"DOING GOOD TO POSTERITY": The Move of the Capital of Maryland in 1695 from St. Mary's City to Ann Arrundell Towne, now called Annapolis

by Edward C. Papenfuse, State Archivist.

Any hopes that St. Mary's City would become the thriving metropolitan capital of Maryland and the principal city of the Chesapeake Bay watershed were buried with Philip Calvert in the winter of 1682-83 as he was laid to rest in a lead coffin beneath the floor of the Jesuit Chapel, one of three large brick buildings that dominated the tiny village on the St. Mary's River.[1]

---

1 Henry Chandlee Forman, Jamestown and St. Mary's Buried Cities of Romance, (Baltimore, Md., 1938) and Henry M. Miller, "The Country's House Site An Archaeological Study of a Seventeenth-Century Domestic Landscape," in Historical Archeology of the Chesapeake, (Washington, 1994), pp. 65-83. The latter includes a comprehensive bibiliography relating to the most recent archaeological work at St. Mary's City. All of the public buildings and principal private residences were larger than those initially built in Annapolis after the move of the capital there in 1695. For example, the State house was approximately nine feet wider (excluding wings), although it was approxiately the same length, as the State House built in Annapolis, while Philip Calvert's townhouse was thought to be one of the largest brick homes ever built in Maryland. See Forman, p. 287 and pp. 253-266. Forman calls the latter "the Governor's Castle," but is was built by Philip as "St. Peters." See the more recent archaeological and historical work cited in Henry Miller's bibliography.

In their vision of Maryland Philip and his older half-brother Cecil, second Lord Baltimore, saw a countryside dotted with market towns, with one capital city serving as an urban center. This was the European way, the way of civilized society as they knew it. But the tidewater Chesapeake was not Europe, and Maryland would develop to reflect the special characteristics of this new world that discouraged concentrated urban settlement. The Calverts' dream did not die. It was merely refined, recast, and then postponed to a later time and another place.[2]

On November 15, 1633, nearly fifty years before Philip Calvert's death, Cecil Calvert had penned instructions to the leaders of the first wave of settlers then bound for Maryland aboard the Ark and the Dove.[3] After detailing how the leaders of the expedition were to cope

---

2 There were numerous failed town plans for Virginia as well. As early as 1607, Captain John Smith urged a vision of urbanization on the Virginians that was similar to that of the Calverts. But he had considerable less success than they, and Virginia remained immune to the lively debate and theoretical argument for how cities ought to be created that saw some success in Maryland. Governor Nicholson, on his removal to Virginia in 1699, did manage to move the capital to Williamsburg and superimposed some elements of a plan on the town that resembled the efforts in Annapolis, but the planter oligarchy which reveled in the virtues of dispersed settlement and plantation life, was too powerful in Virginia. London remained the principal city of Virginia, while, towards the end of the eighteenth century, Maryland planters and Pennsylvania entrepreneurs launched the first sucessful urban venture on the banks of the Patapsco. See John Reps, Tidewater Towns (Williamsburg: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972), passim; J. A. Leo Lemay, The American Dream of Captain John Smith, (Richmond: The University Press of Virginia, 1991), passim; Clarence Gould, "The Economic Causes of the Rise of Baltimore," in Essays in Colonial History Presented to Charles McLean Andrews by his Students(Freeport, N.Y.: Books for Libraries Press, Inc., 1966), pp. 225-251.

3 Their destination was only vaguely understood. On June 20 1632, the king of England, Charles I, granted Cecil Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, lands to the northward of Virginia encompassed within two degrees of latitude. The southern boundary ran along

with William Claiborne and his settlement on Kent Island and a Virginia government hostile to the idea of a new colony in the Chesapeake, Calvert paused to outline his vision of the future of his colony, a vision in which a prosperous city dominated the landscape. There the majority of the population would live and daily venture out to till their fields.

Once the colonists had erected a fort, he wrote, their leaders were to "make choice of a fit place near unto it to seat a town. . . ." They were to have "all the Planters to build their houses. . .near adjoining one to an other, and. . .to cause streets to be marked out where they intend to place the town and. . .cause divisions of land to be made adjoining on the back sides of their houses. . .for gardens and such uses."[4]

---

the Virginia bank of the Potomac River across the Chesapeake Bay to an obscure place called Watkins Point on Virginia's Eastern Shore and from there to the Atlantic Ocean. The northern boundary was thought to be New England, but no one knew for certain. The changes in language describing the boundaries of Maryland made as Lord Baltimore's request for a grant made its way to the King are documented in the original warrants to be found in the Hugh Young collection of Calvert Papers owned by the Enoch Pratt Free Library. The final text of the boundaries is reprinted from the 1635 edition in The Charter of Maryland, June 20, 1632, published by the Maryland State Archives, 1982.

4 The full quotation reads: "make choice of a fit place near unto it to seat a town. That they cause all the planters to build their houses in as decent and uniform a manner as their abilities and the place will afford, & near adjoining one to another, and for that purpose to cause streets to be marked out where they intend to place the town and to oblige every man to build one by another according to that rule, and that they cause divisions of land to be made adjoining on the back sides of their houses and to be assigned onto them for gardens and such uses according to the proportion of everyone's building and adventure and as the conveniency of the place will afford which his Lordship referreth to their discretion, but is desirous to have a particuler account from them what they do in it. ..." The Calvert Papers, in Maryland Fund Publication 28, (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1889), pp. 131-150.

That Cecil Calvert envisioned such an urban world was not remarkable. He lived part of the year in London, which in 1633 was a bustling city of about 340,000 people.[5] Its prosperity gave Calvert an attractive model to follow. Cecil saw his city in the New World as a place of learning and protected religious instruction, a matter of special importance to the Catholic Calverts.[6] Culture would flourish there, and society would achieve refinement. Like London, his new city would be a center of foreign trade, making tax collection easier and ensuring a regular flow of proprietary revenue. Clever and industrious men would find fame and fortune regardless of social standing. Indeed, one of the most popular legends of Cecil Calvert's day was that of Dick Whittington: the rags to riches story of a fourteenth-century ragamuffin who became Lord Mayor of London.[7]

---

5 Cecil Calvert also managed Kiplin Hall, his country home in Yorkshire, and his wife's estate called Hook House, adjacent to Wardour, his father-in-law's castle near Salisbury. For an excellent essay on the latter, see Bryden Bordley Hyde, New Light on the Ark and the Dove Representations of the Vessels in England. The Architectural Setting, Maryland Historical Magazine, 48:185-190, and for Kiplin Hall see Mrs. Arthur Barneveld Bibbins, The English Beginnings of Maryland, Ibid., 28:283-310; Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed., entry under "London," p. 965.

6 English Catholics, for the most part under the leadership of the Catholic Bishop of London (head of the secular clergy, as distinct from orders like the Jesuits), managed to thrive despite persecution and internal strife. Considerable energy was expended in hiding the Church from Protestant England with perhaps the greatest successes and freedom being obtained in London. For a good introduction to how the priesthood functioned in secret see Godfrey Anstruther, The Seminary Priests, A Dictionary of the Secular Clergy of England and Wales 1558-1850, (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon) n.d. A number of the secular priests had links to Maryland under various aliases disclosed by Anstruther.

7 See Lawrence and Jeanne C. Fawtier Stone, An Open Elite?: England, 1540-1880 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984). See also Caroline M. Barron, "Richard Whittington: The Man behind the Myth" in Hollaender, E.A.J., Studies in London

In 1634, Maryland's first settlement on a tributary of the Potomac River was actually a Yaocomico village that the Native American inhabitants had turned over to the settlers, not the European town that Cecil Calvert had imagined. The colonists were sensitive on this point and their spokesperson, the Jesuit Father Andrew White, hastened to reassure Lord Baltimore that they were only making do for the moment in order to get their crops planted. He indicated that they would turn to city building shortly in the fashion that Calvert had dictated, and indeed had already planted gardens adjoining their Indian-made dwellings.[8]

History (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1969), pp. 197-248, especially p. 199: "For forty years, through political upheaval, dynastic change, foreign war and internal rebellion, Richard Whittington managed to create and maintain a considerable fortune." In 1668 Samuel Pepys was entertained at the Southwark fair by a popular puppet show "of Whittington which was pretty to see; and how that idle thing do work upon people that see it, and even myself too." Ibid., p. 197 n. 2. As late as the eighteenth century the story of Whittington's success was thought to be a good example for the young. The poet Oliver Goldsmith remarked that it "might be more serviceable to the tender minds, than either Tom Jones, Joseph Andrews, or an hundred others, where frugality is the only good quality the hero is not possessed of." Ibid., n. 4.

8 The European settlers referred to Native Americans as "Indians," and such contemporary usages is followed here. The interpretation of the colonists' uneasiness about not following their instructions to the letter is based upon a close reading of all of the narratives attributed to Father White. The first printed version was dated May 27, 1634 and published later that year. The last was published in 1635. In the 1634 and 1635 versions White takes pains to tell of their making do with Indian dwellings, planting gardens adjoining the Indian dwellings, and their expectation of living in something better soon. See: A Relation of the Successful Beginnings of the Lord Baltemore's Plantation in Mary-land, 1634, reprinted by the Maryland State Archives, 1984, and A Relation of Maryland, 1635, in Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684, edited by Clayton Colman Hall (New York: Scribner's & Sons, 1910), pp. 76-77. In all liklihood the earliest version of Father White's narrative (reprinted by the Maryland State Archives as A Briefe Relation of the Voyage Unto Maryland, 1984) is a manuscript

But the tidewater economy of the seventeenth century did not lend itself to urbanization. Tobacco, which became colonial Maryland's chief commercial crop, required large amounts of arable land close to navigable water. The rivers and creeks of the Chesapeake opened to settlement a vast wild acreage, and early settlers bought or rented as much land as they could. Tobacco offered land-hungry Englishmen both a profitable enterprise and the opportunity to create large plantations, landholdings of a size available to only the very highest placed in England.

Instead of re-creating the neat villages or market towns of their homeland, Maryland's early settlers spaced themselves apart from each other on plantations carved from the wilderness. They traveled throughout the tidewater mostly by boat or by foot. The settlers brought very few horses into the colony in its early years. Not until the 1670s were they common, and only then did roads suitable for wagon or carriage traffic begin to replace the narrow Indian trails that crisscrossed the interior. For most of the seventeenth century, the settlers' main access to each other was by water, their primary protection the defenses of their own plantations.[9]

---

purchased by the Maryland Historical Society in 1894 and printed in 1899. See Fund-Publication, No. 35, The Calvert Papers Number Three (Baltimore: The Maryland Historical Society, 1899).

9 There seems to have been an early Ferry over the St. Mary's River indicating that some people traveled to the Capital over land from their plantations. Archives of Maryland (Baltimore & Annapolis: The Maryland Historical Society & The Maryland State Archives, 1883-) 1:534-35; 78 (hereafter referred to as Archives). Indeed Augustine Herrman and the ambassadors from New Amsterdam in 1659 (see below, note 13) seem to have traveled by land as much as they did by water on their journey to St. Mary's City. Inventories of estates, however, indicate that in the early years of settlement there were few horses to ride and the most frequent mode of transportation was by boat. See

They lived in relative isolation, employing indentured servants and slaves to produce the food they needed and, above all, to raise the tobacco that allowed them to import all else that was necessary to the life of the plantation.

Whether incoming or outgoing, trade was conducted from each plantation's landing or wharf. When the tobacco was ready for market, the hogsheads in which it was packed for shipping were rolled or dragged to the landing to be ferried out to waiting ships for the trip to England. The same ships brought in manufactured goods and foodstuffs that the people on the plantations could not produce themselves.

Early Marylanders saw no need for towns. In their search for land, newly arrived settlers moved farther and farther from St. Mary's City. In 1650, a group of Puritans from Virginia established themselves at the mouth of the Severn River in a settlement they called Providence, but within a few years they too spread out with no inclination to make Providence an urban center.[10]

---

the analysis of probate records in the research files of the St. Mary's City Commission at the Maryland State Archives compiled by, and under the supervision of, Dr. Lois Green Carr.

10 for a fictionalized account of Providence based upon exhaustive research, see James Moss, Providence Ye Lost towne at Severne in Maryland (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1976).

In 1657, thirty-year-old Philip Calvert and his wife, Anne, arrived in St. Mary's City, where Philip was to hold various offices and be his brother's advisor on provincial matters. Even then, twenty-two years after Cecil Calvert wrote his instructions on the creation of a city, the village of St. Mary's remained a place of promise but little else.

Almost immediately Philip applied himself to strengthening the structure of government and, over time, gave his blessing to efforts of the Assembly to promote the diversified economy that would encourage urban development. As mayor of St. Mary's City, he must have dreamed of a time when a great city such as London, Rome, or Lisbon might arise on the banks of the St. Mary's River.[11] In fact, there is archaeological evidence of the beginnings of a grand baroque scheme of development that Philip Calvert and the colony's Surveyor General, Jerome White, may have derived from their knowledge of Pope Sixtus the V's implementation of urban planning in Rome (1585-1590), and from an acquaintance with the ideas of John Evelyn (1620-1706). Sixtus's plan for Rome was based upon the symbolism of the trinity incorporating four major geographical axes of the Eternal City that in turn resulted in streets forming triangles. The placement of the public buildings in St. Mary's seems to follow such a triangular concept of meaning as well as planning, while the streets radiating out from Rome's Piazza del Populo bear a striking resemblance to not only the plan for St. Mary's City, but also to what occurred with the plan for Annapolis nearly three decades later.

---

11 For Philip as mayor of St. Mary's City see Archives 51: 383; Michael Sharratt, ed. Lisbon College Register 1628-1813(London: Catholic Record Society, 1991), pp. 26-27. Philip, age 15, came with some knowledge of Latin in June 1642, and left for home via Holland in April 1647.

The actual and intellectual link between the two city plans for Maryland may well be John Evelyn (1620-1706) whose brother Richard married into the family of Cecil Calvert's mother, Anne Mynne, and who knew Jerome White's parents in Rome, where as English Catholics, they had gone to escape the religious conflicts ("our Civil broiles") at home. Indeed, in 1671, the year after Surveyor General Jerome White returned to England from St. Mary's City, he happened to fall into company with Evelyn. Evelyn found him to be a "very ingenious Gent.," and fondly remembered Jerome's parents from their days in Rome where they "lived & died with much reputation." It is Evelyn who submitted a plan to King Charles II (in the Queen's bedchamber) for the rebuilding of London only days after the disastrous fire of 1666, a plan strikingly similar to the Piazza del Populo (described in detail in Evelyn's diary) and the present historic district of Annapolis.[12]

---

12 For Pope Sixtus the V's impact on Rome see Erwin Anton Gutkind, International History of City Development Volume IV Urban Development in Souther Europe: Italy and Greece (New York: Free Press, 1969), pp. 431-434. The Piazza del Populo with its radiating streets existed before Sixtus the V's time, but it was he who incorporated it into the grander scheme for the city. I am indebted to Henry M. Miller for the suggestion of Jerome White's and John Evelyn's connection with the plan for St. Mary's City. See Miller's exemplary work on St. Mary's City cited in n. 1 above, but especially "Baroque Cities in the Wilderness: Archaeology and Urban Development in the Colonial Chesapeake," Historical Archaeology, (1988) 22, no. 2: 57-73. For a brief biography of Jerome White see Edward C. Papenfuse, A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979-1985), I: 882. The relationships among the Mynne's, the Calvert's, the Evelyn's and the White's are gleaned from E. S. De Beer's edition of the The Diary of John Evelyn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), especially III: 33, n. 6; 595, and II: 542, n.3. Evelyn's visit to the Piazza del Populo is detailed in II: 374-75. John Evelyn presented his "plot for a new city" out of the rubble of the London fire on September 13, 1666, eleven days after the fire commenced. "I presented his Majestie with a Survey of the ruines, and a Plot for a new Citty, with a discourse on it, whereupon, after dinner his Majestie sent for me into the Queenes Bed-chamber, her Majestie & the Duke onely present, where they examind each particular, & discoursd upon them for neere a full houre, seeming to be extreamly

When Augustine Herrman came to St. Mary's City as ambassador of the Dutch in New Holland (later New York) in 1659, Philip talked with him about "new Netherland and Virginia, and the conveniences of both." He expressed the wish that Maryland might "be so fortunate as to have cities and villages like [the] Manhattans."[13]

Two years later, Philip's twenty-four-year-old nephew Charles, the future Lord Baltimore, arrived in Maryland as governor. Charles undoubtedly chaffed under the watchful eye of an uncle only eleven years his senior. The two did not get along well and Charles complained to his father of Philip's intrigues and warned of Philip's efforts to win the respect of the people. Cecil apparently told both to follow a principle he first set forth in his 1633 instructions and which he repeated in his draft of the 1649 Act of Toleration: remain silent and keep their opinions to themselves. Both seem to have heeded the advice and settled into a long, uneasy truce at St. Mary's City.[14]

---

pleasd with what I had so early thought on:," III: 463. It is hard to believe that such enthusiasm and the plans themselves were not shared with a wide circle of family and friends, although the plans themselves would not be published until 1748. Ultimately Charles Calvert, third Lord Baltimore inherited Woodcote from his Mynne cousin Elizabeth Mynne Evelyn (c. 1628-1692), the widow of John Evelyn's brother, Richard. She was the grand niece of Anne Mynne, wife of the First Lord Baltimore, George Calvert. She was born at about the same time as George Calvert's youngest son, Philip, although they were not blood relatives. No one is certain who Philip's mother was, but is was not Anne Mynne who had died in 1622. Elizabeth Mynne Evelyn had no surviving children. II: 542, n.3.

13 Hall, Narratives, pp. 321-22.

14 The rivalry between Philip and Charles may date to Charles's earliest memories. Philip was the youngest son of George Calvert, 1st Lord Baltimore, born in in 1627. When his father died, Philip was entrusted to his eldest half-brother, Cecil, the Second Lord

Since it appeared that towns in Maryland would not become a reality without encouragement, Charles Calvert, upon instructions from his father, issued a proclamation in 1668 establishing eleven town sites throughout the province through which goods were to be imported. One of these town sites was, of course, St. Mary's, but another was to be situated at "Richard Acton's land in Arundell County." This is the first mention in the records of a town located on the present site of Annapolis.[15]

Baltimore, with the specific provision that he be properly educated. In 1642, at the age of 15, Philip was sent to school in Lisbon where he remained until 1647. He seems to have done well in his studies and defended a thesis in Physics. From 1635, when Charles was born, until 1642 when Charles was five, and then again from 1647, when Charles was nine, until he emigrated to Maryland in 1656, Philip probably was in the household of his guardian Cecil, and quite likely in close contact with his nephew. See: unpublished biographical sketches of Philip Calvert by Lois Green Carr and Edward C. Papenfuse, Maryland State Archives; Lisbon College Register, 1628-1813. (London: Catholic Register Society), 1991, p. 26; Edward C. Papenfuse, et. al.,A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature, 1635-1789. Volume I. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), entries under Philip and Charles Calvert. Charles wanted to return to England in 1665 and in April of 1664 complained bitterly of Philip to his father, telling Cecil that it was a mistake to make him governor in Charles's absence. "I have great cause to fear that I shall find much confusion at my return; ... [I] am very sensible how much he has disgusted all in General & especially those that have been ever faithful to your lordship. .... what he has endeavored to do is to draw the affections of the people from me which I do not fear in the least." If he did not 'fear' it in the least, why worry about making Philip governor? Unfortunately the response from Cecil has not survived, but by the next surviving letter of April 1672, a delicate truce seems to have been struck, although tension with his Uncle is clear from the tone of the text. For Charles's surviving letters to his father, see The Calvert Papers. Number one. Fund-Publication, No. 28. (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1889), pp. 229-305. The language of George Calvert's will (dated April 14, 1632) reads: "Item I doe giue, and bequeath to my youngest sonne Phillipp Calvert the some of three hundred pounds to be paied unto him att the age of one, and twenty, And for his educatcon and maintenance in the meane tyme I doe order and require my eldest sonne Cicell Calvert to take care, and be att the charge thereof." Ibid., p. 48.

15 Archives, 5: 31. discussed in Reps, Tidewater Towns, pp. 92-116.

Calvert's proclamation was modified several times over the next three years, and a map made by Augustine Herrman in 1670 shows thirteen town sites. One of them, named "Arundelton," was on Acton's land, however, it appears that little development actually occurred there.[16] The same was true of other townsites throughout the colony. Charles Calvert described the situation for the Lords of the Committee of Trade and Plantations in March 1678.

The principal place or town is called St. Mary's. But it can hardly be called a town...being in length...about five miles, and in breadth...not above a mile, in all which space, excepting only my own house and buildings wherein the courts and public offices are kept, there are not above thirty houses, and those at considerable distances from each other.

Charles characterized the buildings in St. Mary's City and in the rest of the colony as being "very mean and little...and generally after the manner of the meanest farm houses in England." Nor were there other places that could be called towns, since the people did not choose to build near each other, but instead "near the waters for convenience of trade." Built as they were with "land on each side of and behind their houses," and "in most places...not fifty houses in the space of thirty miles."

As a result, he explained, the province had been divided only into counties, without further subdivisions such as parishes or precincts. The latter development he hoped would take place as the number of people increased to the extent that it altered their trade and made it

16 John Reps, Tidewater Towns, (Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972), pp. 92, 94,117.

necessary "to build more close and to lie in towns."[17] Yet, even as the settlement reached the northern Bay and penetrated the smallest creeks, tobacco remained the major export crop. The plantation system would not die, and by the early 1680s, the center of population in the colony clearly was shifting rapidly up the Bay.[18]

Hoping to serve as an example and focus development on St. Mary's City, Philip Calvert moved into the town from Pope's Freehold, his own plantation just across Chancellor's Creek

---

17 Archives 5: 265-266. "The principal place or town is called St. Mary's where the General Assembly and Provincial Court are kept, and whither all ships trading there do in the first place resort. But it can hardly be called a town, it being in length by the water about five miles and in breadth upwards towards the land not above one mile, in all which space, excepting only my own house and buildings wherein the said courts and public offices are kept, there are not above thirty houses, and those at considerable distances from each other; and the buildings (as in all other parts of the province)very mean and little and generally after the manner of the meanest farm houses in England. Other places we have none that are called, or can be called towns. The people there not affecting to build near each other, but so as to have their houses near the waters for convenience of trade and their lands on each side of and behind their houses, by which it happens that in most places there are not fifty houses in the space of thirty miles. And for this reason it is that they have been hitherto only able to divide this province into counties, without being able to make any subdivision into parishes or precincts, which is a work not to be effected until it shall please God to increase the number of the people, and so to alter their trade as to make it necessary to build more close and to lie in towns."

18 See Illustration 6 for maps of population growth in the Chesapeake Bay watershed from 1670 to 1790 and a table comparing the density and growth of urban population in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. The maps are taken from Herman R. Friis, A Series of Population Maps of the Colonies and the United States 1625-1790 (New York: American Geographical Society, 1940). Population figures are derived from Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, American Population Before the Federal Census of 1790 (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1966), Edward C. Papenfuse, In Pursuit of Profit The Annapolis Merchants in the Era of the American Revolution (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), pp. 14 & 155, and Jacob M. Price, "Economic function and Growth of American Port Towns in the Eighteenth Century," in Perspectives in American History, VIII (1974) 123-186.

from the village. In St. Mary's, he built the largest and possibly most ornate dwelling attempted anywhere in seventeenth-century Maryland or Virginia.[19] But his effort was in vain. A city of such buildings was not to be.

Charles Calvert had other ideas. In the seven years following Cecil's death in 1675, Charles shared Philip's concern over the failure of St. Mary's City to thrive. His solution was different, however. Rather than St. Mary's, he began to think about an entirely new capital where the urban dream of the Calverts might meet with more success.

Now the third Lord Baltimore as well as governor, Charles Calvert also had visions of pushing the limits of his colony northward at least as far as his father, Cecil Calvert, had boldly claimed with the map he ordered made in 1670. Dissatisfied with the first map of Maryland published just after settlement, Cecil apparently had the second cartographer add two rows of trees and a new line that cut across the Susquehanna River farther north than on the original map of 1635.[20] Charles wanted to be sure that the Calvert claim was secure, particularly when William Penn received a grant of land to the north of Maryland in 1680. Penn posed a distinct threat to Lord Baltimore's claim to the trade of the Susquehanna and to

---

19 Forman, Jamestown and St. Mary's Buried Cities of Romance, pp. 253-266, on Philip's house, St. Peters.

20 Edward C. Papenfuse, "Where is Watkins Point?" in Maryland Our Maryland (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1987), pp. 91-110; see also "Nova Terrae-Mariae tabula," 1635, and John Ogilby "Nova Terrae-Mariae tabula," 1671, in Edward C. Papenfuse and Joseph M. Coale III, The Hammond-Harwood House Atlas of Historical Maps of Maryland, 1608-1908 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), pp. 6-7.

lands bordering the Delaware Bay.

In 1682 the Assembly considered yet another act to establish town sites and further regulate trade. Political maneuverings, however, and the reluctance of the Lower House to place too much power in the hands of the Proprietor prevented passage of the bill, in part because the Calvert's and a Committee of the Assembly offered a radical departure from English law to achieve their goal. Building on an English common law practice of condemning private land for mill sites (known as ad quod damnum), a principal Philip had broadened to force the return of Eastern Shore lands to the Indians, they argued that private property could be taken for such public purposes as creating towns. The full Assembly balked, suggesting a string of amendments effectively stalling the bill. The amendments underscored their fears that forcing trade to the proposed towns offered no better alternative to their present way of doing business at their individual landings, and that the use of ad quod damnum proceedings provided neither due process nor just compensation for those planters who already had been granted lands by Lord Baltimore at the proposed town sites.[21] Nothing at this point in the

21 In negotiating peace treaties with the Nanticokes and other Native Americans on Maryland's Eastern Shore, Philip agreed to give back land already taken for settlement. To a degree, the Assembly's concerns about the condemnation process were unfounded. For Philip's use of ad quod damnum in his negotiations with the Indians in the 1670s see Archives 51: 70-72. The value of the property so condemned was determined by a jury and the owner was paid what the jury awarded; for the recommendations of the Lower House Committee and the wariness of the Delegates see Archives 7: 352; 368-369; also see Reps, Tidewater Towns, p. 94 ff on the 1682 town act.

discussion hinted at moving the capital, and when Philip Calvert died in the winter of 1682-83, he may still have been dreaming of St. Mary's as the grand city of Maryland.

His nephew nurtured no such dream as he took the first step toward moving the capital city to a location that was not only geographically, but politically and economically more centrally located. With almost disrespectful speed following his uncle's death, Charles summoned the General Assembly to the house of John Larkin at the Ridge in Anne Arundel County on the first Tuesday in October 1683.[22] When the members were assembled, they proceeded to enact one of the most comprehensive urban planning documents ever proposed for Maryland.[23]

Attuned to Calvert's concern, the legislature designated thirty-one town sites throughout the province and appointed commissioners in each county to oversee the surveying. Two of the most central sites were located in Anne Arundel County. One was on land owned by William Burgess on the South River later called London Town, and the other, also known as

---

22 The Proclamation was issued on July 6, 1683, calling for the Assembly to meet on the first Tuesday in October at the Ridge, home of John Larkin, in Anne Arundel County. Archives 17:144. Philip died sometime between the end of December 1682 and March 1683.

23 Eugenia Calvert Holland, "Anne Arundel Takes Over from St. Mary's," Maryland Historical Magazine (1949) 44:42-51; Archives 7: 609-617, "An Act for Advancement of Trade;" Reps, Tidewater Towns, p. 117. The act also, by virtue of its 100-acre restriction on the size of towns, effectively placed Philip Calvert's fine brick mansion outside the city limits of St. Mary's. The slight was probably unintentional, but it is indicative of the speed and the manner in which Charles Calvert turned his back on any plans his uncle may have had for the development of St. Mary's City as an urban center.

Arundelton, was identified as the town lands at Proctor's near the mouth of the Severn River. Of the two, Calvert preferred the South River location for his new capital. He promised the legislators that as soon as government buildings were erected for the "reception of his Lordship and Council and for holding of Assemblies and Provincial Courts and the several and respective offices thereon," he would "make use of them."[24]

Charles Calvert's act summoning the Assembly was a bit too precipitous, however, for the actual transfer of the capital to take place. All of the trappings of government, including the archives, were still in St. Mary's awaiting a proper home. Besides, Calvert had to deal with more pressing matters. William Penn was hard at work attempting to undermine the boundaries the Calverts claimed in their charter. At the same time, a faction at Court was actively campaigning with the King to force him to surrender his grant altogether. In view of the very real chance that he could lose his colony, Charles decided to return to London to defend himself in person, and adjourned the Assembly back to St. Mary's. Any aggressive schemes for colonial urban development, including the creation of a new capital, were put on hold.

This sudden turn of events did not please the members of the General Assembly and Charles

24 Upper House 6th November 1683 [at the Ridge, Anne Arundel County] "His Lordship being moved by this house to nominate a place for the court house, etc, doth say and declare that when a conveniency shall be provided in South River in Ann Arundel County sufficient for reception of his Lordship and Council and for holding of Assemblies and Provincial Courts and the several and respective offices thereon depending his Lordship will make use thereof for such ends so long as he shall see convenient." Archives 7: 517.

felt compelled to explain himself as he prepared to depart for England. He stated that personal business and the need to properly care for and record the laws were his only reasons for the government's return to St. Mary's. "Tis with some difficulty that I must now acquaint you of my resolutions of going speedily for England where the great exigency of my affairs, not my own inclinations, nor love for that place, doth now draw me," he wrote to the Assembly, adding "It is to preserve my interest and to settle my child in an undisturbed right afore I die, that causeth me to resolve upon this voyage."[25]

When Charles Calvert returned to England in 1684, he could not have foreseen how complicated his world was about to become. The death of King Charles II in 1685 and the accession to the throne of his unpopular brother James spelled difficult times for England and for Catholics in particular. The story of Maryland's part in the Glorious Revolution that occurred in 1688 and 1689 is ably told elsewhere.[26] The net effect of the upheavals in

---

25 Archives 13: 4-5; Holland, "Anne Arundel Takes Over from St. Mary's," p. 44. Miss Holland left out much of the quote critical to understanding why Charles moved the Assembly back to St. Mary's. The quotation reads in full: "Tho I had not the satisfaction I reasonably expected at the meeting I gave you in Ann Arundel; Yet I would not have you believe my adjourning you to St. Mary's was the effect of a dissatisfaction in me towards any persons here present. I must confess the danger I saw our temporary law in, and the necessity of preserving them, forced me to adjourn when I thought to have prorogued you. That and my desires of being near my own home at this time, for the settling of my private affairs moved me to appoint the meeting here. ... Tis with some difficulty that I must now acquaint you of my resolutions of going speedily for England where the greate exigency of my affairs, not my own inclinations, nor love for that place, doth now draw me. It is to preserve my interest and to settle my child in an undisturbed right afore I die, that causeth me to resolve upon this voyage."

26 Lois Green Carr & David William Jordan, Maryland's Revolution of Government (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974).

England and Maryland was that in 1689 Charles Calvert lost political control over his colony, although he retained all rights to the land, and in 1691 the Crown appointed a royal governor to administer the affairs of Maryland.[27] The move of the capital was delayed until the next decade.

In the meantime, Anne Arundel County surveyor Richard Beard laid out at least two of the thirty-one towns designated in the act of 1683. One was London Town on the South River where William Burgess, owner of the town land and a member of the Council, promptly built a court house. The Anne Arundel County Court was meeting at London Town by 1689.[28]

The other town laid out by Beard comprised one hundred acres on a narrow peninsula of land near the mouth of the Severn River. The designated town land was owned by innkeeper Robert Proctor, Quaker Richard Hill, and by Lord Baltimore, who had purchased land for the town at Acton's in 1668. Beginning at the south end of what is today Duke of Gloucester Street, near a house owned by Robert Proctor, Beard drew straight lines for the principal streets and staked out lots along what later became Market and Shipwright Streets. The town attracted a few inhabitants, but over the next ten years many of Beard's lot stakes were

27 In 1715, after Benedict Leonard Calvert, fourth Lord Baltimore, converted to Protestantism, King George I returned Maryland to the the Calverts as a proprietary colony.

28 Archives 8:196.

lost, as was the transcript of the proceedings of the commissioners appointed to lay out the town.[29]

The arrival of Maryland's first royal governor had little direct effect on the development of towns. Sir Lionel Copley was an adventurer whose only objective was apparently to make as much money as he could from the colony as he found it. Copley died suddenly in September 1693, just two years into his administration.[30]

To take his place, the Crown next appointed a career colonial administrator, Francis Nicholson, who had explicit instructions for initiating legislation to promote the development of towns. Nicholson, who was an extraordinary manager of resources and people, launched an ambitious program of education, inter-colonial communication, and the renewal of the Calvert's urban dream. An able governor who knew when to stand firm and when to compromise, Nicholson played a significant role in the transfer of the capital from St. Mary's

---

29 In September 1969 I reconstructed Beard's survey on a 1743 copy of James Stoddert's 1718 re-survey of Annapolis, using the scale of the 1743 plat. Beard referred to Busby's Cove, which I believe later was known as Governor's Pond; to Wattring Cove, which I think is today's harbor of Annapolis; and to Acton's Creek, which I believe should be the proper name for what is known as Spa Creek. The coincidence of streets surviving from the reworking of Beard's plan by Governor Nicholson and the Council suggests that my reconstruction is probably not far from the mark. Duke of Gloucester, Shipwright, and Market streets correspond almost exactly with First, Second, and an unnamed street described by Beard's certificate of Survey. Edward C. Papenfuse, In Pursuit of Profit, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), p. 8.

30 Edward C. Papenfuse, et al, A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature, 1635-1789, vol. 1 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), p. 234.

to what later became Annapolis.[32]

When Nicholson went to Virginia, his instructions contained explicit requirements for legislation erecting and promoting towns. Similar instructions undoubtedly existed for his tenure in Maryland but only those for 1705 are cited in the definitive work by Leonard Woods Labaree. For references to Nicholson's instructions for Maryland and Virginia see the Nicholson Papers, Colonial Williamsburg. For the text of his Virginia instructions and the 1705 instructions for Maryland see Leonard Woods Labaree, Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776, 2 vols (New York: Octagon books, 1967), entries 768, 777-778.

32 David W. Jordan, Foundations of Representative Government in Maryland 1632-1715 (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1987) is the most recent and thorough discussion of Nicholson's skills as governor. Jordan finds Nicholson to be more anti-Catholic than the records in Maryland seem to indicate. Nicholson became exasperated with the political power of the Catholics (as he did with any powerful political faction), but he sought to work with the Catholics, not to over-ride them arbitrarily. This can be seen in his relations with Charles Carroll the Settler who was the Proprietor's representative. See Ilustration 7 for a portrait thought to be of Francis Nicolson painted ca. 1710 and and for which the provenance is thought to be South Carolina, Nicholson's last gubernatorial appointment. The portrait is now lost, but the image used here is a photograph probably provided by the dealer in 1940 when it was offered to the Rockefellers as they were restoring colonial Williamsburg. The search to authenticate the portrait continues with documention to date maintained in the reference files of the Maryland State Archives, Commission on Artistic Property.

The governor of Virginia, Sir Edmund Andros, attempted to take over the colony immediately following Copley's death in 1693, and he briefly held power in St. Mary's City before being supplanted by Nicholson on orders of the Crown. Among other things, Andros made off with what I believe was Chancellor Philip Calvert's manuscript copy of the Charter of Maryland, which because of the beneficence of Arthur Houghton, Jr., is now back in the Archives of the State of Maryland. See: The Charter of Maryland (Annapolis: Maryland State Archives, 1982).

For Nicholson's efforts at improving intercolonial communication see his and the Assembly's recommendations for regularly established post routes entrusted to the care of Perry 'the postman.' On May 20, 1695, John Perry appeared in the house "and being asked what he demanded for officiateing as Post [rider] eight times p. Annum betwixt Potomac River and Philadelphia, he offers to undertake same for L50 sterling per annum." Archives 19: 189.

When Francis Nicholson arrived in the summer of 1694, he found himself dealing with an Assembly whose membership had changed significantly since the previous session. Twenty-five of the forty-two members elected that year to the Lower House were new, especially those from Kent, Calvert, Dorchester, and Cecil counties, and they were keenly interested in a capital city closer to their respective homes. Also, at least seventeen of the forty-two delegates were either associated with the Proprietor or opposed to the Revolution of 1689. This support was centered in Kent, Anne Arundel, and Calvert counties.[33]

The decision made the following October to remove the seat of government to Anne Arundel County was, therefore, a joint effort between the legislators and the new governor to carry out policies developed in the 1680s. Both saw the need to work with each other for the more effective administration of a colony that was developing rapidly in the direction of Pennsylvania. Indeed some Marylanders failed to stop at the border, and Governor Nicholson would soon find himself pleading with the Lords of the Treasury to supply a small frigate to keep the young men of Virginia and Maryland at home:

> [Pennsylvania] hath ... drawn several familys, but expecially young men from Virginia and Maryland, where land is grown scarce to be taken up, by reason of the great Tracts that single persons have, and will not part with but at unreasonable rates. So that as our people increase, they are in a manner necessitated to look out for new countrys. And a great many going from these parts to see that country having got so great a name [Penn's woods], I fear they may learn their ways, and so make them leave of[f] planting tobacco, or at least run it thither, when they see trade is very loose [and illegally imported goods] are sold as cheap in Pensylvania as in Holland.[34]

---

33 It is no wonder that they appeared to be devoted advocates of moving the Government to Anne Arundel County, nearer to their home counties where legislative turnover was the highest. Carr and Jordan, 190-207; Papenfuse, et al, Biographical Dictionary, Session Lists & Biographies of Delegates.

34 By 1700, nearly 46 percent of the colony's population was in Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Cecil, Kent, and Talbot counties. Calculations based upon data in Lorena Walsh,

The officials and freemen of St. Mary's City were loath to see the capital moved.[35] They immediately sent a petition to Governor Nicholson citing sixteen reasons why they opposed the transfer of the capital. The move would end a tradition of sixty years duration, they argued. And what about the local farmers and others whose economic survival depended upon the many visitors who came to St. Mary's City for the sitting of the Provincial Court and the General Assembly? They used proximity to Virginia as a factor in St. Mary's favor, and then contradicted themselves by saying that geography should have no bearing on the subject. They compared the lack of an advantageous location in St. Mary's to a similar lack in the situation of London, Boston, Port Royal, and Jamestown.[36]

On October 11, 1694, the members of the Assembly replied to the citizens of St. Mary's City explaining that they were advocating a move from "this corner & poorest place of the province to the center & best abilitated places thereof." The tradition of sixty years had not brought much growth or many benefits, they noted, suggesting that the future of the colony's trade and course of development lay as much with cities to the northward like New York, as

---

unpublished notes on the population of Annapolis and Maryland. Nicholson's letter to the Lords of the Treasury is in Special Collection, Maryland State Archives, MSA SC 1124, and is dated June 28, 1695.

35 See Archives 19: 75, in which the Mayor, Recorder, Alderman, Common Council and Freemen of St. Mary's "understand that the house of Assembly now sitting are preparing a bill for your Excellency's and Council's assent to remove from this city the Courts of Judicature and principal seat of government & settle the same at Severn in Ann Arundel County."

36 Archives 19: 71-75.

with Virginia. They disparaged the promise that the Mayor and citizens of St. Mary's would find the resources to provide free transportation for the more distant delegates. And finally, went the Assembly's reply, St. Mary's City was in no position to rank itself with London, Boston, and Port Royal.[37]

Two days later, on Saturday the 13th of October 1694, the Assembly passed "An Act for settling Assemblys & Provincial Courts & Erecting a Court house at Ann Arrundell Towne in Ann Arrundell County," and on October 18, Governor Francis Nicholson gave his approval. The deed was done. The capital would at last be moved.[38]

The move to Ann Arrundell Towne, soon to be called Annapolis, was executed with care. All involved realized the importance of the colony's archives. They took great pains to inventory them carefully, noting any damage inflicted on them prior to the move. Those responsible for the move were required to post bond in case of loss and took special precautions for the journey from St. Mary's. They had sacks and leather covers made to protect the government's papers. Loose papers at first not included in the move were sent for promptly. Every effort was made to protect all the books and papers once they arrived in Ann Arrundell Towne, but the attempt was not entirely successful.[39]The records were stored temporarily in a house

37 Archives 19: 76-78.

38 Ibid.

39 The transfer of the records was not only executed with great care, but also it provides a glimpse of how Governor Nicholson worked with committees. On February 12, 1695 several persons appointed to meet at the State house in order to view and inspect the

provided for them and probably also for Governor Nicholson by Colonel Edward Dorsey. While it may have been adequate for the governor, the house fell short as a storage facility. Rats also occupied the building and badly damaged some of the documents stored there, including Beard's plan for the town. The damage to the plat was significant enough to cause comment later in the Assembly.[40]

So conscious were the members of the Assembly for the safety of the records that they even

---

records lying at the State House, met with Nicholson in the Council Chamber. Nicholson asked "what manner of way would be the best and safest for conveying the said Records by Land." The committee answered "that the best way for conveying same will be upon horses in Bags covered with hides, and that to goe over point patience Ferry is the most convenient Roade." See explicit details for transporting the records, including the bags to be sealed up with the Great Seal of the province. See also the list of records transported. Some loose records were missed and the process had to be repeated. Archives 19: 123; 128-132. The records were temporarily stored "in Major Dorsey's house." Archives 19: 122, 135. Whether the house where the records were kept until the State House was built was the same house in which Nicholson lived is not clear. Nicholson lived in a house of Major Edward Dorsey who also built the 40 foot building to the north of State Circle that was used as the temporary State House until Caspar Herrman and his successors completed the State House on State Circle. See Archives 19:292 for the note on May 1, 1696 "that part of the land lying upon the creek by Major Dorsey's house where his Excellency at present lives be set aside for public builders and if in case the same happen to come within any of the said Major's lots, proposed that land be given him elsewhere for it." In 1706 the assignee of Dorsey attempted to recover costs for the land he lost to State Circle and to a street emanating from the Circle. "Governor Colo Francis Nicholson without any Privity of your Petitioner (who was so valuable a Purchaser) caused Mr. Beard the Surveyor not only to run a Street out your Petitioner's Lots but also a Circle about the public Buildings wherein most of your Petitioner's Land is included to his great Detriment especially considering the Houses have never gained him the 10th Part of the Common Interest of his Tobacco he never being heard thereto." Archives 26: 589. I am indebted to Anthony D. Lindauer for this reference.

40 Archives 19: 552.

forbade smoking anywhere near them, including in the Assembly's meeting place. This was one of the first, if not the first, official anti-smoking ordinances in Maryland. Ironically, it came at a time when the very existence of the colony depended upon the success of tobacco exported by the annual tobacco fleet.[41]

Settling the records in Ann Arrundell Towne, as it was then known, proved to be simpler than arranging accommodations for the fifty-four-member General Assembly. The town was not quite ready, a fact painfully apparent from the journals of the upper and Lower Houses. For the meetings of the Assembly Edward Dorsey hastily built a courthouse adjacent to what is today known as College Creek and just to the north of the spot chosen for the new State House. The legislators were housed at the inn of Rachel Proctor, widow of Robert Proctor.[42]

Besides the legislators and government officials who descended on the town, others whose livelihood depended on the government made the move as well. Among those who followed the Assembly was the widow Dinah Nuthead, who moved her late husband's printing press from St. Mary's to become the first woman printer of official documents in any colony, although she found herself specifically forbidden to print anything other than forms, and was denied the title of official printer:

---

41 Archives 19:548.

42 Forty-two members of the Lower House and twelve members of the upper house. Papenfuse, et.al., Biographical Dictionary, 1: 33. For the suggestion that the Assembly was living at Proctor's Inn run by his Widow Rachel see Archives 19: 194, 201, 207, 208, 268, 272, 273, 274. At least one Committee of the House (Public Accounts) met at Rachel Proctor's. Ibid., 194.

Now the Condition of this Obligation is such that if ... Dinah Nuthead shall exercise and imploy her printing press and letters to no other use than for the printing of blank bills, bonds, writs, warrants of Attorney, letters of administration, and other like blanks, ... nor suffer any other person to make use thereof ... unless by a particular license from his excellency the Governor ...[43]

By the spring of 1695, the government was up and running in the new capital city. That it ran at all smoothly, given the many inconveniences and opposing factions, was due in large part to Francis Nicholson's abilities as an administrator and a diplomat.While not always successful, Nicholson clearly tried to be all embracing as governor. He reached out to as many constituencies as possible and attempted to work with all factions.[44]

---

43 quoted in Lawrence Wroth, A History of Printing in Colonial Maryland (Baltimore: Typothetae of Baltimore, 1922), p. 13. For her petition for a license to print see Archives 19: 306, May 5, 1696. Although she printed the official documents, Dinah Nuthead seems never to have been designated the official Printer to the Colony, a title subsequently given to the Clerk of the Lower House, William Bladen. It was nearly eighty years before Anne Catherine Green became the first woman Printer to the State. One possible reason is that Dinah could not sign her name and may not have been literate.

44 Nicholson attempted to ease the complaints of the Quakers, although he would not support their efforts to be completely separate from the rest of the community. Archives 19: 155-56, 185, 461.

When word reached Maryland in May 1695 that Queen Mary had died, the Lower House of the Assembly requested that Nicholson call for a period of mourning. Because he had not received the official notice, however, this was not possible, nor could he stop referring to the dead queen in official documents. Nicholson's proclamation on the death of Queen Mary is a masterpiece of tact designed to placate, not irritate, the various religious factions.He proclaimed that "...for the ease and satisfaction of persons of tender consciences in the Church of England, to take of all reflections which may be made by our Dissenters, and lastly to obviate all pretenses of the Romanists, as if we seemed to pray for the dead," her Majesty's name was to be omitted in all public prayers and services of the Anglican Church, and a day of fasting and solemn humiliation would be strictlty observed on May 11, 1695. By addressing each religious group in the colony-Church of England, Puritans, Quakers and other dissenters, and Roman Catholics- Nicholson acknowledged their particular needs while maintaining an official position of silence on the death of the Queen until he received proper notification from London.[45]

The care with which he handled the proclamation of the Queen's death may have made the way easier later, on the 18th of May, 1695, when Nicholson and the Council suggested that Ann Arundell Towne be renamed Annapolis, after the Queen's sister and heir apparent, the Princess Anne. In choosing this name, the governor and the Council managed to honor both the future Queen and Lord Baltimore's mother, Anne Arundell, although map makers would

45 Archives 19: 143-145.

not note the change for another forty years. Long after the death of Princess Anne in 1715, by then Queen of England, all printed maps identified the town as Arundelton. It would not be until 1755 that Annapolis at last came into its own as a geographical placename, and even then some navigational charts continued the old name.[46]

Nicholson and the Council could not afford to alienate the Proprietor who still had the right

---

46 Archives 19:187. There is no evidence that Nicholson acted alone in choosing the new name. Records suggest that he and the Council chose a name that would do honor both to the future Queen and to Lord Baltimore's mother, Anne Arundel. See Illustrations 8 & 9 for details from portraits of Anne Arundel and Princess Anne. The portrait of Anne Arundell probably was painted after her death and sent to her son Charles in 1672. On August 2, 1673, Charles thanked his father for "my mothers picture which will be a great ornament to my parlor, and though the Painter hath not done it for her advantage as your lordship writes, yet those things are much esteemed here ... ." The Calvert Papers Number One, (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1889), p. 285. The image used here is from an old photograph that may have its origins in an original sent to the Anne Arundel County Historical Society in 1886 by the then Lord Arundell of Wardour. See MSA SC 21 for the letter of transmittal. This portrait bears a striking resemblance to any number of portraits of Henrietta Maria, wife of King Charles I, and after whom Maryland was said to have been named. The only known contemporary image of Anne Arundel is a coin thought to have been struck before her death in 1649. This image is reproduced in A Relation of the Successefull beginnings of the Lord Baltemore's Plantation in Mary-land (Annapolis: Maryland State Archives, 1990. It is possible that the portrait reproduced here is the one that was sent to Charles and which he may have brought back with him when he returned to England. Courtesy of Mark N. Sehatz, Ann Arrundell County Historical Society. I am indebted to Donna Ware for giving me access to all of her exhaustive research on the Anne Arundel portrait. For details of all known printed maps depicting Arundelton and not mentioning Annapolis see Edward C. Papenfuse and Joseph M. Coale, Atlas of Historical Maps of Maryland, 1608-1908 (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), passim. The first general map to show Annapolis was that of Lewis Evans, published in 1755. The first navigational chart to note the town was the very rare "Mapp of the Bay of Chesepeack ..." printed in 1735, but all of the more readily available charts continued to call the town "Arundelton" until after publication of the Evans map. Illustration 10 is the 1719 edition of the Browne/Senex series of A New Map of Virginia, Mary-land ... from the Huntingfield Map Collection, MSA SC 1399.

to grant lands and collect quitrents on all property in Maryland. Also, it was probably on Calvert's town land that the new church and State House were to be built.[47] Because of the Proprietor's earlier interest in the settlement at London Town on the South River and strong support in the Assembly for maintaining that town as the county seat, the governor and Council had to use their utmost skills to persuade the Assembly that "there be a clause added to the Act for Settling Ann Arundell County Court, nominating Ann Arundell Towne by the name of Annapolis, and that the Parish church be therein built and the County records removed thither" from London Town.[48]

Matters of legislation were not all that occupied Nicholson and the members of his Council. They also set about laying out the plan for the new capital city. Over Beard's first uninspired grid pattern of streets, they superimposed two circles around the highest points on the peninsula. The highest was to be the site of the State House, and the next highest the site of the Anglican church. They then called for major streets to be drawn to the points of a compass, which wrecked havoc with some of the original lots on Beard's survey. The most noticeable change was the creation of a triangular lot formed at the juncture of South East Street (now upper Duke of Gloucester) and Church Street (now Main).[49]

---

47 Archives 19:187.

48 Ibid.

49 For an excellent discussion of Nicholson's background and library from which he may have taken some of his ideas see Reps, Tidewater Towns, 117-140. Reps argues that it is Nicholson following the ideas (and perhaps using a book) of John Evelyn who draws the circles around the highest points and calls for streets following the compass;

The first State House in Annapolis was not completed until nearly three years after the capital was moved from St. Mary's. At one point in the long process, Governor Nicholson lost all patience with the contractor, Colonel Casparus Herrman, and sarcastically observed, "I do admire you should so trifle with the Countrey."[50] He threatened to turn the force of the law on Herrman if he were not finished by the following May (1697), but the contractor responded by dying and the building was not finished completely for another full year.[51]

In the meantime, the government got on with its business as best it could in cramped temporary quarters. Nicholson was not the only one unhappy with the progress of the builder.[52] Tempers on all sides were short. The Governor and Assembly were at odds over

---

essentially a baroque plan designed to focus attention on the State House and Church from as many directions as possible. Nicholson's library contained books by Evelyn in 1695. Reps, Tidewater Towns, pp. 125 ff. It is important to realize that Nicholson could do nothing without the advice of his Council, and the record hints that he consulted freely with them about every measure he proposed. It is most likely that Nicholson had the inspiration for the circles, possibly derived from John Evelyn who probably had already inspired Philip and Charles Calvert with similar ideas (see above, n. 12), but he had to convince the Council and the General Assembly in which Edward Dorsey sat, that if his circles imposed upon Edward Dorsey's land, the Assembly would agree to giving Dorsey compensation, a point Dorsey's assignees were still arguing in 1706 when they asserted that "the then Governor Col. Francis Nicholson without any Privity of your Petitioner (who was so valuable a Purchaser) caused Mr. Beard the Surveyor not only to run a Street out of your Petitioner's Lots, but also a Circle about the public Buildings wherein most of your Petitioner's Land is included to his great Detriment." Archives 26: 588.

50 Archives 23: 62.

51 Morris L. Radoff, Buildings of the State of Maryland at Annapolis, (Annapolis: Hall of Records Commission, State of Maryland, 1954), p. 1-11.

52 Radoff, Buildings, p.6; Archives 19: 340.

Nicholson's ambitious building plans for which the Assembly felt there were insufficient funds.

Finally, Nicholson overstepped his bounds as far as the Assembly was concerned. In the ensuing power struggle, Nicholson's diplomatic skills were put to the supreme test in a confrontation with the members of the Assembly over control of the State House. Nicholson's resolution of the dispute reveals a theme for government that has an amazingly modern, twentieth-century ring to it.

The General Assembly and the government clerks shared the same building, and to get to their offices, the clerks had to pass through the Assembly's meeting room. At times, when the members of the House required privacy for secret or sensitive deliberations, their way was barred.

To make a bad situation worse, the temporary State House was used as a temporary church on Sundays. Taking advantage of the legislators' absence on Sunday, May 3, 1696, the Governor and Council posted a notice on the door of the building stating that the clerks should have free access to their offices even when the members of the Assembly preferred otherwise.

The reaction of the assemblymen was swift. On Monday, they put their grievances in writing to the Council; "This house does highly resent and are much grieved to see their privileges so much entrenched upon...," they wrote, going on to point out that, even "considering the

present inconveniences" they had not prevented the clerks getting to their offices unless "prudence and our Duty to his Majesty's service required it." They requested that the offending paper, in which their

rights and privileges are so trampled upon may not remain upon the Journals of the Honorable Council. For as we shall ever endeavor...to give an ample testimony of our duty and affection to his Excellency and the honorable Council, so likewise, we shall endeavor to preserve the rights and privileges we are entrusted with as representatives of his Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects of this province.[53]

Governor Nicholson's response was that the notice had not been posted on the door of the Assembly, but the door of the church (a fine point as Assembly and church were one and the same), so "that all persons might have public notice thereof." It was up to the Assembly to take it down the next day. He said further that it was not "intended that the privileges of the House should be any ways encroached upon," nor, he added, did he and the Council consider the notice a breach of the Assembly's rights. Taking the offensive, Nicholson argued that to shut up the "King's offices" was "a breach of [the] Magna Carta and the liberties of the people." He then reminded the members of the Lower House that they had a lot of work to do to restore the colony to solvency and that they had twice as many representatives for the

53 Archives 19:304.

population as Virginia to do it with. Rather than quarrel about their privileges, he suggested, they might consider reducing their numbers so that government could be conducted more efficiently.

Seeing that his message only fueled the legislators' anger, the Governor decided to let feelings cool off, at least over night. He called the Lower House to the Council Chambers and suspended (prorogued) the deliberations until the following day, thus legally ending any business of the moment and preventing further action by the Lower House. Nicholson's action was also a not too subtle reminder that he had the power to bring their deliberations to an end if he saw fit.

The governor undoubtedly engaged in some arm twisting of those with whom he dined that night and gave them something to think about. Just before postponing their session for the night he presented the Speaker of the House with a printed sermon for the 'Perusall' of the Delegates during the recess. It was a forcefully argued tract entitled Concerning Doing Good to Posterity originally delivered before King William and Queen Mary in 1690 by Thomas Tenison, since 1695, the Archbishop of Canterbury. In this sermon, which is remarkable for its perception of the ecological and political issues confronting society in both the old and new world, Tenison covered many reasons why it was important to think of posterity in every action taken. He was particularly hard on the "Malicious" who "study on purpose to leave that which must go to others in a ruinous condition." They may be left "without a house for shelter, or a tree for shade, or [with] a field worn out with perpetual bearing, or [with] a paper [such as a will or a law]...without a prayer for the prosperity of those who shall come

after them." Nicholson hoped that a reading of Tenison might 'incite the House' of Delegates to adopt a compromise on their differences, although he probably would have preferred that Tenison were there to give his sermon in person. One admirer thought the Archbishop 'to be absolutely one of the most profitable preachers in the Church of England' whose exhortations were 'heavenly ... almost rapturous.'[54]

We will never know if the members of the Assembly were swayed by the Archbishop's sermon, by Nicholson's powers of persuasion and considerable abilities as a negotiator, or by his authority as an agent of the Crown, but when they came together again the next morning, the legislators were in a different frame of mind. Most of them apparently decided that better facilities in Annapolis would help to solve the problem of the lack of privacy in their deliberations and that they had to do something about the debts of the colony.

The new brick State House, completed at long last in 1698, was forty-six feet long, twenty-two feet wide, and two stories high, with a porch on one end.[55] The roof was covered with cypress shingles. It had an office and jury rooms upstairs and a courtroom and offices downstairs, much like the State House building the government had vacated in St. Mary's

54 Archives 19: 307-308; Diary of John Evelyn, V: 307-308; University Microfilm edition of Early English Books, 1641-1700, reel 852:38.

55 Although there is no contemporary image of the first state house in Annapolis, the details of a conjectural drawing based upon the contemporary instructions to the builder is confirmed by a mid-18th century sketch of the Second State house (Illus. 12) which was built "in the same full and ample manner and form as the said late Stadthouse was built." drawing in manuscript minutes of the Tuesday Club, ca. 1750, Evergreen House, The Johns Hopkins University; Radoff, Buildings, p. 13.

City. A large chimney with fireplaces on both floors was at the end opposite the porch, as was a stair case. The foundation was of stone.[56] With his own funds, Governor Nicholson added the finishing touches to the building. In May of 1697, he ordered "a copper vane and a broad pennant" to place atop the State House cupola.[57]

Nicholson and the Council also attended to the building of a brick church near-by on Church Circle, and to the defenses of the town. They called for a conduit, or canal, connecting Back Creek (now College Creek) and Acton's Creek (now Spa Creek), to be guarded by a gate and towers manned by rangers. The Assembly balked at the cost of the conduit, but supported a ditch and a town gate protected by two towers.[58]

---

56 The description of the proposed State House in the Archives is explicit and detailed: "The Court house shall be forty-six foot in length, from inside to inside, and twenty-two foot wide from inside to inside, brickework two story high, the lower story to be Eleven foot in pitch, and the upper story to be eight foot in pitch and plastered on the inside with a porch & porch chamber fourteen foot long & twelve foot wide of the same work, the roof to be girt and hipped, to be covered with pine or cypress plank and shingled with cypress shingles, with convenient apartments in the upper story for one office, and three small rooms for juries, the porch chamber to be fitted for one other office, at one end of the said house a place of judicature, in such form as at the Stadt house now at St. Mary's is, at the other end a chimney with a fire place therein both below and above, and a stair case by the side of the said chimney, the stairs, windows, & doors uniform or as convenient as may be, the lower floor to be laid with brick, and the upper floors with plank. Reps, Tidewater Towns, 118; Archives 38: 24-25. Some basic changes were made in the course of construction. In May 1695 the Assembly directed the builder to "build ... as it was first proposed with these alterations only, that whereas it was to be shingled upon plank. It shall be shingled upon laths, and whereas the foundation was to be made of brick, it shall be of stone up to the water tables..." Archives 19: 189.

57 May 29, 1697, Saturday, "His excellency is pleased to say that he has sent for a copper vane and broad pennant for the use of the State House." Archives 19:514.

58 Archives 19:516.

King William's free school was built with Nicholson's encouragement and financial support, and the Reverend Thomas Bray sent a library for the use of the school. Some of these volumes survive and are housed in the Special Collections of the Maryland State Archives.[59]

at once began to impress upon the members the importance of public education. He desired the doors of knowledge to be thrown open to the poor: the rich could open them for themselves; and what he wanted was a free school in every county. Our ancestors -- all respect to their memory -- were a rather close-fisted gneeration, and this was a proposition to take their breath away. Ten counties -- ten schoolhouses to be built -- ten schoolmasters to be paid!

But Nicholson was not the man to be turned from his purpose. He argued and pleaded with the Councillors and Burgesses. They would begin with one school at Severn. He would himself give more than anybody. He would pay L50 sterling out ofhis own pocket at once, and L25 yearly as long as he held office. He would give his one third of all vessels forfeited for violation of the navigation acts. In fine, he pushed and dragged and shamed them into liberality; and the Council and Burgesses at last loosened their purse-strings and contributed

59 For the history of the Bray collection see "The Reverend Thomas Bray, M. Alexandre Vattemare, and Library Science," by Charlotte Fletcher in Library Quarterly 27(April 1957), pp. 95-99 and MSA SC 3585 with index on MSA SCM 527. Also see Bernard Christian Steiner, Rev. Tomas Bray: His Life and Selected Works Relating to Maryland, Fund Publication no. 37, (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1901). Nicholson was deeply interested in education. As one historian pointed out, after a close reading of the proceedings of the Council and the Assembly, Nicholson

45,000 pounds of tobacco toward building a schoolhouse and engaging a master. Indeed they thought they saw their way clear to two free schools, one at Severn fo the Western, and one at Oxford for the Eastern Shore.

William Hand Browne in his introduction to Archives 20: ix; 181

Miraculously he did all this within the span of a little over three years, while also wiping out the colony's considerable debt. Nicholson continued in Maryland until the winter of 1698, surviving the vicissitudes of an average of two and one half sessions of the General Assembly a year during the four years of his tenure. His last session was held in late October 1698, and the Maryland Lower House thanked him for being "one of our greatest temporall blessings..." and went on to outline his achievements in effusive prose:

That your conduct over us in this place, your great care and study, has been to promote the practice of piety and worship of almighty god by erecting churches, schools and nurserys of learning both for reforming of manners and education of youth, wherein you have not only been a large benefactor, but an indefallible promoter, together with your integrity of maintaining his Majesty's honor and authority in this province, your care in providing arms and military instruments for the defence of it, your regulating, and happy settlements of the civil constitution, both as to the courts of justice and in bringing us out of debt which the public was in, into a condition clear of debt and money in [the] bank, by your promotion of good laws to such purposes, your care to cause speedy justice to be administered to all persons, your pious and just, your noble and benevolent carriage in all things, deserves better

pens and would take up more paper then this to recount. ... [60]

Thanks to the Reverend Hugh Jones, who arrived in the summer of 1696 to become the minister of Christ Church Parish in Calvert County, we know something about the state of Maryland and Annapolis as Nicholson left them in 1699. On his arrival in Maryland, Jones immediately rode "up to the Governor" in Annapolis where he was "favored with a kind reception." He stayed as Nicholson's guest for five weeks.[61]

In letters home, Jones praised Nicholson for his efforts to bring Anglican clergy to Maryland, noting that the planters "had no protestant Ministers hardly among them till Governour Nicholson's time (who has been a great promoter & Encourager of the Clergy)." [62]

Jones also came to the heart of the problem confronting those who had any hope of a metropolitan future for the colony.

We have not yet found the way of associating ourselves in towns and corporations by

60 Jordan, Foundations of Representative Government, 205-206; Archives, XXII: 276.

61 Huntia A Journal of Botanical History, Volume 7, 1987 devoted to the botanical exploration and discoveries in colonial Maryland, but especially pp. 35-41.

62 Ibid.

reason of the fewnesse of handicrafts men & we have no trade att home or abroad but that of tobacco. There are indeed severall places allotted for towns, but hitherto they are only titular ones, except Annapolis where the Governour resides.

Governour Nicholson hath done his Endeavour to make a town of that place. There are in it about forty dwelling houses, seven or eight whereof can afford good lodging and accommodations for strangers. There is also a Statehouse & a free school built with brick, which make a great shew among a parcel of wooden houses, & the foundation of a church laid, the only brick Church in Maryland. They have two market days in the week and had Governour Nicholson continued there some years longer, he had brought it to some perfection.[63]

What Jones and most colonists failed to realize was that dream of a thriving urban capital, or any dynamic metropolitcan center on the banks of the Chesapeake was not possible without more than the leadership of one man, no matter how persuasive, how determined, how

63 In two letters, one written in 1698 and another in 1699, Hugh Jones described the plants and animals of Tidewater Maryland better than any contemporary, sounding the first warnings of the ecological impact of tobacco planting on the landscape: "tho we are pretty closely seated, yet we cannot see our next neighbor's house for trees. Indeed in a few years we may expect it otherwise, for the tobacco trade destroys abundance of timber, both for making of hogsheads [barrels made for shipping tobacco] & building of tobacco houses, besides clearing of ground yearly for planting." Ibid., pp. 37-41.

powerful. From the beginning of the colony Cecil Calvert knew what he wanted. From afar he pushed his representives in the colony to pursue the ideal of compact settlement and minimal impact on the surrounding countryside. His younger half-brother and former ward, Philip Calvert forcefully advocated that the center of the Chesapeake world should be St. Mary's City. His and Jerome White's scheme for laying out Maryland's capital reflects a cosmopolitan approach to urban design unexpected in the wilderness. Philip's nephew, Charles Calvert, resisted the influence of his uncle and was more realistic in his understanding of how the settlement of the colony was progressing. He shifted the focus of place from the periphery of settlement to the center of the colony, laying the groundwork for a move of the capital that few opposed. It took a Royal governor, backed by the support of the crown and all the implied power of the bureaucracy of the British Empire, however, confronted with the intimidating success of a new colony and the new city of Philadelphia to the northward, to make the move to Annapolis a reality. Still the urban dream of the Calverts' was not realized. Until the mid-18th century Annapolis would remain a

City Situate on a plain,

where scarce a house will keep out rain;

The buildings fram'd with Cyprus rare,

Resembles much our Southwark Fair:

But Stranger here will scarcely meet

With Market-place, Exchange, or Street;

and if the Truth I may report,

'Tis not so large as Tottenham Court,

and even then its energy would be mostly vested in providing a seasonal home for legislators, government officials, prosperous lawyers, and a handful of merchants who successfully challenged London and Glasgow's dominance of the tobacco trade.[64] Inspired leadership of the kind the Calverts and Francis Nicholson provided could carry the colony only so far. The elements of a plan, the arguments for an urban strategy that would encompass more thoughtful, less wasteful use of natural resources and still provide a comfortable, safe and secure home for humanity, were in place. But in the face of overwhelming concern with private gain and private interest, much of which was centered on the cultivation of a staple crop that had no redeeming social value, the dream was postponed to another time and another place. Indeed over the next three hundred years and probably for at least three hundred years beyond, the debate over the meaning of "doing good to posterity" would be at the very heart of defining public policy in America, a process about which little is yet known, but from which there is much to be learned. The struggle between those who preferred to pursue a dream of individual independence deeply tied to rural isolation and environmental

64 from the "Sot=Weed Factor' by Ebenezer Cook, 1708, as reprinted in Early Maryland Poetry, edited by Bernard Christian Steiner, Fund Publication, no. 36 (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1900), p. 29-30; Papenfuse, In Pursuit of Profit, passim.

exploitation, and those who sought the benefits of life in the compact, integrated, interdependent, and ultimately environmentally conscious, city is the untold story of not only the watershed of the Chesapeake Bay, but of the nation. Where does each vision of the New World lead? Which side of the debate would find itself, in the Archbishop's words, "without a house for shelter, or a tree for shade, or [with] a field worn out with perpetual bearing, or [with] a paper [such as a will or a law]...without a prayer for the prosperity of those who shall come after them?"