

examine the casual references and early records of land grants, etc., to determine the original limits. From these it appears now well established that Baltimore County was at first intended to include all the northern portion of Maryland, situated on either side of Chesapeake Bay from the Patapsco on the west to the Chester River on the east, and northward as far as the northern bounds of the province. This broad region was at the time almost entirely covered with forests and the few settlements, limited almost exclusively to the waterways, were not as widely separated as they would now appear to be. The unexplored forests at their backs and the easily traversed waterways in their midst tended to give a feeling of compactness and relative security to these otherwise isolated settlements. The jurisdiction of Baltimore County apparently covered the south shore of the Sassafra and the eastern part of the Chester River from a point near the eastern limits of Talbot at that time. It thus included the present site of Chestertown and the major portion of Kent County. It apparently did not include the few settlements along Eastern Neck which were under the jurisdiction of Kent County.

During the decade and a half from the establishment of Baltimore County to the separation of Cecil County there gradually arose a feeling of distinction between the territory on the eastern and western sides of the Bay, the former being called East Baltimore County from time to time. This feeling, stimulated no doubt by the influence of Augustine Herrman, resulted in June, 1674, in a proclamation by Charles Calvert, Captain-General of the province, announcing that all the territory

“from the mouth of the Susquehanna River and so downe the easterne side of Chesapeake Bay to Swan point and from thence to Hell point and so up Chester River to the head thereof is hereby erected into a County and called by the name Cecill County.”

A few days later, on the 19th of June, a second proclamation was issued stating that

“upon further consideration . . . it is thought most necessary that so much of the Easterne side as was formerly added to Kent County doe still remaine and belong to the said County as afore.”

No record has been found to explain either the time or the territory