill, Cecil County, Maryland, until he removed in 1804 to Washington. There he remained until 1813, when he moved to Pittsburgh, returning to Washington in 1815. In 1818 he moved to Baltimore, making a voyage to New Orleans, to which place he took his family in 1819; and where he died on September 3rd, 1820.

Latrobe's activities are spread over such a tremendous sphere that it is impossible to more than briefly narrate them; and the following list is derived from his papers, or those of his family, or from those authorities accepted by the author.

As his English epoch has already been presented, we begin with his life in this country.

- 1799. Fellow of the American Philosophical Society (Several of his papers are presented in their transactions).
- 1815. Member of the American Antiquarian Society.
Member of the Military Philosophical Society (and the designer of their diploma).
- 1799. Member of the Chemical Society of Philadelphia.
- 1808. Member of the Philadelphia Academy of Arts (An intimate friend of Charles Willson Peale, who mentions his desire to have Latrobe paint several backgrounds of his portraits, a request he probably complied with).
- 1811. Vice-President of the Society of Artists of the United States.
- 1813. Honorary member of the Academy of Arts.

1803. Surveyor of the Public Buildings of the United States.
1804. Civil Engineer to the Navy of the United States.
1815. Architect of the Capitol of the United States.
1801. Commissioner of the Navigation of the Susquehanna river (of Pennsylvania).
1801. Surveyor of the Susquehanna river (His map of that river, in connection with the clearing of a channel through its Pennsylvania course, is deposited at the Maryland Historical Society).
1803. Commissioner of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.
1803. Engineer of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal (the funds only permitting him to finish the feeder from Elk Mill. Latrobe's method of removing the earth from the cuts was probably the first railway on this continent).
1804. Surveyor of the Salem Creek Canal.
1804. Surveyor of the City of Newcastle, Delaware (His assistants in this work were his students, Robert Mills and William Strickland, who afterwards ranked foremost as architects; and, each, in turn, occupied their master's post—Architect of the Capitol).
1810. Chairman of the Columbia Turnpike Commission, Washington (In this Connection is Latrobe's amusing letter objecting to a route laid out by the commission—because posterity will complain of its crookedness “after the woods are cut down”).
1810. Engineer of the Washington Canal (The *bête noir* of L'Enfant's plan of Washington City).
1816. Surveyor of the City of Washington (In this connection, and as Engineer of the canal, Latrobe was informed that General Washington upon being asked for the original plan of the city said he “presumed” the original plan was “that plan first published”).
-
1798. Engineer of the fortifications at Norfolk.
1799. Engineer of the waterworks at Philadelphia (Where Latrobe was the first in this country to utilize a steam engine to pump water. The engine was built by

- Nicholas I. Roosevelt; and, when it was not pumping water, it moved an iron and copper rolling mill).
1809. Proprietor and Engineer of the New Orleans water-works (This work was suggested to him by Thomas Jefferson and Governor W. C. C. Claiborne. It was begun by Henry Latrobe, became a continual source of worry to its proprietor, and Latrobe returned from the laying of the final feed pipe to die of yellow fever).
-
1797. Reported upon the Dismal Swamp Canal (at General Washington's instigation).
1797. Reported upon the navigation of the Appomattox river. (During his journey up the river, Latrobe stayed at Bizarre the day Richard Randolph died, and sketched Nancy Randolph whom John Randolph blamed for the death of his brother. See Bruce's Life of John Randolph).
1807. Reported upon the navigation of the Delaware river.
1809. Reported upon the Catawba canal.
1809. Reported upon the Santee Canal.
Reported upon the floods of the Mississippi river.
Reported upon the navigation of the Mississippi river.
-
1796. William Pennock's residence, Norfolk, Virginia.
1797. The Penitentiary, Richmond (As Latrobe designed this institution along the reformatory suggestions of Thomas Jefferson to the Commonwealth of Virginia, it is possible that the latter, while abroad, saw some of Latrobe's designs for such institutions made in his capacity of Surveyor to the Police of London).
- 1797-8. James Harvie's Residence, Richmond, Virginia.
1799. The Bank of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (Regarded as the most beautiful edifice in America, and the fore-runner of classical bank architecture. Originally designed at a coffee house on the back of a letter).
1801. Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.
- 1801-2. The Philadelphia, or New, Theatre.
1802. Restoration of Nassau Hall, Princeton, New Jersey.

1803. The Capitol, Washington (A perusal of the complete text of Thomas Jefferson's letter to General Washington, July 17, 1793, discloses that Dr. Thornton's plan for the Capitol was accepted as a "pretty picture," and was drastically altered by Stephen Hallet and James Hoban, plainly under the guidance of Jefferson. This is confirmed by the description of the plate within the cornerstone—engraved: "James Hoban and Stephen Hallette architects." While the exterior of the wings remained essentially as drawn by Thornton, as carried out in the (first erected) north wing, the central portion, the dome and the interior were entirely the work of Latrobe, with the collaboration of Thomas Jefferson).
1803. The Painting room of Gilbert Stuart, Washington.
1803. The President's Offices.
The President's House.
The Landscaping of the Public Grounds.
(In these works, Latrobe collaborated with Thomas Jefferson who re-arranged the original plans to conform with his taste. Under the regime of James Madison, Latrobe designed the President's House's furniture, and equipped the residence for the President. The furniture was built in Baltimore by the Findlays.)
1803. The Philadelphia Insurance Office.
1804. William Crammond's residence, Philadelphia.
1804. Dr. James McClurg's residence, Richmond.
1804. Dr. Nathaniel Goodwin's residence, Philadelphia.
1805. The Washington Navy Yard. Its buildings and machinery (which constituted the first steam driven industrial plant in this country).
1805. The Cathedral, Baltimore (Where the Trustees viewed his plan "upside down").
1805. The Bank of Philadelphia (Which Latrobe regarded as a "Gothic gem").
1805. The Treasury Fireproof, Washington.
1805. The Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
1805. William Waln's residence, Philadelphia.
1805. Senator Thomas Worthington's residence.

1805. Pedestal for the statue of William Penn, in Philadelphia.
1806. Converted the Bingham residence into the Mansion Hotel, Philadelphia.
1807. Captain William Meany's residence, Philadelphia.
1807. The proposed Military School, Washington.
1807. The Custom House, New Orleans (Fabricated in Washington).
1807. Mrs. Stuart's residence, near New York.
1807. The Masonic Temple and Assembly Room, Philadelphia.
1807. The "re-edification of (Governor) Charles Goldsborough's house," Eastern Shore, Maryland (?)
1808. John Craig's residence, Philadelphia.
1808. John Markoe's residence, Philadelphia.
1808. Christ Church, near the Navy Yard, Washington (Which tradition has confused with Christ Church, Alexandria—that was erected before Latrobe came to this country. Later, will appear St. Paul's Church, Alexandria—that was designed by Latrobe).
1809. The proposed Marine Hospital, Washington.
1809. Buildings of the Navy Yard, New York.
1809. Bank of Washington, Washington.
1810. Kalorama, the residence of Joel Barlow, Washington.
1810. Converted Blodgett's Hotel into the Patent Office, Washington.
1811. John Pope's residence, Lexington, Kentucky.
1811. Long Branch, Robert Carter's residence, Millwood, Virginia.
1811. George Calvert's residence—Riverdale, Maryland (?).
1811. Buildings at the Gosport Navy Yard (Portsmouth, Va.).
1812. Lexington College, Lexington, Kentucky.
1812. Henry Clay's residence, Ashland, Kentucky.
1812. Frederick C. Graff's residence, Baltimore, Md.
1812. General Robert Goodloe Harper's town and country houses, Baltimore (Commenced in 1804. As Latrobe's letters relate to various buildings upon the Oakland estate, it is probable that the spring house, now removed to the Baltimore Museum of Art, is from his design. Whether the town house was that upon Water street, or that upon Cathedral street, is not clear).

1812. E. W. Campbell's residence, Nashville, Tennessee.
1813. Washington Hall School, Philadelphia.
1813. General J. P. Vanness' residence, Washington (Which Latrobe stated was the largest private dwelling he had done in America).
1813. Marlborough Levy Court House, Upper Marlboro, Prince George's County, Maryland (Latrobe's letters pertaining to this building are not quite clear as to whether it was a new design, or a restoration).
1813. Portico of Bellevue, Charles Carroll of Bellevue, Washington (Daniel Carroll, of Duddington, who owned part of the site of Washington, had a son Charles, who owned the estate Bellevue, in Washington County, Maryland. Therefore, it is possible that this portico belonged to the country house—rather than to the Washington City house—Dumbarton).
1813. Samuel Riddle's house, Bedford, Pennsylvania.
1813. Dr. Anderson's house, Bedford, Pennsylvania.
1814. Daniel Beltzhoover's residence, Pittsburg.
1814. Mr. Shira's residence, Pittsburg (A brewer, whom Latrobe describes as having built what was probably the first stern wheel steamboat; designed by Daniel Large).
1814. Colonel James O'Hara's residence, Pittsburg.
1814. A range of houses for Beelen & Co., Pittsburg.
1814. Christian Cowan's residence, Pittsburg.
1814. Colonel James O'Hara's warehouse, Pittsburg.
1814. A range of houses for Henry Clay, Frankfort, Kentucky.
1814. The barracks for the British prisoners, Pittsburg.
1814. Thomas Williams' residence, Baltimore.
1814. Circus for Pepin & Co., Pittsburg.
1814. The Armory, Frankfort, Kentucky.
1815. William Foster's residence, Laurenceville, near Pittsburg.
1815. The restoration of the Capitol, at Washington (His design was rigidly adhered to by his successor, Charles Bullfinch—except for the "coffee-pot" dome in place of Latrobe's "tea-pot" one).
1815. Converted Blodgett's Hotel into the Temporary Capitol, Washington.

- 1815. Mr. Robinson's residence, Pittsburg.
- 1815. St. John's Church, Washington (For which Latrobe wrote the dedication hymn, and occasionally served as the organist).
- 1815. The Merchant's Exchange, and Custom House, Baltimore.
- 1815. James Monroe's residence, Washington.
- 1816. Christopher Hughes' residence, Baltimore (A "frying pan" house).
- 1816. William Lorman's buildings, Baltimore (Where the Fidelity building now stands).
- 1816. Mr. Heron's church, Pittsburg.
- 1816. Reported upon, and drew up estimates for the National University, Washington.
- 1817. Denis Smith's residence, Washington.
- 1817. Mrs. Cassenove's residence, Washington.
- 1817. The proposed Library Company Building, Baltimore.
- 1817. Commodore Stephen Decatur's residence, Washington.
- 1817. Collaborated in the design of the University of Virginia, with Thomas Jefferson.
- 1817. St. Paul's Church Alexandria (Which tradition has confused with Christ Church of that place).
- 1817. Washington County Courthouse, Hagerstown, Maryland.
- 1817. Benjamin Orr's residence, Washington.
- 1819. The restoration of the Cathedral, and the erection of the Towers, New Orleans.
- 1820. The Balize Lighthouse, Mississippi river, New Orleans (After the original design by his son Henry Latrobe).

-
- 1805. The Seal of the Bank of Philadelphia.
 - 1813. The Seal of the Philadelphia Insurance Company.
 - 1802. At Princeton, on Nassau Hall, introduced the first sheet-iron roof.
 - 1804. Designed the Franklin, or Rittenhouse, stoves for Thomas Jefferson's residence, Monticello, and the Capitol, at Washington.
 - 1808. Heated the Capitol, at Washington, with steam and hot-water.

1809. Decorated and furnished the President's house, designing the furniture (as he had done for the Markoe and Wain residences in Philadelphia).

1798. Designed a mortice lock. (Latrobe mentioned, in 1813, that, during his residence in Virginia, he directed the manufacture of the locks for a residence, where he was staying. The mechanic being the slave blacksmith, and the metal being a kegful of brass gun parts).

1802. Designed the proposed drydock, and the necessary canal leading to it, at Washington; wherein Thomas Jefferson proposed to store the Navy's frigates between wars.

1805. Built the first railway in America, for the purpose of hauling dirt, at the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal.

1805. Planned the town of Nescopeck, Pennsylvania.

1806. Patented a method of bridge construction.

Throughout his career, he designed machinery for iron, steel and copper works; paper, cotton and sugar mills; and coal mines. Besides designing and erecting many steam engines and boilers; and being the first to place the power plant of a steamboat below decks. At the Washington Navy Yard, he designed and erected all of the machinery necessary to the construction of a ship.

Besides his writings done in England (which have been mentioned), he wrote (in America):

1798. *The Apology*, a comedy enacted at Richmond.

1806. And later, articles for *The Observer*, Baltimore.

The Emporium, edited by Thomas Cooper.

An encyclopedia published by Kunkel & Chequiers.

An encyclopedia published by Parker & Delaphaine.

And various addresses and essays presented before innumerable societies.

1807. Designed the diploma for the Military Philosophical Society.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE COLLECTIONS OF INDIAN ARTIFACTS BELONGING TO THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

By WILLIAM B. MARYE.

The Maryland Historical Society owns two collections of Indian artifacts. One of them was presented to this Society a number of years ago by Mr. William Moss Boucher, of Annapolis. The other collection, which will be considered first, has been loaned by this Society to the State of Maryland and is now exhibited in the basement of the Hall of Records, at Annapolis.

I. THE COLLECTION AT THE HALL OF RECORDS.

The two cases in which this collection is housed were paid for with funds provided by Act of the Maryland Legislature. They were designed by Mr. Laurence Hall Fowler and made by Meislahn of Baltimore. Each case is provided with two drawers. Objects which have been relegated to these drawers fall into the following classes: (1) found outside of Maryland; (2) found in Maryland—county unknown; (3) not deemed to be especially interesting.

I have prepared a catalogue of the more important objects in this collection, based principally on the old catalogue of the J. Holmes Smith Collection, the collection in which most of these objects originally belonged. Most of the numbers which belonged to respective objects of the J. Holmes Smith Collection have been retained for these particular objects. Numbers on respective objects which had grown faint or hard to decipher have been restored and made legible. All important objects now bear numbers painted on in white ink coated over with shellac to prevent rubbing. If the object is of a light color, a black ground has been painted on to bring out the number.

This Society is greatly indebted to those well known archaeologists of the Smithsonian Institution, Dr. Mathew Stirling, Chief of that Institution, Mr. Neil M. Judd and Dr. John R. Swanton, who came to Annapolis at the request of Dr. James A. Robertson, State Archivist, on purpose to inspect our collection, and to give much needed advice and moral support to this author. We are also much indebted to Mr. Philip Guild, graduate student in geology, Johns Hopkins University, for examining and, where feasible, identifying the several rocks and minerals out of which respective objects were made. Mr. Fowler put himself to great pains and trouble in designing the cases, which are altogether satisfactory, and Dr. Robertson has lent, and is lending most valuable assistance in the placing and care of the collection. Dr. Edward B. Mathews was my main support and prop in caring for the Smith collection during the years it was at the State House.

As I said above, most of the objects belonging to this collection, including most of the more valuable and finer specimens, were originally in the J. Holmes Smith Collection. To this collection has been added a small but interesting collection made by John Hostetter, of Rowlandsville, Cecil County. This collection has been presented to this Society by Mr. J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul, who purchased it from the owner. It consists largely of fragments of banner-stones and pottery found along the Cecil County shore of Susquehanna River, or on islands in the river, between the Conowingo power dam and the mouth of Octoraro Creek. Since the building of this dam these shores have been a great resort of collectors. Great quantities of Indian artifacts have been found there, among which, outside of arrowheads, fragments of soapstone vessels and clay pottery, the banner-stone, generally rare elsewhere, is the commonest type. Most of these banner-stones are broken, the fragment representing, as a rule, about half of the original object. One of the largest collections of artifacts found in this particular place belongs to the Natural History Society of Baltimore. Nearly all of the objects in this collection were found by Mr.

Richard E. Stearns, archaeologist of that society. Most of them are now exhibited in the museum at Druid Hill Park. Another important collection of artifacts from this locality is said to be in the possession of a collector, Dr. Schneider, who resides at Port Deposit, Maryland. It is desirable that persons interested in the archaeology of this state should know the whereabouts of artifacts which have been found in this relatively small area. The presence of so many banner-stones remains, for me at least, unexplained.

The J. Holmes Smith Collection was formed by the late Dr. J. Holmes Smith, Sr., Professor of Anatomy at the University of Maryland, who for many years resided near Kingsville, Baltimore County, and by his son, Dr. J. Holmes Smith, Jr., now of New Orleans. The doctors Smith, themselves, found many of the more important objects in their collection. About thirty years ago I merged my own collection with that of Dr. Smith, and I continued to contribute to his collection for a number of years thereafter. On the death of Dr. Smith his daughter, Miss Mary E. Holmes Smith, fell heir to this collection. She lent it to the State of Maryland and it was transported to Annapolis, to the State House, where it remained on exhibition until April of this year, when it was removed to the Hall of Records. The Maryland Historical Society purchased this collection from Miss Smith in 1930. The contributors to the fund with which the purchase was made were: the late De Courcy W. Thom, John Henry Scarff and myself.

Most of the objects in the J. Holmes Smith Collection were found in the neighborhood of Kingsville, of Upper Falls, and around the head of tidewater on Gunpowder River, in the Eleventh District, Baltimore County, and in closely adjacent parts of Harford County, particularly Joppa farm, Gunpowder River, and Gunpowder Neck. Cecil County furnished a number of interesting objects, particularly Perry Point field, at the mouth of Susquehanna River. There is very little from the Eastern Shore and nothing from Western Maryland. A map has been provided illustrating the situation of places in the

Kingsville—Upper Falls—Gunpowder Neck localities where particular objects were found.

If a note of importance has crept into the foregoing account, it must not be inferred that the collection of Indian artifacts belonging to this Society and now at the Hall of Records is of outstanding interest and value. It does contain one or two rare objects, a number of fine specimens and, in addition to these, a number of more or less interesting objects. It is a pity that we have not four cases, instead of two, for the objects are very much crowded in the cases, particularly in that assigned to miscellaneous objects (one case is occupied solely by grooved axes and a single pestle). I did not see how I could work out a logical arrangement for these assorted objects in the space available, and there are few, if any, of them which I should care to relegate to the drawers.

In concluding this account, I am giving a list of the objects which, in my opinion, are of especial interest:

Problematical Objects.

The collection contains one pick-shaped, or lunate object (No. 18) found in a gravel pit on Gunpowder River, near (old) Gunpowder Station, in Harford County. This, in my opinion, is the rarest object in the collection. It is in perfect condition. It originally belonged to the Dr. J. Holmes Smith Collection. Several similar objects may be seen at the National Museum, Washington, D. C.

Banner Stones.

There are some twenty-one banner stones and parts of banner stones in the collection. Four are unfinished specimens, of which one is broken. One of the perfect ones has an unfinished perforation containing a core, proving the use of a hollow drill. I saw a similar object recently in the collection of the State of Pennsylvania at Harrisburg. The one belonging to this Society (No. 198) was found on Perry Point, Cecil County. No. 12 is a finished banner stone, practically perfect, the only perfect

banner stone in the collection. It, also, was found on Perry Point. Nos. 198 and 12 were originally in the J. Holmes Smith Collection. There is a banner stone with somewhat mutilated wings from Joppa farm, Harford County (No. 16). This specimen was found by the late Dr. J. Holmes Smith. Nos. 287 and 288 are broken banner stones found by Dr. J. Hall Pleasants on the Eudowood farm, Baltimore County, and presented by him to this Society. This collection of banner stones is interesting as illustrating types and materials, but not otherwise remarkable.

Grooved Axes.

There are some thirty-one of these on exhibition, most of them perfect or nearly perfect. Nos. 109, 165 and 287 are remarkable for size and excellence of workmanship. No. 109 was found on the Hyde farm in Long Green Valley, and belonged to the late Joseph Graeme Reynolds. It has been loaned to this Society by his great-nephew, James McSherry Shriver, Jr., of Westminster, Maryland. This is the only object exhibited, which does not belong to this Society. No. 165 was found on Stoney Battery, or Irish Lane, between Kingsville and Fork, Baltimore County, and belonged to the J. Holmes Smith Collection, as did also No. 287, which was found on San Domingo Farm, on Gunpowder River, in Gunpowder Neck. Nos. 123 and 240 are axes of very rare shape, resembling one another. Both were found by Dr. J. Holmes Smith, Sr., on San Domingo farm. No. 149 (J. Holmes Smith Collection) is a rare double-grooved axe from Quiet Lodge farm (now Edgewood Arsenal), Gunpowder Neck.

Celts.

This collection has a number of fair specimens of this type, two which are noteworthy. No. 11, a perfect specimen, remarkable for its size, was found on the Paul Aimee Fleury farm, near Upper Falls, Baltimore County (J. Holmes Smith Collection). No. 155 is a small celt which I found on Bellevue farm, between Kingsville and Upper Falls. The original

polished surface has been worn away, and small crystals stand out, the tops of which have striations which may be due to the original polishing process. It is possible that this is a very old object, if the apparent signs of antiquity are not deceptive. There is no Indian village or camp site where it was found.

Gorgetts.

The collection is by no means rich in these objects. No. 135 is perfect and is a pretty fair specimen. It was found in Cecil County (J. Holmes Smith Collection).

Pipes.

Our collection contains no perfect pipes. As a surface find an Indian pipe is a very rare object in the eastern and central parts of Maryland. This seems to be particularly true of the lower part of the Forks of Gunpowder River and adjacent parts of Harford County, where I have done most of my "collecting." I, myself, found part of the stem of a clay pipe and part of the bowl of a pipe, also of clay, on the Walter Chapman farm, near Upper Falls. These specimens, or such is my impression, were given to Dr. Smith; but I have not seen them since his death. No. 331 of the Maryland Historical Society's Collection is the stem of a stone pipe which was found near Fallston, Harford County, Maryland, and belonged to the late Calvin C. Harlan, surveyor, of Baldwin, Long Green, Baltimore County. It was purchased from his daughter, Mrs. Samuel C. Allen, by General Clinton L. Riggs, who presented it to this Society. No. 337 is part of a clay pipe found recently by me in Green Point field, Joppa farm, Harford County. On account of their rarity this Society has no reason to be ashamed of these fragments. The stone pipe-stem is decorated and is altogether quite interesting.

Discoidal Stones.

The J. Holmes Smith Collection, according to the old catalogue, originally contained three objects of this type. Two were

found on Perry Point, Cecil County; the third, on San Domingo farm, Gunpowder Neck, Harford County. The specimen to which I have given the number "239" is probably one of these three. Objects of this type are rare in these parts. Two perfect specimens were formerly in the possession of my neighbor, the late J. Edward Reynolds, of "Sherwood," Upper Falls, having been found on that farm; but some years ago they were unfortunately stolen and their present whereabouts are unknown.

Folsom Darts.

Our collection contains two "darts" of this type (Nos. 121 and 122), which are from the J. Holmes Smith Collection. These are perfect specimens and there is no doubt as to their proper classification. They have been seen and examined by the representatives of the Smithsonian Institution. These Folsom-type darts were both found on Joppa farm, the land on which the old town of Joppa was formerly situated, in Harford County. Originally these "darts" were in the collection of the late Frank Tyson, who, about thirty-five years ago, kept a tavern at the intersection of the (old) Philadelphia Road and the road to Bradshaw Station, less than a mile from the upper limits of Joppa farm. It is unnecessary to say that in the lifetime of Mr. Tyson and of Dr. Smith no one had any suspicion as to the possible significance of the Eastern Folsom point. It was taken to be merely a curious form of projectile point, not necessarily older than the ordinary spearhead or arrowhead. Since the identification of the Western Folsom dart as an object of unquestionable antiquity, the question whether the darts of this same type, which are being found here and there in the East, or have turned up in old collections and are known to have been found on Eastern sites, as is the case with the two now under consideration, are descendants of the Western Folsom dart, of no particular antiquity, or, on the other hand, are of great age, antedating the known "Indian" cultures, though not, perhaps, so old as the specimens found in the West, has become a matter of considerable interest to Ameri-

can archaeology. I am informed on the best authority that up to the present time no Folsom dart has been found in the East on an Indian village site. A young collector, living near Federalburg, Maryland, has, it is said, a Folsom point found in that neighborhood *near, but not on*, an Indian village site. The association may, of course, be fortuitous, in this particular case. Archaeologists are asking whether the apparent absence of Folsom darts on Indian village sites may not be of high significance. For this reason it is a pity that we do not know on what part, or parts, of Joppa farm these two Folsom darts were found. This farm contains between five hundred and six hundred acres. The number of acres under cultivation must be in the neighborhood of two hundred. There are signs of an Indian village site in Polecat field and in Green Point field, although these signs are by no means conspicuous. Elsewhere on the farm I know of no such signs.

Cache Blades.

The typical cache-blade resembles a rough, unfinished spear-head or knife. Cache-blades are most frequently made of rhyolite or of quartzite, but some are of flint or of other materials. Cache-blades are seldom found in situ. The finding of a number of cache-blades, of the same material and of approximately the same size, within a small area is taken to indicate the presence of a cache, which has been disturbed and dispersed by the plough. The significance of caches of this sort is unknown, and we do not know to what use, if any, the blades were put. The Dr. J. Holmes Smith Collection, now incorporated in the collection of this Society, contained two interesting sets of cache-blades. One of these, consisting of twelve blades, comes from the vegetable garden on a small farm of twenty-five acres, which formerly belonged to Dr. Smith, situated on the road between Kingsville and Fork, in Baltimore County. Dr. Smith, himself, found these blades in his garden, one at a time. So far as I know, no other Indian artifacts have been found in this spot, or elsewhere on this farm. The other blades are part of a cache which was

discovered in situ by workmen digging the foundations of a house on the Charles Standiford farm, on that part of the farm now belonging to Mr. J. Carrington Brown. The site is on a hill, on the north side of the road from Upper Falls to Bradshaw, between Upper Falls and Saint Stephens Church, in the Eleventh District, Baltimore County. This cache is said to have contained about one hundred blades, about three fourths of which were thrown away at targets or marks by some boys who, most unfortunately, arrived on the scene before Dr. Smith. Twenty-seven of these blades were secured by Dr. Smith.

Spearheads.

No. 162, 166 and 332 are noteworthy specimens. Finer specimens, however, are in the possession of collectors living at Cambridge, Maryland. These last were found at Sandy Hill, on Choptank River, a short distance below Cambridge. No. 162, which is of jasper, was found by me on a village site a short distance north of Kingsville, Baltimore County, Maryland, a few hundred yards west of the road between Kingsville and Fork. No. 166, which appears to be of the same material, measures seven and a quarter inches. It was found on the J. Carroll Walsh farm, "The Mound" (now the residence of Mr. Thomas Francis Cadwalader), at Jerusalem Mills, Harford County, in the field between the residence and Kellville. No. 332 was found by the late Calvin C. Harlan, near Baldwin, at the head of Long Green Valley, Baltimore County, and was recently acquired from his daughter, Mrs. Samuel C. Allen, of Baldwin.

In conclusion, I should say that the region from which most of the specimens in this collection were derived, the lower parts of the Forks of Gunpowder River, from Long Green to the head of tidewater on Gunpowder River, and adjacent parts of Harford County down into Gunpowder Neck, is a country of small Indian village and camp sites, none of which, to my knowledge, is especially rich in Indian artifacts of any type, save, of course, arrowheads. The finding of an exceptionally fine grooved axe or spearhead within the limits of this locality is

almost the event of a lifetime, while the collector need not expect ever to find a perfect banner stone, or even a fragment of a pipe in those parts, unless he has rare good luck. For every fragment of an axe he finds there he will find more than fifty arrowheads; for every broken banner stone or gorget, at least two hundred. The number of hours which must be employed in hunting in order to find the better and rarer specimens would be impressive, if it could be estimated. A collection of this sort represents, if nothing else, a vast amount of work. The field at Perry Point, where several choice specimens of this collection were found, is a different matter. This field is reputedly very "rich" in Indian artifacts. It is now in grass, since it became a part of the lands belonging to the Perry Point Hospital.

II. A COLLECTION OF INDIAN ARTIFACTS PRESENTED TO
THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY BY WILLIAM
MOSS BOUCHER OF ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND.

These Indian artifacts were examined and catalogued by me about six years ago. It is understood that all of them were found in Anne Arundel County, and derive, mostly, from the following places and farms:

- (1) Brice farm, north side, Severn River, between the two bridges.
- (2) Winchester farm, adjoining Brice's.
- (3) Phillip's farm, Round Bay, Severn River.

Two-thirds of the collection are derived from the above named places. The remaining one-third is said to be derived, for the most part, from the following sites:

- (4) Colonel Marsh's, Round Bay, Severn River.
- (5) Phillips' place, Round Bay.
- (6) Head of Back Creek, Severn River.
- (7) Ruly's, South River.

(8) Cat Hole Creek, a creek of the south shore of Annapolis Roads.

(9) Greenberry Point farm, Severn River.

(10) Saint Helena Island, Severn River.

(11) Contee farm, Rhode River.

Most of the objects are numbered, but, since we have not had access to Mr. Boucher's original catalogue, which may be in the possession of the Maryland Historical Society, but, if that is the case, has been mislaid, knowledge of the place where found, which is so important in the case of Indian artifacts, is denied to us.

Grooved axes which bear numbers, but which, in the absence of a catalogue, can not be identified as to source, are as follows:

Nos. 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13-21, inclusive, 22, 23, 26, 28, 31-36, inclusive, 38-41, inclusive, and 69.

The following grooved axes can be identified as to source:

No. 8: Greenberry Point farm.

No. 10: Winchester's, Severn River.

No. 22: Saint Helena Island.

No. 27: Saint Margaret's.

No. 29: Greenberry Point farm.

The collection contains sixteen grooved axes which bear no numbers. One of these was found on Rhode River.

In all, the collection contains some fifty grooved axes.

Other objects in the Boucher Collection are:

No. 50: a mortar. Place-of-finding unknown.

No. 53: a pestle. From Brice's farm, Severn River.

No.'s 57-59: celts, or axes without grooves, Places where found unknown.

One celt, the number of which is illegible.

Nos. 67 and 68: hammer-stones, places where found not ascertained.

No. 70: celt. I have no note as to where this was found.

One broken gorget (not numbered), from Ruly's, South River.

One broken tube from Ruly's.

Various knives and "cache blades"; sources unknown.

Fragments of pottery, some of them from Back Creek, Severn River.

This collection should be properly laid out and Mr. Boucher should be requested to inspect it. If he would do the Society this favor, no doubt he could identify as to place-where-found many objects concerning the source of which we are now in the dark. Such knowledge would add much to the value and interest of this collection which he has so generously given to our Society.

ROSSBURG INN, LANDMARK OF A NATIONAL ROUTE.

By WILLIAM F. KELLERMANN.

[Now almost dwarfed by the modern buildings of the campus, Rossburg Inn on the Baltimore-Washington highway at College Park is being restored by the University of Maryland for use as a faculty-alumni club. This account of the construction and history of the Inn, in its time host to the nation's great in their travels to and from the Capital, was prepared some years ago by Mr. Kellermann in partial fulfilment of the requirements for admission to the University of Maryland chapter of Tau Beta Pi, the national honorary engineering fraternity. We are indebted to Dean S. S. Steinberg of the College of Engineering of the University for permission to print this account.]

Prior to the advent of the railroad, the chief means of transportation was by stage-coach over the turnpikes. The word turnpike was used for the earlier highways, because it was the custom to collect toll for the use of these roads, and the person charged with collecting this toll would hold a long pike across the road, and, upon being paid the required toll, would raise the pike in order to allow the vehicle to pass. The raising of the pike gave rise to the word turnpike.

These roads were of the earth and gravel type, and, as a

result, progress over them in bad weather in the heavy stage-coaches was slow.

The road from Georgetown and Washington to Baltimore was probably as good as any other in the east, for as remarked by a traveler over this road, quoted in Archer Hulbert's *Historic Highways of America*, the Baltimore to Washington route was traveled with rapidity and safety equal to any mode of traveling in the east in 1796.

We of today would not think, however, that the travel was very rapid; for, whereas it now takes about one and one-half hours to go from Baltimore to Washington, in those days it took about half a day. At the height of the stage-coach era, when horses were changed every 10 to 12 miles, the running time was reduced to 5 hours. The price for this accommodation was \$4.00.

There are many points of interest along this old road that are worth mentioning. Not far from Baltimore is Relay, where horses were changed on the first regular line of railway transportation in the United States, prior to the introduction of steam in 1830. The first arch stone railroad bridge in America was built here and is still in service. At Elkridge were located the first charcoal furnaces in the United States to use hot blast in the top of the stack to make steam. The pipes for the famous Croton water works of New York City were made at this plant.

At Bladensburg the road passes very close to where ships from England used to land their cargoes. Nearby is the battlefield where the American forces were put to rout by the British in the War of 1812 with the result that Washington was taken and many of the public buildings burned. Bladensburg was the favorite site for duels and many of our statesmen and army and navy officers have journeyed there over the old Baltimore and Washington turnpike to settle their differences on the field of honor. Along the highway at Bladensburg are many old inns and taverns. These inns were a part of the old transportation system, as it was necessary to stop during the journey from Baltimore to Washington for meals, and in some cases travelers would spend the night at one of these places.

About four miles from Bladensburg, in the direction of Baltimore, stands another old inn which played an important part in the lives of the travelers along the Baltimore and Washington turnpike. This inn is known today as the Rossburg Inn, although the older show that it was a part of the Rossborough Estate.

The Rossburg Inn is located on the campus of the University of Maryland at College Park, Maryland, and is one of the oldest buildings in that locality having been built in 1798. The writer has no definite knowledge as to whether the building was built expressly for inn purposes, but it would be logical to suppose that it was, inasmuch as it was used for that purpose shortly after being built. Located on the main thoroughfare, between Baltimore and Washington, 8 miles from the latter city, it served as a sort of breakfasting place for the traveler who made an early start from Washington, and a stopping-off place for others, where meals and lodging could be obtained. On his last visit to this country General Lafayette stopped over night at this inn, while journeying from Baltimore to Washington, and slept in room 14. This was on Monday, October 11, 1824, and the following morning a military escort was sent from Washington to conduct him to the capital city. This information, with the exception of the date, was given verbally to Dr. H. J. Patterson, of the University of Maryland faculty, by a member of the military escort. Dr. Patterson also gave the writer access to a very old tracing of the building and the adjoining land which showed that the estate was called Rossborough, and contained 428 acres. The estate was probably owned by a person by the name of Ross. In the early part of the 19th century, the inn was operated by John W. Brown who also drove one of the stage-coaches operated over the Baltimore and Washington turnpike by Stockton and Stokes. This same person later ran the White House Tavern, an inn located about 2 miles further in the direction of Baltimore on the same road. The stables for the horses at the former inn were located to the north of the building and a little back from the road.

There are four English elm trees that stand in front of the Rossburg Inn. These trees range from 36 inches to 45 inches in diameter and tower above the house, which is three stories high. Being the only ones of their variety in the neighborhood, it is said that they were brought over from England, as reputedly were the bricks used in the construction work. However, when we consider that the highway has been widened and probably has been shifted in location slightly, it is safe to presume that these trees were planted within the original grounds. The terrain along the highway in the immediate vicinity is flat and clear, and as the traveler approaches, these trees, together with the red building, are caught by the eye long before the inn itself is reached. About 35 feet to the south of the rear part of the building is a well which gives a very good supply of water, undoubtedly used since the erection of the inn.

For what length of time the Rossburg Inn was used for inn purposes is not known, but when the Maryland Agricultural College was established by the General Assembly of Maryland in 1856, the land upon which the building stands was made a part of the college. This land was from the Riversdale estate, and was owned by Charles B. Calvert. This same Mr. Calvert was one of the charter members of the corporation which operated the college and was the first president of the board of trustees. The capital stock of the corporation was 2000 shares of \$25 stock. The college was the second technical agricultural college established in the United States and at the time of establishment the Rossburg Inn was the only building on the tract. The construction of other buildings began in 1857 and the college was formally opened in October 1859. During the early history of the college, the old inn was used as a home for the faculty. Mr. N. B. Worthington, president of the faculty from 1864 to 1867, made his home there. By an Act of Congress for the endowment of an agricultural college in 1862, the college was given funds by the Federal Government. By an Act of 1887, the Agricultural Experiment Station was established and \$15,000 yearly appropriated for the establishment and mainte-

nance of agricultural experiment stations in the United States. This was the first agricultural experiment station established in the United States and in 1892 the station was put under a separate director by the board of trustees.

During recent years, a Spanish coin was found in the building with the following words on the obverse—"Carlos III Dei Gratia 1776." On the reverse side were the words—"Hispan Et. Ind Rex Me Irimi." These words, when translated, mean "Carlos III, By the Grace of God 1776" and "King of Spain, and the West Indies. Strengthen me."

The building is constructed of red brick and has a mansard roof. The roof, however, is a new feature, as the original one was of the gable type.

The bricks, said to have been brought from England to Bladensburg, and hauled the remaining four miles over the Baltimore and Washington turnpike, appear to be of the same quality as the common red brick used in this country today, but they are a trifle larger, being $8\frac{3}{4}$ inches by $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches by $2\frac{3}{4}$ inches, whereas the common red brick are $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches by 4 inches by $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches. There is no uniform bonding in the brick work. In the front of the building the system appears to be one header for every two stretchers in the same course, and a course of stretchers every six or eight courses of headers. This is not carried out over the entire front of the building, however, as there are two headers for every two stretchers in some courses. On the sides of the building, the English system of alternate courses of headers and stretchers predominates, although this system is not carried throughout the walls. In the back of the building there is no definite system at all for more than five or six courses. In general the brickwork is in good condition.

The foundation is of rubble masonry up to the ground level. From there up to the first story it is a 19-inch brick wall and from the first story up to the roof, the wall is decreased to 15 inches.

The windows are 2 feet 10 inches by 6 feet on the first and

second floors, but on the third floor front they are smaller and built so to conform to the shape of the roof. On the first and second stories of the front there are white stone lintels over the windows, but elsewhere they are of wood.

The main door is in the center of the building and is 3 feet 6 inches by 7 feet. This door has a joint running its entire height in the center, which gives it the appearance of being two narrow doors made into one.

Above the door there is a semi-circular brick arch having a radius of 30 inches, and a keystone 13 inches deep, varying from 14 inches wide at the bottom to about 8 inches at the top. This keystone has the following inscription on the bottom of it:

T. Coade, London

1798

On the face of the stone there is carved the head of a man, representing Silenus. There is a porch 8 feet wide running across the front of the building. Whether or not this porch is the original, the writer cannot say.

On entering the building from the main entrance, the observer is struck by the large hallway running the full depth of the building, and by the high ceilings. This hall is 8 feet 8 inches wide, and at the center, there is an archway that drops down about 14 inches from the ceiling at the crown. The ceiling is 10 feet 5 inches high, and the general appearance of the hall is improved greatly by the archway. At the rear and to the right side is a staircase which goes up to a landing. From this landing you turn to your left and proceed up another staircase to the second floor. To the right of the hall are two rooms and to the left there is one. In each of the present rooms, there is a fireplace 3 feet 6 inches wide by 2 feet 10 inches high. These fireplaces are in the center of the rooms and the reason for being there will be evident when we consider the fact that fireplaces were the chief means of heating at the time the building was constructed. The partition walls between the hall and the rooms are of brick, and as a result are very thick, being 11

inches. The doorways appear rather low, but this is probably due to the fact that the walls are thick and that they are narrow. They are 2 feet 9 inches by 6 feet 9 inches. The room to the left rear was used for the bar, and had a staircase leading from it to the cellar.

The second story still has the original flooring. The boards range from 4½ inches to 8½ inches wide. The extreme north and south rooms have been removed as in the case of the first floor. During minor alterations in some of the existing rooms when the partitions were removed, it was found that the original nails were of the pounded type, whereas those used today are of the wire-drawn type.

There are four fireplaces on this floor, but they are smaller than those on the first floor. There is a hallway that leads from the landing on the staircase from the first to second floor to the second story of the rear building, which originally contained the kitchen on its first floor. This hallway makes it possible to go from the main building to the rear building without going out into the weather. The staircase from the second floor to the third floor is directly over and exactly like the one running from the first floor to the second floor.

On reaching the third floor, the first thing that comes into view is a metal arrow suspended from the ceiling in the hall by a metal rod. This rod extends up through the roof and is connected to the weather vane on the top of the house. On this floor there are four more fireplaces of the smaller size, and the chimneys begin to converge so that whereas they were approximately in the center of the rooms by the time they reach the roof they are only about two feet apart. This applies to the chimneys on both the north and south sides of the building. On the south side of the building the windows are between the fireplaces, while on the north side the windows are to the sides of the fireplaces.

In the attic, the joists over the third floor are 2 inches by 10 inches, spaced 24 inches center to center. The roof joists are 2 inches by 6 inches, and the sheathing 1 inch thick.

The cellar is reached by a staircase under the staircase from the first to the second floor, or from the outside by a staircase in the rear of the building. The brick partition, which extends up to the first floor and above, divides the cellar into three rooms. The joists under the first floor are in a state of decay and some of them have been replaced. The original ones in some cases have dropped down about an inch below the floor at the center of their span. These old joists were hewn and are approximately 11 inches by 2½ inches and are spaced approximately 16 inches center to center. The maximum span of these joists is 13 feet and it is interesting to note that there is no bridgework whatever. Evidently it was not the practice in those days to use bridgework for joists.

CAPTAIN PHILLIP TAYLOR AND SOME OF HIS DESCENDANTS.

By EMERSON B. ROBERTS.

Captain Phillip Taylor was a Virginian, and one of that gallant band under the command of Captain William Claiborne, who established the first settlement of Englishmen within the bounds of Maryland on Kent Island, August 17, 1631, nearly three years before the arrival of The Ark and The Dove at St. Mary's, March 25, 1634. Phillip Taylor came with the first of Claiborne's men, and is, therefore, not antedated by any person as a Maryland settler. He was born about 1610, in the village of Marden in Herefordshire, and was the son of another Phillip Taylor. Coming to the Province of Virginia, in the ship *Africa*, he established himself in Northampton and Accomac Counties on the eastern shore. There is a Virginia record of 1637 that — Taylor was brought in by her husband, Phillip Taylor of Accomac County (Greer: *Virginia Immigrants*), and another record of a petition for land by Phillip Taylor, 1643,

for the transportation of Jane Taylor. Yet another Virginia record tells of the transportation of Phillip Taylor, Sr., 1643, by Phillip Taylor. In 1642-43 Phillip Taylor was returned to the Assembly of Virginia as the Burgess for Northampton County (*Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia*). Earlier in the same minutes, under date of December 15, 1640, there is this: "The Council hath ordered that a patent shall be granted to the Indians of Accomac County for fifteen hundred acres of land upon the eastermost shore of the seaboard side, and that a new survey thereof be made at the appointment and direction of Mr. Yeardley and Mr. Littleton, and that the right of two hundred acres there already granted unto Phillip Taylor be not thereby infringed, and after a true survey be taken thereof, a patent be made for the said land, for the use of the said Indians" (*Minutes of Council and General Court*, p. 478).

In the Accomac records there are frequent references to Captain Taylor. In 1640 he was admonished not to molest certain Indians. The Letters of Marque and Reprisal issued by Claiborne are addressed to Captain Phillip Taylor as his chief lieutenant. In 1642 Phillip Taylor was one of the original justices for the then newly formed County of Northampton. At the first court he was directed to proceed against a certain Indian town and to do what seemed best for the welfare of the county. Again in 1643, as sheriff, he presented the petition that the county be provided with a gaol (Northampton County Records. See also Wise: *Ye Kingdome of Accawmacke*).

In this study of the Taylor genealogy, there is no concern with the merits of the Baltimore-Claiborne controversy over the legal status of the Kent Island trading post, or the exact meaning of *hactenus inculta*, or the precedence of the Broad Seal of England over the Scottish Signet, or what the King had in mind when he granted Lord Baltimore his charter, around all of which issues the controversy raged in Maryland, in Virginia, and in the councils of King Charles. We are alone concerned that Phillip Taylor came "at the first," was one of the leading

spirits among the Claiborne forces, regarded himself as a Virginian, was captain of one of the boats engaged in the service of supply, and engaged in the pitched battle that was fought in the mouth of the Wicomico River—the first battle between English forces in the New World. Fortunately, there is, for his descendants, his own account of the events of those years, and the part he played, or saw, as an eye-witness. One of the supporting documents presented by Captain Claiborne when he submitted his cause to the King in 1640, was a deposition of Phillip Taylor. This document, recorded in full in *Archives of Maryland*, Vol. V, p. 220, is of great interest as a source of information regarding life and activity on Kent Island, and of the point of view of the Kent Islanders. It begins:

Phillippus Taylor de Accomacke in Colonia de Virginia etatis 30 annor. aut eo circiter natur infra pochiam de Marden in Com. Hereford.

The document reveals Philip Taylor as the commander of one of the pinnaces used in the trading operations between Kent Island and Virginia. Until 1643 or afterwards, he seems to have held his property and residence in Virginia, but later came permanently to Maryland.

The armed conflict between Captain Taylor and his crew and the Maryland forces under Captain Cornwalleys in the mouth of the Wicomico River in 1635 is pictured in detail, colored, of course, with the Maryland point of view of the affair, in the inquest before the Provincial Court, 1637. This bill is recorded in Liber Z, Court and Testamentary Business, 1637 (*Archives of Maryland*, Vol. IV, p. 23).

It is a matter of surmise that Phillip Taylor may have had issue by his first wife, Jane. The records are not clear. If there was such issue, however, Phillip Taylor is probably the forebear of those Taylors who became powerful at a very early date in the affairs of Dorchester County.

The death of Jane Taylor, first wife of Phillip Taylor, is not recorded, nor is it known that she survived until the permanent settlement on Kent Island. His second wife was also Jane, and

there is some evidence to indicate that she was the sister of Cuthbert Fenwick, who was first a Virginian, then a Marylander, and the Lord of Fenwick Manor. It is established, however, that she was born about 1617 (*Archives of Maryland*, Vol. X, p. 560). Her life was fraught with all the tragedy of troublous times. Thrice married, she lost her first and third husbands by execution; one, for the part he had as a Virginian in the opposition to Lord Baltimore and the authority of St. Mary's; the third, at the hands of the men of Providence, for loyal support of the constituted authority of Lord Baltimore in Maryland.

Her first husband was that Captain Thomas Smith, gentleman, a commander in Claiborne's forces in the Battle of Wicomico, May 10, 1635, who won the battle and drove off the Marylanders. Three years later, Lord Baltimore, in settling the disturbed affairs of Kent Island, caused the arrest of Captain Smith, with others. Smith was taken to St. Mary's, tried, and convicted, and there is evidence of the sentence to death by hanging having been carried out (Andrews: *History of Maryland*, pp. 119, 121, and 131). The evidence of Jane Taylor's marriage to Smith is embraced in some testimony in the Allen case to which more detailed subsequent reference will be made. At the time of the trial of the Allen case, she was married to William Eltonhead, who testified that his wife, at the time in question, was "the relict of Smith."

Second, Jane married Captain Phillip Taylor, and became the mother of his children, Thomas and Sarah.

The conjecture that Jane was by birth a Fenwick and the sister of Cuthbert Fenwick, rests not alone upon the fact that she undoubtedly bore a close relationship to the Fenwicks, but upon a deposition she made, June 6, 1653, to the effect that "she was in company with her brother and sister Fenwick . . ." (*Archives*, Vol. X, p. 496). Dr. William Hand Browne, then editor of the *Archives*, indexed "brother" as "Cuthbert Fenwick," but whether he was closer as a brother than the husband of her deceased husband's sister, remains a matter of surmise.

Others who have studied the matter—among them the late Mr. Samuel H. Troth—have also concluded that she was born Jane Fenwick (Letter of Mr. S. H. Troth, March 14, 1909, in papers owned by Dr. Julian Sears, Washington, D. C.).

Direct evidence of the children of Captain Phillip Taylor is embraced in the registry of their mark for cattle and hogs, and this same record affords us all we know of the date of the death of their father. The record runs: "September 29, 1649, Thomas and Sarah Taylor, the children of Captain Phillip Taylor, deceased, their mark . . . (*Archives*, Vol. IV, p. 507). At this date, they were residents of Kent Island, and the above is a Kent record.

After the death of Captain Taylor, his widow married William Eltonhead, Gentleman, Lord of Eltonhead Manor, and Secretary of the Council. His life was sacrificed in illegal execution after the defeat of the Maryland party by the Puritans of Providence, at the "Battle of Severn." While a resident of Calvert County, he was known and was doing business on Kent Island as early as 1648. On June 7, 1648, he, with Giles Brent, Lord of Kent Fort Manor, witnessed a release of Mistress Margaret Brent by Thomas Gerrard for certain debts, in the affair of her celebrated administration of the estate of Leonard Calvert (*Archives*, Vol. IV, p. 428). The ties between Lord Baltimore and William Eltonhead were strong, and express mutual confidence. It appears that at least twice—June, 1642, and again in 1648—William Eltonhead made a trip to London in the interest of Baltimore's affairs (*Archives*, Vol. IV, p. 210). When an ordinance was presented before the House of Lords for the removal of Lord Baltimore and the appointment of a Protestant, January 20, 1646, William Eltonhead was one of those who signed an oath of fealty (*Archives*, Vol. III pp. 173-74). In 1649, Cecilius Calvert issued a special commission "to our trusty and well beloved William Eltonhead, To Be one of Our Privy Council of State within our Province of Maryland." On July 22, 1650, William Eltonhead took the Oath of Councillor (*Archives*, Vol. III, p. 256). Subsequently, he was

chosen Secretary of Council, and in this relation his name is much in the public record of the day.

The feelings of Lord Baltimore toward the affair at Severn are well-known.

In the Proceedings in the Fendall case, at the Court at St. Mary's, November 29, 1660, the record runs: "Then came Josias Fendall and submitted himself to the government of the Lord Proprietary, and professed to do in the future for the good . . . [and the letter of His Lordship, August 24th, was introduced] . . . 'I would have you proceed against such of them as you shall not see fit to pardon . . . upon no terms pardon Fendall so much as his life . . . nor . . . pardon . . . any of those that sat in the Council of Warr at Anne Arundel, and Concurred in the Sentence of Death against Mr. William Eltonhead, or any of my honest friends then and there murdered . . . but do justice upon them, and I shall justify you in it. . . .'" In another letter to his governor, Lord Baltimore directs the Governor and Council "to doe especial care of those Widdows who have lost their husbands in and by occassion of the late trouble vizt: Mrs. Hatton, Mrs. Lewis, and Mrs. William Eltonhead, whom his Lordship would have his said Lieutenant to cause to be supplied out of such rents and other proffitt as are due to his Lordship" (*Archives*, Vol. III p. 326).

William Eltonhead was adjudged by Council to have left a nuncupative will, the action having been taken on a deposition of John Anderton (*Archives*, Vol. XLI, pp. 179, 180). Letters of administration were issued at Patuxent by the Provincial Court, May 14, 1657, to Mrs. Jane Eltonhead.

After reading the record of the Allen case, there can be no doubt of the identity of the Jane who married Phillip Taylor, with the widow, Jane Taylor, who married William Eltonhead. Thomas Allen, of Kent Island, died in 1648 (His will, *Maryland Calendar of Wills*, Vol. I). "At the Court at St. Maries die Jovis, 15th November, 1649, William Eltonhead, Gent.," in right of his wife as plaintiff, brought a suit against the administrators of the estate of Thomas Allen, deceased, and in

the record of the case occurs this significant statement, "whereupon the deft. Alleadged that 380 pounds of Tobacco . . . and produced a Receipt thereof under the hand of one Giles Bashawe whom Mrs. Eltonhead present in the Court acknowledged was the Atty of Capt. Phillip Taylor, her former husband . . ." (*Archives*, Vol. IV, p. 527). Giles Bashaw was a Kent Islander, and had come to Northampton County with the Taylors, and had been one of Claiborne's band. Further in the suit this "William Eltonhead, pltf, sues to be relieved of tobacco due upon two bills, by one of which it appears that the decedent Allen was engaged unto the plaintiff's wife—then the relict of Smith, Gent., for payment of 600 pounds of tobacco to her in November, 1639. . . ." Hence, the conclusions previously drawn as to the several marriages of Jane, whom we now write as Jane (Fenwick?) Smith Taylor Eltonhead (*Archives*, Vol. IV, pp. 496 ff.).

After the tragic death of her third husband, the widow, Jane Eltonhead, continued to reside on the Eltonhead lands in Calvert, near the mouth of the Patuxent, even though they were in litigation. As late as March 23, 1656, there was an Order in Council which had to do with strengthening the militia, and the appointment of officers to fill vacancies. Among other places mentioned "downward on both sides the river and creek to the mouth of the River, including the Plantation of Mrs. William Eltonhead."

Jane Eltonhead survived until 1659. Her will, recorded at St. Mary's, February 28, 1659, mentions her eldest son, Thomas Taylor, and to him she devised "Cedar Point." Her daughter, Sarah, is also mentioned in the will, as also her grandchild, Roger Anderton, leading to the almost inevitable conclusion that her daughter, Sarah, married that John Anderton who attended William Eltonhead in his last hours in prison, and received his last will and testament. Further, she says the debts of William Eltonhead are to be paid.

The circumstances surrounding the death of William Eltonhead resulted in recriminations and litigations that involved

the several branches of the family for a number of years. In these court cases the cards appear to have been stacked against Thomas Taylor, and it seems hardly beyond doubt that the feelings resultant, together with the loss of his property, were the causes of his permanent removal to Kent Island and the eastern shore. In brief this litigation is sketched:

Before the Provincial Court, Wednesday, February 29, 1659, Thomas Taylor, of Patuxent River, aged about sixteen or seventeen years, showed that his mother, Mrs. Jane Eltonhead, Relict of William Eltonhead, Esq., being lately deceased . . . chose as his guardian his mother, Mrs. Jane Eltonhead (*Archives*, Vol. XLI, p. 345).

Before the Court, "Thursday, April 13, 1661. This day came Thomas Taylor, and desired liberty to choose his . . . [the words are lost, but presumably 'guardian'] whereupon he made choice of Phillip . . ." (again the last name is lost here, but subsequent record renders it clear that it is 'Philip Calvert') (*Archives*, Vol. XLI, p. 447).

"August 6, 1661, Captain Josias Fendall demands a writt to arrest Thomas Taylor in an action of detenue," and the warrant was issued to the Sheriff of Calvert County (*Archives*, Vol. XLI, p. 490).

April 1662 an order was issued by the Upper and Lower Houses, directed to the Sheriff of Calvert County, for the appearance of Thomas Taylor to answer suit by Cuthbert Fenwick. The suit was for the recovery of certain lands on the basis that the Court had declared all the heirs-at-law of William Eltonhead barred all claim of land as heirs of William Eltonhead (*Archives*, Vol. I, p. 432).

August 17, 1663. Thomas Taylor, through Phillip Calvert, his guardian, sued for rent due from John Anderton (*Archives*, Vol. XLI, p. 99).

On the same date he entered another suit against Anderton.

September 17, 1663. Thomas Taylor, Cuthbert Fenwick, and John Bogue and William Mills as guardians for Robert and Richard Fenwick, join in a petition before the Provincial

Court in which Thomas Taylor relinquished "for love and affection . . . two hundred acres of land . . . he now liveth on . . . for which free gift . . . Cuthbert Fenwick, John Bogue and William Mills, guardians for Robert and Richard Fenwick release, acquit and discharge Thomas Taylor" (*Archives*, Vol. I, pp. 467, 481).

Before the Court, January 11, 1663-4, a petition of Thomas Taylor by his guardian, Philip Calvert, sets forth that Thomas Taylor is the son and heir of Jane Eltonhead and has occupied in fee simple the Manor of 'Little Eltonhead' in Calvert since the death of his mother . . . (*Archives*, Vol. XLIX, p. 99).

March 29, 1664. Thomas Taylor records an assignment of a portion of 'Little Eltonhead' to his brother-in-law, Thomas Courtney and his wife Sarah (*Archives*, Vol. XLIX, p. 211).

Before the Court, April 5, 1664, Thomas Taylor is declared to be of age.

Before the Court, April 12, 1664, a deposition of John Anderton sets forth the nuncupative will of William Eltonhead by which his land and personal estate was to be his wife's at her disposing, and his desire for her to bestow on Robert and Richard Fenwick something as a remembrance of him (*Archives*, Vol. XLIX, p. 207).

From these fragments then we are able to piece together some story of Thomas Taylor and to draw some highly probable conclusions from them.

Thomas Taylor, son of Captain Phillip Taylor and Jane, his wife, was born about 1643, probably upon Kent Island. He had property rights there, but in his boyhood resided with his widowed mother on his step-father's lands, near the mouth of the Patuxent in Calvert County in the Quaker colony. After he became of age he returned to the eastern shore probably because he had property rights there and because he had lost through litigation whatever property rights he may have had in Calvert.

When and under what circumstances Thomas Taylor became a Quaker is not clear. There can be only surmise that his father

Phillip Taylor and his mother Jane were of the Establishment. The Fenwicks were Roman Catholics. 'Little Eltonhead' was in the Quaker area. Indeed there may be, between the lines in some of the subsequent Quaker records of him, the implication that he was, while of Quaker identification, less orthodox Quaker than some of the Friends. He is mentioned as "the man who wrote for the Friends." Does the phrase indicate complete identification with the Society?

Be that as it may, Thomas Taylor married Elizabeth Marsh, a Quakeress, of Severn, daughter of Thomas and Margaret Marsh, April 1, 1669 "at the house of John Pitt of Patoxon" (Third Haven Records). They may have gone at once to Kent Island or Thomas may have been residing there before his marriage¹. Their home became a focus of Quaker enthusiasm. George Fox, the apostle of the Friends, was entertained there on his trip to Maryland.

Certainly as late as 1672, their residence was still on the island. Afterwards they removed to Talbot, into the Chapel District, near King's Creek. Third Haven Records show (Vol. I, pp. 3, 4): "Att a Mens Meeting att John Pittes the 8th day of the 7th Month 1676. . . . It is agreed by the Meeting that Thomas Taylor doe keepe Friends books and write the concerns

¹ Col. Tilghman in his *History of Talbot County* (Vol. I, p. 107) in introducing the early "Quaker worthies of Talbot" comes to this Thomas Taylor, and after speaking of his early residence on Kent Island, his removal into the Chapel District near King's Creek, and later yet removal into Baily's Neck, asks the question: "Was this Thomas Taylor the son and biographer of that Thomas Taylor who surrendered his benefice at Richmond in Yorkshire to become an unpaid minister among the despised Friends, and who rather than take an oath suffered an imprisonment of ten years and a half, the loss of his real estate for life, and his personal forever, and the deprivation of the protection of law?"

While the answer to the question is not what Col. Tilghman thought it might be the question itself was among the incentives to this study. Thomas Taylor was only one among a number of early Calvert residents who crossed via the islands to those areas of Kent County that are now within the borders of Talbot, Queen Anne's and Dorchester. If subsequent papers of this series are published, they will trace the migration of several of these families—among them the Marshes, the Dixons, the Harwoods, the Stevenses, the Gareys, the Sharps, the Kemps and others.—AUTHOR.

of friends in their Mens Meetings." This office, he appears to have filled for years, and to have been succeeded in it by his son or grandson. The records of Third Haven are replete with references to his actions. As "the man who wrote for the Friends" much of the spelling and misspelling of the proper names of the day can be traced to him. For example, Tredaven, Tredhaven, Tredavon, Third Haven, Trade Haven, Treadhaven, and even Trad Haven, in the records precede the present Tred Avon, and Thomas Taylor is responsible for using a number of them, though he usually seemed to prefer Trad-Haven. He was the keeper of the books, and it was he who received, recorded, and took custody of the "parcel of books, which came from our dear friend and brother, George Fox, before his death, as a token of love." This has been referred to as the germ of the first public library in America. Along with others, he subscribed four hundred pounds of tobacco for the purchase of books for the good of the Meeting.

In 1678-9 Thomas Taylor, with William Sharp and the widow Elizabeth Christison, administered on the estate of Wenlock Christison.

The high character sustained by Thomas Taylor and his wife, Elizabeth, is a matter of testimony in the will of their son, Thomas. In disposing of his personal property, he says, "Ye four (silver spoons) marked 'T T E' to my four sons, each one, for to be kept in ye remembrance of their honest grandfather and mother, who lived and died in Ye Truth, and left a good savor behind."

Thomas Taylor died in 1684 or 1685. His will, a Talbot County document (Liber 4, folio 92, Annapolis), dated July 30, 1684, and probated March 25, 1684-5, mentions his wife, Elizabeth, who is to have "the plantation on which I now dwell as far as 'Poplar Neck.'" The Third Haven Record of the death of Thomas Taylor (Vol. T. f 128-130—12 mo. 13th 1684) show that a part of Thomas Marsh's estate was in his hands at that date. The children mentioned in his will are:

1. Thomas, to whom was devised "Terby Neck."

2. James, to whom "Kingsburry" and "Kingsburry Addition" were devised.
3. John, to whom "Taylor's Chance" was devised. And daughters,
4. Sarah and
5. Elizabeth, and an unborn child.

Of these children we take notice, treating each and some of his descendants in the following paragraphs.

Thomas Taylor (1), second of the name, was under age at the time of his father's death, in 1684. There is a minute in the Third Haven Records, that he appeared before the Meeting, 2nd of the 9th month, 1688, and was advised to go home with his uncle, John Pitt. In 1690, William Sharp and John Pitt proposed to place him with Peter Harwood, to learn the trade of cooper and carpenter (Third Haven Records, Vol. I, p. 199). In adult life, he continued to reside on the lands in King's Creek devised him by his father's will, devising the same property in his own will, made December 16, 1709, probated April 30, 1711 (Annapolis, Liber 13, folio 292) saying "which I now live on." He married before 1707, Elizabeth, to whom some evidence points as the widow of William Sharp (Test. Proc. Liber 19, folio 250). After the death of Thomas Taylor, she married John MacCarthy, May 29, 1718 (St. Peter's Parish Records, p. 92 and Accounts CVII, folio 352). She died about 1726 or 1727, leaving four sons, all by her second husband, Thomas Taylor, second. These were:

Thomas Taylor, third, who probably married in 1718, Ellinor (or Elizabeth), the widow of John Ennalls, of Dorchester County (Adm. Accts., Liber I, folio 228). This Thomas Taylor died, probably in 1727, and was, at the time of his death, clerk of Third Haven Meeting. In Volume II, page 295, Third Haven Records, is this minute: "At a Monthly Meeting at our Meeting House at Treadhaven, the 8th of the 6th month 1727. . . . Our friend Thomas Taylor being Removed by death and being one appointed to give acct. of the said Meeting the meeting leaves the Consideration of appointing one in that place to the next

Monthly Meeting." In the accounting on the estate, the widow, Ellinor (or Elizabeth), mentions her Ennalls children:

John Taylor, under age in 1709.

William Taylor, under age in 1709.

Mordecai Taylor, under age in 1709.

James Taylor (2), son of Thomas and Elizabeth Taylor, inherited from his father "Kingsburry" and "Kingsburry Addition." He married, in 1689, Isabella Atkinson (Third Haven Records).

James Taylor's will was made November 8, 1718, probated May 19, 1719 (Annapolis, Liber 15, folio 109). James, the eldest son, was under 21, but on becoming of age was to divide the dwelling plantation with his brother, Thomas. Joseph was to inherit "Taylor's Chance." A daughter, Elizabeth, is mentioned, as also the wife Isabel as executrix.

John Taylor (3), son of Thomas and Elizabeth Taylor, inherited a portion of "'Taylor's Chance,' two hundred acres on the other side of King's Creek." He appears to have been born in 1684, or slightly earlier, for in 1738, his age was recorded about fifty-four years (Chancery Records I R 3, folio 447).

Sarah Taylor (4), daughter of Thomas and Elizabeth Taylor, received, under her father's will, one-half of certain lands, jointly with her sister, Elizabeth. She married (possibly Henry) Parrott.

Elizabeth Taylor (5), eldest child of Thomas and Elizabeth Taylor, was born November 6, 1669 (T. A. Meeting, Vol. IV—132). By the will of her father, she received one-half of the land at the head of the river, which must have been "Taylor's Desire," and four hundred acres, "Ye Addition." She married, at Tuckahoe Meeting, July 20, 1690, Peter Harwood (T. A. Meeting, Vol. VI, folio 347). These are the parents of Elizabeth Taylor, who married, at Third Haven Meeting, 1710, Isaac Dixon. The descendants of Isaac Dixon and his wife, Elizabeth Taylor are the subjects of a monograph on which the writer is engaged.

TAYLOR.

Phillip Taylor, Sr., of Marden, County Hereford
to Virginia 1643.

Phillip Taylor, of Marden, of Accomac, Virginia;
and of Kent Island, Maryland.

b. cir. 1610, d. cir. 1649

m. 1 Jane —, and possibly had issue.

m. 2 Jane (Fenwick?) her 2nd marriage, d. 1659.

she m. 1 Thomas Smith, Gent., executed
1638, but no issue.

she m. 3 William Eltonhead, Gent., Lord
of Eltonhead Manor, Secretary of
Council, executed, but no issue.

Thomas Taylor
b. cir. 1643, d. 1684 or 1685.
m. 1669 Elizabeth Marsh, of Severn.

Sarah Taylor m. 1 John Anderton.
m. 2 Thomas Courtney.

Roger Anderton

Thomas
under age 1684.
d. 1711.

m. Elizabeth
(widow Sharpe).

Thomas John William Mordecai
m. Ellinor
(or Elizabeth,
widow Ennalls).

James
under age 1684.
d. 1718-9.

m. Isabelle
Atkinson.

James Thomas Joseph Elizabeth

John
under
age
1684.

Sarah
(Parrott)

Elizabeth
eldest child,
b. 1669.

m. Peter Harwood.

Elizabeth Harwood
m. 1710 Isaac Dixon.

Issue.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

"TWO INDIAN ARROWS OF THOSE PARTS."

It was suggested to the chairman of the Hall of Records Commission last May that some of the Indian arrows which Lord Baltimore, by the charter of Maryland, was required to render to the King at Windsor in each year, might be obtained and permanently preserved and exhibited in the Hall. An inquiry of the Constable and Governor of the Castle brought the following reply from Lord Wigram, Deputy Constable and Lieutenant Governor:

WINDSOR CASTLE

June 18th, 1938.

Dear Sir,

I am desired by the Constable and Governor of Windsor Castle to thank you for your letter of the 24th of May regarding the Maryland Arrows.

A careful search has been made in the various Royal Palaces and I regret to say that no trace can be found of these old Indian Arrows which Lord Baltimore was required by the charter of Maryland, of 1633, to render each year unto the King at Windsor.

In 1922 two modern Arrows were given to King George V. by the members of 'The Society of the Ark and the Dove,' and these are exhibited here at Windsor. The 'Ark and the Dove,' was the name of the ship which originally conveyed settlers to Maryland, and the name has been adopted by a commemorative Society in Maryland to-day. I am sure it would not be possible to let you have these.

I am indeed sorry not to be able to assist your wishes.

Yours very truly,

WIGRAM,

Deputy Constable & Lieut. Governor.

Information is sought and correspondence is invited upon the following:

1. Present whereabouts of the memoirs of Edward Warfield, written in 1828, or any copies thereof.
2. The probable removal of George Yates (3) from Baltimore County to Caroline County, Virginia. He was grandson of George Yates (1), deputy surveyor, and son of George (2) and Rachel Warfield Yates, and he married Ann Deaver.
3. History and genealogy of the Deaver family.
4. Descendants of George Yates (3).
5. Any marriages between any of the above-named families and the Calverts.
6. Any connection between the Yates and Middleton families.

MRS. J. BRENT CLARKE,
Cordova Apartments,
Washington, D. C.

Wish to know names of parents of Mathew Mark Reid who was born August 28, 1815, in Maryland. He had brothers named William Leonard, Nathan and David; sisters, Evaline, Letha and Mary Ellen.

Wish to know names of parents of Hannah Huffer who was born in Frederick Co., Md., Feb. 12, 1803. Have been told they were Hannah Miller and Joseph Huffer. Would like names of parents of Hannah Miller.

ALTA CHRISMAN,
3051 Starr St.,
Lincoln, Nebr.

Wanted: To know parents of William Chew, born Jan. 16, 1774, died Apr. 12, 1865. Also to know parents of his wife Lydia Henshaw whom he married about 1803. They lived in Maryland near Baltimore, before going to Ohio. 1860 Richland Co. census gives Md. as birth state of Wm. Chew.

ANNIE R. HUNTER,
234 Maryland Bldg.,
Washington, D. C.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Maryland's Colonial Charm, Portrayed in Silver. By Commander HARRY W. HILL, U. S. N. Baltimore: Waverley Press, 1938. 286 pages, 38 illustrations, \$3.75.

It is 27 years since the chance which determines such things assigned Harry W. Hill, newly commissioned ensign that day, to the old cruiser Maryland for duty. During his tour of duty on that cruiser (which was scrapped a few years ago) his artistic interest was aroused by the intricate embellishments of the great 48-piece set of silver which had been presented to the ship in 1906 when she went into commission, the donor being the State of Maryland, as was the pleasant custom of those days. For these were no ordinary patterns in engraving. Instead, the State Commission had gone to great pains to have some memorable designs, all different and each reminiscent of some historic or scenic wonder from one or another of all the counties in the State. Even the trees and flowers depicted were of local significance.

In the 32 years since Governor Warfield, Mayor Timanus and Chairman E. Stanley Gary sailed down the Bay to present the silver service, along with the Maryland flag, many things have happened in and out of the Navy. Even the silver services which used to be so proudly employed are getting less use, particularly the punchbowls. And with a lessened employment, interest has waned, until today there are many who had quite forgotten there was such a thing as a Maryland service, and who certainly could not identify the scenes portrayed. The old cruiser herself is gone. Happily in 1921 there was commissioned the Battleship Maryland, and to her was turned over the service which her cruiser predecessor had owned.

Happily, too, the gunnery officer assigned to the new battleship in 1928 was none other than Ensign Hill, now Commander Hill, and by this pleasant conspiracy of fate and the Navy

department he was put in a position to renew his long-neglected study of the old service he had first seen in 1911. Happily, too, Captain Taussig was himself interested, and the gunnery officer was encouraged to study this metal picture-gallery and identify the scenes employed in its 48 pieces. That he did, not merely in leisure moments aboard ship but on his annual leaves of absence, spending most of his shore time in wandering about the 23 counties, looking for the very spots depicted on platter or sugar bowl or basket, looking up courthouse records, perusing the hundred-odd books listed in his bibliography, making oral inquiries and writing letters. It was the thoroughness of his quest which led him eventually back to Samuel Kirk's (where the service was made) to learn something of the silversmith's art. On this second trip (an early visit had revealed little) he met the foreman who had worked on the task and through him came on dust-covered notes and sketches which, found earlier, would have saved months of study! At last a really monumental piece of research was completed. There now remained the preparation of a written account of it, and this has at length been completed, and published, in a sizable volume, well printed and illustrated with photographs by which the curious can see just what elements of this or that division of the state were regarded in 1906 as most worthy of having their pictures recorded in silver.

This, inevitably, is the part which will fascinate the historically minded, and shock a good many of them. For the tenacious Commander Hill, once he learned what was depicted, was only started. He now wanted to know why it was depicted, and what right it had to immortality of a sort, and this passion led him deep in the Archives of Maryland and into local original sources, to the Library of Congress, the Hall of Records, and many private homes, to make sure of the claims thus recorded in silver. With dizzying effects in some instances.

The old Treasury Building at Annapolis, for instance, on whose venerated exterior is a tablet fixing 1694 as the date of its erection. Very interesting, to be sure, but Commander Hill

notes in an appendix that in the Official Survey of Annapolis by Stoddert, in 1718, there is no mention of anything within that "publick circle" except "the stadt house, ffree scool and Armory." (This placement of the "ffree scool" within the enclosure also disturbs the local tradition as to the location of old King William's School, predecessor of St. John's.) Or one can note the author's discovery that of the ancient taverns which Garrett County sought to portray on the six fine candlesticks, several were not in Garrett County, nor even in Maryland, but over the Pennsylvania line. On the Anne Arundel plateau are portrayals properly on the Baltimore punchbowl, from which they presumably were crowded off.

Commander Hill hastens over corrections of local traditions, and goes on to contributions which interested him more, and gratified him more in the finding. The sequence he employs is a logical one, taking up each piece, numbering the scenes it includes (there are 167 altogether, in addition to ornamental details of terrapin, wild duck, tobacco plants, etc.) and describing at some length the scene and the historical events associated with it. Some of the scenes are small and considerably conventionalized in design, so that the task of identifying them (without the too long delayed discovery of those blessed notes in the silversmith-foreman's office) must have been in some cases a really stupendous one.

The whole list of 167 scenes is too long to give, but those portrayed on the punchbowl of Baltimore City and County, besides the Great Seal and the Mason-Dixon marker which is incorporated in the ladle's handle (the old Sun Iron building, the first linotype, the first dental college, etc. are in the Anne Arundel gift), may give a hint of what interested the selecting authorities a generation ago. The punchbowl scenes follow:

Baltimore in 1752.	The First Telegraph, 1844.
Bombardment of Fort McHenry.	Peter Cooper Locomotive.
Washington Monument.	First Electric Locomotive.
Laying out Baltimore Town.	First Elevated Railway.

Seven Stars Tavern.	First Gas Street Lamp.
Birth of The Star Spangled Banner.	First Columbus Monument. Battle Monument.
Holliday Street Tavern.	Baltimore Clipper "Flying Cloud."
First Electric Railway.	"Congress Hall."

Commander Hill has done a singularly fine thing in identification, in his laborious study of records to give in each case a distilled summary of information which in many cases was in danger of vanishing altogether from man's memory and record, and in the writing itself of a text which is as readable as it is informative.

MARK S. WATSON.

History of American City Government; The Colonial Period.

By ERNEST S. GRIFFITH, Dean of the Graduate School,
The American University. New York: Oxford University
Press, 1938. Pp. 464. \$3.75.

Essaying to do for the American city what Beatrice and Sidney Webb have done for the manor and the borough in England and what other scholars have done for the American town, Dean Griffith has written an excellent pioneer study of the municipal incorporations in the thirteen colonies prior to the American Revolution, basing it upon an elaborate survey of local histories, published and unpublished documentary collections, and state and municipal archives. Discussing the towns only incidentally, he presents a topical analysis rather than a chronological history of colonial cities and boroughs, the total number of which, he estimates, "lay somewhere between twenty and forty-five according to the criteria chosen" (p. 97). Extending geographically from Gorgeana (York) in the north to Savannah in the south, they ranged from "paper" cities like Bermuda and James, which were founded by the Virginia Company and later dwindled to "three or four inhabited houses," to Philadelphia and New York, whose municipal activities on

the eve of the Revolution "would have been almost recognizable by moderns" (p. 414). Here are discussed with admirable lucidity such topics as the reasons for the establishment of colonial cities, the sources and extent of their powers, the duties and perquisites of their officials, the degree of popular participation in municipal functions, the English and Dutch contribution to American cities, problems of municipal finance, the general quality of government, and the relation of the municipalities with the government of their colony. Of especial importance is the treatment of the evolution of the property tax "that was ultimately to prove by far the most significant contribution of the colonial period to the subsequent course of American fiscal development" (p. 311).

In this study Maryland cities receive their due share of attention. Desirous of promoting settlement and commerce Lord Baltimore granted a charter, now lost, to St. Mary's probably in 1667, but its powers lapsed after the incorporation of Annapolis in 1696. Maryland's new capital was one of the few colonial cities that bore evidences of city planning and was, in addition, "perhaps the only example of a democratic corporation becoming 'close' through usage" (p. 162). But popular elections were subsequently resumed, and by the middle of the eighteenth century Annapolis enjoyed a franchise almost as liberal as that of New York. Under the radical leadership of Samuel Chase popular rights were still further extended, and Annapolis shared the spirit of other colonial cities in resisting the mother country. Baltimore, though its population almost doubled that of Annapolis, remained an unincorporated town at the end of the colonial period and so fell almost entirely outside the purview of this study.

This volume is typographically attractive and contains an adequate and trustworthy index. It demonstrates how effectively antiquarian researches can be utilized by a skilful synthesizer to produce a notable contribution to institutional history.

DONALD MARQUAND DOZER.

University of Maryland.

Youth Tell Their Story. A Study of the Conditions and Attitudes of Young People in Maryland between the Ages of 16 and 24. Conducted for The American Youth Commission. By HOWARD M. BELL. Washington: American Council on Education, 1938. \$1.50.

Ever since we have been blessed with an "old" and a "young" generation—and that has been for some time—we have been faced with a youth problem. At certain times, the problem has been termed real, at others imaginary. Perhaps a truer statement might be that the problem has attained varying degrees of seriousness. Even the casual observer must realize, however, that the economic instability of recent years has heightened youth's problems to the point of gravity for youth and adult alike.

Little aid can be given youth in solving their problems until something is known about those problems. "Youth Tell Their Story" presents the results of an objective survey stating the opinions of Maryland youth on various phases of home, school, work, play, church and current problems. Some 13,500 youngsters of both sexes, of varied circumstances, educational levels and backgrounds are represented. The author contents himself for the most part with giving the facts, often in lively pictographs, as he found them.

The resulting picture of youth is neither idealistically pretty, nor realistically ugly. The need for much more attention to youth's problems is the chief impression. Social and economic environments have changed far more drastically and more rapidly than have the youngsters themselves. Most youth want marriage, homes and children, but find such objectives difficult to attain on their median weekly salary of less than thirteen dollars. Half of the youngsters believe that their education "had been of no great value to them," while 70% feel their communities' lack of adequate recreation programs. Seven-tenths of them are at least moderately active members of some church. At their last opportunity, 55% of them voted, a figure which compares favorably with the nationwide 65% in

the last presidential election. More than anything else the youth of today desire economic security.

Lest one become alarmed at some of the above findings, it might be well to mention that one-third of these youngsters are living in broken homes, and that over half of them were forced by economic reasons alone to leave school at about the eighth grade.

Opinions based on such human experiences are not altogether valueless. "Youth Tell Their Story," a preliminary step toward approaching youth's problems, is worth the attention not of the sociologist alone, but of every person associated with, or interested in children. It is an interesting and challenging picture of how our young people live, what they believe, what they do, and what they hope to do.

H. R. MANAKEE.

Pennsylvania Iron Manufacture in the Eighteenth Century.

By ARTHUR CECIL BINING. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Historical Commission, 1938.

In a scholarly manner, Dr. Bining, assistant professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania, discusses the origin of Pennsylvania's iron and steel industry and its development until the period of the great financial and technical growth which came with the Industrial Revolution. Much of this story—the mechanical side of the industry and its social, economic and political aspects—is typical of early iron manufacture elsewhere in the nation as well as representative of Pennsylvania. Several items of local interest appear including mention of the establishment of the first bloomery in Cecil County approximately a year or two prior to 1716. The book emphasizes the sore need of a similar study for Maryland. Such abundant material is available that little more than careful compilation and interpretation would be necessary. Dr. Joseph T. Singewald, Jr., of course, has touched on phases of Maryland's early iron industry in his "Report on the Iron Ores of Maryland" (1911), but his chief interest was geological rather than historical.