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The history of the Lloyd family at Wye Plantation in Talbot County, Maryland, from the 1650s to the early 1770s refines and complicates the dominant historical narrative of the rise of a native-born Protestant planter elite in colonial Chesapeake scholarship. First, the Lloyds were a wealthy and politically prominent Protestant family that benefited from close ties to Catholics up to the end of the colonial period. Second, in contrast to traditional histories of the colonial Chesapeake that emphasize the raising and marketing of tobacco, Wye Plantation’s history attests to the importance of grain and livestock farming on a commercial scale, in addition to tobacco production, on the upper Eastern Shore since the seventeenth century.

This study examines the strategies of the Lloyd family to build their wealth and influence in Maryland in the context of the colony’s political, economic, and social development. In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the Lloyds forged kinship ties to Maryland’s Catholic gentry, to Quakers, and to the Bennets of Virginia and Maryland. With these connections, the plantation’s trade with London and the West Indies expanded. In the mid-eighteenth century, Edward Lloyd III used his status as a trusted client within Lord Baltimore’s patronage network to develop Wye Plantation as a locus of power. Upon his death in 1770, his son moved aggressively to preserve assets that would be the basis of his own independence.

This dissertation uses an interdisciplinary approach to document Wye Plantation’s history. Sources include probate records, government proceedings, the Lloyd Papers and the Calvert Papers at the Maryland Historical Society, the Cadwalader Collection at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, and portraits by Charles Willson Peale.

While plantation ownership remained the basis of social and political authority in the colony, each generation of the Lloyd family made use of the home plantation in context-specific ways. This thesis examines change in the uses of a Chesapeake plantation, and the meanings attached to plantation ownership, from the point of view of each generation of the Lloyd family during the colonial period.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines change in the use and meaning of a Chesapeake plantation from the point of view of each generation of the owning family during the colonial period. Wye Plantation in Talbot County on Maryland’s Eastern Shore has a remarkable history of continuous family ownership from the 1650s to the present day. Inspired by the survival of landscape features from the colonial and early national periods, the thesis begins the work of placing physical changes in the plantation’s landscape in the context of the economic, social, and political history of Maryland. While plantation ownership remained the basis of social and political authority in the colony, each generation of the Lloyd family had a different understanding of the relationship between family, property, and power.

The historic landscape at Wye Plantation has captured the interest and imagination of antiquarians and academics since the early twentieth century. Wye House, as the site is known today, has one of the best-preserved landscapes of a late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century plantation in the Chesapeake region. The extant great house, built by 1792, dominates the view at the end of an elliptical driveway. Early-nineteenth-century outbuildings, such as a dairy and a meat house, add to the length of the façade of the main house. To the rear of the house is a rare surviving eighteenth-century greenhouse with early-nineteenth-century alterations. The greenhouse is an artifact of earlier pleasure garden designs. (See Figures 4 through 7.)

The landscape at Wye House reflects the prominence of the owning family in the early national period, but there are also signs of occupation during the colonial period.
Along an axis that is perpendicular to the one delineated by the driveway and the greenhouse, and closer to the water, stands a mid-eighteenth-century, one-and-a-half story brick building, a remnant of a complex of buildings that may have included the first Lloyd family dwelling on the site. A family cemetery with burials dating back to the late seventeenth century, alongside the greenhouse, offers further testimony to the site's long history.¹ (See Figures 8 and 9.)

Originally conceived as a landscape history that would incorporate written and material evidence about life at Wye House through to the 1820s, this thesis instead focuses on the colonial period of which, admittedly, little survives above ground. Intensive document-based research on the first four generations of Lloyd family residence reveals a complex history of occupation and land use before Edward Lloyd IV (1744–1796) inherited the plantation in 1770. After 1770, Edward IV profoundly altered the use and appearance of the plantation’s landscape. These alterations, which relate to

¹ Histories of the architecture and landscape of Wye House first appeared in *Maryland Historical Magazine* 17 (1922), 18 (1923), 48 (1953), and in Henry Chandlee Forman, *Old Buildings, Gardens, and Furniture in Tidewater Maryland* (Cambridge, Md.: Tidewater Publishing, 1967). See also Christopher Weeks, *Where Land and Water Intertwine: An Architectural History of Talbot County, Maryland* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984), 53–75. The Vernacular Architecture Forum’s 1998 Annual Conference field guide to Maryland’s Western and Eastern Shores offers a more recent treatment (Michael Bourne, Orlando Ridout V, Paul Touart, and Donna Ware, *Architecture and Change in the Chesapeake: A Field Tour of the Eastern and Western Shores* [Crownsville, Md.: Maryland Historical Trust Press, 1998], 115–19). The VAF guide includes the findings of Dr. Al Luckenbach, county archaeologist for Anne Arundel County, Md., who conducted ground-penetrating radar testing and limited test excavations around the brick building in 1997. His team discovered footprints of several buildings and artifacts showing occupation there from the later seventeenth century to the nineteenth century. On September 5, 2006, the *New York Times* reported on archaeological excavations at Wye House led by Dr. Mark P. Leone. The excavations focus on the nineteenth-century period.
his decision to rely on agriculture with slaves for his income, mark a departure in the family’s history and thus provide an end point for this study.

**Historiography**

When writing a multigenerational history of a plantation-owning family in the colonial and early national Chesapeake, the dominant historical narrative of the rise and decline of a planter elite in Maryland and Virginia constantly rears its head. The Lloyd family specifically has been cited as an example of an “emerging native-born elite” at the turn of the eighteenth century. The Lloyds also offer a counterexample of the thesis of “decline” of the planter elite at the turn of the next century. It is not the purpose of this dissertation to prove or disprove the narrative. Instead, as a history of a single site, this study refines the narrative within a specific local context.²

Briefly stated, the narrative that was developed in scholarship in the 1970s and 1980s is as follows. The rise of a native-born planter elite in early- and mid-eighteenth-century Virginia and Maryland was bracketed by social and political instability in the previous century and contests of authority in the era of the American Revolution. Bacon’s Rebellion in Virginia in 1676 and Coode’s Rebellion in Maryland in 1689 were watershed events, ushering in a new phase of political development. Economic and

---

² In his account of early Maryland politics, David W. Jordan discusses the political implications of native-born colonist majority in Maryland. The first two decades of the eighteenth century formed a “critical period when the new elite of native-born Marylanders was firmly establishing its influence.” By 1715, the Lloyds of Wye Plantation were at the “apex” of Maryland’s politics (*Foundations of Representative Government in Maryland, 1632–1715* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987], 157, 181). Jean B. Russo observes that the owner of Wye Plantation during the Revolutionary era managed to increase his family’s wealth despite challenging economic circumstances (“A Model Planter: Edward Lloyd IV of Maryland, 1770–1796,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 49 [1992]: 62–88).
political opportunities for small planters narrowed as a result of a demographic shift to a
native-born majority among whites and a decline in tobacco prices at the turn of the
eighteenth century. After about 1720, large, slave-owning planters dominated politics and society, their power buoyed by renewed growth in the regional economy. Insecurity, however, began to set in among the planter elite after 1750. Contributing to this insecurity, according to histories of Virginia, were planter debt, evangelical religion, and popular politics. In the era of the American Revolution, elites were anxious and their authority challenged. By the early nineteenth century, their hegemony was broken.  

This standard narrative, largely based on the experience of Virginia, pervades material culture studies as well. In the seventeenth-century Chesapeake, where life for colonists was nasty, brutish, and short, most buildings were of impermanent, post-in-the-ground, frame construction. An age of rebuilding after 1720 by the Chesapeake planter elite was the material counterpart to that group’s strengthening of its social, political, and economic power in the region. Landscapes that were expressive of social hierarchy extended beyond domestic settings to churches and courthouses. Surviving mansion houses are considered potent symbols of the age, offering testimony to planters’ dynastic ambitions. In the age of planter anxiety in the Revolutionary and early national periods, large planters adjusted plantation landscapes to increase supervision over laborers, and retreated with their immediate families into more private spaces within their houses.4


The history of the Lloyd family at Wye Plantation vastly refines and complicates existing knowledge of colonial Chesapeake history. Early Maryland and Virginia had much in common, including location along the Chesapeake Bay, the production of tobacco as a staple crop, a dispersed settlement pattern, and a chronic labor shortage that contributed to the growth of slavery. On the other hand, while Virginia was ruled directly by the crown, Maryland’s status as a proprietary colony, and its Catholic leadership in the seventeenth century, made the colony’s history distinctly different from Virginia’s. The Lloyds were a wealthy Protestant family that benefited from close ties to Catholics up to the end of the colonial period. Maryland’s Catholic gentry survived a revolution against the Catholic-led proprietary government in 1689, though its political power was no longer commensurate with its wealth. Another difference between Maryland and Virginia that had important implications for the shaping of Maryland’s elite was the economy. In particular, Wye Plantation’s history demonstrates the importance of grain and livestock farming on a commercial scale, in addition to tobacco production, on the upper Eastern Shore since the seventeenth century. Histories of


colonial Virginia up to the mid-eighteenth century tend to be much more focused on the raising of tobacco. The Lloyd family also used proprietary patronage as a means to wealth. Close attention to the Lloyd family history at Wye Plantation reveals a complex story of changing family strategies in response to political and economic developments in Maryland.⁵

**The Problem of Writing Wye Plantation's Colonial History: A Discussion of the Sources**

Despite the fact that the Lloyds were a prominent family in colonial Maryland, there exists no extensive biographical study of the family and its relationship to the home plantation that reaches back to the seventeenth century, with the exception of Oswald Tilghman’s biographical sketches of successive owners of Wye Plantation in a history of Talbot County published in 1915. Composed from the notes of his father-in-law, Samuel A. Harrison, Tilghman’s sketches provide little documentation of primary sources.⁶

Probate records, namely inventories, administrative accounts, and wills, at the Maryland State Archives provide the most information about the Lloyd family and Wye

---


Plantation during the first four generations of the family’s occupation of the site, up to 1770. The Lloyd Papers at the Maryland Historical Society, a collection donated by a Lloyd family descendant in the mid-twentieth century, contains few personal letters from before 1830 and little information about plantation management before the 1790s. The documentary record is especially spotty for the time between the deaths of the third and fourth masters of Wye Plantation in 1719 and 1770 respectively. After this gap, the papers generated during the division of Edward Lloyd III’s estate in 1770 provide a snapshot of the plantation at the end of his life. These papers are preserved in two collections, the Lloyd Papers at the Maryland Historical Society and the Cadwalader Collection at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.7

Without the benefit of archaeological evidence, information about the Lloyd family’s dwelling houses and most of the furnishings in them before the construction of the extant house has to be drawn from written inventories. Fortunately, three probate inventories from 1685, 1697, and 1719 document the first Lloyd house at the site. Two privately conducted inventories from 1770 document the second-period house.

Land ownership information for this project was collected from two sources: the Legislative History Project biographical files at the Maryland State Archives, and a publication based on that research, A Biographical Dictionary of the Maryland Legislature, 1635–1789.8

---

7 Maryland State Archives, Annapolis; Lloyd Papers, MS 2001, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore; Cadwalader Collection, Series 2, MS 1454, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
The best-documented political figures in Wye Plantation's colonial history are the third and fourth owners, Edward Lloyd II and Edward Lloyd III. Chapter 2 uses government records in the *Archives of Maryland*, published in Baltimore, and the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies*, published in London, to illuminate Maryland's experience of the crown's direct rule between 1690 and 1715. Edward Lloyd II, the subject of Chapter 2, served as acting governor from 1709 to 1714. Chapter 3, which covers the era of Edward Lloyd III, draws upon the published correspondence between Governor Horatio Sharpe, the sixth Lord Baltimore, and his two London secretaries, Cecilius Calvert and Hugh Hamersly, from the *Archives of Maryland*, plus related manuscripts in the Calvert Papers at the Maryland Historical Society. By using sources generated in Maryland and in England, this dissertation places Wye Plantation within a network of people and interest groups on both sides of the Atlantic.  

**Chapter Summaries**

Chapter 1 begins with Edward Lloyd I (c. 1620–1696), the founder of Wye Plantation, for whom Wye was an enterprise in trade, not a home. A native of the British Isles, he resided for a time in Lower Norfolk County, Virginia, before joining a migration of Puritans to Maryland in 1649. Alienated by the efforts of Virginia's royal governor to enforce conformity to the official practices of the Church of England, Edward I and several hundred other Protestants south of the James River followed an offer of religious freedom.

---

tolerance from Maryland’s government. The group settled north of St. Mary’s City, Maryland’s first seat of government, at a site named Providence (at the current location of Annapolis).

Edward I came to Maryland at a critical juncture in the province’s history. The colony, which was founded in 1632, had already experienced its first rebellion. According to the colony’s charter, granted by Charles I to the son and heir of George Calvert, first Baron Baltimore in the Irish peerage (1580–1632), Lord Baltimore and his heirs forever owned the land and held “absolute” authority over its government. This broad executive power allowed the Calverts to avoid the establishment of the Church of England in the colony and thereby provide religious freedom to persons who shared their Catholic faith. The first Lord Baltimore died the year that the charter was given, but his son, Cecilius Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore (1605–1675), followed his father’s intention to establish Catholic leadership in the colony. He soon met with resistance, however. The high profile of Catholics as landowners and officeholders, and the “supreme” authority of the Lords Baltimore in the colony given by the charter, made the proprietary family vulnerable to charges of absolutism and other anti-papist sentiment. In 1644, a discontented mariner named Richard Ingle harnessed the energy of Protestant settlers to damage property owned by a wealthy Catholic minority.\(^{10}\)

As a leader of the Protestant settlement at Providence in newly created Anne Arundel County, Edward I took advantage of the need of Maryland’s proprietor for Protestant support of his government. In exchange for pledging his loyalty to Lord Baltimore, Edward I acquired land on the Eastern Shore, most of which he sold. In 1668, Edward I returned to London, leaving the daily management of Wye Plantation to his son, Philemon (1646–1685). Edward I remained invested in Wye Plantation and colonial trade until his death.

Edward I’s story exemplifies the opportunities for immigrants to achieve upward social mobility in the mid-seventeenth-century Chesapeake. He established a viable plantation on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay, sat on a colonial governor’s council, and returned home to England. Within Maryland’s specific context, Edward I achieved these milestones as a Protestant supporter of Lord Baltimore’s government, setting an important precedent for later generations.

Chapter 1 continues with Edward I’s son. Soon after Edward I returned to England, Philemon married a young, wealthy, and well-connected Catholic widow in Maryland, Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett (1647–1697). The marriage improved Lloyd family access to political and financial networks in the Chesapeake and beyond. Henrietta Maria was a daughter of James Neale, one of Maryland’s Catholic gentlemen immigrants in the 1630s who had been lured by the proprietor’s investment offer of land, rank, and freedom of Catholic worship. She also was the widow of Richard Bennett II, the son of a prominent and wealthy Virginia Puritan of the same name. The Lloyds’ pragmatic domestic arrangements mirrored Catholic-Protestant political alliances in seventeenth-century Maryland. Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett brought to her marriage with
Philemon Lloyd valuable kinship connections to Catholic gentry families in Maryland. This was all the more important after Charles Calvert (1637–1715) inherited his father’s title in 1675. The third Lord Baltimore departed from his father’s strategy of building a coalition of Catholic and Protestant support. Instead, he granted high-level appointments in the colonial government to a smaller circle of fellow Roman Catholics and a few Protestant relatives. For example, whereas Edward Lloyd I sat on the governor’s council, Philemon Lloyd did not. But Philemon did hold an influential position as speaker of the assembly, the legislature’s lower house.

Along with her kinship ties, Henrietta Maria Lloyd brought to the Lloyd family her high status and her wealth from her first marriage. These last two helped the estate through a critical period when Philemon died suddenly by drowning while his children were still minors. Based on evidence from probate records, Henrietta Maria Lloyd provided a measure of stability to the estate by assuming the status of head of the household. Because she did not remarry, the Lloyd and Bennett family estates remained intermingled during her second widowhood, allowing the wealth of the plantation to grow.

Edward Lloyd II (1670–1719), the subject of Chapter 2, was the eldest son of Henrietta Maria and Philemon Lloyd. He inherited significant advantages in Maryland: a kinship network in the colony, kin-based ties to merchants in London, and a family history of political leadership in the province. As heir to an already established plantation, Edward II could profit immediately from planting and trade.

Existing scholarship identifies Edward II as one of Maryland’s “emerging native elite” at the turn of the eighteenth century, citing his inheritance of family wealth and
kinship ties within the colony as reasons for his elevation in government to the position of acting governor. Chapter 2 examines the extent to which Edward II could rely on these inherited resources, because he lived during a time of tremendous political uncertainty and severe economic disruption. England’s Glorious Revolution began the year that he reached the age of majority. In 1688, the Dutch prince William of Orange invaded England, and England’s monarch, James II, a Catholic, fled to France. In 1689, Parliament declared England’s throne vacant and invited William and his wife Mary, who was James II’s daughter, to rule the country. After news of the revolution reached Maryland, rebels overthrew Baltimore’s government in favor of direct rule by England’s new, Protestant sovereigns. Maryland’s royal government lasted until 1715. The crown returned executive authority over the colony to the proprietor following the conversion of Benedict Leonard Calvert, the fourth Lord Baltimore (1679–1715), to Protestantism.

The twenty-five years of royal government constituted a period of political confusion in Maryland. Roman Catholics lost political ground when the crown revoked the executive powers of their patron, the third Lord Baltimore. Protestants, after seizing control of the government in 1689, passed legislation that effectively barred Catholics from holding public office and “places of trust.” Oaths required by law prevented Catholics from serving in the assembly, on the governor’s council (the upper house of the legislature), on juries, and in the militia. Catholics were also prohibited from practicing law in county courts and in the provincial court, a high court of common law. Maryland’s Catholic gentry continued to wield power, however, by serving the proprietor’s private interests in the colony. As part of the third Lord Baltimore’s settlement with the crown in 1690, the proprietor retained his family’s ownership of all land in Maryland and the right
to collect certain revenues. In a private capacity, then, Baltimore exercised his prerogative to appoint Catholics to offices that administered his land and collected his personal income. Meanwhile, when Maryland was under crown rule, periodic interest in England’s government in revoking the charters of all proprietary colonies threatened to end Baltimore’s private control over land and make the colony’s royal government both permanent and fully sovereign. Also during Maryland’s royal government period, England fought two wars against France—King William’s War, or the War of the League of Augsburg, and Queen Anne’s War, also known as the War of the Spanish Succession. The wars interrupted transatlantic commerce and exacerbated difficulties in the tobacco trade resulting from low tobacco prices.11

Edward II had to navigate economic, social, and political change in order to maintain his elite status. Specific strategies discussed in Chapter 2 include expanding mercantile trade with London, investing in the provisions trade with the West Indies,

11 After 1689, men seeking to hold office in Maryland’s provincial government had to take three qualifying oaths. These were an oath of allegiance to the current king or queen, the “test” oath denying the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the oath of abhorrence, disavowing any claim that the pope had spiritual or ecclesiastical authority in England or its dominions. In 1704, the legislature added an oath of abjuration, to swear against “loyalty or obedience” to the Pretender, the son of James II. In 1716, Maryland’s legislators, during their first meeting under the restored proprietary government, passed a law reiterating the requirement of the four oaths (Beatriz B. Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age: The Catholic Gentry and Community in Maryland, 1689–1776,” Ph.D. dissertation [University of Maryland, College Park, 1993], 51, 143, 150; Lois Green Carr and David W. Jordan, Maryland’s Revolution of Government, 1689–1692 [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974], 212–13; Jordan, Foundations of Representative Government in Maryland, 147; Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 61–97; Archives of Maryland, 24:418 [quote], 30:612–17).
attracting patronage from royal officials, and adopting a new transatlantic code of personal behavior that historians refer to as gentility.12

Using different means than his father, Edward II’s eldest surviving son, Edward Lloyd III (1711–1770), developed Wye Plantation as a locus of power during the mid-eighteenth century. As discussed in Chapter 3, the political and economic context had changed. After the crown turned over control of Maryland’s government to Lord Baltimore, who was now Protestant, in 1715, the restored proprietary government remained in place until the American Revolution. Greater political stability in England and Maryland in the early to mid-eighteenth century gave the patronage network of the Lords Baltimore time to expand. As a Protestant, Edward III was in an advantageous position: Catholics continued to be barred from offices and places of trust within the restored proprietary government. Maryland’s legislature in 1716 renewed its requirement

---

of qualifying oaths, and two years later, it passed a new law denying Catholics the
right to vote. The Lords Baltimore still had the authority, however, to appoint Catholics
as officials who were responsible for collecting the proprietor’s private revenue.¹³

As the heir at law of Richard Bennett III (1667–1749), Edward Lloyd III
benefited from the Calvert family’s continued patronage of Roman Catholics in the
eighteenth century. From his kinsman and neighbor, Edward III acquired great wealth
and the trust of the Calvert family in managing their personal revenue stream from the
colony. Richard Bennett III was Henrietta Maria (Neale Bennett) Lloyd’s son by her first
marriage and, like his mother, a Catholic. Edward III strengthened the family tie when he
married Ann Rousby, Bennett’s wife’s niece. Bennett had one of the largest fortunes in
Maryland, as well as a history of serving the Lords Baltimore in documenting and
collecting quit rents, which all landholders owed to the proprietor according to the
colony’s charter. Bennett made Edward III his heir at law, and within a few years of
Bennett’s death, Frederick Calvert, the sixth Lord Baltimore (1732–1772), whose father
Charles Calvert, the fifth Lord Baltimore (1699–1751), had given Edward III a lifetime
appointment to the council, made him his agent and receiver general. This position put
Edward III in charge of recording and collecting the proprietor’s personal revenue,
including the port duties that paid the governor’s salary and the quit rents that were the

¹³ Hoffman’s book, *Planters of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, 77–95, details the events
that led to the denial of the franchise to Catholics in 1718. Shortly after the restoration of
proprietary government, the fifth Lord Baltimore appointed Charles Carroll the Settler
(1661–1720), a Catholic and a supporter of the proprietor during the royal government
period, to an office that put Carroll in charge of both public and proprietary revenue. The
appointment fed popular fears of a resurgence of Catholic influence in Maryland’s
government, even though the fourth Lord Baltimore had converted to Protestantism and
his heir was Protestant. The proprietor rescinded the appointment.
greatest single source of Lord Baltimore's private income from the colony. Edward III also was responsible for transmitting the proceeds to Baltimore's account in London through bills of exchange. During the fifteen years that he held the office of agent and receiver general of proprietary revenue, Edward III exploited opportunities to develop his own patron-client network in Maryland as a credit lender.

With the Bennett inheritance, Edward III accumulated more wealth than any previous owner of Wye Plantation. Maryland's economic growth in the mid-eighteenth century favored his strategy. The market for oronoco tobacco, the lesser quality leaf grown throughout the colony, recovered after 1715. Demand for grain increased at regional ports, especially Philadelphia, to ship to the West Indies and Southern Europe. This stimulated economic diversification on the upper Eastern Shore. Wheat prices supplemented the incomes of planters who could afford to diversify their crops, and land prices on the upper Eastern Shore rose. By the end of his life, Edward III controlled approximately 40,000 acres of land, oversaw 249 slaves, and owned stores, ships, and other assets as a merchant. Hence, with reasons to be confident about his family's long-term prospects in the colony, Edward III constructed a new mansion house at Wye Plantation.

Chapter 3, with its focus on Edward III's relationship to Wye Plantation, updates an early-twentieth-century explanation of Edward III's apparent negligence of his duties in offices of profit. Historians have not strayed far from an assessment, written by Newton P. Mereness in 1901, that Lloyd was too busy with his plantation to perform as agent and receiver general of Lord Baltimore's revenue, but, as Mereness also notes, Lloyd was too influential to be dismissed from the office. This chapter posits that long-
standing structural problems with the proprietary revenue system hampered Lloyd’s ability to “improve” returns. Furthermore, Edward III lacked motivation to resolve these problems because the informal solutions that had been developed in response, such as credit-lending, debt suspension, and debt forgiveness, enhanced Lloyd’s exercise of personal authority at Wye Plantation.¹⁴

When Edward III died in 1770, his elder son, Edward Lloyd IV, moved quickly to establish the family estate on a more focused and sustainable footing based on the ownership of land and slaves. Chapter 4 chronicles the division of Edward Lloyd III’s estate among his three children, providing a rare, in-depth view of the transition of power from one generation of large Chesapeake plantation ownership to the next. For the first time in the history of Wye Plantation, the heirs to the estate were adults when their father died and there was no widow to delay their inheritances. This chapter combines written documentation of the estate division in Lloyd and Cadwalader family papers with visual evidence in portraits of each heir executed by the same artist, Charles Willson Peale, within two years of the estate division. Studying these sources together exposes tension between the heirs’ expectations of the estate division and its outcome.

¹⁴ Mereness contended that Edward Lloyd III was too preoccupied by his “vast estate” to keep up with his office duties, but he was too important for Lord Baltimore to offend by asking for his resignation (Maryland as a Proprietary Province [New York: Macmillan, 1901], 66). Charles A. Barker, in one of the few subsequent comprehensive histories of Maryland’s mid-eighteenth-century politics, gives the same explanation for Edward III’s retention in office despite his apparent negligence of its duties, citing Mereness (The Background of the Revolution in Maryland [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940], 262–64, 264n). Donnell M. Owings restates the argument in a frequently cited reference work on colonial Maryland history (His Lordship’s Patronage: Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland [Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1953], 167).
Edward Lloyd IV’s family portrait by Peale shows the fifth master of Wye Plantation positioned between the family’s past, symbolized by a mansion house on one side of the canvas, and his family’s future, represented by his young daughter on the opposite side. But the gentlemanly ease that Edward IV (1744-1796) displays as heir to Wye Plantation belies the effort he put into shaping the division of his father’s estate to his best advantage as a planter. Edward IV’s brother-in-law, John Cadwalader of Philadelphia, contested his attempts to manipulate the division. In another departure from the portrait’s scene of domestic harmony, Edward IV also faced resistance from Wye Plantation’s slaves, for whom the estate division ushered in an uncertain future for their families and a temporary loss of productivity on the estate.

Chapter 4 has a shorter temporal scope than the previous chapters because of the wealth of information available about the events of a single year. It also complements Jean B. Russo’s well-researched study of Edward IV’s plantation management following his inheritance in 1770. Russo demonstrates that Edward IV pursued a different course of plantation management than his father. This included withdrawal from mercantile trade and a renewed focus on making a profit from agriculture with slave labor. This dissertation places that decision in the context of the Lloyd family’s long history of mercantile trade and planting at Wye Plantation.  

Colonial Chesapeake plantations were not static entities. For plantations with long histories of successive family ownership, such as Wye Plantation, each owner re-imagined his role as a planter and the plantation’s function in that role. This dissertation attempts to capture that imagination through an interdisciplinary approach.

15 Russo, “A Model Planter.”
CHAPTER 1
THE ORIGINS OF WYE PLANTATION: AN INVESTMENT IN COLONIAL TRADE

For Edward Lloyd, the founder of Wye Plantation on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, Wye was an investment in colonial trade, not a home. Edward I (c. 1620–1696), a nonconformist in the Church of England, was a restless man who traveled from England to Virginia, Maryland, and eventually back to London, leaving the daily management of his Maryland plantation and store to his son, Philemon. The founding of Wye Plantation occurred within the context of overlapping histories of trade, politics, and religion in the seventeenth-century English Atlantic.

As was typical of colonial trading ventures in the early modern English Atlantic, a kin-based network was crucial to the development of Wye Plantation. Philemon Lloyd’s marriage to Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett, the Catholic widow of Richard Bennett II, was a practical union of political and financial power in seventeenth-century Maryland. This chapter exposes the complex personal networks the Lloyd family cultivated in order to succeed, politically and financially, in Maryland at that time.

Edward Lloyd I in Virginia

The continuous residence of descendants of Edward Lloyd I at Wye Plantation over the last 350 years belies the geographic mobility and restlessness of the plantation’s founder. Born in England around 1620, Edward I emigrated to Lower Norfolk County, Virginia, by the time he was in his mid-twenties. In 1649, he took part in a migration of co-religionists north along the Chesapeake Bay to a site now called Annapolis, in
Maryland. After establishing a plantation on newly colonized land on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, Lloyd returned to London, where he died nearly thirty years later, in 1696.1

Edward I’s movements around the English Atlantic took place in two overlapping contexts: a general pattern of travel to and from the American colonies by lesser English merchants seeking opportunity in American trade in the seventeenth century; and the English Puritan diaspora of the 1620s, 1630s, and 1640s. As both a merchant and a Puritan nonconformist, Edward I leveraged kinship and religious networks for economic and social advancement in Virginia and Maryland.

Edward I and his elder brother Cornelius emigrated to Lower Norfolk County, Virginia, by the 1640s, where both were men of standing in the county. Cornelius Lloyd represented Lower Norfolk in Virginia’s House of Burgesses between 1642 and 1653, except for two terms when Edward appeared in his stead (in 1644–45 and 1646). Both men were justices of the peace. Edward held the status of “gentleman,” but his elder brother appears to have had more capital at his disposal as a tobacco merchant who could afford to transport servants to Virginia and receive land in return.2

---

Lower Norfolk in the mid-seventeenth century was a port of call for ships traveling between New England and the Caribbean. Given the region’s poor soil for raising tobacco, the sale of meat, corn, and naval stores to the passing ships was a more reliably profitable sector of Lower Norfolk’s economy. Cornelius Lloyd raised surplus cattle for the provisions trade. At his death in 1654, more than half of the total worth of his personal estate, was invested in over eighty head of cattle, well above a single household’s subsistence level. In Lower Norfolk, therefore, Edward Lloyd was exposed to a diversified economy—part tobacco trade, part provisions trade—that he would later help to establish on Maryland’s Eastern Shore. 3

The Lloyd brothers fit the profile of lesser merchants who sought opportunity in American trade following the dissolution of the Virginia Company in 1624. Such men were “unimpressive” and “obscure” in their origins, often born outside London in the families of lesser gentry and better-off yeomen. Entry into the American plantation trade required less capital than participation in European trade, which large London merchants monopolized. Edward Lloyd I followed an ideal pattern of movement for an enterprising

---

3 Hatfield, *Atlantic Virginia*, 43, 45; Horn, *Adapting to a New World*, 144; Brenner, * Merchants and Revolution*, 117–18, 121. The total value of Cornelius Lloyd’s personal estate was 40,361 pounds tobacco or, at a conversion rate of one pence sterling per pound tobacco, about £170 sterling. In the seventeenth-century Chesapeake, one pence per pound tobacco was considered a low price, and as such offers a convenient minimum value for historians. See Paul G. E. Clemens, *The Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 34; Gloria Main, *Tobacco Colony: Life in Early Maryland, 1650–1720* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982), 17, 24. Appraisers of Philemon Lloyd’s estate in 1685 used the same conversion rate to record debts to the estate (inventory, August 3, 1685, Prerogative Court, Inventories and Accounts, Liber 8, folios 398–406, Maryland State Archives, hereafter abbreviated as MSA).
lesser merchant: travel to an American colony, establish a plantation, and return to London as an overseas merchant, having left the plantation to a trusted agent (in Edward I’s case, his son). Critical to a merchant-planter’s success was the development of a personal credit network that typically relied heavily upon kin. 4

Another component of the Lloyd brothers’ presence in Virginia was their identity as Puritans. Cornelius and Edward Lloyd were part of the English Puritan diaspora of the 1620s, 1630s, and 1640s. Lower Norfolk, Nansemond, and Isle of Wight counties of Virginia comprised one node in a transatlantic Puritan network of trade that included Barbados, Providence Island (off present-day Nicaragua), and Massachusetts Bay. In the Lloyd brothers’ parish along the Elizabeth River, tensions flared under efforts by Governor William Berkeley to enforce religious conformity under the Church of England. In 1645, the parish minister was brought to court for not reading from the Book of Common Prayer and not performing ceremonies prescribed by it. After the offending clergyman moved to a different parish, a lay preacher named William Durand attracted the government’s attention for holding meetings on Sunday in a separate congregation, outside of the parish church. In 1648, Cornelius and Edward Lloyd were accused of encouraging sedition when they supported Durand against legal action. The governor banished the lay preacher from the colony and installed a new minister at Elizabeth River, but he failed to dampen nonconformity in the parish. In 1649, Edward Lloyd was

one of several men charged with violating Virginia law for not attending their parish church and refusing to hear from the Book of Common Prayer. Rather than appear in court, Edward Lloyd migrated to Maryland later that year, along with several hundred other Protestants from southside Virginia. Maryland’s proprietor, Cecilius Calvert, the second Baron Baltimore, offered the Puritans religious tolerance (under the Act Concerning Religion passed by the Assembly the previous year) on the condition that they take an oath of fidelity to the proprietary government. The settlers founded Providence, later named Annapolis, along the Severn River.⁵

Edward Lloyd I in Maryland

For Calvert, the offer of religious sanctuary to the Virginia Puritans was a strategy to build Protestant support for his beleaguered government. By the terms of the colony’s royal charter of 1632, George Calvert, the first Baron Baltimore (d. 1632), and his heirs owned all land in Maryland and constituted the colony’s supreme executive authority. A convert to Roman Catholicism, Baltimore envisioned the colony as a safe haven for his co-religionists. He and his successor, his son Cecilius, initially attempted to install men of Catholic aristocratic descent as heads of government in the colony, backed by possession of large manorial estates. Most settlers, however, were Protestants, and religio-political tensions in Civil War England spilled over into Maryland. In 1644, tobacco trader Richard Ingle led an attack on St. Mary’s City, Maryland’s seat of government, in the name of Parliament, which was at war with Charles I. Ingle’s rebellion exposed the weakness of the proprietor’s government in the colony. It was the first of several rebellions strongly associated with Protestants, who intended to reduce and/or eliminate the influence of the Lord Proprietor in Maryland’s local government affairs and to expand patronage outside a small circle of Calvert kin and Catholic gentry. In a bid to strengthen Protestant support for his family’s government, the second Lord Baltimore in 1648 installed as governor William Stone, a Puritan and merchant-planter from Virginia’s Lower Eastern Shore with ties to Parliament. Puritans in southside Virginia, including Edward Lloyd, migrated to Maryland a year later.6

Alliances transcended religious identity during this complicated and tumultuous period of Maryland’s history. The colony was young and sparsely settled, with less than a thousand colonists before 1660. Whereas William Berkeley, as governor of the royal colony of Virginia, sought religious uniformity in the 1640s, the second Lord Baltimore valued loyalty to his government above religious identity. For example, one of the leaders of the Virginia Puritan migration to Maryland, Richard Bennett I of Nansemond County, Virginia, had come to Lord Baltimore’s aid before. In the wake of Ingle’s Rebellion, Bennett had traveled to St. Mary’s City with an armed force to re-establish the proprietor’s authority.  

Bennett’s motivations for helping Lord Baltimore remain obscure, but he and other Virginia Puritans such as William Stone and Edward Lloyd saw advantages in an alliance with the beleaguered proprietor. Access to land and patronage were uppermost. Lord Baltimore, in turn, sought to gain from the Virginia Puritans’ personal ties to London’s tobacco market. Bennett, for instance, was the nephew of Edward Bennett, a London merchant and former member of the Virginia Company who used his own ships to transport hundreds of colonists to southside Virginia in the 1620s and 1630s. Bennett was well connected to Virginia’s major merchant-planters. Given that tobacco was the

---

*Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1953), 116. A similar theme of efforts by Protestants and other political outsiders to reduce the Lord Proprietor’s executive authority and control over patronage ran through Fendall’s Rebellion in 1660 and Coode’s Rebellion in 1689. The precise date of the invitation to the Virginia Puritans is unknown, but the migrants arrived in Maryland in December 1649, well within the time it would have taken news of the execution of Charles I on January 30, 1649 to reach Maryland (Luckenbach, *Providence*, 3).  

7 Butterfield, “Puritans and Religious Strife,” 32–33; Menard, *Economy and Society in Early Colonial Maryland*, 161, figure 4-2. Krugler discusses the importance that the Calverts placed on personal loyalty in *English and Catholic*. 

---
primary cash crop of Maryland, Lord Baltimore could not afford any disruption to his colony’s tobacco trade that the English Civil War might pose.⁸

Edward Lloyd exploited Lord Baltimore’s need for political and commercial support among Protestants. From the outset of his residence in Maryland, Edward I adopted a practical position as a supporter of the proprietor with political influence among Protestants. Within a year of the migration to Providence, Lord Baltimore appointed Lloyd commander of Anne Arundel County, thus making him an agent of the proprietor at the Providence settlement. As commander, a position modeled upon that of justice of the peace in England, Lloyd had the power to grant land warrants, to collect monies owed to the proprietor, and to summon courts. Lloyd held the position for two years, until events in the English Civil War overtook Lord Baltimore’s efforts at conciliation.⁹

In 1652, England’s Rump Parliament commissioned Richard Bennett as governor of Maryland and Virginia. Two years later, Lloyd was named a parliamentary commissioner of the province of Maryland. Lloyd supported Bennett’s governorship of Virginia and Maryland, though there is no evidence that he took up arms against the proprietor in the Battle of the Severn in 1655, when Governor Stone formally submitted to Bennett’s forces.¹⁰

---

In 1657, Cromwell and Lord Baltimore reached an agreement that restored Baltimore's executive authority over Maryland. Baltimore appointed Edward Lloyd to the restored governor's council in 1658 in his continuing bid to court Protestant support for his regime. In testament to Lloyd's influence with the Protestant-dominated assembly, he served as a mediator between the council and the assembly for the first two years of restored proprietary rule. In 1660, however, another major attempt to reduce the proprietor's executive authority erupted in the assembly. Lloyd survived the shake-up of the government that followed Governor Josiah Fendall's "rebellion." Loyal to the proprietor, Lloyd sat on the council meetings that prosecuted Fendall and banished him from Maryland. Lloyd served on the council for another eight years until his departure for England in 1668.¹¹

Access to land was perhaps the most important inducement for Lloyd to maintain his loyalty to the proprietary government. During his tenure on the council, Lloyd acquired patents for nearly 8,000 acres of land on the Western and Eastern Shores of Maryland, fourteen times more land than he had previously acquired in the colony. For lack of other precious commodities, land was the most valuable resource that Maryland's lord proprietor could distribute to win support for his rule. The proprietor and his agents

could at their discretion hand out large parcels of land in a single patent. Another method of obtaining land in Maryland before 1683 was to import labor in exchange for land.  

Upon joining the council, Lloyd obtained patents for 1,650 acres in Anne Arundel County, almost triple the amount that he acquired in that county at the time of his migration from Virginia. More spectacularly, within a year of his placement on the council, Lloyd patented 4,050 acres in Kent County on the Eastern Shore, in an area that later became Talbot County. Most of this land was contained in a single patent for 3,050 acres (called "Hier Dier Lloyd"), one of only a few land grants of such size on the Eastern Shore. In 1667, Edward Lloyd I acquired a final 2,200 acres in Talbot County before sailing to England the following year.  

Land speculation, not land accumulation, interested Lloyd. His appointment to the council coincided with the proprietor’s opening of the Eastern Shore to land patents. Prior to 1658, Lord Baltimore had prohibited settlement on the Eastern Shore in order to sustain a lucrative fur trade monopoly with Eastern Shore Indians. When the proprietor lifted the settlement prohibition, the opportunity for land speculation was ripe. Early Talbot County offered miles of bayside land, which colonists preferred over the ocean side of the Eastern Shore because of its established communication routes.

---

12 The headright system ceased in Maryland in 1683. For each settler that a merchant or planter transported under this system, that merchant or planter received a headright of fifty acres. To obtain a land patent from the colony’s land office, an applicant requested a warrant for a specific tract of land, had the land surveyed, and paid a series of fees to officeholders (Menard, *Economy and Society*, 22; Clemens, *Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore*, 71, 73).

Navigable waterways offered access to areas further inland. The upper Eastern Shore’s forests supported larger populations of fur-producing animals than the lower Eastern Shore because of the topography. While the fur trade was less profitable after 1660 than before, furs continued to be significant to the local economy until the early eighteenth century. Indian trade also continued, though as the Susquehannas, whose trade network extended to the Great Lakes, gradually withdrew from the area they formerly dominated, more Indian trade took place south of the Choptank River by the end of the century. (See Figure 2.) Besides fur and deerskins, Talbot County’s woodlands also supplied timber and naval stores for export. Hardwood from the area’s forests supported an important local shipbuilding industry. Cheap land also attracted planters, because oronoco tobacco, the regional variety, was profitable in quantity only; it was not valued for its quality like sweet-scented tobacco. The woodlands were also desirable for livestock traders, whose livestock needed additional land for forage.  

14 Helen C. Rountree and Thomas E. Davidson, Eastern Shore Indians of Virginia and Maryland (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1997), chaps. 1 and 3 (including mention of the Great Lakes, 85) and pp. 142, 208–9; Clemens on land speculation, Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore, 73, 75; Lorena S. Walsh, “Summing the Parts: Implications for Estimating Chesapeake Output and Income Subregionally,” William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 56 (1999): 59–60. In 1652, the dominant Indian group on the Upper Eastern Shore at the time, the Susquehannas, yielded claims to land in what became Talbot County. The Nanticokes, the next most powerful group on the Eastern Shore, were less lucrative trading partners for the English. Originally, Talbot County was bounded by the Chester and Choptank Rivers. In 1706, Queen Anne’s County was formed out of northern Talbot County, south of Chester River (BDML, figures 1, 2). J. Court Stevenson profiles several other early Talbot County investors, including a partner in a Barbados sugar plantation, in “Adventurers, Speculators, and Rogues: First Landowners Along the Choptank River at Horn Point,” Maryland Historical Magazine 102 (2007):538–71. Walsh advocates recognizing the variety of economic incentives for colonization of the early Chesapeake besides tobacco production in “Summing the Parts,” 56–58.
Edward Lloyd I, like other Eastern Shore speculators, profited not from price per acre but from the volume of land sold; he disposed of two-thirds of the Eastern Shore land that he patented. His final patent in Kent (now Talbot) County, for 2,200 acres, was almost entirely speculative; he sold 80 percent of it within a few years of his return to England. Edward I also sold one-fourth of his land in Anne Arundel County. Out of a total of about 8,470 acres that Edward I patented in Maryland during his time there, he retained possession of 1,500 acres, less than 20 percent of the total. One of the remaining parcels, 600 acres on the Wye River in Talbot County called Linton, was the core of what became the Lloyd family seat. A 1695 plat shows Linton and numerous other tracts that made up Wye Plantation at the time (Figure 12).

Edward Lloyd I’s movements from England to Virginia, around the Chesapeake Bay, and back fit a pattern of geographic mobility among English Atlantic colonial merchants of the seventeenth century. As a youthful lesser merchant in the American trade, he may have always viewed the Chesapeake as a temporary residence, an opportunity to improve his fortunes at home. While in Maryland, Lloyd took advantage of the weak proprietary government to advance himself politically and thereby pursue financial gain. He established, and left to his son’s management, a young but substantial enterprise on the newly colonized Eastern Shore.

15 Edward Lloyd II lived on the Linton tract, according to the September 2, 1755 deposition of a 61-year-old neighborhood native, John Carslake, in Land Papers, part 23, Lloyd Papers, MS 2001, MdHS. The existing Wye House also stands on the Linton tract, as shown when the 1695 plat (Figure 12) is laid on top of the corresponding section of Map of Talbot County; with Farm Limits, by William H. Dillworth, engraved and printed by Rae Smith in 1858 (Figures 3 and 13).
Philemon Lloyd

When Edward Lloyd I returned to England in 1668, he entrusted his only son Philemon (1646–1685) with the business of developing the plantation and store on the Wye River. Philemon was then twenty-two years of age and a year shy of his marriage to Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett (1647–1697), the wealthy widow of Richard Bennett II (c. 1639–1667), son of the former governor of Virginia and Maryland by parliamentary commission, Richard Bennett I of Virginia. The marriage was of great advantage to Philemon Lloyd because of Henrietta Maria’s high social status, kinship ties, and the wealth of her first husband. Yet, upon marrying her, Philemon took the risk that his children would be converted to Catholicism under their mother’s influence, an outcome that he tried to prevent in his last will and testament.  

Henrietta Maria, who shared the name of Charles I’s Catholic queen, was one of several children of James Neale (d. 1684), an English Catholic gentleman who emigrated to Maryland within the first ten years of the colony’s founding. James Neale had sufficiently high standing for Lord Baltimore to grant him a 2,000-acre manor and to install Neale on the council in 1642. After Ingle’s Rebellion in 1644, Neale and his family left Maryland, apparently to seek political asylum abroad, and traveled to the Iberian Peninsula, where Henrietta Maria was born. The Neales returned to Maryland in 1660, the year of the Stuart restoration to the throne of England, and resettled in Charles County, home to a significant Catholic population. Though Cromwell already had restored Lord Baltimore’s executive authority over Maryland, Charles II’s presence on the throne improved the security of Baltimore’s government and the political fortunes of

16 BDML, 1:129, 2:541.
Maryland’s resident Catholics. In 1662, James Neale resumed his service on the governor’s council, sitting with his daughter’s future father-in-law, Edward Lloyd I.\(^{17}\)

With his marriage, Philemon Lloyd, a Protestant, sustained his father’s strategy of accommodation with the proprietary government. The Neales were well connected to Maryland’s Catholic governing minority. Both of Henrietta Maria’s brothers married women who had family ties to Maryland’s proprietary family. Furthermore, Henrietta Maria forged kinship ties with other high-ranking Catholic families during her marriage to Lloyd. Her daughter by her first marriage, Susannah Bennett, married John Darnall of Calvert County (d. 1684). Darnall and his brother Henry (d. 1711) were Catholic cousins of the third Lord Baltimore, who appointed both men to the governor’s council and provided them with offices of profit. Before Baltimore lost control of the government in 1689, offices in government and land administration overlapped, giving officeholders broad powers and potentially large incomes. Thus, when Baltimore appointed Susannah’s husband John as joint secretary of the colony in 1683 (a position that John shared with another Catholic), John was in charge of recordkeeping in the courts and the land office and collected a portion of the clerks’ fees. John’s brother Henry, meanwhile, was joint chancellor. As keeper of Lord Baltimore’s seal, Henry received fees for the act of affixing the seal to government documents and land patents. When Baltimore left Maryland for England in May 1684, he made Henry his agent for the collection of revenue for the support of government and the proprietor’s private income. John died later that year, but Henry, who served as Baltimore’s agent for the next three decades,

continued to be one of the most powerful men in Maryland. Because the Calverts preferred to govern Maryland through kin, membership in the Calvert kinship network greatly improved a family’s chances for political influence and social advancement.\textsuperscript{18}

In a testament to her education and high social position, Henrietta Maria was a literate woman who, at the end of her life, possessed books that were not the common devotional fare: \textit{Cassandra, Don Quixote}, and \textit{Eliana}. Besides her social standing, Henrietta Maria also brought into the Lloyd family wealth and personal connections from her first marriage. Not much is known about her first husband, Richard Bennett II, including his religious beliefs and, because his father survived him, the amount of wealth at his command. In 1655–56, Richard Bennett II attended Harvard College, where he joined his stepbrother Nathaniel Utie (c. 1635–c. 1675/76). Utie was the biological son of John Utie, a politically prominent Virginia tobacco merchant and planter much like Richard Bennett I. (Richard Bennett I married John Utie’s widow.) Beyond receiving an education in religion and the liberal arts, the young men’s attendance at Harvard must have been calculated to develop their ties to a transatlantic Puritan mercantile network. At Harvard, Richard II displayed his considerable wealth; he rented a study, an unusual

\textsuperscript{18} \textit{BDML, I:191}, 250–51, 271–72; Owings, \textit{His Lordship’s Patronage}, 30, 78, 126. Henrietta Maria’s brother James married Elizabeth Calvert, a daughter of William Calvert, nephew of the second Lord Baltimore and the proprietor’s secretary in Maryland. Anthony Neale’s second marriage was to Elizabeth Digges, a daughter of Protestant Council member William Digges and his wife, a stepdaughter of the third Lord Baltimore. John Darnall was appointed to the council in 1683, four years after his brother Henry.
expense for a first-year student, and then moved into the most costly accommodation at
the college when it became available.\(^\text{19}\)

Upon leaving Harvard, both Richard II and Nathaniel Utie acquired land in
Baltimore County, Maryland. At the time, Richard II’s father governed Maryland (and
Virginia) by Parliamentary commission. When Cromwell restored Lord Baltimore’s
executive authority in Maryland in 1657, the proprietor installed Nathaniel Utie on the
council, as well as Edward Lloyd I.

In 1665, Richard II, then in his mid-twenties, married Henrietta Maria Neale. He
died two years later, leaving an infant daughter, an unborn son, and approximately two
thousand acres of patented land. According to his will, his child, if one was born, was to
receive all his land upon reaching legal age. Richard II also set aside specific personal
property for the child, to which Bennett attributed a total value of 18,000 pounds tobacco,
or £75 sterling (at the conservative rate of one pence per pound tobacco). Upon reaching
“lawfull age,” the child was to receive three Christian indentured servants, five “negro”
slaves, an assortment of livestock (namely cattle, sheep, and swine), and two feather beds
with “appurtanences,” valued in total at 4,000 pounds of tobacco. Bennett attributed an
additional value of 4,000 pounds tobacco to other household “stuff,” namely “bed

\(^{19}\) Adminstration account of Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate, February 27, 1701/02,
Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folio 214, MSA, listing the three romance titles;
Brenner, Merchants and Revolution, on John Utie, 143, 145; Samuel Eliot Morison,
“Virginians and Marylanders at Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century,” William and
Mary Quarterly, 2\(^{nd}\) ser., 13 (1933): 4, 6–7; BDML, 1:129–30, 2:848. Richard Bennett I appears to have paid
for his son’s tuition, but not Nathaniel Utie’s, whose education was paid for by Daniel Gookin, one of the Virginia Puritan out-migrants of
1649 who resettled in Massachusetts. Another book in the Lloyd house was a copy of
“Sir Walter Rawleigh’s history of the world very old” (additional account of Henrietta
Maria Lloyd, admr. of Philemon Lloyd, April 29, 1696, Prerogative Court, Accounts,
Liber 13B, folio 93, MSA).
Linnen, Table Linnen, potts and kettles.” He also protected from claims on his estate a gift to his child of 10,000 pounds of “Principle good Tobacco in cask.”

Two years after Richard II’s death, Philemon Lloyd married his widow. As the next husband of Henrietta Maria Bennett, Philemon Lloyd became the stepfather and guardian of Richard II’s two young children, Susannah and Richard III. Thus, Philemon assumed management of the property of Richard II that was to be the children’s inheritance when they came of age. More significant was the property that would come to Richard Bennett III from his grandfather, Richard Bennett I, who died in 1675, leaving the bulk of his estate to his grandson. Land records for Nansemond County, Virginia, do not survive, but Richard I’s land ownership has been estimated conservatively at ten thousand acres. As a major tobacco merchant in Virginia and the nephew of London

---

20 Will of Richard Bennett, dated January 29, 1665/66, proved May 6, 1667, printed in Maryland Historical Magazine 1 (1906): 73–74; also in Original Wills, box B, folio 46, MSA. For livestock, Richard II specified ten cows with a bull, fifteen ewes with a ram, and five sows plus a boar. If Henrietta Maria had a child by Richard II, she was to enjoy the “whole Estate” until the child reached his or her age of majority. Richard II named his father, his father-in-law, and his wife as the executors of his will. In a statement dated September 17, 1667, Richard Bennett I relinquished the executorship and any claims to his son’s estate by himself, his heirs, and the administrators of his estate. In the same document, Richard I did “Convey and Con firme unto” Henrietta Maria, her daughter Susanna, and their heirs “all that Estate either Reall or personall” that his son possessed at the time of his death, to have and to hold forever (Archives of Md., 57:214). Maryland’s prerogative court honored Richard Bennett II’s will in 1701, when his only son, Richard Bennett III, claimed the full amount of the legacy. At that time, the court also recorded that Henrietta Maria Lloyd, deceased, was entitled to one-third of her first husband’s personal estate, because his will did not provide her with real estate for her support (Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 18, folio 185, July 16 and December 9, 1701, MSA). Richard II’s personal property was not inventoried (Beatriz Betancourt Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age: The Case of Richard Bennett, 1667–1749,” Journal of Southern History 60 [1994]: 207n).
merchant and former Virginia Company member Edward Bennett, Richard I would have had valuable commercial assets and personal connections as well.  

The marriage of Edward Lloyd I’s son, Philemon, to the widow of Richard Bennett I’s son and principal heir strengthened pre-existing ties between the Lloyd and Bennett families. Both Edward Lloyd I and his contemporary Richard Bennett I began their residence in America as members of Puritan communities south of the James River in Virginia. Both men participated in the migration of several hundred settlers from Virginia to Providence, Maryland. Though Richard Bennett I returned to Virginia, politics kept the two men in overlapping circles. Edward I supported Bennett’s governorship of Maryland and Virginia during the Interregnum, and he served on Maryland’s Council with Bennett’s stepson, Nathaniel Utie.

The Lloyd-Bennett marriage was, in one view, a keen business maneuver, well calculated to provide financial security for the young Wye River plantation venture. In seventeenth-century Maryland, marriage was also a way to broker political tensions that were tied to religious faith. The marriage of Philemon Lloyd and Henrietta Maria Neale Bennett was one of a number of high-status, mixed-faith marriages in the later

---

seventeenth century intended to form advantageous alliances in a tumultuous period of Maryland’s history. Strangely, historians have not considered the emotional stress of mixed-faith households in early Maryland.  

Religious difference was a source of tension in the Lloyd household at Wye. Philemon Lloyd lacked the authority, and perhaps the motivation, to prevent the Catholic upbringing of his stepdaughter and stepson; both Susannah Bennett and Richard Bennett III remained in the Catholic faith as adults. But for children of his own blood by Henrietta Maria, Philemon directed in his will that they be brought up in the Protestant religion, and “carried to such church or churches where it is profest and to no other during their minority and until such years of discretion as may render them best capable to Judge what is most consonant to the good will of Almighty God unto wch. I pray God of his mercy direct them.” Anticipating a contest of wills between the executors of his will and Henrietta Maria, Philemon added in a codicil to his will that should “my meaning and intent…be mistaken and disorders well not foreseen between my wife and overseers…that I make it my only request to her by all the obligations of a loving husband to see my will therein performed and that the said overseers put her in minde

---

thereof and see Gods will be done.” Philemon lost the battle with at least one child, Henrietta Maria (1673–1702), who married a Catholic (Charles Blake of Queen Anne County, d. 1732) and whose daughter lies buried across Wye River near the grave of her Catholic kinsman Richard Bennett III.\(^\text{23}\)

Why was Philemon Lloyd so concerned that his children remain in the Protestant faith? The possibility that the children of his blood would come under their mother’s influence and convert to Catholicism was a risk that Philemon took when he married Henrietta Maria and established a mixed-faith household. Philemon must have had sincere objections to Catholicism, because Catholics held the highest positions in Maryland’s government when he wrote his will and the codicil in the early and mid-1680s.

Whereas the second Lord Baltimore was anxious to share power with Protestants in order to keep control of the colony, his son and heir, Charles Calvert, was less willing to spread political favors outside a small circle of fellow Catholics and Protestant kin. The second Lord Baltimore, for example, had welcomed the migration of Virginia Puritans, including Philemon’s father, Edward I, into Maryland during the English Civil War. Edward I, a Protestant, served on Maryland’s council with Henrietta Maria’s father, James Neale, a Catholic. The third Lord Baltimore, who inherited his father’s title in

\(^{23}\) Will of Philemon Lloyd, dated May 27, 1682, codicil dated May 28, 1685, endorsed July 16, 1685, proven April 12, 1686, in Wills, Liber 4, folio 186, MSA; transcription in Lloyd Papers, box 74, MS 2001, MdHS. Information on Henrietta Maria Lloyd the younger’s marriage to Blake is given in Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 423–24; on her daughter’s burial place, see Henry C. Forman, Early Buildings and Historic Artifacts in Tidewater Maryland (Easton: Eastern Shore Publishers’ Associates, 1989), 63.
1675, alienated the colonial assembly with his approach to politics that borrowed from absolutist currents in Europe. 24

As speaker of the assembly from 1678 until 1684, shortly before his death, Philemon Lloyd witnessed Protestant assemblymen’s demands for a larger share of power. Objections to the breadth of Lord Baltimore’s executive authority in the colony (for example, Baltimore’s charter right to appoint men to office and set officeholders’ fees for service) merged with resentment against Catholic influence in Maryland’s highest political circles. At the same time, the impending succession of James, Duke of York, a Catholic, to the royal throne invigorated fears of popish rule in England and fanned anti-Catholicism on both sides of the Atlantic. 25

When Philemon married Henrietta Maria in 1669, they created a household that mirrored Protestant-Catholic political alliances under the second Lord Baltimore. Judging by his will, Philemon envisioned the next master of Wye Plantation as a Protestant. Hampering his ability to control the future of the family estate, Philemon died before his children reached adulthood.

Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s Widowhood: Wye Plantation’s First Critical Period

When Philemon died suddenly by drowning at the age of thirty-nine, the Lloyd family estate entered a critical period. Philemon’s ten children by Henrietta Maria were

minors between the ages of fifteen and less than one year. His Bennett stepchildren were in or close to a position to claim their portion of the Bennett estate and thereby reduce the amount of capital that the Lloyd family could draw upon. Susannah Bennett had been married for a year, and Richard Bennett III was eighteen years of age, three years shy of his majority. Moreover, Philemon left a considerable estate to manage, in land, labor, and trade.\(^{26}\)

Philemon demonstrated a greater interest in accumulating land in Maryland than his father did. At his death, Philemon possessed about nine thousand acres, most of it on the Eastern Shore, a 600 percent increase over his father’s net ownership of fifteen hundred acres. As a young man, Philemon had been an agent for his father in land speculation. He patented 8,400 acres in Kent and Talbot Counties between 1665 and 1667, just before his father returned to England. Philemon retained in his own name only about 2,300 acres in 1671, when he was first elected to the Assembly. As his family grew, however, Philemon pursued longer-term interests in Maryland land ownership; land would be a stable form of wealth for his heirs. He acquired another 4,800 acres by patent and 2,000 by purchase in Talbot County (including an area that later became

\(^{26}\) Philemon Lloyd died young, even by local standards. Clemens calculated the average age of death for white male planters in seventeenth-century Talbot and Kent Counties at 52 years (Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore, 67). Philemon Lloyd’s 1685 probate inventory states that he drowned. Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s children by Philemon Lloyd were Edward II (1670–1719), Henrietta Maria (1673–1702), Philemon II (c. 1674–1733), Anna Maria (1677–1748), James (1679/80–1723), Mary (1680–1690), Alice (1681–1744), Elizabeth (?–by 1696), Margaret (1683–1747), and Jane (1685–1690) (BDML, 2:541).
Queen Anne County). He also had access to Bennett family land through marriage and as stepfather to Richard Bennett II’s children.\textsuperscript{27}

Philemon Lloyd managed slaves and indentured servants at four of the eleven plantations documented in his probate records. At the other plantations, Philemon owned livestock that was under the care of tenants or overseers. Altogether, the probate records document the presence of thirty-eight slaves and nine indentured servants, making Philemon one of the Eastern Shore’s larger planters at the time. Philemon did not own all of this labor; from the inventory, Philemon’s father and his father’s business partner claimed ownership of nine of the slaves and one of the servants. Philemon also had access to undocumented Bennett family slaves by his wife.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{27} This land history is based on Legislative History Project records at Maryland State Archives and \textit{BDML}, 2:541. A father’s survival of his son complicates the effort to determine how much land the son controlled; both Richard Bennett II and Philemon Lloyd I predeceased their fathers. In his will, Philemon specified ownership of 4,550 acres and mentioned an unspecified amount of land on Sassafras River “held in right of my wife.”

\textsuperscript{28} On the relative size of Philemon Lloyd’s operation on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, see Clemens, \textit{Atlantic Economy and Maryland’s Eastern Shore}, 126. On relative plantation size in the later seventeenth-century Chesapeake generally, see Philip D. Morgan, \textit{Slave Counterpoint: Black Culture in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake and Lowcountry} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 39, 41; and Allan Kulikoff, \textit{Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1600–1800} (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 319. Possession of more than twenty slaves qualified the owner for “elite” status in the seventeenth-century Chesapeake, according to Kulikoff, 330–31. Based on Clemens’ research, the adult slaves at Wye in 1685 were likely to have been transported from Maryland’s Western Shore or the West Indies (Clemens, \textit{Atlantic Economy and Maryland’s Eastern Shore}, 60). Appraisers counted eleven adult male and nine female slaves at Wye Plantation in 1685. This excludes the women Low and Penelope Woobye, whom Philemon mentioned in his will. In 1697, the adult male-female ratio was about the same, with twelve men and eight or nine women. Roughly equal numbers of adult male and female slaves lived in the colonial Chesapeake up to the 1680s, before independent slave traders imported more young males directly from Africa. Female slaves, however, lived longer than their male counterparts (Morgan, \textit{Slave Counterpoint}, 3–4).
The majority of the Lloyds’ bonded labor force, consisting of at least twenty slaves and five indentured servants, resided on the “dwelling plantation” on Wye River. Of the six adult enslaved men, one was recognized as a carpenter in the probate inventory. Two male servants were also skilled: one was a tailor, and another a carpenter. Four enslaved women worked out-of-doors, though Old Morgan was “aged and past service.” Two other women, Low and Penelope Woobye, were house servants; their names appear in Philemon’s will, as mothers of children whom Philemon conveyed as legacies, but the women do not appear in the probate inventory. In addition to the Woobyes’ children, at least eight other enslaved children lived at the home plantation in 1685.29

Other Lloyd slaves and servants lived on smaller quarters with fewer than eleven laborers each, a typical size in the Chesapeake before 1690. On Lloyd’s Insula, located across the Wye River from the dwelling plantation and known today as Wye Island, a total of thirteen slaves lived at two separate quarters. Enslaved family groups are more distinct in the documentary record of these outlying plantations. On the Lower Plantation lived a couple named Old Mingo and Cate, two men called Cuckoo and Jack, a woman known as Joan, four enslaved children, two male indentured servants, and an overseer. On a different part of the island, another slave family comprised of a man named Human, his wife, and their young child, lived with a male servant, a woman slave named Bess, and their overseer. Besides the home plantation and the two plantations on Lloyd’s Insula, Philemon Lloyd also owned labor at a fourth plantation known as “Mr. Hawkins

29 Philemon Lloyd bequeathed daughters by Low and Penelope Woobye to two of his daughters.
Plantation," where an enslaved man (considered “very crazy”), his wife, and their three children lived with an indentured male servant.\textsuperscript{30}

Philemon’s father gained experience in a marginal tobacco economy during his time in Lower Norfolk, Virginia. This was useful at Wye Plantation, where, in addition to tobacco, the Lloyds raised livestock, corn, and wheat for plantation use and export. Livestock provided Lloyd and his dependents with food, leather, tallow, fat, and wool. Surplus could be sold locally and in coastal trade. At the time of Philemon’s death, appraisers counted fifty-five head of cattle, ninety-six sheep, and thirty hogs at the home plantation. On Lloyd’s Island, where the surrounding water provided a natural barrier against wolf predation and human theft and kept animals from wandering far, Philemon had over sixty head of cattle, another fifty sheep, eight horses, and at least twenty hogs. Philemon outsourced a large portion of his livestock management to seven freemen, at least one of whom was his tenant. Altogether, these men oversaw the care of a third of his cattle, half of the swine, several horses, and a few sheep. The arrangement allowed Philemon to increase the number of livestock and, if the caretakers lived with a woman with skills in dairying, to supply his plantation with dairy products while saving on labor costs. If the men were his tenants, then their work to maintain the livestock, such as raising shelters and repairing fences, also increased the value of Philemon’s land.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30} Oswald Tilghman, \textit{History of Talbot County Maryland, 1661–1861}, 2 vols. (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co., 1915), 1:147, on the renaming of Lloyd’s Island.

Besides land, labor, tobacco, grain crops, and livestock, another important asset of Wye Plantation at the time of Philemon Lloyd's death was the store. Housed in a single-story building with a loft, the store stocked necessities, such as cloth of various kinds (including “Maryland woolen cloth” of local manufacture), sewing materials (buttons, thread, needles, and thimbles), metal tools, nails, salt, spices (pepper, mace, cinnamon, and nutmeg), and fishing hooks. The few luxuries in the store were for beds and personal attire: a feather bed, a suite of bed curtains, silk petticoats, and “fancy ribbons.”

Like most other merchant-planters of his day, Philemon did not own the ships that conducted overseas trade. The only boat that he owned was a shallop, which was exclusively for bay travel. Philemon took greater risk in lending credit to assist trade; recoverable debts made up a quarter of the total value of his personal estate.32

Eastern Shore Indians may have been among Philemon’s customers. In 1682, Maryland’s Upper House considered making Wye Plantation the single government-

---

Lorena S. Walsh discusses the practice of leasing land to tenants as a means to improve land at no cost in labor to the landowner in “Land, Landlord, and Leaseholder: Estate Management and Tenant Fortunes in Southern Maryland, 1642–1820,” Agricultural History 59 (1985): 373–96. Philemon Lloyd’s will of 1685 names one tenant; his estate accounts do not explicitly identify other tenants. An account of his widow’s estate from February 27, 1702, reported production of tobacco, corn and, at the home plantation, wheat (Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folio 214, MSA).

32 Arthur Pierce Middleton, Tobacco Coast: A Maritime History of Chesapeake Bay in the Colonial Era (Newport News, Va.: Mariner’s Museum, 1953), 222, 231, on ship types. The shallop was worth £10. Philemon Lloyd’s total estate value, as reported by an account of 1688–89 (Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 10, folios 340–45, MSA) was £4,624 (the sum of £3,449 from the original inventory plus proceeds on a shipment of 263 hogsheads of tobacco and goods from England). This amount includes the property claimed by his father and Richard Wynne, valued at £318 in the 1686 additional inventory. Philemon Lloyd’s debts receivable, according to the first probate inventory, amounted to £1,067, plus £333 in bills of exchange.
sanctioned site in Talbot County for Indian trade. The presence of fifty-five deerskins at the Lloyd house in 1685 also hints at Indian trade. Deerskins were a common trade commodity between Indians and the English in the seventeenth-century Chesapeake. While maintaining traditional hunting practices, Indians could obtain European cloth, metal tools, and guns.\textsuperscript{33}

Investment from Edward Lloyd I overseas aided the development of Wye Plantation. When word of Philemon’s death reached his father in London, Edward I and a business partner, Mr. Richard Wynne, sent a letter to Maryland to claim ownership of property at Wye. They named nine African slaves and a male English servant. These ten people comprised over 20 percent of Wye Plantation’s labor force. Edward I and Richard Wynne also claimed horses, cattle, curtains and valences “hung about a bed,” and bills of exchange, for a total value of £318.\textsuperscript{34}

Edward Lloyd I remained invested in Wye Plantation throughout his life. When he died in 1696, eleven years after his son, his slaves in Maryland and all his other property “beyond the seas” passed to his widow, Grace. She, in turn, sold an unspecified number of slaves, valued at £238, to Wye Plantation after Henrietta Maria’s death. (This sum would have bought eight prime male hands at £30 each, based on the value of a prime hand in Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s probate inventory of 1697.) Grace was previously the widow of William Parker (d. 1673/4), another merchant who moved from England to

\textsuperscript{33} Archives of Maryland 7:381–82; Rountree and Davidson, Eastern Shore Indians, 12, 135–37; Hatfield, Atlantic Virginia, 39.

\textsuperscript{34} According to the additional inventory of 1686, Edward I and Wynne claimed ownership of Old Mingo and his wife Cate (Kate), Human and his wife, Jacob the Carpenter, Denby, Mary, a boy named Peter, and a girl named Sarah. The first four lived on Lloyd’s Insula, and the others at the home plantation. The servant’s name was John Freeman.
Maryland and then back to London, suggesting that Edward Lloyd I was part of a community in London that had social and commercial ties to Maryland and Virginia.\footnote{Accounts of Henrietta Maria Lloyd's estate, 1701/02, Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folios 213–19, 339-42 (esp. 341), MSA; will of Edward Lloyd, 1695, proved 1696, St. Mary's Parish, Whitechapel, Middlesex, [England], transcript in box 72, Lloyd Papers, MS 2001, MdHS; will of Grace Lloyd, 1698, proved 1700/01, St. Mary's Parish, Whitechapel, Middlesex, [England], printed in Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 40 (1916): 239; information on William and Grace Parker from Carr and Jordan, Maryland's Revolution in Government, 251, and BDML, 2:635.}

Given Edward Lloyd I's continued investment in Wye Plantation while he lived in London, and his description of himself as "merchant and late planter of Maryland" in his will, it is possible that Edward I conducted some part of the mercantile side of Wye Plantation's business in London—while delegating to his son the difficult work of developing a new plantation.

Having outlived his son, Edward I recognized in his will that Wye Plantation was currently "in the possession or occupation of my daughter-in-law, Henrietta Maria Lloyd." During the twelve years of Henrietta Maria (Bennett) Lloyd's second widowhood, the Lloyd and Bennett estates remained incorporated. Henrietta Maria stepped into the role of head of household after Philemon's death, as evidenced by alterations to the Lloyd house at Wye.\footnote{Two documents testify to the continued intermingling of the Lloyd and Bennett estates while Henrietta Maria was alive and for several years thereafter. An account dated July 16 and December 9, 1701, recorded a request for the separation of Richard Bennett II's

\footnote{Two documents testify to the continued intermingling of the Lloyd and Bennett estates while Henrietta Maria was alive and for several years thereafter. An account dated July 16 and December 9, 1701, recorded a request for the separation of Richard Bennett II's}
The Lloyd House

Henrietta Maria was thirty-eight when Philemon died, and she did not remarry. Despite her advanced age, it was reasonable for her to expect that her wealth and social standing would attract marriage suitors. But she lacked financial incentives to remarry; the total value of her personal estate (at £4,777) was £100 higher than her second husband’s. Given her personal wealth, the mother of twelve children could afford a rest from marriage and childbearing. After Philemon’s death, she had a significant measure of personal power and autonomy in her position as a wealthy widow twice over and as head legacy to his son, Richard Bennett III, out of Philemon Lloyd’s “whole estate” (Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 18, folio 185, MSA). Also, Edward I’s widow, Grace, named Richard Bennett III as the administrator of her late husband’s Maryland estate (Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age” [1994], 209n). Chapter 2 offers other evidence of the combination of Lloyd and Bennett family assets during Henrietta Maria’s second widowhood. Judging from names and ages, perhaps half of the enslaved residents at Wye Plantation in 1685 still resided there in 1697. One of these slaves was Old Mingo, who was the property of Edward Lloyd I and his partner Richard Wynne until his purchase by 1702 by Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate. Old Mingo and his wife Cate moved from the lower plantation on Lloyd’s Insula to the home plantation after Philemon’s death in 1685. An estate account of 1702 credits 1,558 pounds of tobacco to “Old Mingo’s crop,” indicating that he led gangs (Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folio 216, MSA).

Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s probate inventory plus her estate account of 1702 show that besides the home plantation, the two quarters on Lloyd’s Insula (Wye Island) and Tuckahoe remained part of the estate after Philemon’s death. Philemon had bequeathed the island plantations and Tuckahoe to his two younger sons, Philemon II and James. But his widow, at the time of her death, owned livestock on the island (suggesting a land lease) and a family of two slaves and their three children (plus livestock) at Tuckahoe. Furthermore, tobacco raised on the island and at Tuckahoe was credited to Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate in 1702. Henrietta Maria Lloyd also added a plantation called Gross’s or Gross Coate, which she gave to her daughter in her will. This, too, still generated income for the estate in 1702 (will of Henrietta Maria Lloyd, April 26, 1697, proved June 3, 1697, in Wills, Liber 7, folios 252–54, MSA; Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s probate inventory, November 2, 1697, Prerogative Court, Inventories and Accounts, Liber 15, folios 198–211, MSA; estate account, Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folios 213–19, MSA).
of the Lloyd household. Her father-in-law, Edward I, recognized Henrietta Maria’s temporal “possession” of Wye Plantation in his will. Alterations to the Lloyd house during her widowhood demonstrate these interests.37

The Lloyd house at Wye was large for its day, with at least eight rooms. Most colonists in seventeenth-century Maryland lived in one- or two-room houses with a loft. Families of upper rank generally had five- or six-room houses, to accommodate a variety of civic and business functions in addition to a large household. Philemon Lloyd, for instance, was a county court justice and a militia leader before the construction of a county courthouse in the 1680s. His house provided space for local government meetings, the conduct of plantation business, and the storage of related equipment, plus rooms that allowed more privacy for the parents and their children. The hall and the New Room were free of beds, for instance, a marker of the Lloyds’ high status. The Lloyd dwelling

37 The total value of Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s personal estate was £4,777.8.1, the sum of two inventories (Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folios 339–42, 1701/02). Demographic conditions among English settlers in the seventeenth-century Chesapeake, including early parental death, an imbalanced sex ratio, and the abundance of land, favored wealth accumulation by widows. Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s experience was typical in this regard. Notable works on this topic include Lois Green Carr and Lorena Walsh, “The Planter’s Wife: The Experience of White Women in Seventeenth-Century Maryland,” William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 34 (1977): 542–71; Lois Green Carr, “Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake,” in ed. Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert, Women in the Age of the American Revolution (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1989), 155–208; and Linda L. Sturtz, Within Her Power: Propertied Women in Colonial Virginia (New York: Routledge, 2002), introduction and chapter 1. Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate also benefited from an increase in the value of slaves, probably because war disrupted the labor trade as discussed in the next chapter. The value of a prime male hand in Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s probate inventory was £30, £10 higher than in Philemon Lloyd’s inventory of 1685. The value of a prime female hand increased less, from £20 to £22.
likely had a cruciform shape and was initially one and one-half stories. A conjectural drawing shows the New Room as part of a two-story addition off the hall (Figure 14).  

The probate inventories of 1685 and 1697, taken at the deaths of Philemon and Henrietta Maria Lloyd, allow us to tour the house, from the appraisers' point of view, at the beginning and at the end of Henrietta Maria’s widowhood. The appraisers began in the hall, a heated room where visitors were first received. During Philemon’s lifetime, the room was furnished with a square table with a carpet atop, thirteen leather chairs, and six pictures (likely portraits) decorating its walls. The presence of three saddles, three pairs of pistols, and three fowling pieces (light guns for shooting fowl) suggests easy access to the outdoors. Several old steelyards, or balances, indicate that some trade was conducted in this room. The hall changed little over the next twelve years, suggesting that its function remained more or less the same. Though the balances were removed by 1697, indicating the removal of some business, too, there were trade goods stored here: castile soap, brown sugar, a variety of cloth, “a parcel of courting rings,” and two deerskins. There were additional guns in the room, though all ten were considered old in 1697. Also in the hall by 1697 was a book of Scripture, which may have been a gesture by Henrietta Maria to make Protestants feel more comfortable upon their entrance to the house, given

---

38 Main, *Tobacco Colony*, 152, on house size. Philemon Lloyd was a justice of Talbot County for fifteen years, from 1670 until his death, and a captain of the militia for twelve years before becoming colonel in 1679 (*BDML*, 2:541). The county court met at the houses of its justices before the construction of a frame courthouse in 1682 in a town called York on Skipton Creek (Dickson J. Preston, *Talbot County: A History* [Centreville, Md.: Tidewater Publishers, 1983], 48; Jean B. Russo, “Free Workers in a Plantation Economy in Talbot County, Maryland, 1690–1759,” Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1983, pp. 16–18). I sincerely thank architectural historian Michael O. Bourne for his study of the early Lloyd house and the resulting drawing. At Sotterly in St. Mary’s County, a two-story addition with a New Room below and a better bed chamber above, was built by 1727 (personal correspondence with Bourne, November 8, 2001).
her local prominence as a Catholic. A more practical explanation for the book’s presence is that Protestant household members, including indentured servants, met in the hall to listen to readings from Scripture. 39

Off the hall was the “New Room,” a more formal reception space where Philemon, and later Henrietta Maria, communicated their positions as heads of household through objects. The New Room was outfitted to receive a large number of visitors, with eighteen shalloon chairs and a couch. During Philemon’s lifetime, his clothing, worth £14, was stored here (in two chests of drawers), suggesting that he dressed ceremonially there. A sword communicated Philemon’s status as colonel of the militia. 40

When Henrietta Maria became a widow, she replaced her dead husband’s display items in the New Room with her own. Philemon’s clothes were removed, though his sword remained on display, and she installed a suite of “olivewood” furniture, likely of English manufacture with an exotic wood veneer. The olivewood table, stand, and looking glass were formerly in her private chamber, and Philemon made her sole owner of the furniture at his death, after which she added an olivewood chest of drawers. This suite of furniture, like Philemon’s clothing, was used in the act of dressing, and as such is an example of a new kind of furniture related to personal appearance that proliferated in the English Atlantic between 1660 and 1690. Another fashionable addition to the room

---

39 Probate inventory of Henrietta Maria Lloyd, November 2, 1697, Prerogative Court, Inventories and Accounts, Liber 15, folios 198–211, MSA. K. Matthew Kinnamont documents the presence of two itinerant Anglican ministers, James Clayland and John Lillingston, and the construction of a church in Talbot County in the 1670s. The church was built along a road between the Wye and Chester Rivers (“A Passage in Established Religion: Dundee Chapel of St. Michael’s Parish, Talbot County, Maryland,” *Maryland Historical Magazine* 101 [2006], 274–75).

40 The 1685 and 1697 probate inventories both document the presence of eighteen chairs in the New Room.
was a monteith, a basin for keeping wine or drinking glasses cool. Glassware stems rested in curves in the basin’s rim. The monteith’s presence on this provincial plantation shows remarkable currency with English Atlantic fashion and indicates an exclusive level of social reception in the New Room. The room also contained table cloths, napkins, and sheets, a display not only of household wealth in the form of textiles but also of hospitality.\(^{41}\)

From the New Room, appraisers walked upstairs to the “Upper Chamber” (1685) or “High Chamber” (1697). This was a comfortable room with a fireplace, where the head of household entertained more exclusively than in the New Room. When it was Philemon’s bedchamber, it had the second best bed in the house (valued at £14, a pound less than Madam Lloyd’s), complete with a warming pan, as well as eight calf-skinned chairs, a round table, and a looking glass. When Henrietta Maria became head of the household, she made this bedchamber her own. The bed in the High Chamber became the best bed of the house; at £24, it was £10 more valuable than Philemon’s and was the most costly single object in the house apart from Henrietta Maria’s silver, which was

worth £89. She also replaced the leather-bound seats with seven fashionable caned chairs and couch, all with cushions.\footnote{The functions of the Upper or High Chamber seem similar to the Great Chamber of sixteenth-century English houses described by Mark Girouard in \textit{Life in English Country House: A Social and Architectural History} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 88–94. According to the 1685 probate inventory, the silver belonging to Philemon Lloyd was stored in the kitchen building and was assessed at £42, half the value of Henrietta Maria’s silver. On the fashion of caned furniture, see C. Carson, “The Consumer Revolution...Why Demand?” in \textit{Of Consuming Interests}, ed. Carson, Hoffman, and Albert, 594.}

Other rooms above-stairs were the “bleu” and “black” chambers, likely named after their wall paint color, and two studies. The bleu chamber was more expensively furnished than the black chamber, with turkey work chairs instead of wooden chairs, and a single well-furnished feather bed instead of several cheaper beds and bolsters. Six flax wheels were installed in the black chamber after 1685. Also after Philemon’s death, a second study was added near the “old” study. Each contained a substantial bed (two small flock beds were added to the “old study” after Philemon’s death) and old charts. The single study during Philemon’s lifetime also contained a table, three chairs (one with turkey work), two small chests, and an old cittern, a guitar-like musical instrument that was popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A second cittern made its way into the “old study” during Henrietta Maria’s widowhood.\footnote{“Cittern,” in \textit{Oxford English Dictionary}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 3:249. Carson discusses rooms “known by the color of their coordinated textiles and wall coverings,” first appearing in British American inventories in the 1660s and 1670s, in “The Consumer Revolution...Why Demand?” in \textit{Of Consuming Interests}, ed. Carson, Hoffman, and Albert, 630.}

The appraisers next reached the staircase on their approach to “Madam Lloyd’s Room” (1685) or the “Lodging Room” (1697) on the ground floor. In the staircase, the appraisers passed sufficient bedding for several servants (perhaps stored here during the...
day), an old clock, apparel, and two old chests later replaced by two cases of knives and earthenware. Also, in 1697, the appraisers recorded “old books” along this corridor, and an “entry” on the ground floor containing two saddles, an old cupboard, and a chair.

When Philemon was alive, Madam Lloyd’s Room, near the bottom of the staircase, rivaled the New Room as the most expensively furnished room in the house. Its centerpieces were the most valuable bed in the house (valued at £15) and the suite of olivewood furniture that Henrietta Maria later moved into the New Room. Madam Lloyd’s Room also contained two chests of drawers and a cupboard, the contents of which were not revealed by her husband’s probate inventory. A mistress of Henrietta Maria’s status would typically have a private bedchamber in which she might entertain other women.44

After Henrietta Maria moved her sleeping quarters upstairs, “Madam Lloyd’s Room” was renamed the “Lodging Room.” The 1697 probate inventory reveals the wealth of Henrietta Maria’s personal possessions kept in this room, including eleven pairs of women’s shoes, eighteen pairs of women’s gloves, ample sewing materials, £89 worth of silver, more table and bed linens, plus a small hand bell that she and other females in the household might have used to call servants when they had their hands and laps full while sewing. The reflection of firelight from three looking glasses must have improved the women’s vision while they worked.45

44 Crowley, Invention of Comfort, 16; Girouard, Life in the English Country House, chapter 5.
45 Henrietta Maria Lloyd owned nearly twice as much silver as her second husband. According to his probate inventory, Philemon Lloyd’s silver was worth £41.17.0, including a £6.10.6 can and spoons worth £8.6.6. Philemon also owned a silver watch
Henrietta Maria's clothing and jewelry were likely stored in the six trunks and chests in the Lodging Room. Her wardrobe made up nearly thirty percent of the total value of the house's contents in 1697. Of the fourteen gowns in the widow's possession at the end of her life, five were made of silk or satin. Three were morning gowns for the reception of guests in a fashionable state of undress made popular by portraits of Charles II's mistresses. Four headdresses in addition to "other neck lining" were physical markers that Henrietta Maria was exempt from the hard physical labor of women of lower rank. She also had silk petticoats and stockings, a pearl necklace, and a diamond ring. Her wardrobe offers eloquent testimony to her personal deportment as a woman of high social standing.46

Henrietta Maria could supervise the household from Madam Lloyd's Room, later the Lodging Room, because of its location between the hall, the nursery, and service buildings outside. The term "nursery" in early Maryland generally referred to a child's bedroom, and in 1685 the appraisers found two feather beds and two bolsters in the Lloyd's nursery. Since Philemon's death, the nursery had fallen out of use, presumably because the surviving children had outgrown the room. Also, Henrietta Maria had moved worth £4 and, as documented by an account, a silver cane valued at £6.10.0 that was a legacy to a son.

her sleeping quarters upstairs. In 1697, the nursery contained only a case “full of bottles” and “a parcel of other old things.” Just beyond Madam Lloyd’s room (later the Lodging Room) and the nursery was the detached kitchen. At least four servants slept in the kitchen loft. As Henrietta Maria grew older, she probably became more reliant on a cook or housekeeper named Gwin, who had her own room in the kitchen loft during Henrietta Maria’s widowhood. Gwin’s chamber contained an old bed and couch.47

Henrietta Maria Lloyd also owned land in her own right, bequeathing over 2,900 acres in her will. Most of the land in her bequests was in the vicinity of Wye Plantation, indicating that she obtained the land through marriage into the Lloyd and Bennett families and not from her father on the Western Shore. (Moreover, Henrietta Maria’s mother survived her and had to be supported by James Neale’s estate.) In an unusual choice of words for a woman in the colonial Chesapeake, Henrietta Maria referred to one parcel of land as “my seat,” 216 acres of land on Wye River called Henrietta Maria’s Discovery that she purchased from her son Edward Lloyd. The word “seat”

47 “Nursery,” in OED, 2nd ed. (1989), 10:605; Main, Tobacco Colony, 293. Nurseries were rare in early Maryland, appearing only in the wealthiest households. In the Lloyd house, the nursery appears to have outlived its usefulness after the children reached their teens. This fits Karin Calvert’s observation that the focus of childcare in British America before 1750 was getting children past the “perils of infancy” (Children in the House: The Material Culture of Early Childhood, 1600–1900 [Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992], 8). Two of Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s daughters died in 1690, and a third died by 1696. An administration account of 1696 charged Philemon Lloyd’s estate £30 for their funerals and doctor’s fees, £7 for three tombstones, and £5.9.0 for “14 gold rings given amongst the children and relations in memory” (Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 13B, folio 93, MSA). By 1697, all of her surviving children were ages 14 and above. Their advanced ages helps to account for the increase in the number of beds in the house between 1685 and 1697, from nine to twelve. (This figure does not include servants’ beds and bedding in the kitchen and staircase.)
communicated a rare sense of entitlement and pride in possession by a woman of the colonial Chesapeake, admittedly one of high status and considerable wealth.\textsuperscript{48}

As a widow, Henrietta Maria Lloyd was a patron of a Roman Catholic chapel close to Wye Plantation, located at the nearby town of Doncaster. In 1693, John Londey, another Talbot County Catholic, entrusted her with the maintenance of the chapel. Londey bequeathed to her land intended for the support of the chapel and the responsibility to care for the chapel. A plat made for her in 1695 depicts the chapel (Figure 15). In her will, Henrietta Maria added three hundred acres of her own for support of the chapel and its priests.\textsuperscript{49}

As a wealthy widow and locally prominent Catholic, Henrietta Maria Lloyd was a target for those who feared a combined Catholic and Indian uprising against the now Protestant regime. In the wake of the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, a group called the Protestant Association, led by John Coode, seized control of Maryland’s colonial government in the stated belief that the proprietor and his close political circle were too

\textsuperscript{48} Will of Henrietta Maria Lloyd, April 26, 1697, proved June 2, 1697, in Wills, Liber 7, folios 252–54, MSA.
\textsuperscript{49} Information on Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s “church stuff” and Londey’s bequest from Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folio 215, February 27, 1701/02, MSA; and Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age” (1994), 206n. How Philemon and Henrietta Maria Lloyd negotiated space in the house for their separate religious practices and the different religious education of the Bennett and Lloyd children, not to mention that of the servants, slaves, and dependent kin from either side of the family, would make a fascinating study. Negotiation of space and power in mixed-faith households in seventeenth-century Maryland has not been examined critically. Hardy asserts that Henrietta Maria had a chapel in the Lloyd house, on the basis of her possession of “church stuff,” but this author is not convinced (see also Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D diss., 63). The Lloyds’ neighbor Colonel Peter Sayer, on the other hand, had a distinct “chapell roome” in his house (probate inventory of Peter Sayer, March 1697/98, Inventories and Accounts, Liber 17, folios 78–92). Hardy describes early Maryland chapels in her Ph.D. dissertation, pp. 194–201, and the Doncaster chapel specifically on pp. 556–57. Doncaster is one of the “lost towns” established by the colonial government in 1683.
slow to recognize England’s new government. In 1689, Protestant Associators seized arms and ammunitions from Wye Plantation and, across the Wye River, from the plantation of Colonel Peter Sayer, another Catholic of high status. Three years later, the Maryland assembly ordered the return of Madam Lloyd’s arms, after fears of a conspiracy had passed.50

Conclusion

For Wye Plantation in the seventeenth century, the one-to-one relationship between the head of the household and the wealth of the plantation, so often depicted in histories of eighteenth-century Chesapeake plantations, did not exist. The plantation’s founder, Edward Lloyd I, was a mid-seventeenth-century lesser merchant from London who came to the colonies to establish himself in trade. He entrusted his son with the day-to-day management of the plantation and successfully returned home to England. During his residence in the Chesapeake, Edward I took a practical approach to the religious politics of his day. He initially settled in Virginia, but when faced with narrowed economic and political opportunity there because of the royal governor’s hostility toward

---

50 News of King William III’s defeat of James II at the Battle of the Boyne in June 1690 would have dampened fears of a Catholic conspiracy. The value of the arms seized at Wye Plantation was £16.10.0, far beyond the £3.10.0 value of “old guns” in the hall in Henrietta Maria’s 1697 inventory (Archives of Md., 13:335). The discrepancy is curious and suggests that the plantations of elite families with militia leadership roles were more heavily armed than probate inventories convey. For an account by Sayer of the seizure, see Archives of Md., 8:158–62. The seizure of arms is also noted in Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 43, and Carr and Jordan, Maryland’s Revolution in Government, 65. Information on Sayer from Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 43, 63. Hardy calls Henrietta Maria Lloyd and Colonel Peter Sayer the “two leading Catholics” on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, citing the 1689 seizure of arms as evidence (“Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 43, and “A Papist in a Protestant Age” [1994], 207).
Puritans on the eve of England's civil war, Edward I and others in his Virginia Puritan community accepted Lord Baltimore's offer of religious sanctuary in Maryland in return for loyalty to the proprietary government. Edward I's accommodation with Lord Baltimore's regime gave him financial opportunities, including access to newly available land patents for Maryland's Eastern Shore. Furthermore, his son, Philemon Lloyd, married Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett, a woman of high status in Maryland, a Roman Catholic, and mother of the heirs of Richard Bennett I.

After Philemon died, Henrietta Maria Lloyd took over as head of the household while Edward I maintained his investment from London. Henrietta Maria Lloyd's survival into the mid-1690s kept Lloyd and Bennett family interests knit together, and thus gave the plantation an important measure of economic and social stability during the political rebellion of 1689 and its aftermath.
Edward Lloyd II (1670–1719) was master of Wye Plantation at a time of economic distress and political uncertainty. Tobacco prices were low throughout most of his life, wars between England and France disrupted overseas trade, and Maryland passed in and out of royal government. After a rebellion against Lord Baltimore’s government in 1689, Protestants gained political control. But Maryland remained a proprietary colony; Baltimore retained his ownership of the land as part of his settlement with the crown. Through Baltimore’s patronage in a private capacity, Catholics continued to wield power in Maryland. Most importantly, they retained control of the proprietor’s land and the offices associated with land administration. When the crown restored Baltimore’s government in 1715, the gains realized by Maryland’s Protestant political elite were not guaranteed.

The twenty-five years of crown rule in Maryland, from 1690 to 1715, presented opportunities and challenges to the third master of Wye Plantation. Edward II used a combination of inherited resources and newly available strategies to maintain the family’s prominence. Building on inherited commercial ties, Edward II took advantage of new opportunities in trade with the West Indies and London. After serving in the assembly, like his father before him, Edward II surpassed his father’s position in government through the patronage of crown officials and served for five years, from 1709
to 1714, as Maryland’s acting governor. Through his fashionable household furnishings and dress, Edward II displayed the overlapping mercantile and political ties to London that contributed to his power. Edward II’s adaptation to change through trade, politics, and gentility highlights the process of the reformulation of Maryland’s elite at the turn of the eighteenth century.

**Wye Plantation’s Economy, 1696–1719**

**Death and the Division of the Lloyd and Bennett Family Estates**

Edward II became master of Wye Plantation after deaths in the Lloyd family between 1696 and 1701 loosened ties of property ownership. Edward I, the plantation’s founder, died in London in 1696, followed by his daughter-in-law, Henrietta Maria (Neale Bennett) Lloyd, in Maryland in 1697, and his widow, Grace, three years later. Because all three persons owned or controlled property at Wye, their deaths launched a process of dividing the family estate that lasted several years. During this time, the Lloyd family relied on the financial resources of kinsman Richard Bennett III to provide stability.

The survival of Edward Lloyd I and Henrietta Maria Lloyd into the mid-1690s delayed the inheritances of Henrietta Maria’s elder sons, and thus their marriages. As noted in the previous chapter, the Lloyd and Bennett estates were commingled during Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s twelve years as the widow of Philemon Lloyd, even as her elder sons passed into adulthood. All of Henrietta Maria’s sons married after her death, at relatively late ages for wealthy native-born men of their high social standing and family wealth. Bennett married in 1700 at age thirty-four. Edward II married in 1703, at age
thirty-three. His younger brothers, Philemon Lloyd II (c. 1674–1732/3) and James Lloyd (1679/80–1723), married in 1709, at ages thirty-four and twenty-nine, respectively. Also indicative of delayed inheritance, Edward II was first elected to the Maryland assembly in the same year that his mother died.  

Wye Plantation remained a joint Lloyd-Bennett family enterprise for nearly a decade following the deaths of Edward I and Henrietta Maria Lloyd. Richard Bennett III administered Edward I’s Maryland estate. Bennett partnered with his stepbrother, Philemon Lloyd II, to settle their mother’s estate. Copies of Henrietta Maria’s probate inventories were kept at the “company office.” For the next eight years, the men, as a company, represented the estate in court and assumed its debts and other outstanding business. The work included negotiating the purchase of slaves from the estate of Grace Lloyd, widow of Edward I, to whom Edward I had bequeathed his property “beyond the seas.”

---


2 Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age” (1994), 208–9. The reference to “the company office” appears in Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 25, folios 1–5, July 20, 1705, MSA. The office’s location is unknown; one possibility is Wye Town, formerly Doncaster, which was close to both Wye Plantation and Bennett’s (formerly Col. Peter Sayer’s) house across the Wye River. Other administrative accounts of Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate are Prerogative Court, Accounts, Liber 21, folios 213–19, 339–41, and
Bennett’s administration of Edward I’s estate perpetuated family ties between the Lloyd and Bennett estates and maintained Bennett’s financial interest in the fortunes of the Lloyd estate at Wye. Moreover, Bennett’s extensive financial resources and considerable credit network could be relied upon to keep Wye Plantation afloat during the division of the estate among Philemon I’s heirs, and to help Edward II and his brothers establish themselves in trade and planting.

By the 1690s, Bennett had already begun his mercantile career in Maryland, with the benefit of substantial inherited wealth from both his father and grandfather, Richard Bennett I and II. As a youth, Bennett lived in Bristol, England, an important port of call for American shipping, where he very likely trained as a merchant’s apprentice. Bennett’s time in England was also important for reestablishing personal ties to merchant families who had done business with his deceased father and grandfather. When Bennett returned to Maryland, he remained in close proximity to the Lloyd family by marrying into a neighboring household across the Wye River.3

In testimony to the amount of capital at Bennett’s disposal at an early age, Bennett, in a partnership with fellow Roman Catholic and Maryland merchant James

---

Heath, leased the Maryland proprietor’s quit rents (due on all freeholds in Maryland) from 1699 to 1707 in exchange for updating the rent collection records. By this arrangement, the proprietor was to receive a fixed but certain cash income of £500 sterling annually. Bennett and Heath took the risk that the tobacco received from landholders to pay quit rents would yield a profit at a time of depressed tobacco prices. 4

The lease agreement with Maryland’s proprietor suggests the extent of Bennett’s resources to ship and market tobacco. By 1700, Bennett already owned two ships and financed transatlantic shipments. In 1701, his 300-ton ship, the Speaker, transported a shipment from London that the Lloyds of Wye had a share in. Local port records are scarce from this period of Maryland history, but the Lloyd family undoubtedly benefited from other trading partnerships with Bennett. 5

Edward Lloyd II as a Merchant and Planter

As a merchant, Edward II operated on a smaller scale than his half-brother, Richard Bennett III. Nonetheless, he expanded Wye Plantation’s mercantile operations by increasing his participation in the consignment system with London merchants and by investing more in trade with the West Indies. 6

---

4 Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age” (1994), 210. Though tobacco prices had fallen after 1680, Bennett and Heath may have been optimistic when the lease began, given a brief rise in prices between wars, from 1697 to 1702 (Main, Tobacco Colony, 18, 21n).
5 Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age” (1994), 207n; the reference to the Speaker is in the February 27, 1701/02, account for the estate of Henrietta Maria Lloyd, referenced in note 2. Clemens notes the scarcity of local port records in Atlantic Economy and Maryland’s Eastern Shore, 123.
6 Perhaps to bolster his career in trade, Edward II married a merchant’s daughter, Sarah Covington (1683–1755). Sarah was the daughter of Nehemiah Covington, a merchant and Quaker who lived in Somerset County, Maryland, south of Talbot County on the Eastern Shore (Rountree and Davidson, Eastern Shore Indians of Maryland and Virginia, 102). As a Quaker, Covington may have had valuable co-religionist ties with Barbadian Quaker
The growth in mercantile trade at Wye Plantation can be traced in estate administration and probate records. In 1701–1702, the administrators of Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate sold Wye Plantation’s tobacco through two London merchants. One of these, the firm of Micajeh Perry, continued to trade with Wye Plantation over the next two decades. Meanwhile, Edward II established accounts with three other London merchants, at least one of whom, in addition to Perry, sent goods to Wye.7

Edward II operated two stores, one that he inherited at Wye Plantation and another at Wye Town (formerly Doncaster). Edward II also supplied goods to a man named Robert Noble, who sold the goods on Lloyd’s behalf. More stores meant more places for Edward II to collect tobacco for consignment to London merchants and more opportunities to lend credit. Lloyd’s stores carried basic household goods as his father’s had, though with greater variety, such as a larger array of cloth and tableware.8

---

7 Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate account of February 27, 1702 documents tobacco “sold by” Edward Loman and the firm of Micajeh Perry and Thomas Lane (Liber 21, folios 213–19). Edward II, at the time of his death, had accounts with Perry, Captain John Hyde, John Gopsill, and Gilbert Higginson with Robert Poird, all of London (administrative account for Edward Lloyd’s estate, September 20, 1720, Liber 3, folios 255–57, Prerogative Court, MSA). Hyde was a major tobacco importer circa 1700 (Jacob M. Price, Perry of London: A Family and a Firm on the Seaborne Frontier, 1615–1753 [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992], 58, 79 [table 4]). Edward II’s probate inventory included a “parcel of goods” sent by Hyde “as per invoice.” At the time of his death, Edward II had a total balance of over £1,300 among the four merchants.

8 The following probate inventories and accounts document Edward Lloyd II’s personal property: the initial probate inventory, taken August 27, 1719, Talbot County, Inventories and Accounts, Liber 3, folios 1–40; additional inventory, November 12, 1720, Liber 4, folios 107–12; additional account, April 9, April 14, and June 9, 1720, Liber 4, folios 223–24; administrative account, June 15, 1720, Liber 2, folios 518–22; and administrative account, September 20, 1720, Liber 3, folios 255–57, all Prerogative Court, Maryland State Archives.
Edward II was one of an estimated sixty merchant-planters in Talbot County between 1680 and 1713. (The current boundaries of Talbot County were set in 1706.) Merchant-planters in the Chesapeake varied in the scale of their mercantile operations, some providing little service beyond their own plantations. Edward II moved aggressively to take advantage of a confluence of factors: his inherited resources in property and connections, the expansion of the credit market in London after 1690, the greater willingness of London merchants to participate in the consignment trade, at the risk of planters' indebtedness, and regional population growth.9

The emphasis on basic household goods in the stock of Edward Lloyd’s stores in 1719 is consistent with the findings of Carr and Walsh, “Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behavior in the Colonial Chesapeake,” in Of Consuming Interests, ed. Carson, Hoffman, and Albert, 62–63. Lloyd’s stores, for example, stocked cotton cloth (calico) from India, which had the advantages of “lightness, comfort and workability” and was in demand in Europe after 1670 (John E. Wills, Jr., “European Consumption and Asian Production in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries,” in Consumption and the World of Goods, ed. John Brewer and Roy Porter [London: Routledge, 1993], 134). Despite the presence of imported cloth on store shelves and the disappearance of “Maryland cloth,” domestic production of cloth at Wye continued. An enslaved woman named Bess was let in the house to “spin,” though spinning wheels were not recorded in the probate inventory of 1719 (Testamentary Papers, box 25, folder 34, on Edward Lloyd’s estate, 1719–1720, MSA). Evidence of earlier domestic production of cloth at Wye included the size of the sheep population (twice as large in 1685 as it was in 1719), spinning wheels in the black chamber of the Lloyd house in 1697, and, in 1701, a weaver’s room with a bed (account of Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s estate, February 27, 1701/02, Prerogative Court, Liber 21, folios 213–19, MSA).

The consignment system became increasingly widespread in the Chesapeake during Edward II's lifetime as an alternative to the agent system. Before 1670, planters typically sold their tobacco to a London merchant's agent who resided, at least temporarily, in the colony. The same agent sold manufactured goods that his London sponsor had shipped overseas. The agent charged a commission on both transactions. In the consignment system, planters sold their tobacco directly to London merchants, bypassing the local agent. Planters then drew upon their credit with individual London merchants to purchase goods or labor.

For Chesapeake merchant-planters, the consignment system offered the promise of higher returns and greater control over marketing. As the local merchants, they could mark up prices by 100 percent or more to compensate for high shipping costs. To help clients meet these costs, merchant-planters lent credit, and credit-lending generated more profit for merchant-planters.\(^{10}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Price, *Perry of London*, 49, on price increases. See Chapter 3 for references on credit lending as a business. Governor Benedict Leonard Calvert cited the experience of Richard Bennett III in a letter of 1729 to his brother, the fifth Lord Baltimore, with regard to the profits that local merchants reap from charging “from 100 to 200 pr Cent” for
The consignment system also created an opportunity to develop personal credit relationships with merchants in London, the financial center of England’s empire. Planters purchased slaves, for example, by drawing upon their credit in London. Edward II’s correspondence with London merchants also facilitated his trade with the West Indies. His probate records document that Micajeh Perry’s firm sent rum and sugar to Wye Plantation, and through John Hyde, Lloyd financed the consignment of two servants and a slave in Barbados to be sold in Maryland. For Edward II, the provisions trade with the West Indies offset lean times in the tobacco market and provided Lloyd with a credit cushion in London.11

Mercantile trade was a risky investment. Under the consignment system, a planter spent his own capital to erect and maintain his stores. He shared with the London merchant the inability of a neighbor to pay a store debt, and the risk of the loss of cargo at sea. These last two were particular perils during Edward II’s lifetime, when tobacco prices were low and England was at war. Low tobacco prices from 1680 until 1715 (except for a brief rise between 1697 and 1702) reduced planters’ purchasing power and their ability to repay debts. Compounding the problem was a diminished supply of imported goods. Calvert wrote, “as Mr Bennett a great and knowing trader here observes, the trader gets as much for his goods as he Can, in Tobacco, having Allways the whip hand of the Planters necessitys for Cloaths and Tools” (*Archives of Md.*, 25:604).

11 Price, *Perry of London*, 47, on Perry’s minor involvement in the West Indies trade; Parent, *Foul Means*, 95–98, on the importance of credit in London for the Virginia merchant-planter. The incentives for London tobacco merchants to contract directly with individual planters, instead of their own agents, are not entirely clear. London merchants took the risk that planters would not be able to pay their debts in tobacco, for instance when crops failed or tobacco prices were low. One benefit of the consignment system for London merchants was that the ships that they chartered could collect tobacco more efficiently by traveling to several plantations in one voyage, instead of waiting at a single warehouse until the agent obtained enough tobacco to make a return trip worthwhile.
indentured servants from England to labor in the tobacco fields and the high cost of slaves. Though slave prices fluctuated during this period, servants remained a cheaper, short-term option for the majority of planters who lacked the credit to purchase a slave and the capital to sustain the loss if the slave died soon after purchase. Some debtors fled to the Carolinas to find amnesty. Meanwhile, intermittent warfare between England and France between 1690 and 1713 disrupted overseas trade. French and Spanish markets for oronoco tobacco, the variety grown on the Upper Eastern Shore, closed in wartime, and the cost of transatlantic shipping rose due to the risk of seizure by privateers.12

12 Price, *Perry of London*, 34–36, on the cost of imports in wartime; Parent, *Foul Means*, 37, 56–60, 89, on the reduction of the servant trade. King William's War, or the War of the League of Augsburg, from 1690 to 1697, was followed by Queen Anne's War, or the War of the Spanish Succession, between 1702 and 1713. After a fall in slave prices in the Caribbean in the 1680s, slave prices rose during England's two wars with France and dropped between and after the wars. In the 1720s, a prime male hand in the Chesapeake cost on average between £18 and £20, which was still higher than the 1680s price (in the West Indies) of £15 (Richard B. Sheridan, *Sugar and Slavery: An Economic History of the British West Indies, 1623–1775* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973], 252–53; Lorena S. Walsh, *Motives of Honor, Pleasure, and Profit: Plantation Management in the Colonial Chesapeake, 1607–1763* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010], 201–2, 343, 367). Main observed a small but steady rise in the price of slaves in Maryland from the 1680s to the end of the 1710s (*Tobacco Colony*, 274–79). For war's effects on trade in this period, see also Lorena S. Walsh, "Mercantile Strategies, Credit Networks, and Labor Supply: The Colonial Chesapeake in Transatlantic Perspective," in *Slavery in the Development of the Americas*, ed. David Eltis, Frank D. Lewis, and Kenneth L. Sokoloff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 92; and McCusker and Menard, *Economy of British America*, 123.

Maryland’s economy depended “entirely upon Trade,” royal governor John Hart observed in 1714. Despite interruptions in trade and a thirty-year depression in the tobacco market, there were bright spots in the economy. Periodic scarcity of imported manufactured goods drove up demand. The end of the Royal African Company’s monopoly on the transatlantic slave trade in 1698 resulted in more slaves coming to Maryland. Independent slave traders were more willing than the Royal African Company to sell slaves in Maryland, where profit margins were lower than in the West Indies. Tobacco’s lower profitability still generated a market for slaves. And, Maryland’s trade with the West Indies expanded. At the turn of the eighteenth century, the West Indies continued to be the economic engine of the English Atlantic world as a producer of sugar, rum, molasses, and lesser crops such as dye woods and cotton. West Indian planters purchased grain and meat from the mainland colonies to free up valuable arable land for

Period of Colonial Maryland, 1689–1715,” Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1966, p. 314). In 1706, Seymour reported illegal sale of Maryland tobacco to New England merchants for fish, rum, and wooden ware. Meanwhile, Marylanders went “stark naked” for lack of cloth from England. The “extreme want of cloths and bedding” for servants and slaves spurred domestic production of “linens and woolens” (Seymour to Board of Trade, August 21, 1706, CSP, Colonial Series, 23: no. 470; Seymour to Board of Trade, May 10, 1707, Archives of Md., 25:266–67). Maryland’s council also gave accounts to the Board of Trade of the scarcity of imported cloth and other “distressed circumstances” as a result of the “extream low price for Oronoko tobacco” in addresses dated November 4, 1710 and April 16, 1713 (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 319). Not only did London ships arrive “empty,” but they also faced a difficult return voyage. In 1707, ships waited in Maryland for a convoy to England (Archives of Md., 25:225). These testimonies support historians’ arguments for the continued importance of tobacco in Maryland’s economy between 1680 and 1715, when tobacco prices were low (Main, Tobacco Colony, 21–24; Clemens, Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore, 168–74).
sugar production. Foodstuffs from Maryland were also marketed in the Wine Islands (Madeira, the Azores, and the Canary Islands) and Southern Europe.\(^{13}\)

Edward II took advantage of a boom in the local shipbuilding industry that coincided with increased trade with the West Indies by investing in a larger ship than the one his father owned. Edward II took the risk of transporting shipments in his own bottoms, in order to expand in trade, and on his own terms. At the end of his life, Edward II owned two ships—a brig, a seagoing vessel, valued at £470, and a sloop, worth £280, for travel in the Chesapeake Bay and along the Eastern seaboard. Both ships were larger than his parents’ shallop, valued at £10 and £12 in their respective probate inventories.

When Edward II’s probate inventory was taken, on board the brig the Sarah were

---

\(^{13}\) Archives of Md., 29:347 (quote); William A. Pettigrew, “Free to Enslave: Politics and the Escalation of Britain’s Transatlantic Slave Trade, 1688–1714,” William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, 64 (2007): 3–38; Clemens, Atlantic Economy and Maryland’s Eastern Shore, on coastal trade, 176; McCusker and Menard, Economy of British America, 79, 100–01, 155; Dunn, Sugar and Slaves, 273–75. Sugar prices remained high during the war years, though sugar planters did not respond by increasing production (McCusker and Menard, Economy of British America, 157–61; Dunn, Sugar and Slaves, 147). As council president, Edward II wrote to the Board of Trade in 1712 that the corn and wheat that Maryland sent to the Caribbean for “West India goods and salt” were re-exported to Lisbon, New England, and Madeira (July 15, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 11). Shortly after his arrival in Maryland in 1714, Governor John Hart wrote that planters, “finding themselves dayly worn worse by raising tobacco, they now raise stocks of cattle and sowe much grain, for which they find a ready market to Jamaica, Barbados, and Leeward Islands, and even Portugal” (Hart to Lord Bolingbroke, July 11, 1714, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 717). In 1720, Hart attested to the shipment of pork and lumber to Madeira in exchange for wine, rum, and sugar (Jordan, “The Royal Period of Colonial Maryland,” 312). David Hancock discusses Madeira’s importation of food from the Chesapeake in Oceans of Wine: Madeira and the Emergence of American Trade and Taste (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). Trade between the colonial Chesapeake and the West Indies at the turn of the eighteenth century remains a less well-known subject than the coastal trade between the Chesapeake and New England (Douglas M. Bradburn and John C. Coombs, “Smoke and Mirrors: Reinterpreting the Society and Economy of the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake,” Atlantic Studies 3 [2006], 131–57).
foodstuffs probably bound for the Caribbean: bread, flour, pork, and beef. The sloop
_Rebecca_ carried Indian corn, pork, and live hogs.\(^{14}\)

Wye Plantation was capable of producing the foodstuffs found on board the ships, though Edward II also could have bartered store goods for provisions to add to his shipments. Lloyd raised wheat in addition to corn and tobacco, and as a merchant, he was able to offer smaller planters credit for their grain, meat, or livestock to ship on his own bottoms. Wye Plantation’s swine population doubled between 1685 and 1719. Meanwhile, the cattle population held steady, hovering at just under 200 head. The ships’ cargos testify to the family’s sustained interest in diversified agriculture as a hedge against depressed tobacco prices.\(^{15}\)

Edward II shipped provisions to the West Indies to exchange for goods and labor. He introduced to Wye Plantation’s stores the West Indian products of ginger, molasses, and rum. In Maryland he also sold brandy, a French product obtainable in the West Indies. Shortly after his death, his widow sold two female servants and one adult male

\(^{14}\) On the contemporary boom in the shipbuilding industry on the Upper Eastern Shore, see Ben Ford, “A Geographic History of Maryland Shipbuilding, 1631–1850,” _Maryland Historical Magazine_ 102 (2007), 258–75, esp. 267. The ships’ cargo was recorded in the probate inventory of 1719. A sloop was sufficient for coastal trade with New England (Clemens, _Atlantic Economy and Maryland’s Eastern Shore_, 95–96). Trade with the West Indies and the Wine Islands required larger ships. Governor John Seymour wrote to the Board of Trade in 1708 that to his knowledge, “about a dozen” ships built in Maryland, of burdens of up to 400 tons, sailed to “the West Indies and Azores” for trade (June 23, CSP, _Colonial Series_, 23: no. 1570). In 1720, Governor Hart reported that Marylanders owned four small brigantines (Hart to Board of Trade, August 25, CSP, _Colonial Series_, 32: no. 214). This figure puts Edward II, owner of one brig, in exclusive company.

\(^{15}\) An additional inventory of November 12, 1720, documented the presence of a wheat crop at Wye. Swine throughout the Chesapeake thrived under colonists’ benign neglect (Anderson, “Animals in the Wilderness,” 391–92). The horse population at Wye grew modestly between 1685 and 1719, from fourteen to seventeen.
slave from Barbados who had been consigned to him for sale. Edward II may have accepted the laborers as payment for goods delivered to Barbados, on the expectation that their sale would cover the debt owed to him on the island. (Edward II’s probate records do not document earlier consignments of servants or slaves that the deceased may have accepted.) Barbados, England’s leading sugar producer, was shedding labor at the turn of the eighteenth century. Barbados’s middling planters left the island as their economic prospects declined, due to soil problems and consolidation by larger planters. The re-exportation of bonded labor was a consequence of the economic squeeze.  

Edward II did not only sell servants, but he also retained them. This third-generation merchant-planter had proportionately more servants in his total labor force than his father did, despite an increase in the number of imported slaves in the Chesapeake during his lifetime. In 1685, when Edward II’s father died, Wye Plantation’s labor force was 20 percent indentured and 80 percent enslaved. More than forty years later, the plantation’s labor force was 35 percent indentured and 65 percent enslaved. The reduction in the number of slaves at Wye Plantation, from thirty-eight persons in 1685 to thirty persons in 1719, can be attributed in part to partible inheritance—Edward II had six

---

siblings who lived to adulthood—combined with the low reproduction rate among slaves in the Chesapeake during this period. But Edward II’s increased reliance on servant labor still begs explanation, because it is generally believed that planters preferred to own slaves rather than to contract for servants. Slaves were subjected to a greater degree of coercion than servants and, at the same time, were less likely to run away. Furthermore, Edward II had the requisite commercial ties to London to purchase slaves on credit.17

The importance of the provisions trade with the West Indies offers a clue as to how Edward II used servant labor. At the turn of the eighteenth century, servants and slaves on Chesapeake plantations were increasingly segregated in both work and housing. In wealthy planter households, slaves, both male and female, were increasingly confined to tobacco production, while male servants worked in more recognizably “English” agriculture of grain and livestock farming. Furthermore, in eighteenth-century Talbot County, indentured servants and free whites dominated the skilled trades.18

17 Philemon Lloyd had nine servants and thirty-eight slaves at the time of his death in 1685; Edward Lloyd II had seventeen servants and thirty slaves when he died in 1719. Edward II had more indentured male hands (ten men and six boys) than enslaved male hands (nine men and five boys). According to Clemens, the most recent peak of servant immigration from England to Maryland’s Eastern Shore occurred between 1697 and 1701, during a peace with France (Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore, 52–55). Any servants who had come to Wye at that time would have completed their terms of service a decade prior to Edward II’s death.

18 One indication that Edward II employed his slaves in producing tobacco is that appraisers assessed each of the seven prime female slaves at the same premium value (£40) as the prime male slaves. Edward II owned a total of sixteen prime adult slaves, plus nine enslaved children (fewer in number than in 1685, when there were eighteen enslaved children at Wye Plantation) and five older adults. Pressed to give reasons for their low value assessment of the five older slaves, the appraisers had nothing kind or positive to say about these persons. Joan, or Jane, was at least forty years of age, they said, and “past labor” and slow at work. Nann was thought to be crazed or mad; an
Edward II pursued mixed agriculture while not significantly expanding tobacco production at Wye Plantation, as evidenced by his conservative decisions on land and labor acquisition. He inherited 5,300 acres, and over his lifetime he acquired only 1,700 additional acres. While well above the average landholding of 250 acres by Eastern Shore planters of the time, Edward II was not as aggressive in acquiring land as his father and grandfather had been. The sagging tobacco market contributed to a depression in land prices on the Eastern Shore in the early eighteenth century and discouraged speculative

overseer added that she was an “old cross scolding woman.” Frank, over sixty, “stoops with age.” Tom, also around sixty, was “a sorry old Negro.” One appraiser “heard and believed” that Bess, a “decriped” woman, did not work outside but was “let in the house” to spin (Testamentary Papers, box 25, folder 34, MSA).

In domestic living arrangements as well as in work assignments, servants and slaves exhibited greater social distance from one another in the early eighteenth century than their predecessors did before 1660. Several hypotheses have been offered to explain the declining fluidity in race relations at the end of the seventeenth century. One theory points to cultural differences between slaves who were native to the Chesapeake, and the slaves who came directly from Africa in increasing numbers after 1680. The newcomers, mostly men and boys, had trouble assimilating to established slave communities, depressing slaves’ reproduction rates for a generation (Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 3–4, 13–14, 81; Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves, 319–24). Kathleen Brown argues that the presence of slave women in tobacco fields demeaned the value of the work for whites. It can be assumed that the one female indentured servant at Wye in 1719 did not perform field work (Kathleen Brown, Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, & Anxious Patriarchs: Gender, Race and Power in Colonial Virginia [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996], 116–28, 295–96). It can also be argued that given the contemporary decline in servant immigration from England, male indentured servants had greater leverage in choosing work assignments that indicated a status above enslavement. A market for skilled indentured servants persisted in Maryland into the mid-eighteenth century (Walsh, “Mercantile Strategies”; Carr, “Emigration and the Standard of Living”). Jean B. Russo observed that skilled indentured servants in early eighteenth-century Talbot County were often bound to large planters (“Free Workers in a Plantation Economy in Talbot County, Maryland, 1690–1759,” Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1983, pp. 89–90).
land acquisition. Edward II died with two thousand fewer acres than his father possessed thirty-five years earlier.  

While the tobacco market was down, opportunities in the consignment trade with London and the provisions trade with the West Indies beckoned. With the assistance of Richard Bennett III, his half-brother and neighbor, Edward II took advantage of easier credit terms in London as a result of that city’s “financial revolution” after 1688. Through trade, Edward II also strengthened personal ties to London merchants, who, pursuant to the political revolutions in England and Maryland of 1688 and 1689, were, for Marylanders, an important source of political information and influence in the new world of Whitehall politics.

Adjusting to Crown Rule: Political Opportunities and Challenges

Edward II’s political fortunes rose with the establishment in 1690 of crown rule in Maryland. The royal government, which lasted twenty-five years, offered new patronage opportunities to Protestant men with substantial estates in the colony. Those who benefited from the change in government, though, had to navigate considerable uncertainty about the government’s future and mode of operation. Executive authority now rested with the crown, but bureaucratic channels and Maryland’s physical distance

---

19 Land history of Edward Lloyd II is based on *BDML*, 2: 534–35, and notes in the Legislative History Project at Maryland State Archives, which offer no details on his land acquisition. On the Eastern Shore land market and average landholding, see Clemens, *Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore*, 75, 82. In contrast, Edward II’s contemporary, Charles Carroll the Settler (1661–1720), was much more active in the land market, albeit on the Western Shore where more land was available for patent and sale in the early eighteenth century than on the Eastern Shore at that time (Hoffman with Mason, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, xx–xxii, 68 [table 1], 71, 73).
from England obscured the source of that authority. Furthermore, Lord Baltimore
remained Maryland’s proprietor, and the Catholic families who looked after his interests
in the colony retained a significant amount of power through Maryland’s royal period.
During this complex (and poorly understood) phase of Maryland’s history, Edward II
advanced his political career by attracting both royal patronage and “native” support.

Contests of authority were endemic to the royal government in Maryland because
the government’s roots were shallow. The possibility that Lord Baltimore would be
restored as head of the colony’s government kept challenges in his name alive. Because
the crown’s commission of Maryland’s first royal governor cited England’s war with
France as a reason for rescinding the proprietor’s executive control over the colony, the
declarations of peace between England and France in 1697 and 1713 heightened the
possibility of a restoration of his government. Peacetime also revived debates in England
about putting an end to proprietary colonies altogether, in which case Maryland would
become a permanent crown colony. Meanwhile, Marylanders took advantage of the
crown’s weak executive oversight. For example, legislators, in order to protect local
interests, at times questioned the assertion of royal prerogative.20

20 The crown’s reasons for revoking Lord Baltimore’s executive control over Maryland in
1690 are not clear. Officially, the crown chose to rule the colony directly in order to
improve the military security of a colony with a government in disarray (after Coode’s
Rebellion of 1689) while England was at war against France. Lord Baltimore’s
Catholicism hurt his chances to win the favor of England’s new Protestant king and
queen. But there were also other issues, such as reports to the Lords of Trade since the
1670s about lax enforcement of the Navigation Acts in the proprietary colony, that
predisposed the crown toward taking over Maryland’s government (Sutto, “Built Upon
the first royal governor’s commission, see note 32.
While Maryland’s future under crown rule was debated on both sides of the Atlantic, well-connected Protestants sought crown patronage. After becoming master of Wye Plantation in the late 1690s, Edward II advanced quickly as a supporter of the royal government. In his first ten years of service in the provincial government, he secured three acts of patronage from royal governors. Two were promotions within the colonial militia at times of unrest in the colony, and the third was an appointment to the council. With these positions, Edward II developed a reputation as a valuable and trustworthy ally of the royal government.

Edward II reached his highest position in Maryland’s government, though, on a vote by his peers, an event that calls attention to the dynamic between the assembly and council. When royal governor John Seymour died in office in 1709, the other members of the council chose Edward II to serve as that body’s president and thus as acting governor. For the next five years, while the governor’s seat remained vacant, Edward II was in the difficult position of having to uphold the crown’s interests while being responsive to the grievances expressed in the assembly. In 1713, relations between the council and the assembly broke down. Influenced by their overlapping commercial and political ties to London, councilors advocated a different approach to the problems facing the colony.

Edward II retreated to private life a little over two years later, after the council formally acknowledged the end of crown rule and the restoration of Lord Baltimore’s executive authority. Rather than accept a demotion within the council upon the appointment of a more senior member by Lord Baltimore, Edward II kept his political legacy forever tied to Maryland’s royal government—a temporary government with far-reaching effects on the shaping of the colony’s political elite.
Maryland’s Revolution of 1689

Edward II was nineteen years of age when, in 1689, John Coode and his supporters overthrew the proprietary government at its seat in St. Mary’s City. Acting on the pretext that the governor’s council refused to recognize the overthrow of James II from the throne of England, Coode and his followers formed the Protestant Association government and pledged their support to England’s new sovereigns, King William III and Queen Mary. In 1690, William III revoked Lord Baltimore’s charter privilege of executive authority in the colony and recognized the Protestant Association as a legitimate interim government until a royal governor arrived.21

Under the terms of his settlement with William III, Lord Baltimore’s direct patronage powers were limited to his family’s private interests in Maryland. The crown honored Lord Baltimore’s ownership of all land in Maryland and his right to collect rents, fees, and a tonnage duty for his private income, according to the colony’s charter of 1632. After 1690, Lord Baltimore developed a system of offices that was separate from the provincial government, to procure his private revenue and look after his private interests in the colony.22

---

21 The Protestant Association governed the colony until Governor Lionel Copley arrived in 1692.
22 Jordan, “Maryland’s Privy Council, 1637–1715”; Carr and Jordan, Maryland’s Revolution in Government, 112; Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 44. Because proprietary revenue was derived from private property ownership, Lord Baltimore could appoint Roman Catholics to offices within the proprietary revenue system, independent of laws barring Catholics from public office in Maryland after 1692. Offices in this system included the agent who was responsible for submitting accounts and sums to Lord Baltimore, clerks of the land office, surveyors general, and an attorney general (Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage).
The overthrow of the proprietor’s government in Maryland shifted the source of executive authority from Lord Baltimore to the crown in Whitehall. For the first time, the crown expanded its authority in Maryland beyond trade regulation. Before Coode’s rebellion in 1689, the Lords Baltimore personally oversaw Maryland’s legislative and judicial affairs. Government officers and court justices were required to take oaths of allegiance to Lord Baltimore, not to the king. Lord Baltimore alone reviewed Maryland’s legislation, and the governor and his council settled all judicial appeals within the province. After 1689, the crown, acting through the Lords of Trade (later the Board of Trade), issued instructions to the colonial government, reviewed the colony’s legislation, selected the colony’s governors, and approved nominations to the council.23

In the first decade of crown rule, Maryland’s assembly secured political gains for Protestants through legislation, passing a series of measures intended to cripple the political authority of Roman Catholics in the colony. In 1692, the assembly passed a law that effectually barred Catholics from holding public office, by requiring members of government to take an oath denying belief in the authority of the Pope and in transubstantiation. With other legislative acts in the 1690s, Maryland’s government recognized the Church of England as the colony’s established church, and it moved the seat of government from St. Mary’s City to the de facto Protestant capital of the colony, Annapolis. Annapolis was established on the former site of Providence, where Edward

23 Archives of Md., 25:115–16. In 1696, the Board of Trade and Plantations succeeded the Lords of Trade and Plantations, a committee of the privy council. Though the settlement of 1690 denied the third Lord Baltimore executive authority over reviews of colonial legislation and appointments to office in the provincial government, he occasionally consulted the Board of Trade on issues in the colony, such as the treatment of Roman Catholics. The CSP, Colonial Series, document these exchanges.
II's grandfather, Edward Lloyd I, and other Virginia Puritan migrants initially settled in 1649.\textsuperscript{24}

The new regime offered political opportunities for Protestants who were excluded from the former proprietary government. For Edward II specifically, crown rule provided an opportunity, in 1701, to join the governor's council. He thereby advanced beyond his father's highest position in government. Philemon Lloyd, a Protestant and speaker of the assembly, did not receive a council appointment before his death in 1685, despite being a councilor's son and having ties by marriage to a prominent Catholic family. For two decades prior to 1689, most council appointees had been Roman Catholic or relatives of the third Lord Baltimore.\textsuperscript{25}

After the political revolution in Maryland in 1689, the criteria for council appointments changed. Not only did candidates have to be "well affected" to the royal


\textsuperscript{25} As a councilor's son, Philemon Lloyd I would have had some expectation of being named to the council. As discussed in Chapter 1, Edward Lloyd I was a prominent member of a Puritan migration from Virginia in 1649. After serving the Commonwealth government of Maryland and Virginia, Edward I, in recognition of his political influence with Protestants, was appointed by the restored proprietary government to the governor's council. Philemon Lloyd I did not get along well with the governor, Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore, while he was speaker of the assembly from 1678 to 1684 (\textit{BDML}, 1:27, 29; Carr and Jordan, \textit{Maryland's Revolution in Government}, 21--31; Jordan, \textit{Foundations of Representative Government}, 121--29).
government, but also preferably members of the Church of England. All but one of the appointees to Maryland's council during the royal government period were Anglican.\textsuperscript{26}

England's political revolution of 1688 had reinvigorated ties between the crown and the Anglican church. After half a century of political conflict in England, the crown used its formal affiliation with the Church of England to promote civic unity. Governor Francis Nicholson's street plan for Annapolis of 1694 articulated, in physical form, the formal relationship between the crown and the church after the Glorious Revolution. The projected state house and Anglican church occupy the two circles that are the plan's focal points. The state house sits on higher ground, above the church. As construction in Annapolis got under way in the later 1690s, material symbols of royal authority were installed in the statehouse and the church. A portrait of King William III and his coat of arms were displayed in the statehouse, and the king sent silver for use in communion at St. Anne's Church.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{26}The crown instructed royal governors between 1691 and 1715 to nominate men to the council who were “well affected to our government” (Leonard W. Labaree, \textit{Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670–1776}, 2 vols. [New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1935], 1:55–56). According to Jordan, all councilors in Maryland's royal government were Anglicans with the exception of one Presbyterian in the first group of appointees (“Maryland's Privy Council,” 76).

Royal governors were responsible for building a new government that was loyal to the crown instead of to Lord Baltimore. While the crown’s official policy from Whitehall sustained freedom of worship for Roman Catholics and dissenters during Maryland’s royal period, the colony’s religious diversity made royal governors uneasy. Politically dispossessed Catholics posed a risk to crown government as a potential source of support for the restoration of Lord Baltimore’s executive authority. Contributing to the sense of danger to the security of Maryland’s royal government were England’s wars with France, Europe’s strongest Catholic power at the time, and the survival of Stuart claimants to England’s throne. In the minds of crown officials, attendance at services of the Church of England was a visible sign of loyalty to the crown government.28

Hampering royal governors’ efforts to build a new government was the continued wealth and prominence of Maryland’s Roman Catholic leading families and the patronage these families continued to receive from Lord Baltimore, in particular through

---
28 The concerns of Maryland’s royal governors about resident nonconformists and “papists” as potential sources of disorder are well documented in the primary and secondary literature (Jordan, “Political Stability and the Emergence of a Native Elite,” 250–51; Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 61–97; Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., chapters 3 and 4). Governor John Seymour, for example, considered Roman Catholics “declared enemys of our Church and State” (Seymour to Board of Trade, March 10, 1709, CSP, Colonial Series, 24: no. 410). Nonetheless, the crown upheld a policy of “liberty of conscience” in the colony (Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 67, 105). In 1702, Maryland’s legislature passed a version of the “Act for Establishing Religious Worship in the Province according to the Church of England” that the crown already had approved. The act allowed dissenters to worship separately, though they still were required to pay their parish tithe. In 1706, Queen Anne approved a bill allowing Catholics to worship in private (Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age, Ph.D. diss., 74, 116; Carr and Jordan, Maryland’s Revolution in Government, 203–5). In a study of another religiously diverse colony under crown rule at this time, Massachusetts, Phyllis Whitman Hunter argues that attendance at services of the Church of England was a way for colonists in Boston to demonstrate their allegiance to royal authority (Purchasing Identity in the Atlantic World [Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001], 58–59, 73–74, 91–92).
the proprietor’s land office. Unlike their counterparts in the former proprietary
government, Maryland’s royal governors could not offer land to colonists in exchange for
their political support. As Governor Nicholson reminded the Board of Trade in 1698,
“The soil in this province being Lord Baltimore’s, I have no power from the King
concerning it.” Several years later, Governor Seymour complained to his superiors that
Lord Baltimore’s agents in the colony distributed “favour in lands” to influence elections
and votes in the assembly. Royal governors had to use other means at their disposal to
win loyalty at the local level, such as appointments to public office.  

Four Moments in Edward II’s Political Rise

Rumors of Lord Baltimore’s Restoration, 1697–1698, and Edward II’s First
Crown Commission

In May 1698, at age twenty-eight, Edward II received his first act of crown
patronage: Governor Nicholson, with the consent of the council, commissioned him as
colonel of the militia in Talbot County. As a militia colonel, Edward II was responsible
for mustering and training the enlisted and storing arms and ammunition. For this

29 Nicholson to the Board of Trade, August 20, 1698, CSP, Colonial Series, 16: no. 760
(quote); Seymour to the Board of Trade, September 29, 1704, CSP, Colonial Series, 22:
no. 585; Seymour to the Board of Trade, August 21, 1706, CSP, Colonial Series, 23: no.
470; Seymour to Board of Trade, March 10, 1709, CSP, Colonial Series, 24: no. 410
(quote); Hardy, “Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 80, 142. An unsigned and
undated petition, tentatively dated 1716, argued the injustice of Roman Catholics’
exclusion from sitting as members of the assembly and as justices on county benches,
given that they were “the richest and most considerable merchants in the country” (CSP,
Colonial Series, 29: no. 444). Several years earlier, in 1706, the Board of Trade posited
that if the Maryland government enforced penal laws against Catholics and Catholics left
the colony, the crown would lose revenue (W. L. Grant and James Munro, eds., Acts of
the Privy Council of England, Colonial Series, 6 vols. [London: Her Majesty’s Stationary
distinguished title, Governor Nicholson sought men “enough qualified by loyalty, courage, and diligence to be officers.”

At the time of the commission, Edward II had just finished his first session in the assembly as a representative of Talbot County. These upgrades in his status—his election to the assembly and his title as colonel—came quickly after his mother’s death in 1697, when Edward II became master of Wye Plantation.

Governor Nicholson sought Edward II’s support at a time of disturbance in the colony. In March 1698, rumors of Lord Baltimore’s restoration to Maryland’s government coincided with a wave of political opposition to Nicholson within the assembly, led by several individuals from St. Mary’s County. Nicholson attributed the reports to “Lord Baltimore’s Agents and dependents,” and he ordered Henry Darnall, the proprietor’s agent and receiver general, “not to spread rumours of Lord Baltimore’s restoration.” The governor and the council issued a proclamation denying the alleged news in order “to quiet the minds of the people.”

The rumors started, Nicholson observed, “from the first announcement of peace.” The crown had established direct rule in Maryland during King William’s War, and, for the crown, the war justified its takeover of the colony’s government. Maryland was prone

31 Archives of Md., 22:16–17; Maryland council to Board of Trade, [May 1698], CSP, Colonial Series, 16: no. 518; Maryland council minutes, May 9, 1698, CSP, Colonial Series, 16: no. 435 (quotes). See Jordan, Foundations of Representative Government, 196–202, on the opposition to Nicholson in the 1698 assembly and St. Mary’s County.
to fall into enemy hands, read the first royal governor’s commission of 1691, because of the “disorder and confusion” in the colony since Coode’s Rebellion. In a letter to the Board of Trade in 1698, Nicholson expressed his hope that “when the King announces that he will Keep the Government, there will be an end” to the talk of Lord Baltimore’s restoration. Voicing its concern about the colony’s future, Maryland’s council also wrote to the Board of Trade in 1698 to ask that the colony remain under the crown’s direct governance.32

The council’s reasons for concern offer insight into why Edward II was considered a valuable ally of the crown government. Lord Baltimore had influence with Protestants in Maryland, not only because of his land ownership, but also because “many” of Lord Baltimore’s “relations were married to Protestants, and the expectation of office and employment draws many to his interest.” In this light, Edward II’s allegiance to the crown government was valuable because of his kinship ties to prominent Roman Catholic families and recipients of patronage under the former proprietary government. His half sister Susannah Maria Bennett married into the Lowe and Darnall families, who were influential members of the Calverts’ patronage network. Edward II’s half brother Richard

32 Nicholson to Board of Trade, August 20, 1698, CSP, Colonial Series, 16: no. 760 (quote); Lionel Copley’s commission as governor of Maryland, 1691, Archives of Md., 8:263; Maryland council to Board of Trade, [May 28, 1698], CSP, Colonial Series, 16: no. 518; Ian K. Steele, “The Anointed, the Appointed, and the Elected: Governance of the British Empire, 1689–1784,” in P. J. Marshall, ed., The Oxford History of the British Empire, Volume 2: The Eighteenth Century (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 107; Richard A. Gleissner, “The Revolutionary Settlement of 1691 in Maryland,” Maryland Historical Magazine 66 (1971):405–19. In 1711, the crown’s attorney general cited Copley’s 1691 commission in an opinion in favor of the queen’s authority to appoint the governor of Maryland in wartime or until the sovereign was satisfied that Lord Baltimore was capable of securing the colony “against the enemy” (July 21, CSP, Colonial Series, 26: no. 38).
Bennett III also had connections with the third Lord Baltimore; as noted above, from 1699 until 1707 he shared a lease of the proprietor’s quit rents with another Roman Catholic. In addition, Edward II had married into a Quaker family on the Eastern Shore. The Quakers’ refusal to join the militia or to contribute to it financially frustrated royal governors in their attempts to strengthen Maryland’s armed defenses. Edward II’s personal ties to these communities helped to make him an attractive recruit for the support of crown government.33

Edward II’s Appointment to the Council, 1701

With the support of Maryland’s next royal governor, Nathaniel Blakiston, Edward II in 1701 obtained a crown commission to join the governor’s council. A council seat was typically the highest position in the provincial government that native-born colonists could achieve, short of the council presidency.34

Councilors held considerable social and political privileges under royal government. Because their appointments were for life, they were not subject to removal by election. The royal governor with his council had the authority to call, prorogue, and

33 Maryland council to Board of Trade, [May 28, 1698], CSP, Colonial Series, 16: no. 518iv (quote). Susannah Maria Bennett (1666–1714) first married John Darnall (d. 1684), brother of Henry Darnall, Lord Baltimore’s agent and receiver general from 1684 until his death in 1711. She then married Henry Lowe (d. 1717), a Protestant with kinship ties to the Calvert family. Henry’s uncle, Vincent Lowe (d. 1692), held high office under the former proprietary government. Vincent’s sister, Jane, was the third Lord Baltimore’s second wife (BDML, 1:251; 2:534, 548–49, 551). For information about Edward II’s wife, see note 6 above. On Quakers and the militia, see Seymour to Board of Trade, May 23, 1704, and September 29, 1704, CSP, Colonial Series, 22: nos. 343, 585; and the board’s response to Seymour, February 4, 1706, CSP, Colonial Series, 23: no. 84.

34 Governor Blakiston nominated Edward II to fill a vacancy on the council. The crown confirmed the appointment, and Edward II joined the council in 1701 (Blakiston to Board of Trade, January 20, 1701, CSP, Colonial Series, 19: no. 49; Archives of Md., 25:112, 114).
dissolve the assembly, to veto legislation, and to sit as a court of appeals. As advisors to the governor, councilors influenced appointments to office, including the appointments of justices of the provincial court and county courts, naval officers, crown customs receivers, militia commanders, coroners, and sheriffs. After the establishment of the Church of England in Maryland in 1692, the governor and his council also oversaw Anglican church affairs and assigned clergy to parishes. As a reward for service, councilors obtained other government offices that provided income and influence, giving them the opportunity to advance their families even further.\(^{35}\)

While Blakiston’s reasons for nominating Edward II to the council are unknown, the heir of Wye Plantation had the traditional qualifications for high government office in terms of property ownership and social rank. For this, his family background was key. Edward II inherited considerable property in Maryland, including land and labor, giving him a vested interest in the colony. He was comfortably within the company of the wealthiest council members as defined by possession of more than £1,000 sterling in his personal estate and more than 2,000 acres of land. Edward II also had a family history of public service in Maryland: His grandfather also had been a councilor, and his father had served as speaker of the assembly.\(^{36}\)

\(^{35}\) For documented examples of these appointments, see *Archives of Md.*, 25:226, 27:383 (court justice); 25:71, 235 (naval officer); coroner (27:392); sheriff (27:375, 383); 27:495, 29:6 (clergy); and Blakiston to Board of Trade, March 12, 1700, *CSP, Colonial Series*, 18: no. 213 (naval officer and crown customs receiver).

\(^{36}\) David W. Jordan, “Political Stability and the Emergence of a Native Elite in Maryland,” in *The Chesapeake in the Seventeenth Century: Essays on Anglo-American Society*, ed. Thad W. Tate and David L. Ammerman [New York: W. W. Norton, 1979], 265; *BDML*, 2:530. By various measures, Edward II was a wealthy man in Maryland. The value of Edward II’s personal estate as documented by his probate inventory of August 27, 1719, was £5,665 (Inventories and Accounts, Talbot County, Liber 3, folios 1–40;
Through family, Edward II also inherited business connections to London merchants. Colonists who had direct correspondence with London merchants had a distinct advantage in obtaining patronage during crown rule. In the later seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Chesapeake, commercial and political ties to London overlapped through an effective tobacco merchant lobby in Whitehall. Through their contacts in the privy council, Board of Trade, and Parliament, London tobacco merchants influenced trade policy, colonial legislation review, and appointments to office. Through their extensive shipping networks, London merchants were also important conduits of information for colonists and crown officials alike. By expanding Wye Plantation’s trade, Edward II raised his political profile on both sides of the Atlantic.37

Administrative Accounts, Prerogative Court, Liber 2, folio 518, June 15, 1720; (both at Maryland State Archives). Adding sums from additional inventories, including financial assets, the editors of BDML calculated a final balance of Edward II’s personal wealth at £8,270 plus 79,280 pounds of tobacco (2:535). According to the same source, Edward II died in possession of 7,000 acres of land. In a study of Talbot County specifically, Jean B. Russo states that possession of 1,100 acres in Talbot County in the first decade of the eighteenth century qualified a person as “elite” (“Free Workers in a Plantation Economy,” p. 55). In Tobacco Colony, Main set the boundary of the upper third of wealth of decedents in Maryland between 1650 and 1720 at £450 and above excluding financial assets (226). Lloyd was also “elite” in terms of slaveholding. In Talbot County around 1720, less than 20 percent of probated decedents had slaves, and slave owners typically had two to three slaves. Judging by the 1733 census, “large” planters owned ten or more slaves (Russo, “Free Workers in a Plantation Economy,” 85–90).

37 For the brief period of crown rule over Maryland, the crown had unprecedented authority over the colony’s affairs, bringing Maryland more in line with what Virginia experienced as a royal colony. The merchant lobby in London was critical to the political careers of Virginia’s colonists in the later seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. After 1715, London merchants no longer formed such a cohesive lobby for Virginia affairs (Olson, Anglo-American Politics; Alison G. Olson, “The Virginia Merchants in London: A Study in Eighteenth-Century Interest-Group Politics,” William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 40 [1983], 363–88). In the initial years of Maryland’s crown rule, William III’s administration relied heavily on the advice of London merchants to make appointments to the first royal governor’s council in Maryland. The merchants’ influence continued into the next century. For example, the prominent tobacco merchant Micajeh
Edward II also increased his chances for a council appointment by identifying himself as a Protestant and supporting the growth of the Anglican church in Maryland.

As a member of the assembly, Edward II had demonstrated his favor of a state-supported Church of England by drafting legislation to finance the repair of parish churches with a colony-wide tax. Later, in his will, Edward II bequeathed £50 toward the construction of a church in his parish of St. Michael's. Edward II also had a family history of Protestant faith in Maryland on his paternal side.  


Governor Blakiston’s ties to London’s merchant community underscores the connection between trade and politics. When Blakiston returned to England after his tenure as Maryland’s governor ended, the colony hired him to be its agent in Whitehall. The Board of Trade encouraged colonial governments to hire agents to advise the board in the review of colonial legislation. Blakiston’s membership in the Merchant Adventurers’ Company of London made him an attractive figure for the job. Formerly, in the 1690s, the colonial governments of Maryland and Virginia hired London merchants to act as their agents in Whitehall. After 1700, merchants were less likely to be hired as agents, one reason being that merchants lacked sufficient free time for the position. Nonetheless, communication with merchants was an important part of an agent’s job. Blakiston acted intermittently as Maryland’s agent from 1702 until 1721, and he served as Virginia’s agent from 1705 until 1721. The job of a colonial agent required a gentleman’s education (a gentleman’s “waies and addresses”) plus leisure time to meet with the Board of Trade, lobby members of Parliament, present petitions, write reports, and attend social events, such as hunts outside of the city (Ella Lonn, *The Colonial Agents of the Southern Colonies* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945], esp. 28–34, 53 [quote], 54, 393–94; Ian K. Steele, *The English Atlantic, 1675–1740: An Exploration of Communication and Community* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986], 245–47; Pettigrew, “Free to Enslave,” 19; *BDML*, 1:137).

38 *Archives of Md.*, 22:229, 231, 468–69; will of Edward Lloyd, March 15, 1718, endorsed April 9, 1719, copy in Lloyd Papers, Box 74, roll 40, MS 2001, MdHS, also in wills of Talbot County, Liber 15, folio 80, MSA. K. Matthew Kinnamont contends that Edward II, as the son of a Catholic mother, was under political pressure to demonstrate his Protestant faith (“A Passage in Established Religion: Dundee Chapel of St. Michael’s
Richard Clark and Edward II’s Promotion to Major General, 1707

As a councilor, Edward II was in a favorable position to receive or solicit other offices. Such an opportunity came in 1707 when, at a time of domestic security concerns, Governor Seymour promoted him to the rank of major general of the Eastern Shore militia. The commission issued to Edward II and his counterpart on the Western Shore, John Hammond, placed the two men directly under the governor in the chain of military command. According to an act of 1699 that created the positions, the major generals of the Eastern and Western Shore militias were to receive the highest salary in the militia, 3,000 pounds of tobacco a month (£12 sterling at one penny per pound), for their service during times of insurrection, Indian war, and “foreign invasion.” In peacetime, the two major generals were responsible for training the several thousand men who were eligible for the militia.39

Edward II’s promotion to the rank of major general indicates that Governor Seymour considered him a valuable and trustworthy supporter of the crown government. In a letter to the Board of Trade in August 1707, Seymour wrote that he had appointed militia officers from “the most loyall and ablest inhabitants” in an effort to strengthen the colony’s defenses against “any home bred villainy” and foreign invasion.40

The source of the “home bred villainy” was Richard Clark (or Clarke) of Anne Arundel County, an outlaw who had returned to the colony. In 1705, Clark was accused

---


40 CSP, Colonial Series, 23: no. 1101 (quote).
of planning a “conspiracy” against the government that involved joining with Indians and seizing the public magazine in Annapolis. After fleeing to North Carolina, Clark was back in the vicinity of Annapolis in early 1707 with a plan to capture arms and ammunition from the magazine, set fire to the city, and escape with his supporters to become pirates. When the plot was discovered in March, several persons were arrested for their association with Clark, including a delegate to the assembly, but Clark eluded capture and took refuge in Virginia. That summer, Clark continued to make his cause known, writing letters to Seymour under a pseudonym and posting them on “out-houses” and along the roads. The council considered Clark enough of a threat to persuade the governor to keep a number of guards on duty at the armory and the prison at Annapolis at considerable public expense. Clark was finally taken into custody in 1708 and executed, putting an end to the disturbance. 41

Clark’s ability to recruit supporters at a time of economic distress was a matter of particular concern to Governor Seymour and the council. The “generall calamity of debts and mortgaged estates” undermined the colony’s security. Debtors and servants reportedly ran away to join his cause. In a colony where specie was scarce, Clark circulated counterfeit coin that was believed to have been of his own making. Also, in

41 Elihu S. Riley, “The Ancient City”: A History of Annapolis in Maryland, 1649–1887 (Annapolis: Record Printing Office, 1887), 81–85; Archives of Md., 26:450–51, 513–14 (quote), on the 1705 act outlawing Clark; Archives of Md., 27:139–40, on an act of 1707 regarding Clark; Seymour to Board of Trade, June 10, 1707, CSP, Colonial Series, 23: no. 975; Seymour to Board of Trade, August 16, 1707, CSP, Colonial Series, 23: no. 1101 (quote); Archives of Md., 25:219, 224, 227, on the council’s response in the summer of 1707.
Seymour’s assessment, the colonial militia lacked readiness, which contributed to the governor’s discomfort.\(^{42}\)

By appointing Edward II as one of his two highest commanders in the field, Governor Seymour demonstrated the value he placed in Lloyd’s support, loyalty, and leadership abilities. Furthermore, this commission afforded Edward II the opportunity to develop and demonstrate his administrative skills. Not only did he inspire trust from royal governors, but also from his peers, as demonstrated by his election in 1709 to the council presidency.\(^{43}\)

**Edward II’s Election as Council President, 1709**

When Governor John Seymour died in office in July 1709, the council took the unusual step of elevating Edward II to the position of council president and thereby the colony’s acting chief executive until the next governor arrived. The eldest councilor, Colonel Francis Jenkins, protested the decision, citing the usual procedure of installing the eldest member of the council as president of that body. However, attending council

\(^{42}\) Seymour to Board of Trade, August 16, 1707, *CSP, Colonial Series*, 23: no. 1101 (quote); Seymour to Board of Trade, March 6, 1707, *CSP, Colonial Series*, 23: no. 792; *Archives of Md.*, 25:236, 240–41; Seymour to Board of Trade, June 23, 1708, *CSP, Colonial Series*, 23: no. 1570. Maryland’s royal governors considered the colony’s military defenses to be poor. The colony lacked forts on its western frontier, for instance, and the militia was poorly equipped and inadequately trained. See, for example, Nathaniel Blakiston to Board of Trade, August 2, 1701, *CSP, Colonial Series*, 19: no. 689; Seymour to Board of Trade, May 23, 1704, *CSP, Colonial Series*, 22: no. 343; and Seymour to Board of Trade, July 3, 1705, *CSP, Colonial Series*, 22: no. 1210. Clark’s threat in 1707 to approach Annapolis by ship touched on local fears of an invasion by sea. Just a few months earlier, on August 21, 1706, Seymour wrote to the Board of Trade, “We were lately alarm’d by the French squadron and privateers that have infested the West Indies” (*CSP, Colonial Series*, 23: no. 470).

\(^{43}\) Webb observes in the context of England’s colonization of America that a high rank in the military provided an officer with opportunities to gain administrative experience and to demonstrate leadership abilities ahead of the next promotion (*The Governors-General*, 57–148).
members denied Jenkins the position for his “not taking any notice of the Government” since Seymour’s death. Nothing more is said in the legislative record, except that the council selected Edward II, who was the next senior member after Jenkins, to be president some time before the 1709 legislative session began that fall.\footnote{BDML,1:39n; Archives of Md., 27:ix, 377–78 (quote). In 1702, the eldest councilor became council president when the royal governor left Maryland, as royal instructions of 1698 to the governor directed (Archives of Md., 25:121–22; see also Labaree, Royal Instructions, 1:76–77). Jenkins was senior to Edward II in terms of age and years served on the council. Jenkins joined the council in 1699, two years before Edward II. Edward II first met with the assembly as council president in October 1709, three months after Seymour’s death.}

From the council’s point of view, Edward II offered several advantages over Jenkins. Jenkins was of an advanced age, in poor health, and lived a considerable distance from Annapolis, in Somerset County on the Eastern Shore. For these reasons, he had frequently missed council meetings during the previous two years. Therefore, the phrase “not taking any notice of the Government” may have been a reference to Jenkins’s physical absence from Annapolis during the three months following Seymour’s death. Jenkins, an emigrant to Maryland, was sixty years old and one of two veterans of the Protestant Association interim government of 1689–1692 on the council.\footnote{Governor Seymour noted Jenkins’s poor council attendance record in his letters to the Board of Trade of September 7, 1708 (CSP, Colonial Papers, 24: no. 131) and January 10, 1709 (CSP, Colonial Papers, 24: no. 290).}

Jenkins’s poor physical health had also compromised his ability to perform his duties as a militia colonel. In 1709, residents of Colonel Jenkins’s home county petitioned the assembly to relieve him of his local militia duties. The petitioners argued that the colonel’s “great Age and Weakness,” loss of hearing, and memory failure, with “little Likelihood of recovering,” hurt efforts to repel coastal raids by privateers during
the current war between England and France. Jenkins, then, would not have inspired confidence in his ability to serve as the colony’s commander in chief.46

In contrast, Edward II was twenty years younger than Jenkins. Edward II was also Jenkins’s senior officer as major general of the Eastern Shore militia. Given the common history of military service among royal governors in Maryland, the council may have been predisposed to favor a higher-ranking militia officer as acting governor and commander in chief.47

In addition, Jenkins, handicapped by his emigrant status, lacked a kinship network in Maryland that was as extensive or as formidable as Edward II’s. Of most immediate interest was Edward II’s younger brother, Philemon II, who was the colony’s deputy secretary. Maryland’s royal provincial secretary, Sir Thomas Lawrence, had deputized Philemon II several years earlier, before Lawrence departed for England. Lawrence held the second highest office in the colony’s crown government, just below the governor. As

46 Archives of Md., 27:391–92; BDML, 2:486–87. Jenkins died the following year. Reports of coastal raids by privateers at this time are scattered in the legislative record. In her doctoral dissertation, Hardy observed the passing of an older generation of officeholders among Maryland’s Catholic population at the turn of the eighteenth century (“Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 88–89). As Jenkins’s “great age” and death in 1709 illustrates, the same demographic shift was occurring among Protestants who seized power in 1689. Council minutes of 1708 recorded concern about the dwindling number of councilors, now eight in number, including Jenkins, who “is very aged and lives at a great Distance” (Archives of Md., 25:251).

47 From the beginning of English settlement in North America, English government leaders often had military experience prior to their arrival in America. Maryland, as a proprietary colony, stood somewhat outside this trend before 1689, with respect to the criteria that the Lords Baltimore employed for selecting governors. On the community level, though, locally prominent men held rank in the militia. Edward II’s grandfather, Edward I, for example, had the title of commander in Anne Arundel County (Webb, The Governors-General, 148; Ian Steele, “Governors or Generals? A Note on Martial Law and the Revolution of 1689 in English America,” in Administrators of Empire, ed. Mark Burkholder [Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1998], 213–23; Jordan, Foundations of Representative Government, 214; BDML, 1:534).
deputy secretary, Philemon II had a high-profile crown government position and extensive influence over appointments in the provincial court and county courts.\footnote{BDML, 2:541–42; Owings, *His Lordship’s Patronage*, 9, 29, 30, 80. Philemon Lloyd II was deputy secretary until his death in 1732. He married a daughter of John Freeman of Annapolis in 1709 and had a house there (Archives of Md., 27:389–90). With Philemon II as deputy secretary and Edward II as acting chief executive, the brothers held extensive powers of appointment in Maryland. The maturation of kinship ties among Maryland’s “emerging elite” has been cited as a factor in this group’s “rise” to power circa 1700. Part of this process, though difficult to trace, was exclusive access to kinship and credit networks between Maryland and London.}

Although the council’s precise reasons for elevating Edward II to the council presidency remain unknown, the council members who made the decision presumably wanted a president who was willing and physically capable of holding sessions of government and of negotiating with the assembly.

Challenges of Crown Rule: The Negotiation of Power Between Whitehall, Council, and Assembly

Robert Quarry, the surveyor general of royal customs in America and a placeman on Maryland’s council, opposed the council’s decision to meet with the assembly in the fall after Governor Seymour’s death. Quarry preferred to postpone summoning the assembly until the next royal governor arrived. The council could even decline to pass the annual tax levy, Quarry argued, “for at worst it was but a short delay till a Governor came.” Instead, Quarry found, the council “wanted to make a session of it,” and, “(if I mistake not) some of them as willing as the Assembly.”\footnote{Col. Robert Quarry to [Mr. Pultaney, Lord Commissioner of Trade and Plantations], December 2, 1709, CSP, Colonial Series, 24: no. 888. The council was accustomed, at this point, to meeting with the Assembly once a year to pass a tax bill to “defray the Publick Charge” (Archives of Md., 27:411). In contrast to Maryland’s experience from 1709 to 1713, Virginia’s council never summoned the assembly during the absence of a royal governor between 1706 and 1710 (Emory G. Evans, *A “Topping People”: The Rise*}
Quarry’s concern was the council’s ability to uphold and defend royal prerogative. The council, “being Gentlemen of the Country” for the most part, was “wholly in the interest of the Assembly, and as ready to lessen the prerogative.” Quarry’s comments address two recent developments in Maryland’s government: the growth of native-born colonists’ participation at the county and provincial levels, and the increasing power of the assembly. These trends informed the council’s choice of Edward II to preside over that body. Despite provincials’ hopes for cooperation between the assembly and council during the absence of a royal governor, political harmony proved difficult to achieve in practice; the two houses of the legislature did not share all interests in government.

Between 1680 and 1720, Maryland’s white population underwent a demographic shift from a foreign-born majority to a native-born majority. As the proportion of emigrants in the total white population declined, native-born Marylanders entered government office in unprecedented numbers. They served as sheriffs, justices, and attorneys in an expanding county court system, and stood at local elections for seats in the assembly, which doubled in size by the addition of two seats per county after 1689. Aided by the passage of an act in 1694 “for advancement of the Natives and Residents of this province,” the Maryland-born occupied an increasing proportion of local offices by election, appointment, and purchase.50

—and Decline of Virginia’s Old Political Elite, 1680–1790 [Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2009], 43–45).

50 Menard, “Immigrants and their Increase.” Carr and Jordan’s Maryland’s Revolution in Government, 8–11, 207, discusses the growth of the county court system and the addition of assembly seats. The act for the “advancement of Natives and Residents” of Maryland required residence in the colony for three years prior to taking an office “of Trust or
The demographic shift toward a native-born majority also affected council membership. Edward II was part of a "new generation" of councilors who, after 1698, replaced the first appointees under crown rule upon their deaths. The second-generation councilors in Maryland's royal government were more likely to be natives of Maryland. Whereas two of the first twelve councilors under crown rule (12%) were born in Maryland, six of the twenty men appointed between 1700 and 1715 (30%) were natives. The new appointees were also, on the whole, wealthier and benefited from wider kinship networks in the colony. 51

Another increasingly common characteristic of councilors during crown rule was prior service in the assembly. The majority of councilors appointed after 1689, including Edward II, had been members of the assembly. This was partly due to the earlier age at which natives of the colony began their political careers. Other factors, though, were an evolving political culture that favored a stronger assembly and the political needs of royal governors. 52
The assembly gained power while Maryland was under crown rule. The political revolutions of 1688 and 1689 in England and Maryland advanced an existing trend in the colony, since the 1670s, of increased legislative activity. After crown rule was established in Maryland, the colony’s assembly grew more assertive in its claims to authority over internal affairs. The assembly also met more frequently and with greater regularity during the royal period. Between 1661 and 1689, under the former proprietary government, no sessions were held in eleven out of the twenty-eight years. In contrast, from 1690 to 1715, the assembly met at least once a year, sometimes twice or three times, regardless of whether a governor was in residence. Throughout the English colonies, assemblies followed Parliament’s lead in claiming power of the purse and to more “immediately represent the people.”

Meanwhile, the council lost some authority after Maryland’s revolution of 1689. Under Lord Baltimore’s government, the governor and the council constituted the highest court of appeal in the colony and had the final word on legislation. With the establishment of crown rule, suits for more than £300 could be sent to the king and his privy council on appeal, and the crown assumed final veto power over legislation. Also during crown rule, councilors no longer had the privilege of sitting on county courts. Nor

were councilors, by law, allowed to sit as provincial court justices, though royal
governors did not follow this prohibition strictly.\textsuperscript{54}

Royal governors also promoted crossover in membership between the assembly
and council through their choice of councilors. These governors lacked the extensive
patron-client network with colonists that the Lords Baltimore had developed since the
1630s. Moreover, royal governors had a high turnover rate and anticipated promotion to
positions elsewhere in England’s empire. Out of practical necessity, then, royal governors
sought councilor candidates with experience and influence in the colonial legislature in
order to advance their legislative agendas. Royal governors could also use the life-long
council appointments as patronage to win support in the lower house.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{54} Carr and Jordan, \textit{Maryland’s Revolution in Government}, 9–10, 205–8; Jordan,
“Maryland’s Privy Council,” 82–83. At about the same time, in the aftermath of Bacon’s
Rebellion in 1676, Virginia’s council also lost a measure of independence to the crown.
Even so, Maryland’s councilors during crown rule were less powerful than their Virginia
counterparts. In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Virginia councilors held
considerable influence over land distribution. In another difference between the colonies
while Maryland was under crown rule, Virginia’s councilors served as customs officials,
which were lucrative offices, whereas Maryland’s councilors did not (Evans, \textit{A “Topping
People,”} 18–21; Webb, \textit{The Governors-General}, 329–435; Michael Garibaldi Hall,
\textit{Edward Randolph and the American Colonies, 1676–1703} [Chapel Hill: University of
North Carolina Press, 1960], 148). A topic for future study is the extent to which the
crown’s experience in Virginia (and in other colonies) influenced its policy toward
Maryland. In the early eighteenth century, the crown was still struggling to diminish the
power of an independent planter interest in Virginia. In 1710, for example, Governor
Alexander Spotswood arrived in Virginia with royal instructions to discourage the
engrossment of land by a few families, a policy that Virginia’s great planters opposed

\textsuperscript{55} David W. Jordan, “Sir Thomas Lawrence, Secretary of Maryland: A Royal Placeman’s
Fortunes in America,” \textit{Maryland Historical Magazine} 76 (1981), 22–44; Mark A.
Burkholder, ed., \textit{Administrators of Empire} (Brookfield, Vt.: Ashgate, 1998), xxiv–xxv.
With the exception of Nathaniel Blakiston, Maryland’s royal governors had no personal
connection to the colony prior to their arrival. Blakiston’s uncle, Nehemiah Blakiston (d.
1693), emigrated to Maryland in the 1660s and supported Coode’s rebellion in 1689
\textit{(BDML,} 1:136–37). Nathaniel Blakiston’s relationship to Maryland continued to be
Because of the assembly and council’s overlapping membership, the shared backgrounds of native-born colonists in both houses, and the convergence of power between the two bodies, it has been suggested that the assembly and the council grew more alike in terms of membership and interests during Maryland’s royal period. Supporting this view is Quarry’s comment in 1709 that Maryland’s council, being made up of “Gentlemen of the Country,” was “wholly in the interest of the assembly.” To preserve royal authority in Maryland (and its exercise through royal prerogative), Quarry believed that it was necessary for the council to forbear meeting with the assembly in the fall of 1709.\(^{56}\)

The royal customs officer and placeman could not force his view upon the council, though. As a crown official, Quarry was caught between the crown’s belief that royal authority was best delegated to non-natives, and the crown’s reliance on local property owners for day-to-day governance because of its decentralized colonial administration.

There was, on the one hand, the expectation that the council would maintain the status quo until a royal governor arrived. Only a governor with a commission from the crown represented “royal will and power” in an English colony. When selecting colonial governors, the crown preferred to place its trust in non-natives, usually men with

\(^{56}\) Jordan argues that the council and assembly exhibited closer ties during crown rule than under the pre-revolutionary government of the third Lord Baltimore ("Maryland’s Privy Council"; *Foundations of Representative Government in Maryland*, esp. 180–82).
experience in the royal army and a patron in the royal court. In the absence of a
governor, the crown instructed, the council was to pass no acts "but such as were of
absolute necessity."

For day-to-day government, though, the crown placed considerable trust in
colonists, preferably men of property who were able and well-connected, because of
England’s decentralized colonial administration. In case of the death or absence of a royal
governor, the council was expected to provide temporary executive leadership until the
arrival of a new governor. The power and influence of the council, for instance in

---

57 Stanley N. Katz provides a useful summary of the balance of functions of a royal
governor, council, and assembly in “New York Government and Anglo-American
Politics,” in Colonial America: Essays in Politics and Social Development, ed. Stanley N.
Katz (Boston: Little, Brown, 1981), 268–71 (quote, 270). On the crown’s instruction to
the council to approve only “necessary” laws during the absence of a royal governor, see
Labaree, Royal Instructions, 1:74, and the repeated references by the council to the
instruction in their first meeting with the assembly after Seymour’s death (Archives of
Md., 27:382, 386, 400, 416, 508). Maryland’s council minutes recorded receipt of the
instruction in 1700 (Archives of Md., 25:110–11). Early in Edward II’s tenure on the
council, Governor Blakiston, on the eve of his return to England in 1702, advised the
council “that they always give Speedy Compliance and answers to the several letters and
Directions they shall from time to time receive” from the Board of Trade, and “that they
do not call the Assembly together unless upon an Emergent Occasion” (Archives of Md.,
25:122).

Governor Nicholson expressed the common suspicion among crown officials of
colonists’ ability to curb their self-interest out of loyalty to the English government: After
four years of residence in Maryland, he wrote to his superiors, “I have observed that
people in these parts are very much for having a native for Governor, and a great many of
them are pretenders to the office. You can be the judge whether this will be in the interest
of the King and of English trade” (Nicholson to Board of Trade, August 20, 1698, CSP,
Colonial Series, 16: no. 760). Even the wealthy and well-connected colonist William
Byrd II of Virginia failed in his bid for the governorship of his native colony. In 1710, he
received the Duke of Marlborough’s opinion that only “soldiers” would govern
plantations (Kenneth Lockridge, The Diary and Life of William Byrd II of Virginia,
appointments to office and advice on legislation, remained prominent during a governor's absence.\textsuperscript{58}

The crown, in fact, did not offer clear signals about how much authority the council and its president could assume in the absence of a governor. The instructions sent with Governor Seymour in 1704 stated that upon his death or absence, the council was to "administer" the government, with the eldest councilor presiding. In 1707, the Board of Trade acknowledged that this instruction had caused "many controversies and disputes" over the distribution of power within colonial governments, and it issued an "additional" instruction to clarify the role of the council president. The president had the authority of a "Governor and Commander-in-Chief" until the arrival of a new governor. The crown wanted a distinct head of government.\textsuperscript{59}

With their decision to make Edward II council president, his peers entrusted him with extensive power in the colony for as long as the governor's seat remained vacant.

\textsuperscript{58} England's preference for decentralized administration of its colonies, in contrast to Spain's centralized approach, gave considerable latitude to Maryland's elite to oversee the colony's internal affairs. Between 1689 and 1715, England maintained only a handful of salaried agents of the crown, principally royal governors and customs officials, in its overseas colonies. England's low-cost, low-maintenance approach focused on trade regulation and information-gathering (John H. Elliott, \textit{Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492–1830} [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006], 117–52, 219–51). As Elliott points out, the English crown created proprietary colonies in order to attract private investment and reduce the crown's effort and expense in colonization (118).

\textsuperscript{59} Labaree, \textit{Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors}, 1:74, 76–77; Board of Trade to the Earl of Sunderland, December 21, 1709, \textit{CSP, Colonial Series}, 24: no. 919; Board of Trade to the queen, October 26, 1710, \textit{CSP, Colonial Series}, 25: no. 441; and Board of Trade to the president of the council in Maryland, October 26, 1710, \textit{CSP, Colonial Series}, 25: no. 442 (quote). Edward II acknowledged the October 1710 communication in his opening address to the assembly in 1711, relating that the crown had rejected legislation that the colony had passed by the authority of the assembly and council. The Board of Trade required legislation to read that it had been approved by the assembly, council, and council president (\textit{Archives of Md.}, 29:4).
Edward II was more able (and possibly more willing) to provide an active leadership role in meetings with the assembly than the most senior councilor, Colonel Jenkins. But as acting governor, Edward II also assumed more responsibility as a defender of royal prerogative. Eventually, Edward II had difficulty reconciling the different views of the council and assembly in the fourth year of his presidency. As Quarry commented in the fall of 1709, colonists in both the upper and lower houses shared a desire to protect and promote local interests. Disparities in wealth and power, though, undermined cooperation between the two houses.

Edward II as Council President, 1709–1714: Fashioning a Role for Maryland’s “Native Elite”

In his official capacity as council president, Edward II had influence over appointments to office, petitions to the council, and chancery court proceedings. In compensation for his service, Edward II claimed one moiety (that is, one half) of a royal governor’s income from the government’s charge of nine pence per hogshead of tobacco cleared for export. Given that this portion of a royal governor’s annual salary in Maryland was around £1,200 sterling, Edward II likely received several hundred pounds a year.60

60 Out-of-session council minutes do not survive for the years that Edward II served as president (Archives of Md., 25:x), making it difficult to assess the full extent of his influence on the council. Owings lists the following higher-ranking appointments that Edward II made in his capacity as council president and chancellor: two registrars in the chancery court, two naval officers, and one temporary crown customs receiver to be confirmed by the crown (His Lordship’s Patronage, 141, 161, 164, 178). Legislative proceedings printed in Archives of Md., vols. 27 and 29, document county-level appointments made by the council as a whole. A more complete picture of Edward II’s influence as council president would emerge if his personal and business ties to every petitioner to the council and every applicant for office were investigated.
As the highest-ranking executive officer in the colony, Edward II was also in a position to enforce or ignore violations of the Navigation Acts. As acting governor, it was his responsibility to enforce the trade laws. But the laws were easily evaded, according to

For salary information, see Berkeley Seymour’s petition to the queen, enclosed in the Earl of Dartmouth to the Board of Trade, August 14, 1710, CSP, Colonial Series, 25: no. 343; Archives of Md., 27:382, 383; and Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 21–22. During Maryland’s royal period, the colony’s government charged one shilling on each hogshead of tobacco exported for the support of government. Out of each shilling, nine pence went to the governor and three pence to the purchase of arms and ammunition. To provide some sense of how much Edward II received in compensation while council president, Thomas Tench, who was council president and acting governor from July 1702 to April 1704, claimed the “best part of £1,000” from the moiety of nine pence per hogshead (Seymour to Board of Trade, May 23, 1704, CSP, Colonial Series, 22: no. 343; Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 120). The money owed to Governor Seymour’s estate from the collection of nine pence per hogshead of tobacco on ships cleared between the time of his death and John Corbett’s commission as governor in the latter half of 1710 provides another benchmark. John Hyde estimated that amount to be between £400 and £500 (John Hyde to Berkeley Seymour, enclosed in Mr. Seymour to the Board of Trade, June 27, 1711, CSP, Colonial Series, 25: no. 908; Board of Trade to Lord Dartmouth, July 19, 1711, and enclosure, CSP, Colonial Series, 26: no. 33). On the date of Corbett’s commission, see CSP, Colonial Series, 25: nos. 292, 387, 718, and note 64 below.

After his council presidency, Edward II stirred controversy for his decision to retain his compensation during his presidency as both a councilor and a council president. In 1716, the assembly asked Edward II to return the councilor’s salary of £52.13.6 and 29,580 pounds of tobacco (worth approximately £120, at one pence per pound) that he had received during his council presidency. Councilors were allowed 150 lb. tobacco, or 150 pence, for each day in attendance, but those with offices of profit customarily declined the salary. Edward II, however, refused to return the money. The assembly remarked during the 1716 dispute that while commander in chief, Edward II received more compensation “than all the members of the Councill put together.” In his defense, Edward II said that he remained a member of council while he was council president and therefore deserved both salaries. The assembly, which considered the double salary “unjust,” contended that Edward II was, “by Her Majtys. Instruction…a Body Distinct from the rest of the Council.” Lloyd had the “full power of Commander in chief, acted as such and had a negative voice” in legislation. The discussion addressed the ambiguity about Edward II’s constitutional authority as council president (Archives of Md., 30:384–85, 425, 442–43, 486, 560). In 1719, Governor Hart shared with the council a letter from Captain John Hyde to Edward II (now deceased), reporting the Board of Trade’s opinion that Edward II was entitled to collect a councilor’s salary while president (Archives of Md., 33:329).
crown officials who believed that colonists had interests in illegal trade. Governor Nicholson found it difficult to enforce the Navigation Acts in Maryland's county courts. In his experience, the vice-admiralty courts were more effective. Governor Seymour observed that clandestine trade was difficult to monitor because goods were loaded and unloaded at the planters' "owne Dores." English merchants, too, expressed a lack of confidence in the ability and desire of Maryland's colonists, in the absence of a royal governor, to enforce laws on trade for the benefit of the "Queen's revenue."61

Through legal mechanisms as well, Edward II and the council had an opportunity, in the absence of a royal governor, to ease the conditions of trade for their own benefit. For example, in 1713, the council persuaded the assembly to revive a bill to prohibit the importation of grain and other foodstuffs from Pennsylvania, thus achieving a small victory for the larger planters who raised grain and operated within extensive credit networks. The council's intention was to encourage Maryland's grain export trade, which was "beginning to flourish." Maryland-built ships, the products of a growing shipbuilding industry, were large enough to carry "great Quantities." Councilors were eager to draw

---

61 Nicholson to Board of Trade, July 1, 1699, CSP, Colonial Series, 17: no. 579; Seymour to Board of Trade, July 3, 1705, CSP, Colonial Series, 22: no. 1210; Maryland merchants to Board of Trade, [February 12, 1712], CSP, Colonial Series, 26: no. 314. For accounts of Maryland colonists' interests in illegal trade, see Edward Randolph to Commissioner of Customs, June 27, 1692, CSP, Colonial Series, 13: no. 2295, and Nicholson to Board of Trade, July 13, 1697, CSP, Colonial Series, 15: no. 1178. England developed vice-admiralty courts in the American colonies in the 1690s to enforce trade regulations. Trade law evasions are well-documented because of the English colonial administration's emphasis on trade.
the grain trade away from Pennsylvania merchants, because the trade brought "ready money" and bills of exchange to Maryland.\textsuperscript{62}

As men of "good estates" and high office, councilors had the resources to invest in grain farming to supplement their businesses as merchants and planters of tobacco. As noted above, the grain market in the West Indies had the potential to offset the decline in profit from the sale of oronoco tobacco to merchants in England. The crown, however, wanted to discourage planters in Maryland and Virginia from diversifying their crops. From the crown's point of view, an exclusive focus on the cultivation of tobacco in the two colonies made the colonists dependent on England for imported manufactures and thereby maintained a healthy balance of trade, to the benefit of England's treasury. Soon after Edward II became council president, the crown repealed acts from both Maryland and Virginia for the establishment of towns, concerned that these concentrated settlements would promote craftsmen's trades and the production of domestic manufactures. The crown preferred to have the colonists "turning their hands to manuring and cultivating their wast[e] lands for tobacco."\textsuperscript{63}

Though Edward II as acting governor exercised a rare degree of power for a native of the colony, he was aware that he lacked the authority of a commissioned

\textsuperscript{62} Archives of Md., 29:238 (quote). The "Act prohibiting the importation of bread, beer, flour, wheat" or other grain from Pennsylvania was first passed in 1704, revived in 1707, and then repealed in 1709 because of drought (Archives of Md., 27:172–73, 397, 445, 482). Pennsylvania was a major supplier of grain to the West Indies at the turn of the eighteenth century.

\textsuperscript{63} Board of Trade to the queen, November 30, 1709, CSP, Colonial Series, 24: no. 883; orders of the queen in council, repealing acts of Maryland and Virginia for establishing ports and towns, December 15, 1709, CSP, Colonial Series, 24: nos. 904, 906; commissioners of Her Majesty's customs to the Lord High Treasurer, July 28, 1709, CSP, Colonial Series, 24: no. 661 (quote).
governor. In May 1711, after presiding over the second legislative session of his council presidency, he wrote to Whitehall to request the arrival of a governor to uphold royal prerogative. The council had likely received word that in 1710, the queen’s privy council had commissioned a man named John Corbett to be Maryland’s next royal governor. But Corbett never arrived in Maryland. By 1712, the office was open to new bids. Corbett’s arrival would have relieved Edward II of a difficult legacy from Governor Seymour’s administration with respect to judicial system reform and the provincial secretary’s claim to ordinary license fee revenue as part of his salary. These two issues will be discussed in turn.64

Edward II inherited from Seymour the task of implementing an unpopular change to the colony’s judicial system. Queen Anne had approved the governor’s action, by royal prerogative, to create and appoint itinerant judges of the provincial court, a court of common law. Seymour had sought to improve the quality of Maryland’s justice system—and to heighten the crown’s profile in the colony—by expanding the jurisdiction of the provincial court and placing a few, handpicked provincial court justices on circuit. Seymour envisioned the traveling judges as instructors in royal prerogative to the “Country borne,” who “neither know their Duty to the Queens Ma[jes]tye nor the Respect they owe the Civill Magistrate.” Because of assembly opposition to Seymour’s plan to extend the reach of the provincial court at the expense of county courts, where assembly

64 Jordan, “The Royal Period in Colonial Maryland,” 322, cites Lloyd’s letter to the Board of Trade. On Corbett’s commission and delay and the continuing bidding process, see same, pp. 317–18. Maryland residents expected the arrival of the colony’s next royal governor in the fall of 1711 (Archives of Md., 29:113).
delegates often served as county court justices and attorneys, the governor had invoked royal prerogative to create the itinerant justice positions. 65

In Edward II’s first session as president, the legislature grappled with Queen Anne’s approval of Seymour’s appointment of four itinerant provincial court justices. The assembly declared the itinerant justices inconsistent with the “Constitution of the Country.” The council, for its part, cited the lack of its authority as a body to “alter” the queen’s decision. 66

By the opening of the next year’s session of government, news had arrived from London of the Board of Trade’s instruction to the assembly to pay the itinerant judges their salaries. The assembly responded that this payment could not be imposed without their consent. Attempting a different maneuver to defeat Seymour’s plan, the assembly proposed legislation to expand the authority of county courts at the expense of the provincial court, which remained in Annapolis for lack of salaries for the itinerant justices. Citing financial distress in the colony because of “a Long & Tedious war” resulting in losses of tobacco at sea and the closure of tobacco markets in France and Spain, the assembly argued that legal fees in the provincial court and the costs of travel to Annapolis posed hardships for indebted persons. As a result, debtors were leaving Maryland, notably for North Carolina, which had granted them amnesty. The assembly maintained that suits could be resolved more quickly and at less cost in county courts.

Arguably, too, delegates who were county justices and attorneys would benefit from the increased traffic in their courts if the bill were to pass.\(^67\)

The council initially resisted the assembly’s action, observing that the legislation would alter the justice system in such a way that—without a governor’s approval—would be an incursion on royal prerogative. “You have little regard to what Censure may fall upon us by passing such an Act,” the council admonished the assembly. Anticipating “great opposition” by the Board of Trade, the council offered its approval of the bill if the lower house agreed to hiring an agent in London “to Speak to our Laws.” The assembly refused the deal, insisting that an agent was unnecessary. By the time a royal veto reached Maryland’s shores, the assembly pointed out, an objectionable law would have already expired. Adding that the bill would not have a negative impact on trade, the assembly expressed its preference to legislate with short-term measures.\(^68\)

In the end, Edward II threw his support behind the assembly, risking a royal veto in order to maintain his leadership in the legislature. He agreed in 1710 to approve the bill to limit the jurisdiction of the provincial court, with expiration in two years, and dropped the requirement to hire a London agent. Relying on the Board of Trade’s

---

\(^67\) Archives of Md., 27:493–94, 500, 511, 559. In 1710, the lower house continued to refuse to pay the itinerant justices a salary. Aubrey Land interpreted a similar bill in the assembly in 1733 as a bid for power by county justices (The Dulanys of Maryland [Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1955], 133–34).

\(^68\) Archives of Md., 27:502, 504, 508–11, 556. The council reasoned that a reduction in the provincial court’s jurisdiction of suits in common law impinged on royal prerogative (502). For the Board of Trade, one of the purposes of a colonial agent was to speed the process of legislative review in Whitehall. Maryland’s assembly, however, found it convenient at this time to keep the review process at two- to three-year intervals.
allowance to the council to exercise its discretion in determining which laws were necessary, Edward II justified his decision by his assessment of need.69

As predicted by both houses of the legislature, news of a veto of the 1710 grievances law by the Board of Trade arrived two years later, the same year that the act was to expire. In his opening speech to the 1712 session of government, Edward II anticipated that the assembly would ask the council to approve the act’s renewal in spite of the Board of Trade’s explicit disapproval, and he tried to put to rest rumors that he would not oppose the assembly’s proposals. “Some have a notion,” Lloyd stated, that “I may assent to any Laws that may be proposed.” Lloyd reminded the assembly that “Her Ma[jes]tys royal Instructions have restrained me from passing any Acts in the Absence of a Governor in Chief” but what was necessary for the “Peace and Welfare” of the colony. Nonetheless, the assembly urged the council “to assert its Authority” to redress grievances. Despite a suspension of hostilities between Britain and France, the delegates argued, there remained the widespread economic hardship on which need for the 1710 grievances act was based. Ultimately, Edward II agreed to renew the bill on the advice of other council members, who spoke of “wretched” financial conditions and the continued threat of social disorder that justified the act’s initial passage.70

69 By the act passed in 1710, county courts were allowed to hear suits for damages up to £20 or 5,000 lb. tobacco (Archives of Md., 27:559–61).
70 Archives of Md., 27:559; 29:69, 84 (quote), 91 (quote), 100–102, 120. The 1710 grievances act read that debtors “Dayly desert their habitations,” and those who remained in Maryland “sculk in the woods or otherwise Ride Armed with Designe to Resist the Officers of Justice” (Archives of Md., 27:559). Edward II explained the council’s decision to renew the act in a letter to the Board of Trade dated November 20, 1712 (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 145).
As the colony awaited the arrival of a royal governor who, in the council’s opinion, “we cannot but believe will be more fully instructed in her Majesty’s good Pleasure toward her Subjects here than the Honble Presidt. at present,” Edward II presided over a fifth consecutive legislative session in 1713. He opened the session cautiously, having in hand the queen’s instructions to reverse an act of 1704 that denied the provincial secretary, Sir Thomas Lawrence, an income from ordinary license fees.71

Secretary Lawrence claimed the ordinary license fees as part of his office income. But his effort lacked support in Maryland’s legislature, which preferred to distribute the money at the county level. During Governor Seymour’s administration, Edward II had supported the passage of a bill in 1704 to deny Lawrence the income from the ordinary license fees, and he supported the act again when it was up for renewal in 1708. When Seymour solicited the advice of his council on the bill in 1704, Lloyd joined the minority position on the council that the governor, council, and assembly had the authority to deny Lawrence the income from tavern licenses. Francis Jenkins, the elder councilor who lost his bid in 1709 to be council president, shared the majority opinion that the laws of England did extend “in these remote parts.” Four years later, in 1708, Edward II took part in a joint assembly–council committee meeting that affirmed the 1704 decision to deny Lawrence the ordinary license fees. Now, as council president, Lloyd had to comply with a crown decision that was contrary to his earlier position.72

71 Archives of Md., 29:94 (quote). For a thorough treatment of the Lawrence fee affair, see Jordan, “Sir Thomas Lawrence, Secretary of Maryland.” By issuing ordinary licenses, the colonial government regulated the sale of alcoholic beverages and set standards for guest accommodations.
72 Archives of Md., 24:349–50 (quotes), 27:237–38. Arriving at the same conclusion, councilor Henry Coursey likened Maryland’s position to Ireland’s, which “altho’ a
After intensive lobbying by Lawrence in England, the queen had ordered Maryland’s legislature to grant him the income from ordinary licenses, plus back pay since 1704. Lawrence claimed that he was owed a total of £600. Offering the royal instructions as proof of “how Strictly I am commanded” by the crown, Edward II asked the assembly, in 1713, to comply with the queen’s instruction. But the contentious issue dominated what was to be Edward II’s last session as council president, eroded the remaining goodwill between the upper and lower houses, and tested Edward II’s leadership abilities.\(^{73}\)

Though the assembly acknowledged the council to be “both a good and useful part of the Legislative power of this Province,” the lower house proceeded along a course of unilateral action that disturbed the council. The assembly exercised its right under the crown government to petition the queen without the consent of the council. The direct address to Queen Anne argued, with a history of the colony’s laws, that the assembly had the right to deny Lawrence the income from ordinary license fees. In effect, the assembly asserted a right to review a crown decision. The assembly contended that the queen would see the justice of its argument that the colonial legislature can dispose of “such fines or taxes” imposed on their own countrymen.\(^{74}\)

---

\(^{73}\) Archives of Md., 29:204 (quote); 25:247–48.

\(^{74}\) Archives of Md., 29:222–23, 230 (quote).
Upon hearing the petition, the council replied in astonishment, “we cannot approve,” because of the queen’s command that Lawrence be paid. The council asked the assembly if it was willing to risk its reputation on the issue. When the assembly insisted on sending the resolution to the queen, the council warned that she might impose “hardships” on the colony out of her “displeasure” of the assembly’s “Neglect and Contempt” of the queen’s command. The council was not specific, though, about what these “hardships” might be. At another point in the 1713 session, the council expressed its concern about retribution from the queen, if the assembly did not follow her command to pay Lawrence: “We can have but little Confidence she should Extend her Bounty and Favours to us.”

For the remainder of the 1713 legislative session, the assembly and council remained deadlocked on the issue of Lawrence’s claim to the ordinary license fees. The assembly praised Edward II for his “ingenuity” in government over the last four years, recognizing that as the acting head of that government, Lloyd was in the difficult position of having to reconcile his “duty” to the crown with his “love” for her subjects. Nevertheless, Edward II’s last session as council president ended without agreement between the assembly and council on how to respond to the queen’s order to give Lawrence the fee revenue. The assembly sent its petition to the queen, explaining its position on the fee issue, not heeding the council’s advice that obeying the queen’s order was in the “true Interest” of the colony.

---

75 Archives of Md., 29:219 (quote), 231 (quote), 236, 246 (quote).
76 Archives of Md., 29:207, 231, 236 (quotes). Twice during the 1713 session, the assembly refused an offer by the council of a joint conference to discuss Lawrence’s claim to the ordinary license fees. When a conference took place on November 13, the
Why, in the fall of 1713, did the council attach particular significance to the queen’s recent order to pay Lawrence? The council did not insist on the assembly’s compliance with all orders and directions from the crown during Edward II’s tenure as council president. For example, the assembly continued to deny salary payments to itinerant justices of the provincial court throughout his presidency. Nor had the council always championed Lawrence’s claim. During Edward II’s first session as council president, the assembly composed an address to the queen defending its decision in 1708 (during Governor Seymour’s administration) to deny Lawrence the revenue from the ordinary license fees. The council forwarded the address to Whitehall without objecting.77

Timing made the difference in 1713. News of a cessation of hostilities with France arrived in Maryland in late 1712 and caused the political ground to shift beneath the council’s feet. As had occurred at the end of the last war, peace raised the prospect of a change in the source of executive authority in the colony’s government, either back to Lord Baltimore or permanently with the crown. When negotiations resumed in Whitehall about ending all proprietary colonies, the third Lord Baltimore considered selling his proprietorship to the crown. With some change in government likely, the council representatives of the two houses failed to reach an agreement (Archives of Md., 29:233, 241, 243–45, 248). The crown endorsed the Maryland assembly’s petition to the queen regarding Lawrence’s claim to the ordinary license fees as received on January 29, 1714 (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 567). 77 Archives of Md., 27:378–80, 493–94; Maryland council to Board of Trade, February 2, 1710, CSP, Colonial Series, 25: no. 93; Jordan, Foundations of Representative Government, 225–26, 226n; president and council of Maryland to Board of Trade, November 4, 1710, CSP, Colonial Series, 25: no. 474.
members reassured the queen of their loyalty and trustworthiness in a bid to maintain their privileges. 78

Whatever concerns the councilors may have had about the security of their appointments under a new government, a more pressing matter—and one that the council had more control over—was the tobacco trade. The recent truce with France raised the prospect of a revival in the tobacco trade. During the previous peace between 1697 and 1702, for example, tobacco prices rose, freight costs fell, and goods flowed into the colony again. Unlike that last interval of peace, though, planters in both Maryland and Virginia in 1712 and 1713 were concerned that recent English government actions hampered post-war recovery in the tobacco market. News from London in 1713 about a bill in Parliament to ease the terms of payment of duties on imported tobacco encouraged councilors in both colonies to lobby for a change in government policy. 79

78 News of the truce between England and France arrived in Maryland by November 1712. Peace was official in July 1713 (circular letter from the Earl of Dartmouth, August 21, 1712, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 50; Edward Lloyd to Board of Trade, November 20, 1712, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 145; circular letter from the Board of Trade to colonial governors, July 15, 1713, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 396). On the renewal of efforts in Whitehall to end all proprietary colonies, and the third Lord Baltimore’s offer to relinquish his proprietorship of Maryland, see Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 78. The manuscript proceedings of the council during the 1713 session, a copy of which would have been sent to Whitehall, recorded such exhortations from the council to the assembly as, “we have by many Messages Endeavored to perswade your House to comply with her Majesty’s Commands,” and, “It will lye at your door if you refuse the Warning given you and We,” that is, the council, “shall clearly be acquitted therefrom” (Archives of Md., 29:236, 254). See also Edward II’s report on the 1713 session in his letter to Lord Bolingbroke, February 20, 1714, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 586.

79 For an account of the impact of peace on trade with Maryland in 1698, see Governor Nicholson to Board of Trade, August 20, 1698, CSP, Colonial Series, 16: no. 760. On July 15, 1712, Edward II wrote to the Board of Trade, “the planters finding some encouragement for the rise of tobacco the last year on the hopes of peace, they have very industriously betoken themselves to the culture thereof” (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no.
The low returns on tobacco had been a major theme in the council’s letters to
the Board of Trade during Edward II’s presidency. Wartime freight charges and the
higher import duty that England imposed on tobacco in 1702 had raised the cost of
American tobacco in foreign markets. Furthermore, French and Spanish markets were
closed to English traders during Queen Anne’s War. Dutch tobacco merchants, seeking a
cheaper product, began to purchase a low-grade, European-grown leaf to sell on the
Continent, taking a large share of the market away from oronoco tobacco growers in
Maryland and Virginia. Lastly, in 1711, customs officials in England introduced a new
duty payment method that proved to be unpopular with London tobacco merchants.
According to the new procedure, import merchants had to pay duties in cash within
twelve months of landing, instead of with bonds payable in eighteen months. Merchants
complained about the lack of ready money to pay within the required time limit.80

The ongoing difficulties in the tobacco trade endangered the estates of rich and
poor in Maryland. Planters ran up debts with Marylanders and with British merchants.
Because of the decline in planters’ purchasing power, ships returned from England with
protested bills of exchange instead of manufactured goods. The value of land fell, which
had important implications for credit negotiations, marriage, and inheritance. In a joint
address to the queen in the fall of 1712, Maryland’s assembly and council wrote that as a
result of the last war, “most of us are miserably impoverished and many quite ruined.”

11). The same optimism fueled expanded production of tobacco and the purchase of
bonded labor on credit after King William’s War.
80 John M. Hemphill, Virginia and the English Commercial System, 1689–1733 (New
380; Leonidas Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, Governor of Colonial Virginia, 1710–1722
Councilors, despite their wealth, were hurt by the tight credit. Substantial property owners in Maryland were not only planters but also merchants, creditors, and landlords for whom tobacco was the most widely used medium of exchange.\textsuperscript{81}

The councils of both Virginia and Maryland considered the fall of 1713 an opportune time to petition the Board of Trade for assistance in the tobacco trade. In September 1713, Virginia’s council responded to “late advices” from commercial contacts in London that the city’s tobacco merchants had “applied to the Parliament for a moderation of the high duties.” In a letter to the Board of Trade, councilors described the “unhappy effects” in Virginia of the low returns on tobacco and asked for a reduction of the duties. Similarly, Maryland’s council and assembly sent a joint address to Whitehall in November 1713, soliciting the board to represent the “circumstances of this poor

\textsuperscript{81} President and council of Maryland to Board of Trade, November 4, 1710, CSP, \textit{Colonial Series}, 25: no. 474; president, council, and assembly of Maryland to Board of Trade, [November 20], 1712, CSP, \textit{Colonial Series}, 27: no. 145 (quote); president and council of Maryland to Board of Trade, April 16, 1713, CSP, \textit{Colonial Series}, 27: no. 319. Hemphill offers personal testimony by large planters in Virginia on the impact of the poor tobacco market on their estates during the last years of Queen Anne’s War (\textit{Virginia and England’s Commercial System}, 30–32). In 1713, Virginia’s council informed the Board of Trade that:

the credit of the merchants and more considerable planters...is now sunk to an incredible degree: those who either by their own industry had acquired, or from the more prosperous fortune of their ancestors received considerable estates, have instead of improving thereof in the way of the tobacco trade, by a continued decay of that commodity, so far involved themselves in debt, that they have now little left but the melancholy prospect of their ruined prosperity. A large stock of negroes heretofore accounted the chief riches of this Colony, has only contributed to the more speedy undoing of their owners, for he who has made the best crops of tobacco has but the more effectually diminished his estate, while that commodity has served only to bring him in debt besides the entire loss of his principle adventure....It will not appear so strange that many have left off planting (September 14, CSP, \textit{Colonial Series}, 27: no. 473ii).
Province” to the queen and to members of Parliament in the hopes of obtaining "redress and relief" in the tobacco trade. 82

The 1713 legislative session in Maryland highlighted the different perspectives of council and assembly members on what was in the "true Interest" of the colony. Influenced by their diverse financial interests in Maryland, their overlapping commercial and political connections to London, and the power they owed to crown patronage, the councilors were attuned to events in England. Meanwhile, the assembly rejected the

---

82 Governor Alexander Spotswood to Board of Trade, September 14, 1713, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 473 (quote); council of Virginia to Board of Trade, September 14, 1713, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 473ii; address of the assembly, council, and president of Maryland to Board of Trade, [November 20, 1713], endorsed as received January 13, 1714 and read April 16, 1714, CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 503; Archives of Md., 29:218, 224, 246–47. Because of the broad agreement for the need for "relief" in the tobacco trade during Maryland's 1713 legislative session, both the assembly and the council agreed to hire an agent in London (Archives of Md., 29:207–10, 213–14). On April 16, the Board of Trade forwarded to Lord Bolingbroke, for presentation to the queen, the September and November 1713 addresses from Virginia and Maryland on the "decay of the tobacco trade" (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 647). The board also wrote a letter to the House of Lords, dated June 5, 1714, communicating the colonists' concerns about the "low price of tobacco" due to competition from European-grown tobacco and the "high duties" on tobacco imported to England from the colonies (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 688). Enclosed was a letter of June 2 by London tobacco merchants Micajeh Perry and John Hyde on the tobacco trade (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 686).

Dodson points out that London's tobacco merchants and Virginia colonists advocated different approaches to reviving the tobacco market. The London merchants lobbied Parliament to restore the customary grace period for payment of duties. Virginians, on the other hand, targeted a reduction in "heavy duties" as a solution to the problem. Marylanders shared their neighbor's sentiments. For example, a letter from the president and council of Maryland to the Board of Trade of April 16, 1713, suggested reducing "the heavy charges on tobacco" in order to revive the tobacco market and thereby discourage tobacco planters from grain farming, domestic manufactures, and outmigration (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 319).
council's attempt to use the ordinary license fee issue to win favor with the queen. More important to the delegates was the assertion of their right to control public monies. 83

Events in 1714 offered the promise of a return to normalcy. The crown dropped Lawrence's claim to the ordinary license fees from its agenda after the secretary died in April. Parliament passed a law that eased the terms of payment of tobacco duties. This act created a warehouse system by which tobacco could be stored, under crown supervision, for up to fifteen months until merchants paid charges or re-exported the tobacco. Also in 1714, the crown issued a commission to John Hart as Maryland's next royal governor. Hart arrived in Maryland in June, and Edward II assumed a more "natural," subordinate position as the first-named (or, highest-ranking) member of the council. 84

Any sense of normalcy following Governor Hart's arrival was short lived, however. Hart had not received his commission as governor through the usual patronage channels, but instead by the direct influence of the Calvert family, a harbinger of the change in government to come.

83 Archives of Md., 29:233, 253. In the same session, the assembly argued for the right to review appointments to provincial offices, specifically targeting the treasurers of both shores (Archives of Md., 29:217–18, 221).
84 Jordan posits that the crown abandoned Lawrence's claim when he died because he left no direct heirs (Jordan, "Sir Thomas Lawrence, Secretary of Maryland," 39). On the parliamentary law of 1714, see Dodson, Alexander Spotswood, 44–45. The law was considered a victory for London tobacco merchants, who did not lobby to lower duties but instead to ease the terms of their payment. The crown appointed John Hart as governor of Maryland in January 1714 (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 539). Two weeks later, Lawrence asked the Board of Trade to include his claim to ordinary license fee revenue in Hart's instructions as governor (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 555). Governor Hart arrived in Maryland in June (CSP, Colonial Series, 27: no. 695). He made no mention of Lawrence or ordinary license fees in his opening address to the legislative session that month (Archives of Md., 29: 347–50).
Proprietary Government Restored, 1715

Governor Hart had the unusual distinction of being Maryland's only royal governor to obtain the office through the patronage of the Calvert family. Throughout the crown rule period, whenever the governor's office was vacant, the third Lord Baltimore petitioned the Board of Trade, without success, for the right to appoint the colony's governor. The political calculus changed when Benedict Leonard Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore's oldest son and heir to the title, converted to Protestantism in 1713. At the time, there was renewed interest in the English government, at the close of Queen Anne's War, to end all proprietary colonies. To prepare for this possibility, Lord Baltimore considered negotiating a financial settlement with the crown in which he would name his fourth wife, whom he had recently married, as the beneficiary, or so his son believed. If such a deal was made and the family's proprietorship of Maryland ended, the younger Calvert would be deprived of a major source of income as well as whatever compensation that the crown provided. In the effort to salvage his "patrimony," the heir formally joined the Church of England and withdrew his children from St. Omer's, a Jesuit school in Flanders, to place them in English Protestant schools.85

85 William Blathwayt to Lord Dartmouth, enclosed in Lord Dartmouth to Board of Trade, March 10, 1711, CSP, Colonial Series, 25: no. 718; petition of Benedict Leonard Calvert to the king, enclosed in Secretary Stanhope to Board of Trade, February 4, 1715, CSP, Colonial Series, 28: no. 200; order of the king in council, approving John Hart as governor of Maryland "upon the petition of Francis Lord Guilford, who, as guardian of Charles Lord Baltimore, has re-appointed him," April 30, 1715, CSP, Colonial Series, 28: no. 372; Hardy, "Papists in a Protestant Age," Ph.D. diss., chapter 4; Jordan, "The Royal Period in Colonial Maryland," chapter 7; Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 78–80, 86–87 (quote, 78). Hoffman discusses Benedict Leonard Calvert's relationship with his father, which had deteriorated prior to his conversion to Protestantism. The younger Calvert provoked his father's anger by separating from his wife and living with the woman with whom he had an affair during his marriage.
Benedict Leonard Calvert’s renunciation of Catholicism cost him his father’s financial support, including an annual allowance that paid his children’s school fees, but the action improved his standing with England’s rulers. Unlike his father, Calvert won Queen Anne’s approval of his choice of the next governor of Maryland. Her government appointed John Hart as governor in January 1714 and issued him a commission. A series of deaths then briefly clouded Maryland’s future. Queen Anne died in August 1714, leaving no surviving children and the throne vulnerable to a challenge by James Stuart, the Pretender. After the third Lord Baltimore passed away in February 1715, Calvert held his father’s title only briefly before dying in April and passing the title to his fifteen-year-old son. By the middle of May, though, King George I, approved Hart’s appointment as governor of Maryland and restored the Calvert family’s executive control over the colony.  

These events caught up to Maryland in the summer of 1715. In August, a little more than a year after his arrival, Governor Hart presented before the council a letter by Francis North, Lord Guilford, the guardian of the fifth Lord Baltimore (and a member of the Board of Trade). In the letter, Lord Guilford said that he had, on his ward’s behalf, “nominated and approved” Hart as governor, and the king had confirmed the appointment. The wording of the letter suggested that the crown had restored the Calvert

---

86 Queen Anne and her successor, King George I, both demonstrated an interest in bringing Lord Baltimore’s line of descent into the Protestant faith. For example, according to Benedict Leonard Calvert’s negotiation with the queen, a portion of John Hart’s payment of £500 a year to Benedict Leonard Calvert while Hart was governor was to be applied toward the cost of Calvert’s children’s Protestant education (Secretary Stanhope to Board of Trade, February 4, 1715, CSP, Colonial Series, 28: no. 200). After rumors of a Jacobite rebellion in the spring and summer of 1715, an uprising took place in Scotland in September (Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 78).
family's executive authority over the colony. But Maryland's council was reluctant to acknowledge the change in government without direct communication from the king. In December, Hart presented before the council another letter, this time from the fifth Lord Baltimore and his guardian, affirming that the restoration had taken place. The council now consented to a public declaration of the change in government without having received official communication from the crown.87

Edward II took leave of the council before its next meeting in February 1716. According to council minutes, he never attended another council meeting before his death in 1719. The reasons for his nonattendance are unclear, but the timing of his departure suggests that he was offended by his loss of place as the most senior member of the council. At the February 1716 meeting, Thomas Brooke (c. 1659–1731) resumed his seat on the council with a letter of appointment by the fifth Lord Baltimore and his guardian. Brooke outranked Lloyd because of his prior service on the council, from 1691 until the crown revoked his appointment in 1708. Governor Seymour had successfully appealed to the crown for Brooke’s removal from the council, citing Brooke’s nonattendance at council meetings, his recent conversion from Roman Catholicism to Protestantism, and the presence of his two Jesuit brothers in Maryland. The governor had cast sufficient doubt on Brooke’s loyalty to Maryland’s royal government.88

88 Archives of Md., 25:245, 265, 327. Thomas Brooke of Calvert County was a third-generation resident of Maryland whose father converted to Catholicism. His stepfather was Henry Darnall, a powerful placeman as Lord Baltimore’s agent and receiver general from 1684 until his death in 1711 (BDML, 1:170–72; Chapter 1). Brooke’s restoration to the council may have invigorated concerns, identified by Hardy, that the Calvert family would bestow patronage on supporters of the former proprietary government and Roman Catholics (“Papists in a Protestant Age,” Ph.D. diss., 137, 148).
In another indication that Edward II was not comfortable serving in the new proprietary government, Lord Baltimore’s instructions of 1718 for an interim government (after a planned departure by Governor Hart) anticipated that Edward II might decline the proprietor’s offer of an office. The instructions read that the first-named councilor, Thomas Brooke, was to be the acting governor. Edward II, the second-named councilor, was to be the keeper of the great seal, and if he refused the position, that position was to go to the third-named councilor. Edward II’s loyalty to the new government remained untested; he died before the instructions arrived in Maryland. 89

Edward II ended his service in Maryland’s provincial government while he still held the highest rank on the council, rather than accept a lower status as “second-named” councilor in the restored proprietary government. Prior to this, Edward II used opportunities provided by the crown government to build upon his inherited advantages of an established plantation, kin-based commercial ties to London, and a family history of political prominence in Maryland. His first promotions--two commissions in the colonial militia and a seat on the council--came from royal governors. These appointments demonstrated his value to the royal government. Marylanders also sought his leadership. Upon the death of a governor, Edward II’s peers on the council elevated him above a more senior member to preside over the government. Colonel Jenkins’s disadvantages as an emigrant to Maryland serve as a foil to Edward II’s advantages by birth in the colony: Jenkins was older, infirm, and lacked powerful kin-based ties at the upper reaches of government. As council president, Edward II worked to maintain the respect of both the assembly and the crown.

Edward II's house at Wye Plantation offers another illustration of how the Maryland native both inherited and created opportunities for social and political advancement. Edward II, his wife, and their children lived in the house that he was born in, but the interior of the house was updated in ways that reflected the current owner's wealth and connections.

The Lloyds' Style of Life: Fashion and Gentility

Edward II's probate inventory of 1719, the third and last in a succession of inventories of the first-period Lloyd house, reflects changing norms of social interaction in Maryland at the turn of the eighteenth century. The 1719 inventory documents changes in room use, the subdivision of space for increased privacy, and the installation of new and fashionable furnishings since his mother's death in 1697. Edward II also acquired an expensive coach, a portable marker of status. Edward II's probate inventory captures the material life of an elite family a generation before the great rebuilding by native Chesapeake gentry that began in the second quarter of the eighteenth century.90

90 Chapter 1 describes the Lloyd house according to probate inventories of Edward II's parents from 1685 and 1697. The longevity of the first period house at Wye, from before 1685 to after 1719, suggests that it had a substantial timber frame. Brick dwellings were rare outside of towns in seventeenth-century Maryland (Willie Graham, Carter L. Hudgins, Carl R. Lounsbury, Fraser D. Neiman, and James P. Whittenburg, "Adaption and Innovation: Archaeological and Architectural Perspectives on the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake," William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 64 [2007]: 451–522, esp. 482). In terms of consumer spending, Edward II was consistent with decedents in selected counties in Maryland and Virginia with a total estate value of £451 and above in the first two decades of the eighteenth century, according to Carr and Walsh's amenities index in their article, "Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behavior in the Colonial Chesapeake." Lloyd owned table forks and knives, for instance, when these objects were not ubiquitous. Tea and teaware, as discussed below, were rare outside of urban areas.
At the Lloyd house at Wye Plantation, the hall and the hall chamber remained at the core of the roughly eight-room dwelling. The hall continued to be a busy place for household members and visitors, a multipurpose room where a dozen chairs and a number of guns were kept. The hall chamber retained the functions of receiving room and best bedchamber that Henrietta Maria Lloyd introduced as a widow. The room still contained the best bed in the house (valued at £25 in 1719) along with seven cane chairs and a cane couch.

New furnishings installed in the hall and hall chamber, though, were fashionable improvements. An expensive ensemble of “a looking glass and sconces,” valued at £8, updated the appearance of the hall. An imported marble slab table top complemented the amplified light. Polished stone was cool and smooth to the touch, introducing a different sensory experience and a different aesthetic from the table carpets of the seventeenth-century hall. Edward II and his wife also improved the lighting in the hall chamber by replacing a single mirror with two, more expensive looking glasses.91

Other new display objects in the hall were an escritoire, a clock, and a telescope. An escritoire is a writing desk with enclosed drawers and a fold-down front, and as such, Lloyd’s possession of eleven tables and fifty-five chairs scores high on the index, and his ownership of six pieces of case furniture was well above the average of two or fewer. 91 Devices that amplified light, such as mirrors and sconces, became increasingly popular among wealthier Anglo-American households in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries (Crowley, The Invention of Comfort, chapter 4). According to the probate inventories of the Lloyd house at Wye Plantation, the number of looking glasses in the house increased over time, from a total of three in 1685, to six in 1697, to eight in 1719. Like the mirrors, the marble table top provided a “lustrous surface” that was fashionable at the time (Crowley, 129). Marble tops were easier to clean than table carpets, Peter Thornton observes. Taste was changing, too; in Northern Europe, carpets began to move off tables and onto the floors at the turn of the eighteenth century (Thornton, Authentic Decor: The Domestic Interior, 1620–1920 [New York: Viking Press, 1984], 59, 60).
offered visual testimony to the correspondence and recordkeeping that took place in the household. The clock’s appraisal value was £8, indicating that it was more valuable and more substantial than the “old clock” worth £1 that his parents had in the staircase. The telescope, used for surveying and astronomy, hints at Edward II’s interest in scientific observation, one of the attributes of a learned gentleman in the later seventeenth century.92

The hall, then, assumed some of the functions of the “old” and “new” studies, which no longer existed at this time, and of the New Room where Philemon I and his widow Henrietta Maria had displayed their status as the heads of household in a large receiving room. In contrast to the utilitarian hall of the two previous generations, the hall in Edward II’s lifetime was a more personal reflection of the master of the household, who conducted plantation affairs here amid material evidence of his family’s civility.93

Meanwhile, the New Room of Edward II’s parents’ generation devolved into a parlor. In the 1680s and 1690s, the New Room was a semi-public space furnished to seat at least twenty individuals amid symbols of Philemon Lloyd’s and Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s status, such as a sword and olivewood furniture. By 1719, the heated room was renamed a parlor. Containing several lesser beds, a “very old” cradle, three “very old

93 Rafaella Sarti in Europe at Home: Family and Material Culture, 1500–1800 discusses a similar type of writing desk, the scrittor, which defined a room as a study in Renaissance Florence (trans. A. Cameron [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002], 132). Because Edward II conducted more business in the hall, fewer persons were obliged to proceed past this semi-public room of the house. The six pictures in the hall in 1697 are not mentioned in the 1719 inventory.
chairs,” a “damag’d” chest of drawers, tin, and earthenware, the now informal room was used by household members for sleeping and eating.

The decline in status of Philemon and Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s New Room after 1700 reflected a trend on both sides of the Atlantic toward greater domestic privacy and the creation of smaller and more socially exclusive settings in which to receive guests. By the second decade of the eighteenth century, Edward II and his wife created the “New Room in the Shed.” This addition contained the most fashionable room in the house, with a specialized environment for having tea. The “New Room in the Shed” contained six cane chairs and a cane couch, providing about as much seating as the hall chamber. The canopy bed was not the best bed of the house; it was less than half the value of the bed in the best bedchamber, the hall chamber. But it was in all likelihood draped in material that complemented the remarkable set of japanned furniture in the room. A “fine” chest of drawers, a dressing table with a mirror and drawers, and a tea table, all “japanned” in imitation of the Chinese lacquered furniture that the East Indies Company shipped to England, made up the most expensive suite of furniture in the house (totaling £22). Likely created by London cabinetmakers, these fashionable novelties would have looked stunning with light, amplified by a pair of “broak” sconces, reflecting off the gilt decorative patterns on their painted surfaces.  

---

94 Graham, Hudgins, Lounsbury, Neiman, and Whittenburg, “Adaption and Innovation,” 493–518, provides an up-to-date discussion of the trend toward greater privacy in the colonial Chesapeake as expressed, for instance, by room subdivision, closet installation, and the removal of servants and slaves into their own quarters. Main offers other examples of new, smaller receiving rooms in wealthier households in early eighteenth-century Maryland in Tobacco Colony, chapter 6. With the East Indies Company’s importation of lacquered furniture from the Far East stimulating demand in the late seventeenth century, the English experimented with lacquer work and applied it mostly to
By creating a specialized environment with Asiatic décor in which they served tea, as suggested by the presence of the tea table, the Lloyds heightened the exoticism of the new beverage on the shores of the Chesapeake Bay. The Lloyd family also took tea in more private quarters, in the hall chamber (the master’s bedchamber) or in the recently created closet off the hall chamber. Appraisers in 1719 recorded the presence of china, a tea table, a looking glass, several groceries, including sugar, and a violin in the hall chamber closet.95

Edward II and his wife Sarah introduced tea to the Lloyd house. Tea and related consumer goods, including china and sugar, were more readily available through transatlantic trade during Edward II’s generation. However, in the British American colonies, tea was not common in households at this time. In Maryland, tea drinking was rare outside of urban areas in the 1710s.96

case furniture (Hans Huth, *Lacquer of the West: The History of a Craft and an Industry, 1550–1950* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971], 1–2, 38–43). Demonstrating the importance of the New Room in the Shed to Sarah’s role and position in the household, Edward II in his will bequeathed to Sarah the room’s contents. English studies on seventeenth-century furniture associate women with exotic objects such as tea and lacquered furniture, but a Boston study refutes this assumption, citing evidence of merchants as consumers of japanned furniture in England and Massachusetts (Ethan W. Lasser, “Reading Japanned Furniture,” in *American Furniture 2007*, ed. Luke Beckerdite [Milwaukee: The Chipstone Foundation, 2007], 167–90). If, as Adriana Turpin writes, London merchants in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries had a “taste for oriental wares,” then Edward II and his brothers may have learned about the fashion either on their visits to England or from their correspondents there (“Furnishing the London Merchant’s Town House,” in *City Merchants and the Arts, 1670–1720*, ed. Mireille Gainou [Wetherby, U.K.: Oblong Creative, 2004], 60).

95 The closet was one of the modifications of the existing Lloyd house that gave the Lloyd family more privacy. Thornton discusses the use of bedchamber closets for taking tea in *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in Holland, France, and England*, 293, 296.

96 Carr and Walsh, “Changing Lifestyles and Consumer Behavior in the Colonial Chesapeake,” in *Of Consuming Interests*, ed. Carson et al., tables 1 through 5; Carson,
Because the tea service required the possession and “mastery of specialized tools,” historians consider the performance an indicator of gentility, a transatlantic code of conduct that required the use of fashionable goods. Gentility gained currency in the British American colonies in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries as an indicator of wealth, education, and higher social rank.97

“The Consumer Revolution in Colonial British America: Why Demand?” in ibid., 456, 524; Kevin Sweeney, “High Style Vernacular: Lifestyles of the Colonial Elite,” in ibid., 8–9, figure 3; Main, Tobacco Colony, 247–48; Girouard, Life in the English Country House, 204–5. According to the data presented by Carr and Walsh cited above, tea and teaware occurred in zero percent of decedents’ households before 1700 in selected counties of Maryland and in York County, Virginia. By 1722, tea and teaware, outside of urban areas, appeared almost exclusively in the upper tier of wealth (£491 and above). Sweeney asserts that tea was an “exotic new beverage” in the British American colonies in the 1720s. John E. Willis contends, on the other hand, that it was the stimulant qualities of tea, not exoticism, that drew its customers, in “European Consumption and Asian Production in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries,” in Consumption and the World of Goods, ed. John Brewer and Roy Porter (London: Routledge, 1993), 134. Edward II’s parents entertained with alcoholic beverages, which was much more common among all ranks in Maryland before 1720 (Main, Tobacco Colony, 212; see also Chapter 1).

Edward II also updated his personal appearance to convey his family’s wealth and status. The total value of his clothing plus horses’ “furniture with swords and pistols and other [accoutrements]” was £82, according to his probate inventory. This sum was four times the combined value of his father’s clothing (£14), saddles, sword, and pistols. Some portion of this increase is attributable to fashionable apparel. A notable proportion of men of Edward II’s generation were no longer satisfied by the “plain style” of their fathers’ clothing. Edward II’s generation had a wider variety of cloth available to them, including the Indian-made cottons (calicos) in Edward II’s stores. Powdered wigs and lace entered gentlemen’s wardrobes in Boston in the 1690s. New cuts of clothing required more tailoring, for instance to create the recently introduced ensemble of breeches, coat, and waistcoat. By wearing these new styles, recent emigrants, crown officials, and ship captains fostered their circulation in the colonies.98

Besides outfitting himself for riding on horseback, Edward II also owned a coach, a highly exclusive means of transportation during this period. Transport by coach allowed passengers to travel in apparent physical comfort, indicating their higher status. The horses and servants that attended the coach reflected the owner’s wealth. Valued at £55, the coach was the single most expensive luxury object in Lloyd’s probate inventory. The

---

98 Main, *Tobacco Colony*, 239 (quote); Karin Calvert, “The Function of Fashions in Eighteenth-Century America,” in *Of Consuming Interests*, ed. Carson et al., 260–65; Hunter, *Purchasing Identity in the Atlantic World*, 71–100; Carson, “Consumption,” 359. Edward II’s probate inventory does not itemize his clothing. A change in attitude among men at the turn of the century on how much to spend on personal dress explains Main’s contradictory findings from probate inventories between 1700 and 1720, when, for the first time, a significant number of men owned clothing worth upwards of £40 to £60, while other wealthy men were satisfied with older modes of dress. Charles Carroll the Settler, a well-educated man who emigrated to Maryland in 1688 and settled in Annapolis, had a wardrobe worth £114 at his death in 1720 (Hoffman with Mason, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, 77).
coach, like the tea and japanned furniture, communicated Edward II’s metropolitan ties: as the technology of coaches improved after 1660, their popularity in London increased. On the flat terrain of Maryland’s Eastern Shore, a coach was not impractical, though vehicle maintenance may have been easier to procure in Annapolis.\(^9^9\)

In Maryland’s new seat of government, fashionable dress and the possession of a coach addressed the need for portable markers of status in a city in the early stages of development. Several buildings that lent themselves to processional display of rank, such as an Anglican church and a state house, were erected quickly in the mid- to late-1690s under Governor Francis Nicholson’s leadership. But progress thereafter was uneven during Edward II’s lifetime. In 1704, the partially completed state house, intended for use by the assembly and courts of law, was destroyed by fire. Reconstruction took several years to complete. Until a “Council House” was built adjacent to the state house, the council met in temporary quarters, including the recently constructed brick building for a free school. Annapolis also lacked a dedicated governor’s residence. Royal governor John Seymour, at his first meeting with the assembly, complained that his residence was not “fitt for a gent[lema]n that bears a Publick character.” Seymour would have expected, at the very least, a room dedicated to entertaining, where he could receive local men of influence and visiting crown officials amidst a visual display of his power and rank.\(^1^0^0\)


\(^1^0^0\) *Archives of Md.*, 24:23, 26, 226, and 25:45 on church construction in Annapolis, 1698–1700; *Archives of Md.*, 19: 594–96, on intended use of the state house; *Archives of*
Seymour's comment highlights one disadvantage of the royal governor's temporary residence in Maryland: destined to be reassigned to another colony or recalled back home, Seymour lacked an incentive to build and furnish a permanent residence in a manner that he believed better reflected his standing in the colony. (Like Maryland's other royal governors, Seymour rented a house in Annapolis.) Edward II, on the other hand, had long-term family interests in Maryland, and he stood to gain from remaining in the colony, rather than staying in England past his schooling or a merchant's apprenticeship. By spending some expense on updating the appearance of his house and his person, Edward II (and his wife) maintained the family's investment and high profile in the colony in the third generation of residence.

Conclusion

Edward II’s perspective on the function and meaning of Wye Plantation was shaped by the crown’s direct rule (after Maryland’s revolution of 1689) and an economic downturn in Maryland that lasted most of his adult life. Edward II found ways to take advantage of opportunities in the new government, and he softened the impact of the economic crisis on Wye Plantation by expanding in the provisions trade with the West Indies. By acquiring fashionable goods and demonstrating their gentility with these objects, Edward II and his wife displayed the family’s connections to London, through trade and politics, that elevated their position within Maryland.
CHAPTER 3

POWER PLAY: WYE PLANTATION UNDER EDWARD LLOYD III, 1730–1770

When Edward Lloyd III (1711–1770) became the master of Wye Plantation in the early 1730s, he inherited the advantages of possession of the family seat, three generations of commercial connections in England, and the legacy of his family’s political leadership in the Maryland colony with the mutual support of the Lords Baltimore. As the heir at law of his half-uncle, Richard Bennett III, who died in 1749, Lloyd acquired additional wealth, credit in London, and the trust of the Calvert family with their private revenue. Confident in his wealth and political position inside the proprietary patronage system, Edward III rebuilt the Lloyd house at Wye Plantation.

The new house symbolized Lloyd’s investment in Wye Plantation as the locus of his power. He leveraged his position in Lord Baltimore’s patron-client network to expand his influence through credit-lending. When ultimately threatened by a potential loss of status as a reliable creditor, Edward III resigned from the highest office in Lord Baltimore’s private revenue system in order to protect his family’s legacy at Wye Plantation.

A New House, a New Generation at Wye Plantation

Edward Lloyd III was eight years old when his father, Edward Lloyd II, died in 1719, at the age of forty-eight. Edward III’s three siblings, including his elder brother Philemon, his younger brother Richard, and his sister Rebecca, were also minors, ranging from age eleven to two. Their mother, Sarah Covington Lloyd, remarried in 1721 to
James Hollyday, a planter and lawyer of Queen Anne’s County who was thirteen years her junior. The couple remained at Wye Plantation for about ten years and had two children of their own. Edward III’s elder brother died in 1729, at the age of twenty-one. In 1733, Hollyday moved his family to a new house at his seat in Queen Anne’s County, Readbourne, effectively leaving Wye Plantation in the hands of the next heir, Edward III, when he was twenty-one.¹

Some time in mid-century, Edward III conducted the first major rebuilding of his family’s house at Wye. Based on the evidence of two inventories from 1770, Edward III erected a double-pile, Georgian-style structure with a more ordered and symmetrical appearance than the previous Lloyd house. The principal ground floor rooms were the passage, dining room, and parlor; in a display of symmetry, each had a room directly above it on the second floor. The house’s ground-floor plan was similar to that of two mid-eighteenth-century houses of Virginia’s planter elite, Colonel Landon Carter’s Sabine Hall (after 1730) and John Tayloe II’s Mount Airy (1758). Edward III’s house provided an up-to-date interior for a genteel family. (See Appendix B for a list of room names and contents.)²

¹ BDML, 1:450–51, 2:535; James Bordley, Jr., The Hollyday and Related Families of the Eastern Shore (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1962), 69. Bordley relates that Sarah Lloyd renounced her rights to Wye in favor of her son Edward III in 1732, and that she and Hollyday moved to Readbourne in 1733. Sarah Lloyd was thirty-eight and Hollyday was twenty-five when they married. Sarah died in England in 1755 while visiting her daughter, Rebecca Lloyd Anderson, wife of William Anderson, a merchant in London.

² Two different inventories survive of Edward Lloyd III’s house, one in the Lloyd Papers at the Maryland Historical Society and another in the Cadwalader Collection at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; see Appendix B. Both inventories were made privately for the purpose of dividing Edward III’s estate. A 1783 tax list recorded a brick house at Wye, so Edward III may have built his house in brick (Assessment Record,
The earlier Lloyd house had, at its core, a hall-and-parlor plan. Rooms were added and altered over time as needs and fashions changed. The hall, though, remained a multipurpose room that provided access to more formal and more private rooms in the house.\(^3\)

In the Lloyd house of 1770, the traditional functions of the hall—the labor of maintaining a household—receded from visitors’ immediate view with the introduction of the central passage. The first-period Lloyd house, in 1719, had a passage that was little more than an intermediary space between rooms, separate from the hall, and was furnished with several old chairs, a table, and a chest of drawers for storage. The passage in Edward III’s house, in contrast, was much more important as an initial reception room.

---

General Assembly of Delegates, Talbot County, 2nd District, Maryland State Archives. The tax record gives no other information about the brick house. The surviving, third-period house is a framed building. Jean Russo kindly shared the 1783 tax record with me. I also thank Mark R. Wenger for discussing the design of Edward Lloyd III’s house and identifying comparable houses, including Sabine Hall and Mount Airy. For an elevation drawing of Sabine Hall as it would have appeared circa 1770, see Rhys Isaac, *Landon Carter's Uneasy Kingdom: Revolution and Rebellion on a Virginia Plantation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 5. Edward III’s eldest son married one of John Tayloe II’s daughters, a fact that enhances the usefulness of comparing Edward Lloyd III’s house and Mount Airy.


\(^3\) There was “little effort at formal design” of dwelling houses in the seventeenth-century Chesapeake, remarks Henry Miller in “The Country’s House Site: Archaeological Study of a Seventeenth-Century Domestic Landscape,” in *Historical Archaeology of the Chesapeake*, ed. Paul Shackel and Barbara Little (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1994), 66. See Chapters 1 and 2 for a full description of the first documented Lloyd house.
for visitors. In 1770, the passage was elaborately furnished with thirteen paintings, two maps, several tables, and two settees. The presence of a breakfast table suggests that the Lloyds also used the central passage as an informal living space, as was common in high-style Virginia houses during the summer. A fireplace heated the room in cooler months. Lloyd’s thirteen-year-old daughter Elizabeth was undoubtedly referring to the passage when she wrote fondly to her uncle, James Hollyday, who was then in London, “yr Picture hangs in our Gallary which puts us very often in Memory [of] you.” Through portraiture, the family displayed its history, wealth, and connections.4

Edward III also introduced a dining room, another feature of high-style Georgian houses of mid-century Maryland and Virginia. Based on available evidence, the dining room was the most expensively furnished room in the house. Along its walls were two pier glasses, valued together at £30, and four paintings that were of greater individual value than the ones in the passage. Dining was a key element of genteel behavior in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake, and the importance of the dining room in the second-period house at Wye is a strong indicator of the cultivated manners of the Lloyd family. However, rooms used exclusively for dining were rare in the British mainland colonies before 1750, and even at Wye, the function of the “dining room” was not exclusively for consumption of a formal meal. The presence of the card table and two tea tables indicates

4 Elizabeth Lloyd to James Hollyday, Wye River, September 29, 1755, box 1, Bordley Papers, MS 64, MdHS. The second-period house continued a trend of relegating service functions to outbuildings.
that the space also served as a sitting room, where gaming and conversation continued into the evening hours, the large mirrors amplifying the available light.5

High-style houses constructed in mid-century, often in brick, reflected the social and political confidence of Edward III’s generation of elite Chesapeake planters. Unlike his father, Edward III lived during a time of political stability in England and Maryland and steady economic growth in the colony. Furthermore, Edward III enjoyed “insider” status in the Calvert family’s reinvigorated political patronage network. As recounted in the previous chapter, King George I restored Lord Baltimore’s executive control over the colony’s government in 1715, after the fourth Lord Baltimore converted to Protestantism. The fifth and sixth Lords Baltimore headed Maryland’s government for the next sixty years, up to American independence. This continuity of government gave the Calvert family’s patronage network time to re-develop with respect to offices in the provincial government. For example, Edward III served only one three-year term in Maryland’s assembly as a representative of Talbot County before the fifth Lord Baltimore gave him a lifetime appointment to the council in 1744, a seat that he held for the next twenty-four years.6

5 Carson, “Consumption,” 347. The Tayloes of Menokin in Virginia in the 1770s had a large dining room that doubled as a sitting room (Wenger, “Dining Room,” 155). Neither of the surviving inventories of the 1770 Lloyd house lists a large table in the dining room, but these inventories do not provide a full accounting of the house’s contents. More private and informal dining took place above stairs, in the “Yellow Room” and the “chamber over the parlor.” The Yellow Room, which had several beds, six chairs, a dressing table, and fireplace, also contained two closets that held a variety of drinking glasses, china dishes and plates, delft plates, stone mugs, tea, spirits, sugar, sweetmeats, tamarinds, and other foodstuffs. The chamber over the parlor was outfitted to serve tea, coffee, and chocolate.
Furthermore, Lloyd, as a large planter, benefited financially from the recovery of the tobacco trade after 1715 and rising grain prices after 1740. As returns on agricultural estates improved, planters invested in their families’ futures by accumulating land and slaves. They also built new houses to accommodate new modes of genteel behavior, such as more elaborate dining rituals. The practice of gentility in refined environments conferred an air of social and cultural authority. Because large planters of the mid-eighteenth century were accustomed to spending most of the year at their home plantations, the houses of these men, who dominated Maryland’s society and politics, were important sites for the performance of their authority.⁷

⁷ Richard L. Bushman posits that there was a “spiritual” element to gentility in early America, of raising yourself above others by a moral standard (*The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* [New York: Vintage Books, 1992], 182–83). In a rural setting, politeness gave its practitioners “cultural authority” outside of court, which was empowering (*Matthew McCormack, The Independent Man: Citizenship and Gender Politics in Georgian England* [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005], 65).

Lois Green Carr’s article, “Emigration and the Standard of Living: The Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake,” puts into perspective the Lloyd family’s situation by
At Wye Plantation, a key element of Edward III’s house, with respect to performance, was its location. It sat at the nexus of the Bennett and Lloyd family properties. With its two-story, double-pile, neoclassical design, the house’s exterior conveyed a suitable sense of order and control over Lloyd’s expanded landholdings in Talbot and adjoining counties following Bennett’s death in 1749. With the Bennett inheritance, Lloyd oversaw the reincorporation of Bennett and Lloyd family property for the first time since the death of his grandmother, Henrietta Maria Lloyd (d. 1697). The proximity of Bennett’s property to Lloyd family property and the history of its descent made the inheritance all the more significant for Edward III—and provides important background to Edward III’s treatment of Wye Plantation as the locus of his authority.  

8 Bennett, in his will, bequeathed to “my cousin Edward Lloyd of Talbot County” the residue of his estate, both real and personal, and he named Edward III his heir at law. Edward III also held in trust land that Bennett gave to his children. For example, to Edward III’s eldest son, the intended heir of Wye Plantation, Bennett granted three tracts located near the Lloyd house, on the Lloyd side of Wye River. These tracts (Henrietta Maria’s Discovery, Town Road, and Crouch’s Choice) appear on the 1695 plat made for Henrietta Maria Lloyd (Figure 12; will of Richard Bennett, dated September 25, 1749, proved February 17, 1750, copy in Lloyd Papers, box 74; original in Wills, Queen Anne’s County, Liber 28, folios 466–81, MSA). Edward Lloyd III in his will stated that he was Bennett’s “Residuary Legatee, Devisee & Heir at law” (written March 6, 1750/51, proven March 26, 1770, box 71, Lloyd Papers). See Chapter 4 for more information about Bennett’s bequests to Edward III’s children.
Edward Lloyd III’s Accumulation of Wealth on Wye River

Edward III accumulated more wealth than any previous owner of Wye Plantation and was one of the richest men in Maryland. At the end of his life, Edward III owned 252 slaves and over 40,000 acres of land. His father, in contrast, died in possession of thirty slaves and 7,000 acres. Charles Carroll of Annapolis, one of Maryland’s largest landholders at mid-century, wrote in 1756, “There is but one man in the Province whose Fortune equals mine.” Carroll’s reference, it is believed, was to Edward III. Lloyd, as well as Carroll, far exceeded the average eighteenth-century elite Marylander’s landholding of approximately 2,200 acres.9

9 Charles Carroll to his son, Charles, 26 July, in Dear Papa, Dear Charley…., ed. Ronald Hoffman, Sally D. Mason, and Eleanor S. Darcy, 3 vols. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 1:32, 36n; Burnard, Creole Gentlemen, 35, on an average elite person’s land ownership in eighteenth-century Maryland, citing as his source Lois Green Carr, “Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake,” in Women in the Age of the American Revolution, ed. Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989), table 3, pp. 164–65. To use another measure, Burnard defines an “elite” head of household as possessing personal property valued at £650 or above; 7 percent of over 6,000 probate inventories compiled between 1691 and 1776 from which Burnard took his data met this upper limit. A “large estate” would be worth £2,500 and above (7–9). The total value of Edward III’s personal estate at death, according to BDML, was £10,961, excluding debts owed to the estate. According to Burnard’s data, Lloyd belonged to the top 5 percent of probated individuals in Maryland who owned fifty or more slaves (36–38). The number of slaves belonging to the estate of Edward Lloyd III given above is the sum given in an inventory in the Lloyd Papers from 1770 (174) plus the seventy-eight additional slaves that Edward III gave as a marriage portion to his daughter Elizabeth and her husband, John Cadwalader, just two years prior (Inventory of Edward Lloyd’s estate, December 1770, Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers; “List of Negroses, Stock &c at Shrewsbury, Wards Gift, and Hammonds Plantations,” August 1768, box 16, folder 5, Cadwalader Collection, series 2, Historical Society of Pennsylvania). The figures published in Edward III’s biographical sketch in BDML do not include the dowry slaves.
Several factors favored Edward III’s accumulation of wealth, including his inheritance of Wye Plantation at an early age, an additional inheritance from his uncle, Richard Bennett III, in 1749, and the length of his period of ownership (forty-one years). Furthermore, Edward III presided over Wye Plantation during a time of growth in the Chesapeake economy. A slow but steady recovery in tobacco prices after 1715, combined with rising grain prices after 1740, supported an increase in land prices and more economic diversification in the tidewater in the mid-eighteenth century. Favorable agricultural export markets were also incentives to keep, and not sell, land and slaves.  

Edward III maintained the diversified investments that were a hallmark of Chesapeake merchant-planters of the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Mercantile trade continued to be an important part of the business of Wye Plantation, and trade networks continued to evolve. In the 1730s, after his father’s death, Liverpool merchant factors set up business at the nearby port town of Oxford, Talbot County. The factors competed with merchant-planters like Lloyd in the tobacco and consignment trade. Lloyd maintained the store at the Home Plantation, and he operated three others in Talbot and Queen Anne’s Counties in partnership with his brother Robert and his

---

brother-in-law, William Anderson, a London merchant. Lloyd also had an account of long standing with Mathias Gale of Whitehaven.  

Edward III continued to trade with the West Indies, as his father had done. He owned at least four vessels at the time of his death, one of which, a ship called the Edward and Richard, had a cargo of wheat and corn on board. Edward III had imported wine aboard this ship the previous year.  

---

11 Clemens, *Atlantic Economy and Maryland’s Eastern Shore*, 199, on Oxford. The three stores were located at Wye Mill, Wye Town (formerly Doncaster), and Queenstown (BDML, 2:536–37; Jean B. Russo, “A Model Planter: Edward Lloyd IV of Maryland, 1770–1796,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 49 [1992], 67). Lloyd’s accounts with William Anderson of London and Mathias Gale of Whitehaven are documented in Lloyd ledger, 1770–1774, box 14, volume 5, p. 230, Lloyd Papers. Twenty years earlier, Lloyd in his will of 1750 referred to his account with Gale. Evidence of Edward III’s activity as a merchant during his lifetime is scattered and offers an incomplete picture. Surviving port records of Oxford, for example, are spotty. Better known is the state of his affairs at the end of his life as documented by his estate settlement and subsequent sales of family property by his eldest son and principal heir (Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers).  

12 Clemens notes Lloyd’s Philadelphia trade connections and participation in West Indies trade in *Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore*, 126, 201. Oxford was a point of departure for ships carrying provisions to the West Indies up to the 1760s. In April 1770, the Philadelphia firm of Thomas Willing and Robert Morris bought the Edward and Richard, its cargo of 5,103 bushels of wheat and 2,800 bushels of corn, plus ship provisions, for £2,961 current money (Lloyd ledger, 1770–1774, box 14, volume 5, Lloyd Papers). Edward III’s heirs also sold three schooners between 1770 and 1775, the Baltimore for £35, the Rebecca for £80, and the Anne and Elizabeth for £52 (Russo, “A Model Planter,” 67; Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, “list of enquiries,” May 25, 1775, box 71, Lloyd Papers). For more information on the sale of Edward III’s assets after his death, see Chapter 4. The amount of wheat on board Edward and Richard at the time of its sale was at the upper end of Wye Plantation’s annual production, so Edward Lloyd III may have purchased wheat from neighbors. In 1774, steward Richard Grason reported an average yield at Wye Plantation of 4,000–5,000 bushels of wheat (Russo, “A Model Planter,” 72). Edward III imported wine on the Edward and Richard in 1769; his estate owed £316 sterling for the customs duty (entries dated September 1770 in Lloyd ledger, 1770–1774, box 14, volume 5, and in day book, 1770–1774, box 15, volume 6, Lloyd Papers).
Mills were a new investment for the Lloyds of Wye Plantation. Edward III acquired a grist mill, which reduced his cost for flour, a valuable export in the eighteenth century, especially in the southern European market. Lloyd also owned fulling and hemp mills for the production of cloth and cordage.

As was also characteristic of merchant-planters, Lloyd was a creditor. The single most valuable part of Edward III’s personal estate at the time of his death was his debts receivable, amounting to about £11,400 sterling and £8,200 current money. As discussed below, Lloyd leveraged his several offices in the proprietary revenue system to expand his credit-lending business. Money lending was itself a means of making money and an incentive to accumulate property. With more property, a planter could back larger loans and invest the returns in additional land, slaves, and plantation improvements, for the benefit of his heirs. Edward III’s father and his kinsman Bennett had both been creditors. 13

Edward III’s most important long-term assets were his immense holdings in slaves and land. Lloyd’s accumulation of slaves and land over his lifetime enabled him to increase agricultural production at Wye Plantation. Tobacco remained an important cash crop on the Upper Eastern Shore while, in the second half of the eighteenth century, the wheat trade offered a more reliable source of income. As discussed in earlier chapters, the Upper Eastern Shore had a long history of mixed farming for the provisions trade with New England and the West Indies. As a large planter, Lloyd could afford to expand wheat production in response to rising grain prices. The costs of raising wheat for market

13 Russo, “A Model Planter,” 67; BDML, 2:536–37; Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers; Burnard, Creole Gentlemen, 91, on the business of money lending; Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age,” on Bennett as a creditor.
favored larger planters like Lloyd. In order to receive as much profit from wheat as from tobacco, six times the amount of land had to be cleared, and cleared more thoroughly, for the wheat crops. This was an expense of both labor and land, as was the care of livestock to pull plows across the grain fields.\textsuperscript{14}


Clemens posits that tobacco held on particularly strongly in Talbot County because of ongoing strength of Talbot County merchant-planters’ connections to English tobacco merchants into the 1760s. For example, Edward III’s sister Rebecca married William Anderson, a prominent London tobacco merchant. Also, the market was favorable enough: Charles Carroll of Annapolis, a planter with most of his holdings on Maryland’s Western Shore, kept tobacco as a cash crop into the 1770s (Hoffman with Mason, \textit{Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland}, chapter 7 and pp. 336–37). One incentive to grow tobacco was faith in the boom portion of the boom-bust cycle, and indeed tobacco prices rose in the late 1760s (McCusker and Menard, \textit{The Economy of Colonial British America}, 139; T. H. Breen, \textit{Tobacco Culture: The Mentality of the Great Tidewater Planters on the Eve of the Revolution} [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985], 127). Walsh observes that larger-scale wheat production was “grafted” onto traditional methods of tobacco and corn production (“Slave Life,” 187). The concept of “grafting” is a useful one because it suggests planters’ reluctance to abandon traditional tobacco culture.

Walsh cites the “widespread” presence of plows in Talbot and Kent Counties as early as the 1730s as evidence of raising grain for market on the Upper Eastern Shore (“Slave Life,” 185). Clemens locates the temporal shift toward more grain cultivation on Maryland’s Eastern Shore in the 1740s (\textit{Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore}, 177, 182–83). An inventory of Lloyd’s personal estate recorded plows at three of the seven quarters of Wye Plantation. (None were recorded at the home house quarter.) The Hammonds quarter had four plows when Edward III’s daughter and her
In 1770, Wye Plantation consisted of at least seven quarters. A third of the plantation’s enslaved population lived at the Lloyd’s home plantation, that is, seventy-six of the 174 slaves who remained in his possession after his daughter’s marriage. Also at Wye were 320 head of cattle, 345 hogs, 258 sheep, 87 horses, and five pair of oxen.\(^\text{15}\)

The more than 800 percent increase in the number of slaves at Wye Plantation (from thirty to 252, including Elizabeth’s marriage gift) between the time of his father’s death in 1719 and his own in 1770 is attributable in part to births. After 1720, the number of slaves born in the Chesapeake began to outnumber the African- and Caribbean-born slaves. Persons born in the Chesapeake tended to live longer, be more resistant to disease, and bear children at an earlier age. Giving birth in the colony also helped to even out the sex ratio. Edward III’s father, who oversaw about as many indentured servants as slaves, died before this demographic shift occurred.\(^\text{16}\)

Edward III’s acquisition of slaves outpaced natural increase, however. Other possible sources of slaves were purchase and inheritance. Slaves were shipped to Oxford in the 1730s and early 1740s, for example, and Lloyd possessed sufficient credit in

---

husband sold this former part of Wye Plantation to Edward IV (inventories of Edward III’s estate, December 1770, and of Hammonds plantation, 1772, box 71, Lloyd Papers; Chapter 4). Edward Lloyd III’s neighbor and kinsman, Richard Bennett III, in his will of 1749 mentioned wheat crops at two of his plantations, including his dwelling plantation on Morgan Neck.

\(^\text{15}\) The seven quarters were Home House, Four Hundred Acres, White House, Davis, Forrest, Nutwell’s Chance, and Sweats (inventory of Edward III’s estate, December 1770, Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers). Edward III also had a plantation called Severn River in Anne Arundel County. A Talbot County plantation named Hammonds, and three Kent County plantations known as Worton Manor, Wards Gift, and Shrewsbury were marriage gifts and bequests to his younger two children; see Chapter 4. See also Russo, “A Model Planter,” 70.

London to purchase slaves. Probably the greatest influx of slaves occurred in 1749, when Edward III inherited the residue of Richard Bennett III’s estate as Bennett’s heir at law.\(^\text{17}\)

While Edward III used his slaves primarily as field hands, a slave’s value went beyond his or her labor. In the cash-poor society of the eighteenth-century Chesapeake, slaves were considered assets that could be traded, mortgaged, sold, or bequeathed. Slave owning was a marker of status and financial well-being.\(^\text{18}\)

Land ownership, too, was an indisputable marker of status, and as the most stable form of wealth in colonial British America, offered long-term financial security for a family. The amount of land that Edward Lloyd III controlled at the time of his death—over 40,000 acres in four counties on the Eastern Shore plus a foothold of 100 acres in Anne Arundel County—was unprecedented in his family’s history. (See Figures 16 and 17.) Lloyd inherited nearly half of his holdings. He was also active in the Eastern Shore land market; he patented, resurveyed, and purchased land. Lloyd also acquired land through his credit-lending business. From a default on a loan, Lloyd obtained 8,200 acres in Dorchester County on the Eastern Shore.\(^\text{19}\)

\(^\text{17}\) Clemens, *Atlantic Economy and Maryland’s Eastern Shore*, 124, 165–66, on the importation of slaves into Oxford. Bennett in his will referred to a recent shipment of slaves, the profits from which he bequeathed to a legatee. As native birth rates increased among slaves in the Chesapeake after 1740, the region’s planters generally preferred to rely on births, rather than purchases, to increase their slaveholdings (Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 60).

\(^\text{18}\) Burnard, *Creole Gentlemen*, 39–42.

\(^\text{19}\) No single document lists all the land in Edward Lloyd III’s possession at the time of his death. Sources in the Lloyd Papers, several of which were created for the settlement of Edward III’s estate, include his proven will of 1750/51, an unsigned will of circa 1770, an incomplete will from circa 1770, an undated list of land in Talbot, Queen Anne, Kent, Dorchester, and Anne Arundel Counties marked with the initials of Edward III’s three
At the time of his marriage, at age twenty-eight, Edward III possessed about 5,200 acres of land in Talbot, Queen Anne, Dorchester, and Anne Arundel Counties through inheritance from his father and deceased elder brother. His father had bequeathed to him 900 acres in Talbot County and 1,000 acres in neighboring Queen Anne County. When his elder brother Philemon died at age eighteen, Edward III became the heir of his father’s dwelling plantation, plus other land in Talbot County totaling 1,421 acres, and the family’s 100-acre foothold in Anne Arundel County across the Chesapeake Bay.

Edward III’s land ownership more than doubled when Richard Bennett III, his neighbor and “cousin,” died in 1749. Bennett, who had no children and whose wife predeceased him, named Lloyd his heir at law in his will, giving Lloyd legal claim to all property in Bennett’s estate not devised to others. Lloyd thereby acquired 8,835 acres on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, and he also gained control over an additional 2,946 acres that Bennett devised to Lloyd’s daughters. As a result of the Bennett bequest, the amount of land that Lloyd controlled on the Eastern Shore in 1750 ballooned from approximately 6,000 acres to over 17,500 acres. Though the number of slaves that Lloyd inherited from surviving children, a list of Talbot County lands taken from “mr Richardson’s book” March 1770, a list of lands sold dated 1777, and Richard Bennett III’s will of 1749 (“Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III” and “Estate Papers of Various Lloyds,” box 71, Lloyd Papers). The manuscript notes of the Legislative History Project at the Maryland State Archives are an invaluable aid. The LHP notes include information from county debt books, deed books, and patent books. Based on this research, Edward Lloyd III’s land ownership at death has been estimated at 43,000 acres (BDML, 2:537). Also according to the LHP research, Lloyd obtained the over 8,000 acres in Dorchester County from a default on a loan between 1748 and 1756.
Bennett is undocumented, undoubtedly some portion of the slaves that Lloyd owned at the end of his life could trace their ancestry to Bennett family lands.²⁰

Kinship ties underlaid Bennett’s decision to make Lloyd his heir at law. Bennett and Edward III’s father were half-brothers, both born of Henrietta Maria Lloyd. Bennett lived across Wye River from the Lloyds of Wye throughout his adult life, in the house that Colonel Peter Sayer previously occupied. (Bennett married a niece of Sayer’s widow.) Edward III married a ward of the Bennett household, Ann Rousby (1721–1769), thereby strengthening his familial ties with Bennett.²¹

In a world in which kinship and business ties overlapped, Bennett passed his family business to Lloyd. On a practical level, Lloyd would have been familiar with the

²⁰ In their respective wills, Bennett referred to Edward III as his “cousin,” and Edward III referred to Bennett as his “uncle.” According to the manuscript notes of the Legislative History Project on “Edward Lloyd, 1711–1770,” at the Maryland State Archives, the debt books show that Lloyd inherited from Bennett 3,800 acres in Talbot County, 1,435 acres in Queen Anne’s County, 3,200 acres in Kent County, and 400 acres in Dorchester County. Bennett devised an additional 1,213 acres in Talbot County to Lloyd’s daughter, Elizabeth, and 1,733 acres in Kent County to his daughter, Henrietta Maria. Documentation of any property that Richard Bennett III may have had in Nansemond County, Virginia, from his father was lost along with other colonial records of that county; see Chapter 1. Nor is there documentation of the number of slaves Bennett owned at death. Clemens cites a single Talbot County record from 1733 to say that Bennett owned thirty slaves in that county at that time (Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore, 124). Hardy provides no additional information on how many slaves Bennett owned or controlled in her article on Bennett, “A Papist in a Protestant Age.” No inventory of Bennett’s personal estate has been found.

nature of Bennett's business dealings and with his assets, being a merchant-planter on a large scale in his own right as well as a neighbor. Furthermore, if Bennett had any fear of losing property by dispossession under an act of government, then Bennett's bequest of the better part of his estate to Lloyd offered security for Bennett's estate. Lloyd, who was a member of the Church of England, had been a member of the governor's council for several years when Bennett died. (Since 1718, Roman Catholics in Maryland could not vote nor hold public office.)

Despite his high station in government, Edward III was concerned about retaining the property in the face of a legal challenge and acted quickly to secure the inheritance. Bennett's closest blood relatives, the children and grandchildren of Bennett's deceased sister, Susannah Maria (Darnall Lowe), contested his legal status as Bennett's heir at law. In a will written a little over a year after Bennett's death, Lloyd appointed two men to defend his interest against the "Romish Party," a reference to Susannah's Catholic offspring. (As discussed in Chapter 4, this same will was proven as Edward III's legal will, despite subsequent drafts.) In another indication of the importance of the Bennett

---

22 According to Hardy, Lloyd took over some of Bennett's business before his death. Hardy also states that Bennett owned close to 50,000 acres and a "vast personal estate." Hardy suggests that Bennett's close ties to the Lloyds of Wye gave Bennett, a Catholic, political cover at a time of hostility toward Catholics in Maryland politics ("A Papist in a Protestant Age," 203, 213–14, 224n; Hoffman with Mason, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, 265–78). Despite his close dealings with Bennett, Lloyd was not friendly toward Roman Catholics as a group. In 1755, he was reluctant to host refugee Acadians because he considered them a potential source of disorder among the approximately three hundred (by Lloyd's estimation) Catholic slaves along Wye River (letter, Edward Lloyd to James Hollyday, printed in *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser., 5 [1948]: 571–75).
legacy to the Lloyd family, Edward III and his wife named their next son, Richard Bennett Lloyd, after the man.\textsuperscript{23}

Edward III valued the Bennett inheritance in order to provide for the future for his family. The additional land and slaves enabled Lloyd to expand agricultural production in his own name and improved the long-term financial security of the Lloyd family estate. With enough land and bonded labor, a family could ride out the division of property when the master of a household died. For Edward III specifically, the Bennett legacy provided enough land outside of Wye Plantation to allow the home plantation to pass to his eldest son undivided, with sufficient property left over to provide well for his younger children.\textsuperscript{24}

Offices

In a society in which inheritance of office was commonplace, Bennett, by naming Lloyd as his principal heir, endorsed Lloyd as his successor to the proprietor’s trust in proprietary revenue affairs. For twenty-six years, Bennett had been responsible for

\textsuperscript{23} Will of Edward Lloyd, March 6, 1750/51, proved 1770; Testamentary Papers, box 49, folio 19, MSA, regarding the estate of Richard Bennett of Queen Anne’s County. See also Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age,” 225n. In the 1751 will, Lloyd named his brothers-in-law, Abraham Barnes and Robert Jenkins Henry, to defend his interest in legal contests over Bennett’s will. Bennett’s niece Elizabeth was married to a man who was not a good financial manager, which may have been another factor in Bennett’s naming of Lloyd as his principal heir (Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age,” 217–18, 218n). The Lloyd Papers contain drafts of wills, incomplete and unsigned, by Edward III from 1767 and 1770 (Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, MS 2001, MdHS). See Chapter 4 for more information about these documents.

\textsuperscript{24} Clemens comments that Eastern Shore merchants invested in land and slaves when they could (\textit{Atlantic Economy and Colonial Maryland’s Eastern Shore}, 196). Hoffman’s book, \textit{Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland}, discusses one family’s pursuit of financial security through landholding.
recording rents owed to Lord Baltimore and collected on his behalf. Bennett’s fiduciary relationship to Lord Baltimore survived regime changes and a political climate hostile to Roman Catholics. Within several years of Bennett’s death, Lloyd absorbed even broader powers as chief revenue agent for Lord Baltimore.

Bennett had been involved in a series of efforts under the third and fifth Lords Baltimore to assert control over proprietary revenue assessment and collection. After a fire in 1699 destroyed a rent roll, which was a record of the rents owed to Lord Baltimore and collected by rent farmers, Lord Baltimore contracted with Bennett and another Maryland merchant, James Heath, to create a new rent roll over an eight-year period, ending in 1707. Rent rolls documented quit rents and manor rents owed to Lord Baltimore, and the amounts collected from freeholders and manor tenants, respectively.

Governor Benedict Leonard Calvert, in a letter to his older brother, the fifth Lord Baltimore, expressed in simple terms the obligation of Maryland’s residents to pay rent on land they had purchased or leased. “You are the Proprietary of the soil,” Calvert wrote in 1729, “and as such, the people from time to time owe you...Rents and fines.” Besides rent, the Calvert family claimed fees for land transactions, such as a payment of caution money to obtain a warrant to survey vacant land before obtaining a patent.\(^{25}\)

\(^{25}\) Archives of Md., 25:604. For details on the 1699 contract between Baltimore, Bennett, and Heath, see Chapter 2. Quit rents were the largest single source of proprietary revenue (Charles A. Barker, The Background of the Revolution in Maryland [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940], 140, 380). In the seventeenth century, the Lords Baltimore created manors in an attempt to delegate administration of the colony to a loyal, landed nobility. In the next century, manors were less frequently created as a reward for service. In the mid-1760s, manor lands amounted to 115,000 acres (Barker, 265). More land in Maryland was held as freehold. The Lords Baltimore had additional “reserved” land. For basic information on manors and other forms of land tenancy in Maryland, see Newton D. Mereness, Maryland as a Proprietary Province (New York: Macmillan, 1901), 49–58.
Land-based revenue was only a part of the total proprietary revenue. A portion of this income was spent on the support of Maryland’s government, for instance to pay the governor’s salary, and the remainder was for Lord Baltimore’s private use. Other sources of proprietary revenue included a tonnage duty on tobacco exports and fees for various licenses. But soon after the fifth Lord Baltimore’s marriage in 1730 and the birth of his son in 1732, the land-based revenue, and quit rents in particular, received renewed attention.²⁶

In 1731, upon the death of the single rent roll keeper, James Carroll, the fifth Lord Baltimore commissioned Bennett to take over the position. In 1733, the Calverts enacted a series of reforms of the proprietary revenue system, and the office of rent roll keeper was divided into two, one for each shores. Bennett’s duties were reduced to the Eastern Shore, where he was responsible for hiring rent collectors and for making and signing the quit rent rolls, or debt books, before submitting them each year to the agent and receiver

²⁶ By the terms of his marriage settlement, the fifth Lord Baltimore was tenant for life and his son was tenant in tail, therefore the father could not “subject his Son to the loss of any Landed Property” by alienation or bequest. The marriage settlement also required that “customary quit rents” were to be paid in cash, not in kind (Cecilius Calvert to Benedict Calvert, July 9, 1752, and Cecilius Calvert to Benjamin Tasker, May 15, 1752, Calvert Papers, No. 1147, MdHS). In 1733, the proprietor issued instructions to reform the proprietary revenue system. Quit rent payments, which had been suspended in 1717, were reinstated in 1733 at a rate of four schillings per hundred acres (Barker, Background of the Revolution, 129–37, 257; Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 76). The duties of the agent and receiver general that were laid out in 1733 remained current up through the time Lloyd took the office in 1753. The agent was responsible for overseeing the collection of quit rents, manor rents, caution money payments of five pounds sterling per one hundred acres, a tonnage duty of fourteen pence per ton, license fees, and alienation fines. In 1753, ordinaries, ferries, and boat pilots required licenses (Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 21–22, 74–77; Barker, Background of the Revolution, 140–43; Baltimore to Horatio Sharpe, Instructions (incomplete), [1753], Calvert Papers, No. 1147, MdHS; Board of Revenue to Bennett Allen, instructions, 1768, Archives of Md., 32:400–407). Barker estimates that £2,000 of the proprietary revenue each year went to persons other than Lord Baltimore, for government expenses (143).
general. Bennett remained rent roll keeper of the Eastern Shore until his death, at which time his chosen successor for that particular office, Edward Tilghman of Queen Anne's County (1712–1785), took his place.

Tilghman was another of Bennett’s nephews in the Lloyd family. Tilghman’s mother and Lloyd’s mother were sisters. Bennett had close personal relationships to both men, and within a few years of Bennett’s death, the first cousins were the rent roll keepers for both shores. For half a century, Bennett had maintained the trust of the Calvert family for documenting rents owed and collected, a key component of their private revenue system. Bennett passed on this trust to his nephews as part of his legacy. 27

At the time of Bennett’s death, Lloyd held two offices formerly occupied by his stepfather, James Hollyday. These offices, the treasurer of the Eastern Shore and the naval officer at Oxford, were principally concerned with provincial revenue, though

---

27 Owings, *His Lordship’s Patronage*, 88, 176–77. Hardy discusses Bennett’s close personal ties to his nephew, Edward Tilghman, and Bennett’s role in securing the office of rent roll keeper for him, in “A Papist in a Protestant Age” (1994), 220. Edward Tilghman’s mother was Anna Maria Lloyd (1677–1748), a daughter of Philemon Lloyd and Henrietta Maria Lloyd, Bennett’s mother (*BDML*, 2:820). In his will, Bennett referred to Tilghman’s mother as “my sister Ann.” As Bennett’s heir at law, Lloyd was likely to have assumed possession of any documentation of the proprietor’s revenue that Bennett had at his house when he died. If Lloyd was already handling a portion of Bennett’s plantation business before Bennett died, as Hardy posited in “A Papist in a Protestant Age” (1994), 224, then Edward III may have been familiar with Bennett’s accounts for Lord Baltimore, too, before entering the offices of agent and receiver general and rent roll keeper of the Western Shore. Other examples of inherited offices are Henry Darnall to his son-in-law, Charles Carroll the Settler, the office of agent and receiver general in 1711, and Benjamin Tasker to his son-in-law, Daniel Dulany, Jr., the office of commissary general in 1758 (Hoffman with Mason, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, 67, 73; *Archives of Md.*, 9:412). For more examples of inherited offices, see the list of civil officers in Owings, *His Lordship’s Patronage*, 112–86. Hoffman notes the importance of personal trust in proprietary revenue appointments in *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, 88–89.
naval officers were also responsible for collecting Lord Baltimore’s tonnage duty.

Provincial revenue, as opposed to Lord Baltimore’s proprietary revenue, was levied and spent in the colony under the direction of the governor, Council, and Assembly. The treasurers, one for each shore, received taxes and fines. Maryland’s six naval officers were responsible for two port duties that were provincial revenue.  

Lloyd resigned from both offices when, in 1753, he received a commission from the sixth Lord Baltimore to be agent and receiver general. This position put him in charge of collecting Lord Baltimore’s total proprietary revenue, which amounted to as much as £12,000 sterling annually, and transmitting the sum to London through bills of exchange. That same year, Maryland’s governor appointed Lloyd to be rent roll keeper of the Western Shore. The former agent, Benjamin Tasker, had also held this office. Meanwhile, Lloyd retained his seat on the council.  

By naming Lloyd as his heir at law, Bennett not only indicated his personal trust in Lloyd’s ability to handle complex financial affairs, but he also conveyed to Lloyd sufficient property to hold the highest office in the proprietary revenue system, that of agent and receiver general. In a letter to Lloyd in 1752, the sixth Lord Baltimore’s 

---

28 Owings, *His Lordship’s Patronage*, distinguishes between proprietary, provincial, and royal or crown revenue on pp. 60–65. On Hollyday’s offices, see BDML, 1:450–51, and Owings, 158, 163. Maryland’s governor appointed the colony’s two treasurers, one for each shore, and its six naval officers (Owings, 60–61, 64).  

29 The agent’s collections varied by the year, but increased over time. In 1729, Benedict Leonard Calvert estimated that the proprietor could potentially collect £6,000 in private revenue from the colony, mostly from quit rents, if payment was made in pounds sterling instead of in kind. After 1750, the proprietor received closer to £10,000 a year (Owings, *His Lordship’s Patronage*, 77). According to Barker, between 1762 and 1771, the agent and receiver general transmitted to Lord Baltimore £13,217 sterling a year on average (Background of the Revolution, 143–44). Cecilius Calvert in 1759 estimated 10 percent of land office “profits” to be on average £400 to £500 per annum (Calvert to Sharpe, November 18, 1759, Archives of Md., 31:520).
principal secretary, Cecilius Calvert, informed him that the London merchant firm of Capel and John Hanbury offered to provide the necessary security on Lloyd’s behalf.

Because of the size of amounts that an agent handled, the office required a security of a size that only “Men of the greatest Property in the Province” could afford. Lloyd’s successor, for example, could not find the financial backing to post a bond in excess of £5,000 sterling. As agent, Lloyd had to maintain enough credit in London to cover the sums transmitted by bills of exchange when Lord Baltimore collected on the bills.

Lloyd’s personal wealth in Maryland after the Bennett inheritance, combined with his increased credit in London as Bennett’s heir at law, helped Lloyd to meet the financial requirements of the office of agent and receiver general.30

The benefits of the office of agent and receiver general were considerable, though difficult to document. Like other proprietary government officials, the agent and receiver general was expected to supplement a modest annual salary with fees, commissions, and “special favors” in the land office. When Lloyd entered the office, the agent and receiver general

30 Cecilius Calvert to Edward Lloyd, July 9, 1752, in Calvert Papers, No. 1147, MdHS; Sharpe to Baltimore, June 23, 1761, Archives of Md., 9:524; Sharpe to Baltimore, March 31, 1768, Archives of Md., 14:480; minutes of the Board of Revenue, April 5, 1768, Archives of Md., 32:397–98 (quote). Not only did Lloyd inherit a great deal of property from Bennett in the form of land and slaves, but he also inherited Bennett’s credit relationships with London merchants. Bennett’s standing as merchant was so strong that he was considered “independent” of London merchants (Price, Perry of London, 65). At the time of his death, Bennett was a creditor to London merchant Micajeh Perry, and to the estate of London merchant John Hyde, which owed Bennett £7,000 (Price, Perry of London, 41, 88; Hardy, “A Papist in a Protestant Age,” 94, 224). Hyde had accounts with the former agent and receiver general, Benjamin Tasker, and the fifth Lord Baltimore (Archives of Md., 31:489, 503). Tasker also had an account with the Hanbury firm of London (Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 167). The method of transmitting sums to Lord Baltimore encouraged Lloyd to underreport collections, so as to not be overdrawn in London. If Lloyd inflated returns, it would be difficult for him to make up the difference (John Smail, “Credit, Risk, and Honor in Eighteenth-Century Commerce,” Journal of British Studies, 44 [2005], 444).
general had an annual salary of £150 sterling minus a saddle payment of £50 sterling a year. As agent, Lloyd was entitled to keep 10 percent of caution money, alienation fines, and manor rents, but no portion of the more lucrative quit rents and port duties. (In 1760, the agent’s portion of manor rents was reduced to 5 percent.) As rent roll keeper of the Western Shore, on the other hand, Lloyd could extract a 5 percent commission on quit rents. According to one study, Lloyd’s net income as agent and receiver general varied, with a low of £381 in 1758 and a high of £799 in 1761. As rent roll keeper, Lloyd is believed to have netted more than £100 each year.\footnote{Aubrey C. Land, The Dulanys of Maryland (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1955), 130 (quote). On Lloyd’s salaries and estimated take-home income, see Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 36, 79–80, 89, and Barker, Background of the Revolution, 382–83. Owings used the information provided in Barker’s book, pp. 380–81, to estimate the annual personal income of the agent and receiver general. See Barker, 382–83, to compare the incomes of various offices of profit. In Sharpe’s assessment, a law practice yielded a higher annual income than an agent’s salary and commission (Sharpe to Baltimore, May 23, 1760, Archives of Md., 9:411). For persons without a law degree, however, the office’s benefits were considerable. Lloyd’s predecessor, Benjamin Tasker, did not have formal legal training when he entered the office of agent and receiver general in 1734, nor, according to Land, was a law degree required (Dulanys of Maryland, 131–32).}

The agent and receiver general also received compensation in land, though precisely how this was achieved is unclear. Charles Carroll the Settler (1660–1720) doubled his landholdings while he was agent and receiver general, as well as keeper of the proprietor’s great seal, in the 1710s. Lloyd’s land ownership also doubled during his tenure as agent and receiver general, from over 17,500 acres in 1752 to an estimated 43,000 acres at his death, two years after his tenure ended. Lloyd had less expansive powers in the proprietor’s land office, though, than Carroll did. Carroll, as both agent and keeper of Lord Baltimore’s seal, controlled both ends of the land patent process: He

---
 issued the warrants necessary to survey land and affixed the seal on the resulting patents. After the restoration of Lord Baltimore’s government in 1715, the governor held the proprietor’s great seal, but the agent continued to control access to warrants. Whether Lloyd, as agent, used this power for personal gain has not been studied.32

More apparent is the expansive credit-lending opportunities of the agent and receiver general, due to the lack of specie in the colony and a chronic shortage of cash in eighteenth-century English commerce as a whole. In 1729, Benedict Leonard Calvert reported from Maryland that rent was often paid in “corn, wheat, Beef, Pork” or some other “commodity of the Country.” Rent collectors had to convert these goods into money, and the money into bills of exchange. By the fifth Lord Baltimore’s instructions of 1733 to reform the proprietary revenue system, rents and alienation fines had to be paid in pounds sterling, or at least transmitted to Lord Baltimore in that currency. Dulany, the first agent under the new rule, lent money at interest to persons unable to pay fees for

32 Hoffman, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, 70 (note 14), 71 (table 2), 73; Owings, *His Lordship’s Patronage*, 9–10, 26–27. Hoffman’s biography of Charles Carroll the Settler posits a connection between the offices he held and his land acquisition, but it does not offer specifics except with regard to his credit lending. If there were actions that Carroll took, as head of the land office, that gave him an advantage in acquiring land in quantity and at lower cost, such as giving himself priority over other applicants for warrants for vacant land, waiving fees payable to himself, or underestimating the value of resurveyed land, Hoffman does not discuss these. Aubrey Land’s biography of another proprietary favorite, Daniel Dulany (1685–1753), suggests what might be found through careful examination of the land records. According to this history, Dulany took advantage of “informal methods” in the land office in the 1720s to purchase land warrants on credit. (Land cites a promissory note by Dulany offering to pay the caution money for a warrant for 5,000 acres in a year’s time.) Dulany then, against proprietary policy, “subdivided” the warrants and sold them to smaller buyers. Land contends that land office officials tolerated “such irregularities” by land speculators (*Dulanys of Maryland*, 102). Lloyd apparently did not exploit his offices to speculate in western land; all of his land acquisitions after 1752 were on the Eastern Shore.
land warrants or certificates of survey. Insofar as payment of rents and fees could be collected in cash, Lloyd’s offices put him in the rare position of being a man with cash. ³³

Furthermore, Lloyd’s transfers of large sums of proprietary revenue to London in pounds sterling annually benefited his mercantile business and credit-lending business. The more credit Lloyd possessed in London, the more willing London merchants were to send goods in bulk at a reduced price. For instance, as early as 1700, Bennett imported goods at wholesale prices because of the strength of his credit in London. Lord Baltimore’s trust in Lloyd to have adequate credit in London to cover the bills of exchange to the value of the proprietary revenue—a trust that Richard Bennett III helped to establish by making Lloyd his heir at law—was itself a vote of confidence in Lloyd’s reliability as a merchant (who could sell your tobacco) and as a creditor. Lloyd’s position as agent and receiver general thus boosted Lloyd’s reputation in London and in Maryland as a creditor. ³⁴

³³ Archives of Md., 25:604–5; Land, Dulanys of Maryland, 102–3, 129–30. Because of the specie shortage, Lord Baltimore accepted payment in foreign currency (Board of Revenue to Benedict Allen, Instructions, 1768, Archives of Md., 32:402). As a merchant, Edward III was accustomed to handling foreign coin. Benedict Leonard Calvert, writing before the currency act in Maryland of 1733, supported the issue of paper money in the colony. In corroboration with Calvert’s report, Hoffman writes that James Carroll, the rent roll keeper for both shores in the 1710s and 1720s, was “not always able to collect cash” (Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 101). In 1768, Lord Baltimore’s secretary wrote that Lloyd “Complains greatly of the want of cash in the Province” (Hugh Hamersly to Sharpe, March 28, 1768, Archives of Md., 14:475). The December 1770 inventory of Lloyd’s possessions included £115 sterling worth of French crowns, Lyon dollars, and “coppers.”

³⁴ Price, Perry of London, 38, 156n. Edward Lloyd III sent bills of exchange by his brother-in-law William Anderson, merchant of London and a dinner guest of Lord Baltimore’s (Archives of Md., 14:347; Land, Dulanys of Maryland, 279). Anderson used a ship under Captain Love that sailed directly from Wye River to London (Archives of Md., 14:173 [1764], 261 [1765], 409 [1767], 552 [1768]).
Lloyd's insider status in the proprietor's patronage network, as agent and receiver general in addition to councilor, underpinned his standing as a creditor. Easing the terms for lending, Lloyd, and those with whom he did business, could expect that he would be agent for years to come; his predecessor in the office, Benjamin Tasker, held the office for nearly twenty years. Given the personal nature of Lloyd's appointment to the office of agent and receiver general, only Lord Baltimore had the power to remove Lloyd from the office. Lord Baltimore's private patronage offered a considerable degree of job security for officeholders and their heirs, so long as the trust of the Calvert family was maintained. 35

The fifth and sixth Lords Baltimore, like their predecessors, relied heavily on trusted kin and friends of the Calvert family to govern Maryland and to collect their private revenue, and Edward Lloyd III was one of the favored sons of Maryland. Secretary Calvert wrote in 1754, "Mr Lloyd the Agent since his Admittance into that office has rendered My Lord such Service, & I am Sensible is a Man of Real Importance to the Proprietors Welfare & Support of Life." Several years later, the secretary reflected that Lloyd "has been Honoured & Rewarded well by Both Lords," that is, with a council seat by the fifth Lord Baltimore and the agent's office by his son, the sixth Lord Baltimore. 36

35 Cecilius Calvert, in a postscript to a letter to Sharpe dated February 29, 1764, suggested that Sharpe "avoid sollicitation abt. the Recr. Genl.'s Employ, is to say that office is intirely with my Lord a peculiar belonging to him & is a Noli me tangere but by my Lord" (Archives of Md., 14:142–43). Calvert was responding to Sharpe's inquiry about a candidate for the office (Archives of Md., 14:111).

36 Quotes from Calvert to Horatio Sharpe, December 12, 1754, Archives of Md., 31:473; Calvert to Horatio Sharpe, November 27, 1758, Archives of Md., 31: 504.
The Calverts recognized the importance of building and maintaining allegiances with Maryland’s native elite through patronage. On a practical level, native Marylanders had the advantage of “an intimate knowledge of the country.” At the same time, the sixth Lord Baltimore and his secretary, Cecilius Calvert, neither of whom had spent time in Maryland, knew few Maryland residents personally. In 1764, Secretary Calvert commented that, apart from a few individuals, “I know not Provincial People but En Passant.” Edward III exploited this weakness in the proprietor’s knowledge by exercising a measure of independence from the proprietor’s instructions and from Governor Sharpe. If Edward III feared removal from office, he did not show it.37

As a client of Lord Baltimore’s, Lloyd developed his own patron-client network through appointments to office in addition to credit lending. As agent and receiver general and as rent roll keeper of the Western Shore, Lloyd had extensive influence over appointments in the complex proprietary revenue system. The land office employed surveyors and clerks. The rent roll keepers contracted with rent collectors and manor stewards to collect rent from freeholders and manor tenants, respectively.

Lloyd leveraged the accumulated wealth of Wye Plantation, after the Bennett inheritance, to obtain the office of agent and receiver general. Lloyd could reasonably

37 Calvert to Horatio Sharpe, October 17, 1764, Archives of Md., 31:554. Governor Sharpe, in 1768, commented on the importance of a native Marylander to hold the office of agent and receiver general after Bennett Allen, a recent English transplant, failed to improve upon Lloyd’s performance. Sharpe wrote that the office “required an intimate knowledge of the Country & of every Law & of every Branch of the Revenue arising within it & the greatest skill & Experience in Accounts” (Sharpe to Hamersly, October 30, Archives of Md., 14:545). Several years earlier, John Ridout, Sharpe’s personal secretary, lost bids to high provincial government offices, despite Sharpe’s support. Ridout was not a native of Maryland, which hurt his chances (James Haw, “Patronage, Politics, and Ideology, 1753–1762: A Prelude to the Revolution in Maryland,” Maryland Historical Magazine, 85 [1990], 242; Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 129, 132).
expect that having the highest proprietary revenue office would not interfere with his
duties as master of Wye Plantation but, in fact, would facilitate the growth of his family’s
estate, so long as the trust of the Calvert family was maintained. In his twenties and
thirties, Lloyd witnessed his kinsman and neighbor, Richard Bennett, operate as a rent
roll keeper in addition to maintaining his business as a major merchant and planter. The
Calvert family’s demands on the proprietary revenue system changed in the 1750s,
however, as one generation of the proprietorship ended and the next generation took
control.38

Context of Change, 1751–1753

In 1753, Lloyd succeeded Tasker in the offices of agent and receiver general and
rent roll keeper of the Western Shore. Tasker had resigned from the offices, citing health
reasons. But it was also a time of transition in the highest reaches of Maryland’s
proprietary government. The fifth Lord Baltimore had died in 1751. Because his only
surviving legitimate son, Frederick, was, at that time, two years shy of the age of
majority, Frederick’s guardians temporarily administered the colony. In 1752, the
governor of Maryland, Samuel Ogle, died, and Tasker, as the most senior councilor (as

38 A rent roll keeper was expected to keep the rent roll at his place of residence (Calvert
to Sharpe, April 7, 1757, Archives of Md., 6:538). Carl R. Lounsbury’s discussion of
county court clerks’ offices in eighteenth-century Virginia is helpful in this context.
When court was out of session, the clerks worked from their home plantations, and they
kept papers with them for ease of access and safekeeping (The Courthouses of Early
Virginia: An Architectural History [Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005],
296–301).
well as Ogle’s son-in-law), became acting chief executive until Frederick came of age and appointed a new governor.  

During Frederick’s guardianship, the guardians examined the accounts for 1750 that Tasker submitted as agent and receiver general. Their review prompted new attention to the agent’s duties as chief proprietary revenue officer. Complaining of arithmetic errors, gaps of information, and lack of clarity in how returns were reported, the guardians were frustrated in their effort to determine their ward’s real and potential annual income from Maryland. This figure was important for marriage negotiations; Frederick married in 1753. In an effort to collect information and to make the accounts “more correct and explanatory,” the guardians issued new instructions to Tasker in 1752. Secretary Calvert sent a detailed form for the agent and receiver general to follow when submitting accounts. For freeholds, stricter attention was to be paid to the amount of acreage held under specific rent rates, and by whom. The guardians also requested more information about the manors, such as the number of acres claimed under which lease terms. The guardians, in their effort to learn as much as possible, asked how much land was “still ungranted in each County,” and what were reasonable quit rent rates for each parcel, “according to their situation and Goodness.” To improve oversight and collection, the agent and receiver general was directed to review the rent rolls, also known as debt books, before paying the rent roll keepers their commission on rent collected, and before submitting the accounts to Lord Baltimore. To avoid the

39 Tasker asked Lord Baltimore’s secretary, Cecilius Calvert, for permission to resign from the office of Agent and Receiver General in a letter dated April 19, 1752. Calvert cited the letter in a communication to Lloyd of July 9, 1752 (Calvert Papers, No. 1147, MdHS).
introduction of copying errors with each annual rent roll, the guardians asked the agent to prepare one master rent roll and, in subsequent years, to send to London changes only.⁴⁰

When Frederick Calvert came of age the following year, in his new capacity as the sixth Lord Baltimore he promptly commissioned a new governor, Horatio Sharpe. Sharpe was an army officer and the younger brother of Frederick’s former guardian, John Sharpe. The young proprietor sent with Sharpe Lloyd’s commission to be the next agent and receiver general.⁴¹

The hopes and expectations of the sixth Lord Baltimore and his secretary, his uncle and former guardian, Cecilius Calvert, ran high when Sharpe and Lloyd entered their respective offices. As a result of the guardians’ review of 1750, Lloyd started with a fairly specific set of instructions. Secretary Calvert also advised Lloyd that, as agent, he

---

⁴⁰ Cecilius Calvert to Benjamin Tasker, May 15 and September 14, 1752; and Frederick’s guardians, Arthur Onslow and John Sharpe, to Benjamin Tasker, May 14, 1752, all in Calvert Papers, No. 1147, MdHS. Onslow was Speaker of the House of Commons and, like the fifth Lord Baltimore, a landowner in Surrey. John Sharpe was a solicitor of Lincoln’s Inn and a legal advisor to the fifth Lord Baltimore (DNB, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/75619 and 20788, accessed January 9, 2009]; Land, Dulanys of Maryland, 96–97). The guardians were perplexed, for instance, by different rent rates being applied to the same parcel of land, and figures were entered in the general account without sufficient indication of how the amounts were derived. In 1768, the revenue board gave similar instructions to Lloyd’s successor, Bennett Allen (Archives of Md., 32:404). Lloyd’s mercantile experience suited the office of agent and receiver general: In 1770, after Lloyd left the office, the board asked for accounts to be made in a “mercantile manner” (minutes of the Board of Revenue, March 26, 1770, Archives of Md., 32:463). In a letter to Baltimore, Sharpe apologized for submitting a sketch “made out in the Military rather than the Mercantile method,” to provide information about the sale of reserved lands (March 31, 1768, Archives of Md., 14:476).

⁴¹ “Sharpe, Horatio,” DNB, 10:50–51.
would be providing the sixth Lord Baltimore’s only means of income, his “whole pecuniary substance.”

In 1753, Lord Baltimore instructed the new agent and the new governor to work together to increase returns on his landholdings. In addition to “perfecting” the rent rolls, Lloyd and Sharpe were to “encourage” the sale of vacant land. Create new manors out of “judiciously reserved” land, Lord Baltimore directed, and charge higher rents. For existing manors, appoint manor stewards who have “an eye to improve the manors,” to make the land more valuable. Lord Baltimore was also sensitive to potential revenue that was lost to widespread evasion of rents and fees, overly high commissions charged by rent farmers, and poor recordkeeping. To help him carry out his instructions, Sharpe, upon his arrival in Maryland, appointed Lloyd to fill Tasker’s other vacated office, the rent roll keeper of the Western Shore.

42 Cecilius Calvert to Edward Lloyd, July 9, 1752, Calvert Papers, No. 1147, MdHS.
43 Cecilius Calvert to Edward Lloyd, July 9, 1752, and Lord Baltimore to Horatio Sharpe, “additional” instructions (incomplete), 1753, Calvert Papers, No. 1147, MdHS; Barker, *Background of the Revolution*, 256–59. Historians have not examined critically the Calvert family’s renewed efforts in the 1750s and 1760s to collect more revenue from their colony. Beyond Frederick Calvert’s behavior as a dissolute spendthrift, there may have been other motivations to raise proprietary income, such as a shift in expectations in the amount of wealth to be derived from British colonies, the need to finance other investments by the family, including Frederick’s marriage, or the costs of war and colonial administration at mid-century. On Frederick’s poor moral character, see his DNB profile (cited above); Barker, *Background of the Revolution*, 256; and J. E. Ross, ed., *Radical Adventurer: The Diaries of Robert Morris, 1772–1774* (Bath: Adams and Dart, 1971), 3–5. According to Barker, Frederick’s father had other sources of income besides Maryland, specifically stocks that provided him with £1,000 a year (256n). Frederick’s claims to the contrary, then, may have been facetious. A shift in attitudes toward the value of land in eighteenth-century England may have also influenced the Calvert family’s expectations for increased revenue from Maryland. Rising prices in England for grain and land spurred an “agricultural revolution” and discussions of how to improve land in order to turn a profit. English landowners’ interest in converting marginal land into arable land, for example, is analogous with Lord Baltimore’s interest in generating
Power Play: Secretary Calvert, Governor Sharpe, and Colonel Lloyd, 1753–1768

Governor Sharpe’s efforts to make the proprietary revenue system more efficient and rational put him on a collision course with Lloyd. The system had structural problems, particularly at the level of collections, but Lloyd lacked motivation to reform the system, despite the incentive of a commission on returns. As the Calverts’ land agent in Maryland, Lloyd frustrated the proprietary family’s hopes of increasing their profit margin on their land ownership in the colony.

Empowered by his own patronage from Lord Baltimore, Lloyd resisted Sharpe’s efforts to centralize government in Annapolis, determined to hold on to his privileges as a placeholder. Lloyd maximized his independence by operating, as much as possible, from Wye Plantation. The importance of Wye for Lloyd as a locus of power emerges from published correspondence between Governor Sharpe and Secretary Calvert.

As Baltimore directed in his instructions of 1753, improved management of the rent rolls was one of Sharpe’s targets. Rent rolls recorded quit rents, the greatest single source of proprietary income. “Nothing has ever given me greater Uneasiness than my Inability to serve your Lordship to your Satisfaction” in the matter of the rent rolls,

cash from unsettled “vacant” land. As traditional ties to land eroded, land increasingly became regarded as a commodity. In Maryland, as in England, land prices rose in the eighteenth century as grain and tobacco markets improved. As Baltimore’s land agent, Lloyd was expected to increase the profit margin on the Calvert estate in Maryland. But he inherited customary relationships that hindered his efforts. On the stress that the modern demand for cash placed on older methods of estate management, see Beth Fawkes Tobin, Colonizing Nature: The Tropics in British Arts and Letters, 1760–1820 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 86–87. The proprietary revenue system could not satisfy the Calverts’ need for cash, though the Calverts believed that it could.
Sharpe wrote to Lord Baltimore two years after his arrival. At that time, the
delinquency of the rent roll keeper of the Eastern Shore, Lloyd’s cousin, Edward
Tilghman, came under the scrutiny of Governor Sharpe and Secretary Calvert and
touched off a skirmish between Sharpe and Lloyd. According to Sharpe, Tilghman did
not issue rent rolls and did not sign debt books, which put quit rent collectors in a poor
position. In an effort to remedy the situation, Sharpe asked Lloyd to exchange his
position as rent roll keeper of the Western Shore for Tilghman’s post on the Eastern
Shore. In Sharpe’s mind, this was a rational proposition. Lloyd spent little time on the
Western Shore, and Lloyd’s personal oversight would improve collection. Secretary
Calvert agreed with Sharpe’s reasoning, adding that shipping land records across the bay
put the records at risk of being lost. 44

Lloyd had a different view. He rejected the idea that there was any “reason to
complain of any Neglect” in his performance as agent, being Tilghman’s supervisor, and
he was “absolutely averse to resigning” the position of rent roll keeper of the Western
Shore. Money and power were at stake for Lloyd. The Western Shore position was
considerably more lucrative than its Eastern Shore counterpart. Lloyd also had an interest
in protecting Tilghman as his kinsman. 45

44 Calvert to Sharpe, May 13, 1755, Archives of Md., 6:206; Sharpe to Baltimore, March
27, 1756, Archives of Md., 6:382; Baltimore to Sharpe, July 13, 1756, Archives of Md.,
6:449 (quote); Calvert to Sharpe, April 7, 1757, Archives of Md., 6:538; Calvert to
45 Sharpe to Baltimore, July 13, 1756, Archives of Md., 6: 450, 453 (quotes); Owings, His
Lordship’s Patronage, 89–90. Also out of geographic considerations, Secretary Calvert
proposed in 1757 to split the receiver general’s post into two, one for each shore, with
required residence on the same shore as the office held, if Lloyd were to resign (April 7,
Archives of Md., 6:538). Lloyd may have also resisted a transfer of duties to Eastern
Shore rent roll keeper in order to help his cousin maintain his place, out of both family
Sharpe and Lloyd also disagreed about influence over appointments to offices of profit in the proprietary revenue system. In a letter to Lord Baltimore in 1756, Sharpe acknowledged Lord Baltimore's order "to pay due Regard to" Lloyd's recommendations for the distribution of offices. Sharpe assured his patron, "I have always paid the greatest Regard to [Lloyd's] Advice" in the "Disposal" of "places." As evidence, Sharpe reported that Lloyd had named four out of the seven sheriffs on the Eastern Shore. This was a significant concession on Sharpe's part, because the appointment of sheriffs was one of the few appointment powers that the governor held directly. Yet, Sharpe confessed to Secretary Calvert in a letter of the same day, "I cannot help thinking [Lloyd's] Desire to have the Recommendation to all Offices which in virtue of his Post he must have Inspection into a little extraordinary." Sharpe was taken aback if Lloyd intended to name men to all offices subordinate to his position, including a new rent roll keeper to replace Tilghman on the Eastern Shore: "surely he cannot desire more than to be one of them himself & to have nominated the other, but if he means all the Officers that he must at times be necessarily concerned with he must then have the Recommendation or Appointment to every Place in the Government for there is not one but as Agent he must frequently have business with."  

---

46 Sharpe to Baltimore, July 13, 1756, Archives of Md., 6:451; Sharpe to Calvert, July 13, 1756, Archives of Md., 6:453. In 1756, Lord Baltimore authorized sheriffs to collect quit rents in addition to their former duties of gathering fines and forfeitures owed to the proprietor. Because quit rents yielded more revenue, the new instruction gave the agent and receiver general an increased interest in whom the governor appointed as sheriffs (Owings, His Lordship's Patronage, 69).
Secretary Calvert, for his part, was frustrated with Lloyd’s delays in submitting accounts of proprietary revenue. In a 1756 letter to Governor Sharpe, Calvert noted that Lloyd had delivered over £3,000 “to My Lord’s Account & a Sketch of his Account for 1754 but...he has neither sent the Land Office, Naval Officers nor any other Accounts or Vouchers to prove it—tis a peculiar Conduct.” Lloyd’s “Delay,” Calvert continued, “can’t be submitted to much longer, His Lordship hearing it with uneasiness & in Defiance of Duty to his Affairs essential.” In 1759, Lloyd blamed late returns on the “remissness” of rent farmers in Kent and Cecil Counties. Sharpe was “surprized” that Lloyd did not take legal action against the farmers, “unless he is desirous of always having some Excuse for not Closing his own Accounts.” Later that year, Calvert communicated to Sharpe the hope, attributed to Lord Baltimore, that Lloyd would resign for “Bad Conduct” and irregular method, instead of being forcibly removed from office.47

As Secretary Calvert and Governor Sharpe exchanged ideas on how to make the proprietary revenue system more rational and efficient, both men agreed that Lloyd’s personal wealth and residence on the Eastern Shore were major hindrances. In 1760, Sharpe reported to Lord Baltimore his frustration with Lloyd for failing to improve rent collection on Lord Baltimore’s manors on the Western Shore, adding, “I have often mentioned this matter to Colo. Lloyd but as he seldom spends a Day in Annapolis & his Attention & Thoughts are so engrossed by his own Affairs I have long despaired of

47 Calvert to Sharpe, March 1756, Archives of Md., 6:371–72; Sharpe to Calvert, April 18, 1759, Archives of Md., 9:326–27; Calvert to Sharpe, November 18, 1759, Archives of Md., 31:519. In the same letter of March 1756, Calvert complained that Lloyd sent him three rent rolls for the Western Shore for 1753, but the rolls did not follow the form given in the 1752 instructions. Calvert believed that the form was necessary for “proper Returns perfected agreeable to his Lordship’s Expectation.”
seeing any Plan for their better Regulation carried into Execution.” Sharpe wanted to make the agent’s residence in Annapolis mandatory. In his opinion, “the Impropriety of an Agent’s Residing on the Eastern Shore is not less in my Opinion than if a Clerk of His Majesty’s Exchequer was to reside constantly at Bath or Canterbury.” Furthermore, Sharpe believed that someone who did not already possess a “monstrous Fortune” would be more attentive to the “Administration or management of Your Ldp’s Affairs.” A “large Estate in this Country” does not make a profit, Sharpe observed, unless the owner “devotes a great part of his time to the Care & Management of it.” Sharpe mentioned other council members who, after building houses at a distance from Annapolis, spent less time in the city. Lloyd’s personal wealth and commitment to overseeing Wye Plantation’s affairs across the bay did not make him a responsive bureaucrat in a system undergoing reform.48

In 1761, Sharpe’s frustration with Lloyd’s “professions and promises” was met with renewed energy by the proprietor and his principal secretary to exert more control over the collection system, and thus generate more revenue, by improving recordkeeping and reducing fraud that Baltimore was convinced was occurring, bleeding the system of potential profit. Calvert issued new instructions to Lloyd that included orders to establish

48 Sharpe to Baltimore, May 23, 1760, Archives of Md., 9:407, 411-13. In the same letter, Sharpe indicated that sheriffs delivered the quit rents to Edward III’s “dwelling” on the Eastern Shore (411). In further evidence that Edward III operated as agent and receiver general from Wye Plantation, Sharpe mentioned in a letter of July 1767 that the “Books & Papers relative to his Ldp’s Revenue now in the hands of his Agent” would eventually be moved into the office under construction in Annapolis (Sharpe to Hamersly, July 27, 1767, Archives of Md., 14:412). Lloyd carried papers with him over the bay when he relinquished the office of agent and receiver general (Sharpe to Hamersly, October 30, 1768, Archives of Md., 14:542).
a permanent agent’s office and residence in Annapolis and to submit accounts annually to a review board in that city.49

Lloyd was slow to respond to the 1761 instructions. Two years later, the secretary wrote to Sharpe that Lloyd “complys not almost with any requisitions sent him; he’s like Fabius Maximus cunctando, but not in Merit.” Quintus Fabius Maximus’s strategy of delay in the second Punic War saved Rome from Carthaginian troops, but Calvert was less sanguine about Lloyd’s tactics. “After upwards of five years repeated admonitions of his delay in accounts,” Calvert continued, Lloyd had sent accounts for only three out of the five years due. When, in the following year, Calvert received Lloyd’s accounts for the years from 1757 to 1761, the secretary judged them to be “Erroneous & confused.”50

Secretary Calvert pursued a standard of accountability that may have been impossible, given structural problems in the proprietary revenue system. By the time Lloyd was in charge of collection, information gaps and errors had accumulated in the land records and rent rolls, due to inaccurate and outdated land surveys, fraud in the land office, lack of disciplined methods in recordkeeping, and periods of Calvert family

49 Barker, *Background of the Revolution*, 263; Calvert to Sharpe, November 18, 1759, summarized in Sharpe to Baltimore, May 23, 1760, *Archives of Md.*, 9:403–4; Baltimore to Lloyd, Instructions, October 8, 1761, *Archives of Md.*, 32:391–95. According to the 1761 instructions, the review board was to consist of at least three of the following officials: the governor, commissary general, deputy secretary, attorney general, and a judge of the land office. Lord Baltimore continued to suspect fraud in the system. For example, in 1765, he suspected the rent farmers (Calvert to Sharpe, May 21, *Archives of Md.*, 31:563).

50 Calvert to Sharpe, March 1, 1763, *Archives of Md.*, 31:531; Calvert to Sharpe, complaining that Lloyd’s accounts “Blend one year with another,” February 29, 1764, *Archives of Md.*, 14:130–31. In both letters, Calvert noted Lloyd’s delay in constructing an office in Annapolis as directed in the 1761 instructions. In 1765, Sharpe enclosed, in a letter to Calvert, a plan to build, in brick, a “proper Repository” in Annapolis for the agent and receiver general’s accounts. Whether Sharpe or Lloyd was the author of the plan, though, was unspecified (November 11, *Archives of Md.*, 14:241).
neglect. Sharpe observed the cascading effects of errors and outright fraudulent information in seventeenth-century land patents. Because the rent rolls were based on the land patents, the rolls "are & will perhaps for ever be in some measure erroneous."

Consequently, quit rents that were derived from "old Patents" were not "rightly calculated." Further complicating matters, over time, land records had been lost or damaged. Early in his tenure as agent, Lloyd argued that he could not provide a history of land tenures in the debt books according to the 1752 instructions because the "Original Takers up were not known." Recordkeeping oversights provided opportunities for rent evasion. In 1768, for instance, an inquiry found that "many People hold Land not charged on the Rent Roll...for which no Quit Rent has been paid." Complaints about errors in the rent rolls persisted as late as 1774.51

51 Sharpe to Baltimore, May 23, 1760, Archives of Md., 9:406-7 (quote); Calvert to Sharpe, [1756], Archives of Md., 6:371 (quote); minutes of the Board of Revenue, instructions to Bennett Allen, June 30, 1768, Archives of Md., 32:405 (quote); minutes of the Board of Revenue, February 23, 1774, reporting, "the Rentals of the Western Shore are replete with Errors having been kept in a confused State for many years and part of them transcribed by the late Rent Roll Keeper without correcting the same," Archives of Md., 32:474. The "late Rent Roll Keeper" was a reference to either William Haywood, who occupied the office in 1772 and 1773, or his predecessor, Reuben Meriwether, who took over from Lloyd in 1768 (Owings, His Lordship's Patronage, 177). Daniel Dulany exploited the "informal methods" of recordkeeping in the land office in the 1720s and 1730s to speculate in land (Land, Dulanys of Maryland, 102). For references to fire, exposure to weather, and other damage to records that occurred when Annapolis was in its infancy as the colony's capital, see Owings, His Lordship's Patronage, 88; Archives of Md., 29:44, 206, 263; and Chapter 2. A land patent recorded the boundaries and the value of a parcel of land, based upon survey, and the terms under which that land was held, including the annual rent owed to Lord Baltimore. Anthony Parent cites a practice in seventeenth-century Virginia of making out land patents in such a way as to minimize rent payments (Foul Means, 34). Barker comments that by the mid-eighteenth century, problems in the proprietary revenue system had accumulated so as to be nearly insurmountable (Background of the Revolution, 261).
Despite the importance of rent rolls to the rent collection process, rent roll keepers failed to keep up with population growth and change. Maryland’s population grew from approximately 30,000 persons in 1700 to over 160,000 in 1763, making it much more difficult for rent roll keepers to keep up with landownership and tenancy histories. Also, the proprietor’s attention to the rent rolls was intermittent. In 1722, Lord Baltimore requested updated rent rolls, and as late as 1766, they were still regarded as incomplete. Meanwhile, settlers encroached on manors and reserved land.52

Lloyd was aware of impediments to “perfect returns” in the proprietary revenue system. At the same time, he exhibited a lack of will to reform the system. His resistance to reform is curious, given that as the proprietary revenue increased, Lloyd profited accordingly from his commissions. Why, then, did he not share in Sharpe and Calvert’s attempts to improve efficiency and increase returns? The answer lies in the relationship that Lloyd cultivated between his revenue offices and Wye Plantation. Lloyd used the office of agent and receiver general to increase his personal power and to exercise a great deal of personal independence from Wye Plantation. Lloyd allowed informal solutions to problems in the revenue system, such as debt forgiveness, to continue because they enhanced his position as a creditor and as a patron.

Suspension of rent payment and debt forgiveness were informal solutions, exercised by rent collectors over generations, to problems of the proprietary revenue

---

52 Brendan McConville, The King’s Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America, 1688–1776 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 152; Baltimore to the agent and receiver general, instructions, December 5, 1722, Archives of Md., 38:432; Baltimore to Sharpe, instructions, February 21, 1766, Archives of Md., 32:395. As early as 1729, Benedict Leonard Calvert informed his elder brother that the proprietary manors needed to be resurveyed because of encroachment (Archives of Md., 25:609).
system. Colonial Maryland's lack of specie and occasional credit shortages made it difficult to compel payment. For example, after eight years as rent farmers, Richard Bennett III and James Heath in 1707 reported that "out of compassion," they did not collect rent from persons unable to pay or from orphans' estates. Bennett and Heath also did not collect rent from persons who lived outside Maryland. Sixty years later, collectors continued to exercise discretion about whether or not to demand payment. Sometimes collectors considered absentee owners' debts not worth pursuing, if collection required travel and filing suit. Lord Baltimore's instruction in 1733 to collect rents and fees in cash, preferably in pounds sterling, did not ease the problem. Collectors who distrained, or seized goods for nonpayment, were "often puzzled to sell what they take," Sharpe wrote. To spare the trouble, the collectors "sometimes suffer the Tenants to fall in Arrears."

Sharpe criticized Lloyd for not taking a harder line against rent farmers, whom Lloyd, as agent, was legally entitled to sue for not fulfilling the terms of their bond. A rent collector had to weigh the risk of damage to personal relationships if he compelled payment. A rent farmer insulted Lloyd, for instance, when Lloyd pressed him for payment. In 1766, Lord Baltimore chastised Lloyd for not pursuing debts from negligent rent farmers: "A reasonable Indulgence to my Debtors, I shall never deny, but there is a time when Moderation ceases to be a virtue."

---

54 Sharpe to Calvert, April 18, 1759, 9:326–27; Baltimore to Sharpe, instructions, February 21, 1766, Archives of Md., 32:396 (quote). Rent farmers were to be sued if they did not submit revenue to the receiver general, according to the bonds with which they entered their position (Board of Revenue instructions to Bennett Allen, 1768, Archives of
Because debt was pervasive in colonial America, Lloyd acted in the interest of protecting his web of credit, rather than in the interest of "perfect returns" or perfect accounts. This was one way that Lloyd used his revenue offices to increase his power and independence at Wye. Given the difficulties of rent collection, Lloyd extended credit rather than sue for nonpayment. By extending credit, Lloyd lubricated the proprietary revenue system, giving farmers more time to collect. Baltimore extended the same courtesy to Lloyd, until 1766. Lloyd thereby maintained his position at the center of a colony-wide credit network, from Wye Plantation, without jeopardizing the personal relationships that gave Lloyd power.55

Lloyd's behavior—and the older mode of patronage that allowed it—was increasingly out of step with developments in the wider British Atlantic world in the eighteenth century, specifically, the emergence of civil service as a profession and the growth of provincial urban centers, where middle-class professionals lived and worked. To some extent, Calvert and Sharpe were seeking, in Lloyd's high proprietary revenue

---

55 Many histories of early America address the culture of credit, but the specific ways in which people dealt with (or without) credit remain a subject of study. Craig Muldrew's community-based approach, using court proceedings, illuminates the interpersonal aspect of creditor-debtor relations (The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England [New York: MacMillan Press, 1998], esp. chapters 6 and 7). Breen's Tobacco Culture offers a provocative, if dated, discussion of the interpersonal aspects of debtor-creditor relations in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake, with a focus on the relationship between Virginia planters and their English merchants. Chapter 3 of Burnard's Creole Gentleman, in a response to Breen, studies the credit market within Maryland and finds Marylanders indebted to one another.
offices, the attributes of a professional civil servant. Sharpe hoped to install, in Lloyd’s place, a full-time employee, a person whose wealth depended upon his “public Employment.” By residing in or near Annapolis, the agent could attend to Lord Baltimore’s revenue affairs “regularly & punctually,” and, Sharpe argued, would be more accessible geographically to his subordinate officers for settling accounts.56

Sharpe was describing a situation like that of Thomas Irving, a contemporary and highly successful royal customs official. A native of Scotland, Irving arrived in Boston in 1767 to oversee the collection of customs data for all thirteen mainland colonies. Within six years, Irving introduced “order and efficiency” to the customs office. Out of “very confused, imperfect and inaccurate” records, Irving created a single master document, much to the royal Treasury’s delight. Irving had served the British government’s need for information about customs revenue, an important source of its

56 Calvert to Sharpe, November 18, 1759. Archives of Md., 31:520 (quote); Sharpe to Baltimore, April 20, 1761, Archives of Md., 9:509–11 (quote, 509), in which Sharpe also wrote, “the Agent’s whole time ought to be devoted to Your Ldp. ’s service & the management of Your Affairs;” Borsay, The English Urban Renaissance. Calvert described his vision of the permanent agent’s office with attached residence in Annapolis in a letter to Sharpe of February 29, 1764: “it must be very sufficiently Constructed, with an Apartmt. &ca at least for a Clerk, he must have to reside there for his Cor[respondence & there must be Rooms & with Divisions, Desks & shelves & Drawers to place & Lock up all Deeds & papers &ca belonging as well as all his Lordshps. Mathematical Inst[uments]....I hope the spot on w[ich] the Building is to be Erected will sufficiently admit additional Buildings & have extension of ground to contain all matter & things necessary for the residence of the Recr. Genl.” Calvert was heartened by news that Lloyd, showing “some appearance” of “obedience” to Baltimore’s instructions, had “agreed with Mr. Carroll for a Peice of ground on w[ich] he intends to Build” (Archives of Md., 14:135–36). Sharpe reported in March 1767 that an office was built during the previous summer, on another piece of land, but Lloyd had not yet moved into it his “Books & Papers...relative to His Ldps Mannours Quit Rents & other Estate” (Archives of Md., 14:383). By 1768, Lloyd had a “Deputy” in Annapolis, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer (Sharpe to Hamersly, October 30, 1768, Archives of Md., 14:546). Whether Lloyd employed this deputy in any meaningful way, though, is unknown.
wealth. Irving’s celebrated ability to deliver this information to the Treasury in London provides a benchmark for the proprietor’s complaints about Lloyd’s behavior in office. Lloyd did transfer money to Baltimore on a fairly regular basis; what Baltimore and Calvert complained about was the lack of information about the delivered sum.57

Meanwhile, Sharpe had at his disposal in Annapolis a growing pool of candidates who were more likely, and more willing, to meet his ideal of a civil servant. In the 1750s and 1760s, the city attracted lawyers, physicians, merchants, and craftsmen who came to Annapolis to seek their fortune as the city grew. After Annapolis became the colony’s capital in 1694, government and legal activity in the city increased. Annapolis’s economic growth quickened after the close of the Seven Years War in 1763. By then, Annapolis was enough of a metropolis for Sharpe’s house on the outskirts of town to be considered a villa. Opportunities for sociability in the city expanded, with an assembly room, annual horse races, and the construction of houses with formal gardens by wealthy residents. Sociability provided opportunities for men without proprietary patronage to court offers from high-ranking officials, a significant number of whom were year-round residents of the city or the surrounding county. Notably, the majority of members of Lord Baltimore’s proposed committee to review the agent’s accounts, according to his instructions of 1761, were Annapolis residents.58

---


Lloyd came under greater scrutiny in early 1766, when, to “his Lordship’s Chagrin and uneasiness,” Lord Baltimore received £10,000 without accounts. Lord Baltimore and his new secretary, Hugh Hamersly, had been anxious to hear from Lloyd, whose “Silence and neglect...these last 14 months past” made Lord Baltimore concerned about his ability to “keep pace” with his expenses. “His Lordship thinks it hard to Starve with so Noble a Patrimony,” Hamersly admonished Sharpe. In February 1766, as soon as Lord Baltimore received the £10,000 without accounts, and in light of Lloyd’s continued reluctance to submit his accounts to examination to officials in Annapolis, the proprietor sent a representative to investigate Lloyd’s bookkeeping. In a letter of introduction for John Morton Jordan, addressed to Sharpe, Lord Baltimore expressed his motivation for sending Jordan: “it is as plain as noon day that I am intirely in the dark & much injured”

---

Governor Sharpe; Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 212–17, on Annapolis in the 1760s and sociability; James Haw, “The Patronage Follies: Bennet Allen, John Morton Jordan, and the Fall of Horatio Sharpe,” Maryland Historical Magazine 71 (1976), 134–50, on the overlap between society and politics in Annapolis; Mark P. Leone, “The Georgian Order as the Order of Merchant Capitalism in Annapolis, Maryland,” in The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology of the Eastern United States, ed. Mark P. Leone and Parker B. Potter, Jr. (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1988), 235–61, on gardens; Charles Scarlett, Jr., “Governor Horatio Sharpe’s Whitehall,” Maryland Historical Magazine 46 (1951) 8–26. Edward III was an honorary member of the Tuesday Club of Annapolis, meaning that he was a “desirable” participant but was ineligible for full membership because he lived outside of Annapolis (Elaine G. Breslaw, ed., Records of the Tuesday Club of Annapolis, 1745–1756 [Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988], xv–xvi, xx). If Lord Baltimore’s instructions of 1761 (Archives of Md., 32:391–95) were followed, the committee to review Lloyd’s accounts as agent and receiver general would have potentially included the following officeholders between 1761 and 1766, all residents of Annapolis: Daniel Dulany, Jr., Stephen Bordley, Walter Dulany, Edmund Key, and George Steuart. The exceptions were Charles and Robert Goldsborough of Dorchester County and Benedict Calvert of Prince Georges County (Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 129, 131–32, 134, 169)
for lack of information about his private revenue. The proprietor sought the unknown sums that were owed to him.\textsuperscript{59}

Jordan, a tobacco merchant and a native of Virginia, arrived in Annapolis from London in May 1766. In a letter of introduction to Governor Sharpe, Hamersly, Lord Baltimore’s new London secretary, described Jordan as a “particular acquaintance” of the proprietor, a “Gentln of considerable Credit as a mercht & well versed in Accots.” Lord Baltimore instructed Jordan to assist the governor and Deputy Secretary Daniel Dulany, Jr., with the sale of manor and reserved lands and an audit of his private revenue accounts. Jordan, Sharpe, and Dulany, plus the two judges of the land office, formed a new committee that finally initiated the review of Lloyd’s accounts of the proprietor’s revenue that Baltimore had requested five years earlier.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{59} Hamersly to Sharpe, 9 November 1765, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 14:235; Hamersly to Sharpe, January 31, 1765, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 14:257 (quotes); Hamersly to Sharpe, February 20, 1766, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 14:272 (quote); Baltimore to Sharpe, February 23, 1766, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 14:272–73 (quote). Cecilius Calvert died in November 1765.

\textsuperscript{60} Hamersly to Sharpe, February 20, 1766, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 14:267; Baltimore’s instructions of 1766, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 32:395–97; Hamersly to Sharpe, March 22, 1766, with additional instructions to add the judges of the land office to the “Standing Committee of Acco[un]ts,” \textit{Archives of Md.}, 14:281; Barker, \textit{Background of the Revolution}, 265; Haw, “Patronage Follies,” 134–36; \textit{Archives of Md.}, 14:242, in which Sharpe noted that Jordan was known to have been a “trader” south of the Potomac River. Before Jordan’s appointment was confirmed, Secretary Calvert described him as “a sort of mercht.” who “gives out on the Royal Exch[ange],” adding, “the Gentlemans Character not the [best] I will obstruct him all I can” (Calvert to Sharpe, August 25, 1765, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 31:565). Charles Carroll of Carrollton considered Jordan to be a “braggart” with a pretty wife (Hoffman, Mason, and Darcy, eds., \textit{Dear Papa, Dear Charley}, 1:402n8). The committee of Jordan, Sharpe, and Dulany, and the two judges of the land office dissolved in March 1768, when Jordan left for England with the committee’s report. A board of revenue was established in its place. Membership on the board followed the 1761 instructions (see note 49). In August 1768, Lord Baltimore formally appointed Jordan as “Supervisor of Accounts, Lands & Revenues in and from the Province of Maryland” (minutes of the Board of Revenue, October 26, 1768, \textit{Archives of Md.}, 32:409).
Lloyd, who had refused to obey the 1761 instruction to send his accounts to a board in Annapolis for review, complied with this latest initiative with an intent to resign. For the next two years, Lloyd shared his accounts with the new committee as it performed its review. But Lloyd’s complaints about the committee’s proceedings, and specifically about Jordan, began soon after it started. Within the first six months, Lloyd told Secretary Hamersly that he was “much hurt” by the committee’s proceedings. In particular, Lloyd told “of Reports he Imagines to have been Spread in the Province by Mr Jordan to his prejudice.” Sharpe, in a response to Hamersly’s letter informing him of Lloyd’s disgruntlement, revealed something of the committee’s findings: “That His Ldp has suffered Loss by the unmethodical Way in which Colo. Lloyd has hitherto gone on his Indulgence to many who should have been compelled to make punctual payments & his Attentions being too much taken up by the Multiplicity of his own Affairs must be apparent to the Colo. himself as well as to us.” Sharpe suggested that he, as an honorable member of the committee, kept these views to himself, continuing, “had [Edward III] pursued the Instructions sent him in Octobr. 1761...he might have avoided the Chagrine you say Mr Jordans Discourse seems to have given him, for my own part I have declined talking at all about [Edward III’s] Conduct.” In letters to Hamersly and Baltimore, Sharpe was less discreet. In March 1767, Sharpe wrote to Lord Baltimore that it was “apparent” to the board that revenue was lost because of Lloyd’s “Dilitoriness” or “Inability” to manage the office.61

---

61 Hamersly to Sharpe, November 8, 1766, citing a letter from Lloyd to Hamersly “lately sent,” *Archives of Md.*, 14:346 (quote); Sharpe to Calvert, March 1767, *Archives of Md.*, 14:382 (quote); Sharpe to Baltimore, March 1767, *Archives of Md.*, 14:375 (quote). Just a few months before Jordan’s arrival in Maryland, Lloyd told Sharpe that he “absolutely
Lloyd complained about the rumors that the audit generated, and he attributed much of them to Jordan. Because account audits were indisputably routine procedures in mercantile and government life, Lloyd directed his anger toward a softer target, a newcomer in Maryland. For Lloyd, the audit represented the loss of Lord Baltimore’s trust. The 1766 committee was expected to produce a report that traced “every Evil up to its Source,” in order to prevent future “Irregularities and Mischiefes” in the office of the agent and receiver general. Jordan would then carry the report personally to Lord Baltimore. In late 1767, Lloyd wrote to Hamersly of “the great Indignitys” of having his accounts reviewed by the commission, including “Declarations of one of the Commissioner as If he was largely Indebted” to Lord Baltimore. This unnamed commissioner—probably Jordan—implied that Lloyd was not acting in Lord Baltimore’s best interest.62

---

62 Hamersly to Sharpe, July 20, 1767, Archives of Md., 14:406 (quote); Hamersly to Sharpe, March 28, 1768, citing letters from Lloyd to Hamersly from November 1767, Archives of Md., 14:475 (quote). Lloyd had little difficulty sending revenue to Lord Baltimore when the committee directed it. On July 14, 1766, Sharpe reported to Baltimore that the committee found Lloyd to be in “arrears” for over £8,000 owed to Baltimore, based on the account for 1764 and a sketch of the account for 1765, and that Lloyd promised to remit this sum (Archives of Md., 14:316). Lloyd sent £8,300 in bills of exchange in 1766, plus another £5,300 in 1767 (Archives of Md., 14:331, 406). The unnamed commissioner’s “declarations” echoed the proprietor’s own suspicions that money was owed to him.
Even though “in every Instance his Accounts have been found right,” Lloyd resigned from the offices of agent and receiver general and rent roll keeper of the Western Shore when the committee finished its report in early 1768. Lloyd also stopped attending council meetings. Once again, Lloyd deflected perceived criticism onto Jordan. In June, three months after Jordan had left the colony for London, Sharpe informed Hamersly that “Colonel Lloyd is so much dissatisfied with some Things he has been told were reported of him by Mr Jordan” that Lloyd declined to attend the last session of government in Annapolis.” Sharpe added, “I question whether he will choose to act again in any Public Station.” Lloyd resigned from his seat on the council later that year.63

The suggestion by the unnamed commissioner that Lloyd did not have the money to back a “true” reporting of real and potential revenue may have had some basis in fact. Lloyd could not submit a greater amount by bills of exchange than he could reasonably collect. Lloyd had hinted at trouble earlier; in 1764, Calvert wrote that Lloyd “admits

---

63 Hamersly to Sharpe, March 28, 1768, Archives of Md., 14: 475 (quote); Sharpe to Hamersly, June 22, 1768, Archives of Md., 14:509 (quote); Sharpe to Hamersly, November 28, 1768, noting Lloyd’s resignation from the council (Archives of Md., 14:554); Owings, His Lordship’s Patronage, 167, 176. In a letter to Lord Baltimore of February 9, 1768, Sharpe reported, “We have at last finished with Colo. Lloyd,” though Sharpe asked Lloyd to stay until September in order to collect debts (Archives of Md., 14:464). In March 1768, Sharpe appointed a replacement for Lloyd in the office of rent roll keeper of the Western Shore (Archives of Md.,14:547).

There were apparently no claims on Edward Lloyd III’s estate by Lord Baltimore as a result of the 1766–1767 review, judging by Edward Lloyd III’s estate papers in the Lloyd Papers. In 1771, the Board of Revenue completed its review of Lloyd’s accounts from October 1767 until his resignation, and found them “just and true” apart from two debts worth less than £250 (Archives of Md., 32:468). Confusion in the accounts continued after Lloyd’s departure from office. John Morton Jordan’s accounts as agent were found to be “not only Erroneous but very irregularly Stated” (minutes of the Board of Revenue, April 15, 1772, Archives of Md., 32:471). Jordan had informed the board a year earlier that he had difficulty compelling “Farmers and others, who have the Receipt and management of his Lordship’s Revenue, to furnish him with accounts stated and settled” so that Jordan could draw up the accounts (Archives of Md., 32:469).
very dangerous credit.” If Lloyd could not deliver on the bills of the exchange that he sent to London, then Lord Baltimore’s own line of credit was negatively affected. Lloyd compounded the difficulty of his situation when he submitted money without full documentation.

Lloyd operated with the trust of the proprietor that he was not committing fraud, that is, not withholding money from Baltimore or failing to collect on the money due. By attributing malicious rumors to Jordan, Lloyd sought to neutralize the criticism that he had failed to perform his duty to Lord Baltimore. Lloyd ultimately resigned to save his reputation as a reliable creditor and thereby preserve the long-term viability of the Lloyd family estate.64

Conclusion

With the help of his close kinsman, Richard Bennett III, Lloyd possessed sufficient personal wealth as well as the trust of the Calvert family to be named as chief collector of Lord Baltimore’s private revenue. Lloyd’s ownership of Wye Plantation was key to his obtaining the office of agent and receiver general, but he would not sacrifice the family estate to keep the office when his reputation as a creditor was threatened by rumor. Lloyd held a position of trust, as Lord Baltimore’s land agent in the colony, on a set of assumptions about how the proprietary revenue system operated. When Lord

---

64 Reputation and creditworthiness were closely tied; to lose credit or reputation was devastating to a business in the eighteenth century (Mathias, “Risk, Credit, and Kinship”; Toby L. Ditz, “Shipwrecked; or, Masculinity Imperiled: Mercantile Representations of Failure and the Gendered Self in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia,” *Journal of American History*, 81 [1994], 51–80).
Baltimore attempted reform of that system to “perfect” returns, Lloyd resisted in order to protect his personal independence and authority, based at Wye Plantation.
CHAPTER FOUR

"UNEASINESS AND CONFUSION" AT WYE PLANTATION:
THE DIVISION OF EDWARD LLOYD III’s ESTATE IN 1770

The death of Edward Lloyd III in January 1770 introduced a difficult period of transition for the Lloyd family and their slaves. Edward III’s heirs had to divide the accumulated wealth of a generation, depressing the profitability of the estate in the short term. In an attempt to minimize disruption and property loss, the elder son, Edward IV, assumed privileges as the heir at law and administrator of his father’s estate. His brother-in-law, John Cadwalader, challenged these as contrary to a “fair and equal division.” This disagreement over the administration of the estate generated tension within the Lloyd family, each member of whom had a distinct legal role and financial interest in it. Slaves, too, had a stake in the outcome of the division, and an examination of their experience of the division further exposes the difficulties of the transition.

This chapter offers the first detailed account in this dissertation’s multigenerational history of the process of dividing the Lloyd family estate among heirs. For the first time in the history of the Lloyds of Wye Plantation, the heirs were adults when their father died and there was no widow to delay their inheritance. Fortunately for historians, documentary evidence of the heirs’ negotiation has been preserved in collections of Lloyd and Cadwalader family papers, at the Maryland Historical Society and the Historical Society of Pennsylvania respectively. In addition, portraits of the three heirs and their families by Charles Willson Peale, executed in 1771 and 1772, provide visual evidence of each heir’s perspective on the estate division: their legal standing in
relationship to the estate, the outcome of the division, and their assumptions and intentions for the future. Together, the written and visual sources capture a moment of transition in the history of Wye Plantation and for each of the men involved in the division.¹

Inheritance was not a passive process. In his family portrait by Charles Willson Peale, Edward IV’s figure projects gentlemanly ease in his situation as master of Wye Plantation. In fact, Edward IV took an active role in shaping his inheritance. His efforts to control the outcome of the division of his father’s estate were made with the intention of maintaining and improving Wye Plantation during his generation of ownership.

Prelude to the Division: The Death of Edward Lloyd III

Edward Lloyd III died at age fifty-nine, leaving two sons and one daughter. His wife, Ann, had died several months earlier. Edward III’s will directed that his funeral be

¹ As recounted in the previous chapters, Edward Lloyd I was alive when his oldest son reached adulthood, but he left a widow. Philemon Lloyd I (d. 1685) and Edward Lloyd II (d. 1719) died while their children were still minors. The principal written sources about the division of Edward Lloyd III’s estate are Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, microfilm roll 39, Lloyd Papers, MS 2001, Maryland Historical Society; and the Cadwalader Collection, Series 2, MS 1454, Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Two authors have explored the common history of the three portraits discussed in this chapter. Karol A. Schmiegel discusses the paintings in the context of Charles Willson Peale’s life and work in “‘Encouragement Exceeding Expectation’: The Lloyd-Cadwalader Patronage of Charles Willson Peale,” in New Perspectives of Charles Willson Peale, ed. Lillian B. Miller and David D. Ward (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press for the Smithsonian Institution, 1991), 51-72. I am grateful to David Steinberg for sharing his unpublished manuscript, titled “Manufacturing Descent: Familial Continuity in and with Charles Willson Peale’s Late Colonial Portraiture,” in 1998, during his fellowship at the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia. Other works that focus on John Cadwalader’s patronage of Peale and other American artisans are listed in note 24 below. Unlike these earlier discussions, this paper places the three portraits in the context of Wye Plantation’s history.
held without "pomp" and conducted in the presence of only his "nearest Relations,"
the burial at his home to begin "precisely at six o'clock in the Evening." A pair of stone
monuments mark the site where Edward III and his wife, Ann, lie buried at Wye House
(Figure 9).²

Edward III had been one of the wealthiest men in mid-eighteenth-century
Maryland. At the end of his life, the merchant-planter controlled approximately forty
thousand acres of land in five counties on the Eastern Shore, and a foothold in Anne
Arundel County of one hundred acres, across the Chesapeake Bay. Wye Plantation was
made up of seven plantations, occupied by 174 slaves and their overseers, 320 head of
cattle, 345 hogs, 258 sheep, and 87 horses. At the home plantation, a "brick store" and a
"great store" contained store goods and plantation supplies. The value of Edward III's
personal property, which included debts receivable, slaves, livestock, plantation tools,
ships, store goods, and household furniture, was approximately £35,000 current money.³

---

² Will of Edward Lloyd III, signed March 6, 1750/51, proven March 26, 1770, Estate
Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers (copy also in Wills, liber 37, folios
474–80, MSA); BDML, 2:537.
³ The total estate value of £35,184.2.5 current money is given in Lloyd ledger 1770–
1774, p. 230, box 14, volume 5 of the Lloyd Papers; Russo, "A Model Planter," 67, cites
the same source. The single most valuable part of Edward III's personal estate was the
debts receivable, amounting to about £11,400 sterling and £8,200 current money (Lloyd
ledger 1770–1774, p. 230; Russo, "A Model Planter," 66). This included bonds divided
by lot on December 28, 1770, worth a total of £12,129.6.1 current money. Each heir also
obtained one-third of £8,262.5.0 sterling, or £2,754.1.8, in bills of exchange and other
"cash" with Mathias Gale and James Anderson in England. Goods divided on July 25,
1770, including store goods, had a total value of £7,277.9.7 current money (Lloyd ledger,
1770–1774, p. 230; see also note 31 below). Slaves were the next most valuable form of
Edward III's personal property, calculated at a total value of £7,204 current money
("Inventory of sundry Stock belonging to the Estate of Edward Lloyd Esqr deceased,"
1770, box 71, Lloyd Papers; confirmed by each heir's portion of slaves to the value of
£2,400.13.4, documented in Lloyd ledger, 1770–1774, pp. 221, 226, 230). The livestock,
tools, silver plate (alone worth £1,773), and house furniture divided on December 28,
Edward III’s will and testament, written in March 1751, nearly twenty years before his death, contained few specifics about the distribution of his estate. Instead, Edward III made provisions for his family in light of his recent entrance into the position of “Residuary Legatee, Devisee, and Heir at Law” of his wealthy kinsman and neighbor, Richard Bennett III, who died in 1749. Edward III opened the document with instructions for his funeral, his wife’s housing, and his children’s education. Most important, though, was his nomination of two executors to represent his family’s interests in an ongoing legal dispute over the validity of Bennett’s will. Edward III offered the nominees, who were his brothers-in-law, £200 sterling each in compensation. (As noted in the previous chapter, descendants of Bennett’s sister protested Bennett’s will, hoping to overturn Edward III’s status as residuary legatee of Bennett’s real and personal property, but their suit was unsuccessful.) Because Bennett had bequeathed specific parcels of land to Edward III’s first three children, the father reserved for his newborn, second son a 3,200-acre manor out of the Bennett inheritance. Edward III’s will did not provide any other instructions about how his land or his moveable property was to be divided among his heirs.  

1770, were valued at a total of £3,800.12.9, or £1,366.17.7 per heir. Edward Lloyd III’s estate was solvent. Cash in the house, revenue from the sale of a ship, store goods, and slaves—all were divided in full, without an initial deduction for debt payment. For a more detailed description of Wye Plantation under Edward III, and for his relative wealth in Maryland, see Chapter 3.  

4 In his will of 1751, Edward III directed that his daughter Elizabeth be “put to school” between the ages of ten and thirteen in Annapolis or Philadelphia, and then “come home to her mother,” who would oversee her continuing education. Edward III’s two sons, Edward IV and Richard Bennett, were to be tutored at home in languages, “writing and Ciphering” until the age of twelve. Both boys were then to be sent to England for a university-preparatory education and to attend the Inns of Court. The younger brother, Richard Bennett Lloyd, was to study law until the age of twenty-five or until he had a
When Edward III died in January 1770, his three surviving children, Elizabeth Lloyd Cadwalader, Edward Lloyd (IV), and Richard Bennett Lloyd, were between the ages of twenty-eight and nineteen. Two of the three children, then, were of age to inherit immediately. Because Edward III’s will did not contain specific instructions on how his estate was to be divided among his children (apart from the land set aside for Richard Bennett Lloyd), the division of his property proceeded as if he had died intestate. Edward IV, as his father’s elder son, was the heir at law and, according to the law in Maryland, thereby inherited all of his father’s real estate, that is, the land and the improvements on that land, with the exception of the 3,200-acre manor that Edward III reserved in his will for his younger son. The personal estate (or moveables), in accordance with the law and custom of Maryland, was to be divided into equal shares for each of the children. Because Richard Bennett Lloyd was in England at the time that his

degree in “that Learned Profession.” Whether the brothers pursued this course of study is unknown; Edward IV did not practice law as a profession, and his brother entered the army at age twenty-three (see below). Edward III nominated Abraham Barnes and Robert Jenkins Henry as executors.

Richard Bennett III in his will (cited in Chapter 3) had devised specific tracts of land to Edward III’s first three children, Elizabeth, Henrietta Maria, and Edward IV. On Bennett’s bequests to the daughters, see note 16. To Edward IV, Bennett reserved several tracts of land near the Lloyds’ home plantation. These were Crouch’s Choice and “the island included in its survey” (acreage unspecified), Henrietta Maria’s Discovery (216 acres), and Town Road (50 acres less 16 acres promised to Sarah Grason by Bennett’s mother, Henrietta Maria Lloyd). Bennett wrote in his will, these “lands do Joyne and lye together near the Mouth of Wye River” and made up Town Plantation. “Town” was a reference to Doncaster, later called Wye Town. In 1826, Henrietta Maria’s Discovery was considered part of Wye House, and Crouch’s Choice and Town Road were parts of Wye Town, according to a list of lands of Wye Plantation of that year (Estate Papers of Various Members of the Lloyd Family, box 72, Lloyd Papers). The 1695 plat (Figure 12) shows tract locations. Bennett directed that if Edward IV died without heirs, the bequest was to revert to his mother and her heirs forever.

To ensure that his newborn son, Richard Bennett Lloyd, also benefited from the Bennett inheritance, Edward III in his will set aside for him a tract of 3,200 acres in Kent County called Worton Manor.
father died, his elder brother, Edward IV, and his brother-in-law, John Cadwalader, initiated the division of the father’s personal estate in his absence. Elizabeth’s participation in the estate division is undocumented; as a femme-covert, she had no legal authority independent of her husband over moveable property.⁵

After Edward IV began the process of administering his father’s estate, it became evident that Edward IV and Cadwalader had competing interests in the division of

⁵ Maryland law followed English common law in recognizing the eldest son as the deceased’s next of kin and the first in the line of descent. If a man died intestate, all of his land descended to the eldest son. If the man left two sons and two daughters, Elie Vallete explains, the “eldest son is heir at law, and takes the land in exclusion of” his siblings (Vallete, The Deputy Commissary’s Guide within the Province of Maryland [Annapolis, 1775], 9–10, 97, 141 [quote]). According to Marylynn Salmon, Maryland was one of only four British mainland colonies that observed primogeniture in intestate cases. The other three were Virginia, South Carolina, and New York. In Pennsylvania, eldest sons received a double share of the land (Women and the Law of Property in Early America [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986], 142, 227n5).

Partible inheritance was the norm for the division of personal property in the colonial Chesapeake. In colonial Maryland and Virginia, if a father died intestate and left a widow, his moveable wealth was to be divided equally among his children after a widow’s customary third portion was removed from the common fund or hotch pot and his debts were paid. If there was no widow, the remainder of his personal property, after debts were paid, was to be divided into equal shares for each of the children (Lois Green Carr, “Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake,” in Women in the Age of the American Revolution, ed. Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert [Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1989], 155–208; Jean Butenhoff Lee, “Parental Bequest Practices in Charles County, Maryland, 1732–1783,” in Colonial Chesapeake Society, ed. Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988], 306–41, esp. 308–9; Lorena S. Walsh, From Calabar to Carter’s Grove: The History of a Virginia Slave Community [Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1997], 45; Vallete, The Deputy Commissary’s Guide, 107–8).

Under English common law, a married woman was a femme-covert, which meant that she had no legal identity separate from her husband. The personal property that she brought to a marriage came under her husband’s control. Therefore, Elizabeth Lloyd’s husband would control the personal estate that Elizabeth inherited from her father. John Cadwalader’s authority over the land that Elizabeth brought to the marriage, however, was not absolute. By law, Elizabeth had to give her consent to the sale of any portion of that land (Linda L. Sturtz, Within Her Power: Propertied Women in Colonial Virginia [New York: Routledge, 2002], chapters 1 and 2; Salmon, Women and the Law of Property in Early America, 15).
property. Both men were in the process of establishing their own households, and both intended their respective plantations to be sources of long-term wealth and status for their families. Cadwalader, a native of Philadelphia and a former dry goods merchant, entered into Maryland planter society through his marriage to Elizabeth. Cadwalader hoped that additional land as well as slaves would descend to Elizabeth after the death of her father. Cadwalader also had an immediate need for cash to pay for improvements to a recently acquired townhouse in Philadelphia. Edward IV, meanwhile, received neither land nor slaves from his marriage into an elite Virginia planter's family. Therefore, it was in Edward IV's interests to minimize the loss of land and prime hands during the settlement of his father's estate. As the older son and heir at law, Edward IV was also responsible for seeing his younger, unmarried brother, Richard Bennett Lloyd, established on a secure financial footing.6

Portraits by Charles Willson Peale document the household status of each heir at the time of the personal estate division, as well as their individual interests in the deceased father's estate.

Charles Willson Peale's Portraits of the Heirs

As was customary in the colonial Chesapeake, Edward IV (1744–1796) as his father's first-born son became the next master of his father's home plantation. Edward IV's family portrait by Charles Willson Peale from 1771 commemorates his inheritance

---

of the plantation and his new standing as head of the household (Figure 18). In the
portrait, Edward IV is shown with his wife, Elizabeth Tayloe Lloyd, and their first child,
Anne, outdoors, in a park-like setting, with a great house in the distance. Edward IV’s
standing figure leans over a garden bench, upon which his daughter and his wife are
seated. In Peale’s composition, the heads of the three subjects form an arc that descends
from Edward IV to his daughter to his wife. Mrs. Lloyd is holding a cittern, a musical
instrument that represents her knowledge of music and thus her refinement. The cittern is
also a symbol of domestic harmony in this circle of three.\(^7\)

As his father’s heir at law, Edward IV was responsible for maintaining the
family’s wealth and status for future generations. The portrait communicates Edward
IV’s position between his family’s past and future, with an image of a great house on the
left side symbolizing his family’s past, and depictions of his wife and child on the right
side representing the future.\(^8\)

The image of a high-style building, depicted on the bank of a waterway on the far
left of the canvas, represents the Lloyd family dwelling (Figure 19). The image may have

---

\(^7\) Burnard, *Creole Gentlemen*, 154–56, notes Maryland planters’ preference to give the
eldest son the home plantation and younger sons lesser estates. Schmiegel identifies the
musical instrument in Edward IV’s family portrait as a cittern (“‘Encouragement
Exceeding Expectation’,” 60).

Lawrence Stone and Jeanne C. Fawtier Stone outline the responsibilities of an eldest son
and heir in the context of English county gentry. Their points are relevant to colonial
Maryland’s propertied elite. The “first” duty of an estate owner, the Stones relate, was “to
pass on to his successor the inheritance of seat and estates in as good a condition as he
himself had found them.” Improvement of the estate was a second priority: “If [the
owner] left both estate and seat in more flourishing shape than he found them, so much
the better” (266). Maryland native Charles Carroll of Carrollton, writing to a friend in
England in 1765, conveyed his sense of duty to improve “my parental acres” (quoted in
Hoffman with Mason, *Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland*, 220).
been fictional; it closely resembles an Anglo-Palladian pattern-book design for a “garden pavilion” by Isaac Ware, published in 1756. Nonetheless, the image was a potent symbol of Edward IV’s inheritance and status as heir at law. To indicate that the estate descended on Edward’s side of the family and not his wife’s, the image of the great house is just off the hip of Edward’s figure. More specifically, lines from Edward’s figure intersect with the house image, one line extending from the row of coat buttons on the right side of Edward’s coat and another line along the bottom fringe of his coat. The close association between Edward IV’s figure and the house image conveys familial continuity, as does the presence of the child in the portrait. Edward IV, as heir, was responsible for maintaining an “ancestral estate” in perpetuity. 9

With its conversation piece format and the setting of a domestic park, Peale’s portrait of Edward IV and his family explicitly represents its subjects as members of an elite rank of society by invoking the model of England’s landed gentry. A conversation piece was a specific type of portrait that was fashionable among Britain’s middling ranks (lesser gentry, professionals, and merchants) in the mid-eighteenth century, after it had gained favor among aristocratic patrons. A conversation piece typically shows a group of people, often a family, in an informal setting. With its use of outdoor settings, this

9 Schmiegel identifies the building image in The Edward Lloyd Family as Ware, A Complete Body of Architecture (London), plate 39 (“Encouragement Exceeding Expectation,” 60). The exterior appearance of the house that Edward III built between 1730 and 1770 is unknown, though inventories from 1770 suggest that it was a two-story, double-pile building. For information about his house, see Chapter 3 and Appendix B. The same Ware plate is believed to have been a model for the circa 1770 façade of Mount Clare, built by Charles Carroll, Barrister, outside Baltimore (Michael F. Trostel, Mount Clare: Being an Account of the Seat built by Charles Carroll, Barrister, upon his Lands at Patapsco [Baltimore: National Society of Colonial Dames of America in the State of Maryland, 1981], 35–37). Brewer uses the phrase “ancestral estate” in “Entailing Aristocracy in Colonial Virginia,” 337.
portrait type was particularly well suited for displaying possession of a landed estate. The portrait thus drew meaning from a belief widely held in both colonial Maryland and contemporary England that land ownership was the true basis of social and political authority.10

With its English style and imagery, Edward IV’s family portrait by Peale tapped into aristocratic connotations of family, property, and power. Men who seek power “wish to combine their name, family, and estate in the strictest union, and, leaving nothing to the disposal of providence, they wish to prolong this union, if possible, to the end of time,” observed the eighteenth-century Scottish judge and author Henry Home, Lord Kames, in a history of the law in England and Scotland. Wealthy families in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake used entail, primogeniture, and other restrictive inheritance practices in order to sustain family wealth over generations at a specific geographic location.11

10 Schmiegel identifies the portrait type as a conversation piece (““Encouragement Exceeding Expectation’,” 60). On conversation pieces as a genre, see Ann Bermingham, Landscape and Ideology, The English Rustic Tradition, 1740–1860 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), chapter 1, especially p. 18. Schmiegel comments that at this early stage in Peale’s career as a portrait artist, The Edward Lloyd Family was an ambitious work because of the large size and Peale’s difficulties with the conversation piece format. The canvas measures 48 by 57 ½ inches (Charles Coleman Sellers, Portraits and Miniatures by Charles Willson Peale, in Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 42, part 1 [Philadelphia, 1952], 128).

The same year that Peale painted his family’s portrait, Edward IV was first elected to Maryland’s assembly as a representative of Talbot County (BDML, 2:538). Both events occurred in 1771, after Edward IV’s father died and he came into his inheritance. In England, land ownership was a qualification for political participation. “The greater the property the greater the claim to political power,” observed Stone and Stone in An Open Elite? (13).

11 Home (Lord Kames), Historical Law Tracts, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1758), 1:183. Home continued in the tract titled “History of Property,” “Such ambitious views, ill suiting the frail condition of humanity, have produced entails in this island.” Entail was the legal
Edward IV married into a family that practiced primogeniture, which heightened the importance of the land and slaves that would descend to him from his own father’s estate. Edward IV’s father-in-law, John Tayloe II of Mount Airy, Virginia, promised each of his seven daughters a marriage gift of £2,000 sterling in cash. Tayloe considered this an advance on their inheritance, intending to pass the remainder of his estate to a son. Cash portions to daughters was a typical strategy of Virginia’s elite planter families in the eighteenth century, who, to prevent the breakup of their estates, preferred to keep land and slaves together for their sons’ inheritance.

At the time of Edward IV’s marriage to Elizabeth in 1767, John Tayloe II had a large fortune, including approximately 500 slaves and 40,000 acres of land. Despite his wealth, John Tayloe II did not pay in full his marriage gift to Elizabeth and Edward IV before his death in 1779. His estate lacked the cash to discharge the debt. Therefore, responsibility for its payment fell to Tayloe’s only son and heir, John Tayloe III, who was a minor at the time. The son’s guardians protected the estate against loss until the son came of age, in 1792, twenty-five years after Edward IV’s marriage.12

practice, permitted under English common law, of limiting descent of property to one heir or heiress and to heirs of his or her body forever. Strict settlements were another means by which England’s aristocracy sought to protect their heirs’ inheritance. As noted in Chapter 3, the fifth Lord Baltimore by the terms of his marriage could not convey land in Maryland that was intended to pass to his son and heir. Brewer argues in “Entailing Aristocracy in Colonial Virginia” that the practice of entail was more common in colonial Virginia than historians formerly believed. Entail was legal in Maryland, too, though the extent of its use is unknown (Vallette, *The Deputy Commissary’s Guide*, 91; Carr, “Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake,” 168; Lee, “Parental Bequest Practices,” 322–23; Burnard, *Creole Gentlemen*, 160–61, 165).

12 Elizabeth Tayloe Lloyd’s only brother, John Tayloe III, was born several years after her marriage, in 1771. Edward IV and his wife received horses, including his winning racehorse Nancy Bywell, in partial payment of the marriage gift before John Tayloe II died. The remainder of the debt plus interest was not paid in full until Tayloe’s son and
The estate that John Tayloe III's guardians preserved included all of the deceased father's land and slaves. This was possible under Virginia law, which defined slaves as real property and allowed slaves to be attached to specific parcels of land.

Edward IV, on the other hand, could expect to lose two-thirds of his father's slaves to an estate division. This was for two reasons. In Maryland, slaves were defined as personal property and would be divided as such among heirs. Also, it was common in mid-eighteenth-century Maryland for planters' daughters to inherit slaves, with or without land.\(^\text{13}\)


\(^\text{13}\) Burnard, Creole Gentlemen, 151–53; Carr, "Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake," 168–69. In 1705, Virginia's legislature passed a law that defined slaves as real property. According to Virginia's 1705 law, if a property holder died intestate, his eldest son inherited all his slaves, on the condition that the son paid his siblings for the value of those slaves. In 1727, the Virginia colony passed a law that recognized the attachment of slaves to specific parcels of land, so that both land and slaves would pass along the intended line of descent (Brewer, "Entailing Aristocracy in Colonial Virginia"; Carr,
Peale’s portrait of Edward IV’s younger brother, Richard Bennett Lloyd (1750–1787), also communicates the sitter’s status by indicating his possession of a landed estate (Figure 20). Peale painted the portrait during the summer of 1771, when Richard turned twenty-one and came into his inheritance. As the younger son of Edward III, Richard inherited a substantial amount of land (by his brother’s beneficence) and a portion of his father’s personal estate, but unlike his elder brother he could not boast of the family seat in his portrait. Richard is shown alone, leaning against a plinth outdoors at a nonspecific, high-status dwelling, with an unidentified landscape in the background. In contrast to the park in his brother’s portrait, the landscape in Richard’s portrait, in which a river passes over rocks and alongside trees, does not bear signs of man’s improvement.

Richard was living in England when his father died, and he was about to return there after Peale painted this portrait. Richard arrived in America for the settlement of his father’s estate in late 1770. Richard’s participation in the estate division is not evident until December 1770, when all the family members met at Wye Plantation.14

In contrast to the portraits of the Lloyd brothers, Elizabeth and John Cadwalader’s family portrait by Peale highlights moveable wealth in an urban context (Figure 21).

---

14 Schmiegel comments that Peale typically painted landscapes specific to the sitters or at least taken from nature (“‘Encouragement Exceeding Expectation,’” 62). The scene represented in Richard Bennett Lloyd’s painting, however, has not been identified. Richard Bennett Lloyd was in England presumably for his education.
Elizabeth (1742–1776), the oldest child of Edward III and his only surviving daughter, married Cadwalader (1742–1786) in 1768. Best known for his service as a military officer under George Washington during the Revolutionary War, Cadwalader was a third-generation resident of Philadelphia. His father, Thomas Cadwalader, was a physician, and his mother, Hannah Lambert, was the daughter of a large landowner in New Jersey. For his education, Cadwalader attended the College of Philadelphia and conducted a Grand Tour of Europe. Neither he nor his younger brother pursued a profession. Instead, with capital provided by their father, John and Lambert Cadwalader began a dry goods importation firm in Philadelphia in 1763, when post-war demand for imported goods was high. The brothers closed the business in 1769, by which time Cadwalader had acquired, by marrying Elizabeth, an alternative source of income from plantations.  

At the time of their marriage, the Cadwaladers took over three plantations, which were mostly on land that Richard Bennett III had devised to Elizabeth and her sister: 1,213 acres in Talbot County to Elizabeth, and 1,733 acres in Kent County to Henrietta Maria, who died in or before 1750. Bennett directed in his will that if one of the sisters died, his gift to her was to revert to the surviving sister. Thus, Elizabeth inherited the land intended for Henrietta Maria. Bennett included in his bequests the slaves and livestock that were on that land at the time of his death. Presumably, then, some portion of the

seventy-five slaves on three plantations that Edward III conveyed in his marriage gift to the Cadwaladers descended from Bennett’s slaves.16

At Elizabeth’s marriage, Edward III gave the newlyweds two parcels of land that complemented Elizabeth’s inheritance from Bennett. In Talbot County, Edward III conveyed to the couple a parcel of 54 acres adjoining the two tracts that Bennett devised to Elizabeth. These three tracts made up Hammonds plantation. In Kent County, where the Cadwaladers had two plantations called Shrewsbury and Ward’s Gift, Edward III purchased 33 acres in 1768. Before his death, Edward III acquired 123 additional acres of the same tract, which he intended to give to Elizabeth.17

---

16 Richard Bennett III left to Elizabeth and her heirs forever two tracts in Talbot County called Bodwell’s Indian Neck (913 acres) and part of Carter’s Inheritance (300 acres). These were located, Bennett wrote, “on the Southern part of Wye River.” Edward III added Bennett’s Point (54 acres). An 1826 list of lands identifies Bennett’s Point as part of Hammonds plantation (Estate papers of various members of the Lloyd family, box 72, Lloyd Papers). Shrewsbury plantation was on a 1,733-acre tract in Kent County, south of Sassafras River, called Bennett’s Regulation that Bennett devised to Elizabeth’s sister, Henrietta Maria, and her heirs forever. Bennett stipulated in his will that in case of Henrietta Maria’s death, the land was to revert to her sister. In an unsigned and undated draft of a will, Edward III acknowledged that Richard Bennett III devised to his daughter Henrietta Maria “Certain Lands” with slaves and their increase, livestock, and tools, and that at her death, the land descended to the surviving sister but the personal estate did not and was vested in her father. Edward III, in the same document, confirmed his deed of gift to Elizabeth, at the time of her marriage, of the slaves at Shrewsbury plantation with their clothing and bedding, tools, and livestock (Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers).

17 The Legislative History Project at MSA notes Edward III’s gift of the 54 acres in Talbot County and 33 acres in Kent County to his daughter in 1768. John Cadwalader, in a letter to Edward IV of January 3, 1771, informed him that another man claimed the 123-acre property called Standaway that Edward III intended for the Cadwaladers. Cadwalader had already had slaves at work on the land, making ditches for a meadow (Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers). Edward IV later conveyed the 123-acre parcel to Cadwalader, as was his father’s intention (will of John Cadwalader, April 29, 1785, sealed March 11, 1786, and Edward Lloyd III’s draft of a will from 1770, both in Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers).
Clearly, Edward III, at the time of his daughter’s marriage, felt compelled to sacrifice little of his own landownership to augment his daughter’s inheritance of 2,946 acres from Bennett. The amount of land that Elizabeth inherited from Bennett was sufficient to qualify the couple as “elite” landholders in mid-eighteenth-century Maryland and to support Elizabeth if she became a widow. Bennett’s legacy to Elizabeth also allowed Edward III to reserve virtually all of his own land for his two sons, if he wished to do so. 18

Besides land, Elizabeth Lloyd Cadwalader brought slaves to her marriage. The seventy-five slaves were worth a third of Edward III’s marriage gift to the Cadwaladers, the total value of which was £10,000 in Maryland currency. In addition to slaves, livestock, and tools on the three plantations, Edward III gave the couple at the time of their marriage silver worth £427 sterling, a set of “enamel’d table china” valued at £27 sterling, and three house slaves named Sall (age 25), Nan (age 9), and Doll (age 13). For the remainder of the sum, Edward III provided £1,000 sterling in bills of exchange and £793 in cash. (To offer some points of comparison, Elizabeth Tayloe’s dowry, as noted above, was £2,000 sterling, or £2,660 in Maryland currency. Richard Bennett Lloyd, in

---

18 Elizabeth’s total of 2,946 acres from Bennett (including her sister’s portion), plus another 210 acres from her father, was well above the mean of 238 acres that eighteenth-century planters in Charles County left to their daughters according to a study by Jean B. Lee (“Parental Bequest Practices”, esp. 328). As was typical of other planters’ daughters’ experiences at mid-century, though, Elizabeth’s brothers received a far greater proportion of their father’s land than Elizabeth did. Possession of 2,200 acres approximately defines elite landholder status in mid-century Maryland; for references, see Chapter 3, note 9.

During the estate settlement of 1770, John Cadwalader contended privately with Edward IV that Edward III in fact intended to give his daughter more land after his death. In support of his view, Cadwalader cited an unsigned will of 1770, described below in note 33.
his marriage settlement of 1775, mortgaged his estate in Maryland of land, slaves, and livestock for £20,000 sterling, or £26,600 current money.\textsuperscript{19}

The newly married Cadwaladers established their principal plantation in Kent County, which was a convenient distance from the couple’s primary residence in Philadelphia. At the time, Kent County was a major producer of wheat for buyers in Philadelphia and Chestertown, the county seat. Cadwalader entered commercial farming at a propitious time, for in the late 1760s, prices for wheat and flour were high. A recent increase in demand for grain in southern Europe supplemented older markets for grain in the Caribbean. With outfitted plantations in Kent County from his wife’s family, plus his own connections to the mercantile community in Philadelphia, Cadwalader could expect to draw a reliable income from raising grain and livestock on the Upper Eastern Shore or renting out land and slaves to tenant farmers. An inventory of the marriage gift from 1768 shows that all three plantations produced wheat and corn. The smaller of the two Kent County plantations also raised spelt and rye.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{19} “A Chedule of Slaves Plate Jewels Money Stocks of Horses Cattle Sheep & Hogs & other Chattels the personal Estate of Elizabeth Lloyd,” August 21, 25, and 30, 1768, box 16, Cadwalader Collection, series 2; Richard Bennett Lloyd’s marriage settlement, July 22, 1775, in Miscellaneous Legal Documents, box 74, Lloyd Papers.

Despite Cadwalader’s new status as a planter, Peale depicted him in his family portrait, completed in the summer of 1772, without signs of landed wealth. Instead, Peale’s portrait of Cadwalader, his wife, and their newborn daughter highlights the family’s ties to the city. The portrait was one of five pictures that Cadwalader commissioned of Peale for the front parlor of their townhouse in Philadelphia. The other four portraits were of Cadwalader’s immediate family: his father, mother, younger brother, and the oldest of his five sisters.  

In the family portrait, Elizabeth Cadwalader is shown seated, alongside a high-style table that supports her infant daughter, Anne. Both female figures are on the left side of the canvas. Cadwalader, the only standing figure, dominates the right side of the canvas. He is depicted as if he has just come in from the outdoors, his active stance suggesting movement toward the center of the canvas, his feet apart, holding a peach in an outstretched hand for his daughter, and a walking stick at his side.

The portrait is suggestive of several aspects of the Cadwaladers’ life in Philadelphia. Moving across the canvas from left to right, the high-style mahogany table in the foreground of the portrait symbolizes Cadwalader’s status as a patron of the arts in crops at each of the three plantations. Shrewsbury plantation that year produced 900 bushels of wheat, valued at £225. Ward’s Gift produced 600 bushels and Hammonds’, 500 bushels. Shrewsbury also had the most livestock of the three plantations, with 152 head of cattle, 86 horses, and over 200 each of sheep and hogs. Cattle were important in grain farming as a source of manure and as draft animals. Horses, too, were draft animals. Surplus livestock and meat could be sold; in his will, Cadwalader directed that a portion of the “annual meat income” from Shrewsbury plantation support his widow.

the city. Commissioned locally, the table was part of a suite of furniture created specifically for the couple’s new townhouse. In 1769, Edward III had advanced £2,500 to Cadwalader for the purchase of an existing townhouse on Second Street in Philadelphia. From 1770 until 1772, the Cadwaladers made extensive improvements to the house, spending over £5,000 to construct outbuildings, to refinish the interior of the house, and to furnish it. In the process of creating the “highest expression of the rococo interior in the American colonies,” Cadwalader gave considerable patronage to Philadelphia craftsmen, whose invoices must have motivated Cadwalader to seek an immediate division of his father-in-law’s estate.22

The expensive clothing worn by the subjects in the painting offers a quick “read” on the family’s high social status. Perhaps no other element denotes the family’s urban situation as much as the attention to dress and the wealth spent on its consumption. Notable elements include the gold trim on Cadwalader’s coat, the several layers of delicate material in the dresses worn by Elizabeth and her daughter, and the jewels adorning the mother’s upper body and her fashionably high headdress. In comparison,

Elizabeth’s sister-in-law, Elizabeth Tayloe Lloyd, appears almost plain in Edward IV’s family portrait by Peale. 23

Lastly, Cadwalader’s standing pose denotes his position as the head of his household. Elizabeth and her daughter are both subordinate figures in the portrait’s composition; Elizabeth’s face looks upward toward her husband. The portrait gives visual expression to Elizabeth’s legal standing as a femme-covert during the division of her father’s estate.

The three portraits by Peale reflect the heirs’ different relationships to Lloyd family wealth and document their situations at a time of transition. Edward IV was the principal heir to his father’s extensive landed estate. His younger brother, Richard Bennett Lloyd, could not boast of possession of the family seat, but he did inherit “secondary” land on which to build his wealth. The Cadwalader family portrait, in contrast, emphasizes moveable wealth.

Though the portraits of Edward IV’s family and Cadwalader’s family display different personal backgrounds—one rural, the other urban—the two men’s interests converged in 1770 in their desire to improve a landed estate. Both men were in the process of establishing new and expanding households. Both men preferred to invest in

agriculture with slaves rather than in mercantile trade in order to provide their families with a long-term means of support.

Within several months of his father’s death, Edward IV became both the executor of his father’s will and administrator of his estate. This put him in the best possible position to exert control over the distribution of his father’s property. As the fifth master of Wye Plantation and a direct descendent of the plantation’s founder, Edward IV had an obligation to perpetuate the union of “name, family, and estate” for at least a generation. However, as his brother-in-law John Cadwalader would remind him, Edward IV had less authority over the division of his father’s personal estate than over his father’s real estate.

The Division of 1770

Edward IV’s first act in the administrative process was to prove his father’s will. In March 1770, Edward IV swore an oath, as his father’s “Eldest Son and Heir at Law,” that the document he submitted to the commissary general was the “whole only and true will of said Edward Lloyd that hath come to his Hands possession or knowledge.” Of the two men whom Edward III nominated in his will to be its executors, the one who survived declined the position of executor when the will was proved. The next in line to be executor was Edward IV, as his father’s elder son and next of kin. In a combination of his roles as elder son, heir at law, and executor of the will of 1751, Edward IV had the
power to distribute his father’s real estate among his siblings as he wished, with the exception of the tract reserved for his younger brother. 24

Within days of proving his father’s will, Edward IV obtained, in early April 1770, permission from the commissary general to proceed with the estate administration, including the division of the personal estate, without a formal appraisement, if the heirs could agree to a distribution. The commissary general’s decision implies that debts owed by Edward Lloyd III were small enough to be covered by his heir at law even after his personal estate was divided. Upon receipt of the letter of administration, Lloyd became the administrator of his father’s personal estate in addition to being the executor of his father’s will (and his father’s heir at law). As such, Edward IV was responsible for paying as well as collecting his father’s debts. He was obliged to fulfill any obligations his father had as executor or administrator to other men’s estates, including Richard Bennett III’s. In a legal sense, Edward IV assumed his father’s person. 25


25 Edward Lloyd to John Cadwalader, April 2, 1770, box 4, Cadwalader Collection, series 2; Vallette, *The Deputy Commissary’s Guide*, 118. Cadwalader later reflected, “I gave up my Right to the Administration” in the hope that Edward IV “would divide every thing immediately” (John Cadwalader to Edward Lloyd, August 30, 1770, Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers). According to Vallette, the “residuary legatee” had the “best title” to the letter of administration. Without the commissary general’s exemption, an inventory had to be made within three months of a person’s death (*The Deputy Commissary’s Guide*, 9–11).

As administrator, Edward IV was responsible for making an account of the debts that his father owed and were owing to him, with the end goal of distributing the “residue” of the personal estate among heirs. In his *Deputy Commissary’s Guide*, Vallette encouraged administrators to wait for twelve months after receiving their letter of administration before they distributed what remained of the personal estate among heirs after debts were paid. This measure was intended to reduce complications in case of future claims on the estate. But Vallette acknowledged that an heir’s “right to a
Because Richard Bennett Lloyd was in England in April 1770, Edward IV and Cadwalader initiated the process of dividing Edward Lloyd III’s personal estate into three equal shares. Later that month, Edward IV and Cadwalader signed a memorandum of their agreement on how the personal estate would be divided. The document, drawn up by Robert Goldsborough, a lawyer close to Edward IV’s age and from another prominent Talbot County family, broke down the personal estate into three categories: slaves; debts receivable in the form of bonds, bills of exchange, notes, and specialities (meaning, contracts under seal); and everything else (“all residue”).

By the terms of the April agreement, “all the Negroes belonging to the estate of” Edward III were to “be divided into three lots” of equal value. Each of the parties to the agreement was to “draw lots for the choice of the said negroes.” House slaves were granted the privilege of objecting to their allotment if they preferred to join another household among the three heirs: “if it should happen that any of the House servants or distributive share” began immediately upon an intestate’s death, and that, in practice, some deputy commissaries (who represented the commissary general’s office on the county level) allowed personal property divisions to begin within the twelve-month waiting period (The Deputy Commissary’s Guide, 48, 114).

One curiosity of the Lloyd estate division is that Elizabeth Lloyd Cadwalader and her husband received a full third share of her father’s personal estate in addition to Elizabeth’s marriage portion. In the colonial Chesapeake, it was commonplace for a daughter’s marriage portion to be considered an advance on her inheritance. Edward IV’s father-in-law, John Tayloe II, for example, considered his marriage gifts of £2,000 sterling in cash to each of his daughters to be the entirety of their inheritance from his estate (Vallette, The Deputy Commissary’s Guide, 114–15; Carr, “Inheritance in the Colonial Chesapeake,” 155; Lee, “Parental Bequest Practices,” 313–14, 330).

26 “Goldsborough, Robert (1740–1798)” in BDML, 1:363; memorandum of an agreement, April 25, 1770, Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers. Cadwalader considered Goldsborough “young and inexperienced” (John Cadwalader to Edward Lloyd, August 30, 1770, Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers). Richard Bennett Lloyd wrote a letter to Cadwalader from London on March 24, indicating his whereabouts at the time (box 4, Cadwalader Collection, series 2).
Negroes should prefer to go to that person who may not happen to get such House servant by Lot, then [that] Person to whom such unwilling servant may fall by Lot is to give up such servant to such person to whom such House servant may prefer to live with” upon payment of the value of the “unwilling servant.”

Lloyd and Cadwalader began with the last category of goods in the April agreement, the “residue” of the estate, which included store goods, ships, household furniture, plate, livestock, and plantation tools. The April agreement allowed the sale of “such household lumber and remnants or parcels of store goods as may be agreed” by Edward IV and Cadwalader “to be sold and disposed of” for the benefit of the estate, with the proceeds to be divided equally among the heirs.

Edward IV and Cadwalader then started to dismantle the mercantile business of Edward III. In April, they sold a ship, the Edward and Richard, including its cargo of 5,103 bushels of wheat and 2,800 bushels of corn, to a Philadelphia mercantile firm, Willing and Morris, for £2,961 current money. The ship, which sold for £1,000 out of the total purchase price, had a crew of ten sailors and a captain. As provisions merchants, Willing and Morris could use a ship of this size for voyages to the West Indies.

---

27 Wainwright cites a letter by Richard Bennett Lloyd (in the Cadwalader Collection) that suggests that some house slaves chose Cadwalader over himself (Colonial Grandeur in Philadelphia, 28). A similar arrangement was made in the articles of agreement dated October 10, 1772, for Cadwalader’s sale of Hammonds plantation to Edward IV. According to this agreement, Cadwalader would “sell and deliver to the said Edward Lloyd all such Negroes as are now on the premises, belonging to the said John Cadwalader, who shall choose or consent to be sold to the said Edward Lloyd.” The copy in the Lloyd Papers was signed by Cadwalader and two witnesses (Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71). See note 51 for other examples of slave owners granting house slaves the privilege of choosing a household.

28 Lloyd ledger, 1770–1774, records the sale of the ship to the firm of Thomas Willing and Robert Morris at an entry dated April 20, 1770 (box 14, volume 5, p. 200, Lloyd
The contents of Wye Plantation’s storehouses were the next items that Edward IV and Cadwalader addressed. Toward the end of July, Edward IV sent Cadwalader a list of “sundry goods, merchandize, and household furniture delivered [to] John Cadwalader” as part of his third portion of Edward III’s personal estate. Included on this list were hundreds of gallons of wine and spirits, large stores of perishable goods such as sugar, pork, and hogs lard, and common household goods such as cloth, tools, nails, and china.²⁹

---

²⁹ “List of Sundry Goods, Merchandise, and Household Furniture delivered John Cadwalader in part of his one thirds of the estate of Edward Lloyd III deceased,” July 25, 1770, box 71, Lloyd Papers. Day book entries of July 14, 1770, record Cadwalader’s and Edward IV’s shares of wine (box 15, volume 6, Lloyd Papers). The total value of the goods delivered to Cadwalader was £2,425.16.6 current money. “Sundry goods, wares, merchandise, household furniture, pork, wool, lard &c” went to Edward IV and his brother. Edward IV recorded under his own name, at an entry dated July 30, 1770, the value of his thirds plus Richard Bennett’s thirds, with a figure of £4,851.13.0 (Lloyd ledger, 1770–1774, box 14, volume 5, pp. 205, 230, Lloyd Papers). In an undated letter to his overseer William Gough, Cadwalader wrote, “All those Articles that are not worth dividing, we have agreed to pack up without an Invoice and deliver them immediately to Mr Lawrence to make the most of. We have finished the Brick Store & the great Store Loft” (box 16, folder 2, Cadwalader Collection, series 2). Thomas Lawrence auctioned goods from the Lloyd estate in Philadelphia in September 1770, the proceeds from which (£478) were divided among the heirs. The estate sold two schooners in 1770, the Rebecca and the Baltimore, for £80 and £35 respectively (Chapter 3, note 12). More goods were
Though this might seem a promising start to the division, Cadwalader accused Edward IV of injustice within several days of the inventory being made. Cadwalader composed a letter to his brother-in-law from a residence in close proximity to the Lloyd house to communicate what he felt he could not say out loud as a “Guest in your own House.” He objected to Edward IV’s claim of first choice over “all the household goods (amongst which there was a great deal of Lumber) and all the Remnants of Goods & other Articles in the Stores.” Cadwalader was incensed that Edward IV claimed first choice “in every thing” and attempted to pay him, Cadwalader, an equal value “in the very Rubbish and Lumber” that Edward IV “refused” to take for himself. “Did you ever see the emblematical figure of Justice?” Cadwalader continued. “She is truly represented with leaden feet and iron Hands—she moves slowly, but, when once she gets the Delinquent in her clutches, she never quits her Hold till full reparation is made.” Cadwalader closed his letter with a request that an outside party give “Judgment” on Edward IV’s claim to first choice.30

Two weeks later, an agent of Edward IV arrived at Cadwalader’s house in Philadelphia to retrieve the proceeds of the sale of the Edward and Richard and its cargo. Mr. Richardson brought with him a letter from Edward IV enclosing “a list of all the Bonds which are in my hands at present,” out of which Edward IV had selected one-third for himself and another third for Cadwalader. In his letter, Edward IV made no direct reference to Cadwalader’s dispute with his claim of first choice. Instead, Edward IV

sold at auction in Annapolis the next autumn, fetching £95 (Lloyd ledger, 1770–1774, entry dated October 1, 1771, box 14, volume 5, p. 235, I.Lloyd Papers).

30 John Cadwalader to Edward Lloyd, from “Mr. Grason’s,” July 30, 1770, Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers. Cadwalader mentioned the July division again in his letter to Edward Lloyd of August 30, 1770, in same.
offered to make changes to the list if Cadwalader made “any reasonable objection.”

Next, Edward IV suggested a method of bringing the estate division to a close. Both he and Cadwalader could choose an “indifferent person to value the remainder” of the estate, and when the two representatives do not agree, they can call in a third. “After which,” Lloyd wrote, “I propose paying you your third in Cash.”

Convinced that Edward IV was conspiring to deny him and his wife an equal portion of Edward III’s personal estate, Cadwalader wrote a lengthy reply in which he described the process of the estate division up to that time. “To prevent an appraisement, which would have been an almost endless Piece of Work, we came into an agreement to divide every thing in kind, equally,” Cadwalader recalled. He reminded Edward IV, “Your father repeatedly said...that he intended an equal division of his Estate between his children.” Yet, as both administrator and heir at law, Edward IV claimed privileges that made Cadwalader uneasy, such as first choice of the personal property. Cadwalader described the July inventory as “a Division of such articles as would have been a Loss to you, had you gone into an appraisement—such as the Wine & Remnants of Goods & almost all the Rubbish of the Estate—and then, to bring on a Dispute, you set up a claim that every honest man would blush to mention, that is, a right to the first choice in every

---

31 Edward Lloyd to John Cadwalader, August 13, 1770, recipient’s copy in box 4, Cadwalader Papers, series 2, and personal copy in Estate Papers of Edward III, box 71, Lloyd Papers. Lloyd’s letter continued, “the Stock Negroes Plate &c you will receive agreeable to valuation specifically.” If Cadwalader disapproved of the plan, Lloyd offered to “procure two Gentlemen of undoubted integrite to value the estate undivided and pay your third as the Law directs” (recipient’s copy). By the terms of the men’s April agreement, Cadwalader could not be given cash in lieu of slaves. The man who carried Edward IV’s letter to Philadelphia may have been William Richardson, Jr., of Dorchester County, “Late Factor” of Edward Lloyd III (Richardson to Cadwalader, Gilpin’s Point, September 3, 1772, folder 3, box 16, Cadwalader Papers, series 2; BDML, 2:679–80).
thing that was to be divided—How could this be a fair and equal Division?” To address the problem, Cadwalader proposed that all parts of the estate, not just the slaves, be divided by the drawing of lots. Fortune would level the playing field. 32

Cadwalader also accused Edward IV of “avarice” in the distribution of his father’s land. “Not satisfied with keeping all the Lands your Father intended for your Sister,” which “rented for £600 per annum,” Cadwalader noted in frustration that Edward IV omitted mortgages from the personal estate division. With support from his lawyer, Edward IV claimed mortgages as real, not personal, estate, because of the potential of foreclosure. If defined as real estate, the mortgages belonged to the heir at law.

Cadwalader, for his part, cited the “Opinion of very eminent Lawyers” that all mortgages not foreclosed in the lifetime of the deceased “were personal estate, and must be divided.” To press his claim, Cadwalader described mortgages in a more benign light as “Security for the Payment of a Sum of Money lent & the Interest,” not as potential land seizures. 33

32 John Cadwalader to Edward Lloyd, August 30, 1770, box 71, Lloyd Papers. By including bonds in the proposal to divide the remainder of the estate by lot, Cadwalader in effect rejected the list of divided bonds that Mr. Richardson had delivered earlier that month.

33 An unsigned draft of a will in the Lloyd Papers is dated January 1770 on page seven of eight pages (Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71). In this document, Edward III was more specific about the distribution of his land among his three children. He directed that his daughter Elizabeth, for example, was to have “all other Tracts or Parcels of land” in Kent County “not heretofore Given or Devised.” This amounted to several hundred acres. The draft continued, “All the rest and remainder of my Real Estate in wheresoever country and wheresoever it may lye To hold unto her the said Eliza. & her Heirs forever.” This is an unusual clause, given that Elizabeth had two brothers and the preceding pages of the draft enumerate only a third of Edward III’s total acreage. (Of the 13,500 acres noted in the 1770 draft, the parcels specified for Edward IV made up 7,319 acres, and those for his younger brother, 6,181 acres.) Edward III included in the 1770 draft the usual instruction that his personal property was to be divided equally among his children.
Cadwalader’s argument was, to some extent, laboring against a history of acquisitive practices by the Lloyd family and by Maryland’s credit-lending elite in general. With regard to mortgages, Edward III, for instance, had seized 8,000 acres in Dorchester County for nonpayment of a debt. His uncle, Richard Bennett III, had a reputation for foreclosing on mortgages, as Peale related in his autobiography: Bennett “amassed his immense wealth as the writer believes by lending out money on interest, and taking mortgages on lands as security, and if the Interest was not regularly paid, adding it to the principle & with accumulated interest swallowed up the property given in security.” Creditors did not necessarily keep the land that they seized in foreclosure; by selling it, they raised money for other investments.34

To make clear his suspicion that Edward IV was cheating him, Cadwalader threatened to withhold Edward IV’s portion of the money received for the sale of the ship Edward and Richard and its cargo, as long as Lloyd “unjustly” kept “my Property of much more value,” referring to the bonds and mortgages—though slaves were the next topic that Cadwalader addressed.

Notably, the 1770 draft named different executors than the proven will: Edward III’s only surviving brother, Richard Lloyd, and Cadwalader. Cadwalader used this knowledge in his letter to Edward IV of August 30, 1770: “Why was you so very anxious to administer, and alone too, when your Father, by leaving you out of the Executorship in his intended will, in Effect, declared he thought you unfit for it?” Cadwalader asserted that Edward III did not intend his son to be the executor of his will.

34 Legislative History Project biographical files, “Edward Lloyd, 1711–1770,” MSA; Lillian B. Miller, ed., The Selected Papers of Charles Willson Peale and his Family, 5 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983–2000), 5:148. Edward IV’s intention might not have been to keep the land he seized in foreclosure, but to sell it. Charles Carroll the Settler, for example, sold a portion of the 12,500 acres that he obtained by foreclosure (Hoffman with Mason, Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, 70–71). Edward IV, by the end of his life, sold much of his father’s land outside of Talbot County (BDML, 2:539; Legislative History Project biographical files, “Edward Lloyd, 1744–1796,” MSA).
An administrator’s delay in delivering slaves to heirs was a common complaint in estate settlements, Vallette relates in *The Deputy Commissary’s Guide*. In this case, Cadwalader complained to Edward IV, “You told me...that the Negroes could not be divided ‘till after Harvest, because Appraisers could not be had....After Harvest, I found you was determined not to divide ‘till the crop was finished.” Cadwalader tried to frighten Edward IV into a speedier division of slaves with the reminder that expensive autumn clothing disbursements were due: “The cold weather is advancing very fast, and if the Negroes should not be divided soon, there will not be Time to cloath them before the Winter—If you have any Humanity, you must feel for the Distresses of these poor Creatures. Remember, tho’ they are Slaves, they are your fellow Creatures.”

The stakes were high. The more than fifty slaves that Cadwalader could expect from the estate division, when combined with the seventy-five slaves of his wife’s marriage portion, would allow Cadwalader to expand agricultural production substantially and thereby generate a higher income. Furthermore, there were advantages in acquiring slaves from Wye, instead of purchasing slaves from other owners. The field hands who were removed to Kent County would be familiar with the mixed agriculture of the Eastern Shore, including the skills necessary for wheat farming. Cadwalader, lacking experience as a planter, relied on the practical knowledge of his slaves and his manager

---

35 Vallette, *The Deputy Commissary’s Guide*, 134–35. An administrator was obligated to maintain the value of an estate until it was distributed among heirs (ibid., 117–18). Cadwalader asserted that Lloyd neglected his duties as administrator when he traveled to Virginia for “five to six weeks” while “the Estate was suffering every Day for want of an Administration.” In a letter to Cadwalader dated April 2, Lloyd had announced his intention to travel to Virginia with his wife because his mother-in-law was in poor health (box 4, Cadwalader Collection, series 2). Morgan describes a typical clothing allocation in *Slave Counterpoint*, 125. See also Richard Bennett III’s will, which includes a list of clothing to be delivered to his slaves after his death.
for day-to-day operations. Also, slaves from Wye Plantation were likely to be known to one another and would move in family groups. All of these factors would ease their adjustment, and thus increase their productivity, when they arrived on Cadwalader's land. 36

Frustrated with Edward IV's assumption of privileges as both administrator and heir at law, Cadwalader expressed his dwindling trust in Edward IV's administration. "Some things you will divide, as, I suppose, it suits you best; others, according to Law—what Security have I that you will not alter your mode again," Cadwalader remarked in light of Edward IV's seemingly arbitrary decisions. Accusing Lloyd of not observing their mutual commitment to an equal division according to the terms of the April agreement, Cadwalader wrote forcefully to Lloyd, "You have forfeited your word, your Honour."

The division now reached an impasse. Cadwalader refused the bonds that Edward IV offered him. He also rejected Edward IV's offer of cash in lieu of the undivided

---

36 On the knowledge and skills required for grain and livestock farming in the colonial Chesapeake, see Lorena S. Walsh, "Slavery and Agriculture at Mount Vernon," in Slavery at the Home of George Washington, ed. Philip J. Schwartz (Mount Vernon, Va.: Mount Vernon Ladies Association, 2001), 47–77. When George Washington initiated a transition at Mount Vernon in the 1780s from a traditional mix of tobacco-corn-wheat crops to grain and livestock farming, it took time for his slaves to become accustomed to new tasks and routines. Washington's interest in the writings on agricultural improvement out of England compounded the difficulty. In 1793, Washington sought to replace a plantation manager who had formerly worked for John Cadwalader with another manager from Maryland's Eastern Shore because, Washington wrote, "there seems to be more large Estates cultivated altogether in the farming system there than in other parts of the Country" (George Washington to William Tilghman, July 21, 1793, Papers of George Washington, Library of Congress). See also Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 170–75, for a description of the labor requirements of grain and livestock farming in Tidewater Maryland and Virginia.
remainder of the estate. Edward IV, for his part, tenaciously hung onto his claim of first choice.

After receiving Cadwalader’s letter of complaint, though, doubt crept into the mind of Edward IV about whether he might lose his position as sole administrator of his father’s estate if Cadwalader made his concerns public. Could his letter of administration be revoked? Edward IV asked this and other questions of Daniel Dulany, a prominent lawyer in Maryland, in order to clarify his legal position in light of the April agreement with Cadwalader. Lloyd asked Dulany “whether as being Heir at law to his deceased Father & also as being Adm[inistrato]r he is not Intitled to his Priority or first choice in all such things as are not by this Agreement to be divided by Lott,” that is, all but the slaves. Phrasing his question differently, Lloyd asked whether Cadwalader could legally “compel” a division of the bonds by lot, a method that would deny Lloyd first choice. Lastly, Lloyd focused on the issue of slaves: “Could Mr Cadwalader claim a right of choice equally with Mr. Lloyd the administrator” in regard to slaves, or has not Lloyd a right to pay the other heir “what and how many Negroes [Lloyd] pleases so that he pays [Cadwalader] one full third part in value?” By choosing which slaves to give to Cadwalader, as long as their value amounted to one-third of the total value of the slaves, Edward IV could retain the most able hands for himself. Only a quarter of the enslaved at Wye in 1770 fell within the age range of prime hands; close to 40 percent were younger than age sixteen. This was the norm for a plantation of Wye’s size in the mid-
eighteenth century, but Edward IV sought the opportunity to shape a more efficient and productive workforce.37

Dulany’s response was largely sympathetic to Edward IV. Dulany dismissed Edward IV’s concern about retaining his position as administrator, recounting the law’s position that only if Edward IV was found “negligent” would his letter of administration be revoked. Dulany added that he considered the drawing of lots a “peculiar” method for dividing an estate apart from slaves. On the issue of bonds, Dulany believed that Cadwalader should have accepted the bonds that Edward IV offered (on the list carried by Mr. Richardson). But Dulany acknowledged that Cadwalader was not bound by the April agreement to do so, because of the potential difficulty of collecting on the debts that the bonds represented.

At the same time, Dulany corrected Lloyd’s claims about the authority of an heir at law. Dulany wrote, an “Heir at law is not intitled to any preference” in the distribution of the personal estate, but an administrator was, if the intention was an equal division.

Edward IV, as the administrator of his father’s estate, had forfeited his right to a first choice of slaves when he signed the April agreement. Had this agreement not been made, Dulany conceded, “I am of the opinion Mr Lloyd the administrator might pay Mr Cadwalader any Negroes so that the Negroes paid be one full share part in value.” Lloyd had tied his hands with the April agreement.  

With Dulany’s legal opinion in hand, Edward IV wrote to Cadwalader in a cool manner. Lloyd sought to regain the upper hand in the negotiations by presenting himself as a gentleman and a restorer of domestic harmony. He dismissed Cadwalader’s letter of August 30 as “a piece of mere Art and Craft, without which you might not hope to succeed so well in your Attempts to wound, or rather to ruin my Reputation” as a trustworthy gentleman. Lloyd struck at Cadwalader’s own reputation as a gentleman, calling Cadwalader’s letter “such a Piece as no good Man would have wrote.” “Personal Abuse, and foul Language, are, I think, unworthy of a Gentleman,” Lloyd continued. Suggesting that Cadwalader had lost the reasoned self-control that true gentlemen possessed, Edward IV chastised Cadwalader for giving in to his anger rather than seeking accommodation. Lloyd observed, “there appears scarce any thing but Heat without Light, & Rage without Reason” in Cadwalader’s letter of August 30.

Posturing as a man in control of his emotions, Lloyd made a bid to proceed with the estate division “in a quiet manner,” that is, privately and without public contest. He assured his brother-in-law that “it has ever been my Desire, to have the Estate divided” as

---

38 Daniel Dulany to Edward Lloyd, opinion, September 8, 1770, Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers.
39 Edward Lloyd to John Cadwalader, November 9, 1770, box 4, Cadwalader Collection, series 2. Lloyd’s personal copy of this letter, undated, is in the Estate Papers of Edward Lloyd III, box 71, Lloyd Papers.
the April "agreement directs." Lloyd refused Cadwalader's suggestion to divide the remainder of the personal estate by lot, citing the advice of a "sage eminent in the Law," a reference to Dulany, that "the agreement did not require any part of the Estate to be divided by lot, other than the Negroes." But, Lloyd continued, "having an Aversion, to Altercation, and perhaps, what may be worse, such as rude and ungentle expressions; I am desirous to get rid of it, as soon as possible, and hope you will attend here on the 20th of this month." With the appearance of composure, Edward IV expressed his willingness to reconcile their differences in order to proceed with the estate division.

**Christmas at Wye Plantation, 1770**

In late December, Edward IV, Cadwalader, and Richard Bennett Lloyd, who had arrived from England, met at Wye Plantation to divide what remained of Edward III's personal estate. (The participation of the eldest sibling, Elizabeth Lloyd Cadwalader, is undocumented.) On a private inventory of Wye Plantation and the Lloyd house, an heir's initials or lot number ("1", "2," or "3") was written on the line for each entry, including entries for individual slaves (Figure 22). The words "gamed for and won" appear beside the more valuable livestock, such as large bulls and English boars, and some household items (a portion of the china, a larger portion of the glassware, and a pair of silver candle snuffers).  

40 Cadwalader’s initials and signature, and not Elizabeth’s own, appear on the December 1770 estate division documents. Elizabeth may have been pregnant at the time and therefore stayed in Philadelphia; her child Anne, who appears in Peale’s portrait of Elizabeth and John Cadwalader, was born in 1771. (For Anne’s birth date, see Wainwright, *Colonial Grandeur*, i; and Sewell, “Charles Willson Peale’s Portraits of the Cadwalader Family,” 25.) In the document shown as Figure 22, Richard Bennett Lloyd’s lot number was “1”, Edward Lloyd’s was “2”, and John Cadwalader’s was “3.” Notably, the men did not gamble over slaves. On gambling as part of eighteenth-century
The account of the household goods gives a sense of the opulence of the Lloyd house interior. Richard and Cadwalader each obtained one-half of what must have been a magnificent pair of silver "branch candlesticks," which together were valued at £472 current money. Each candlestick was equal to the value of three prime male slaves, with money to spare for a youngster. Edward purchased a silver bread basket, valued at £89, from another of the heirs. A tea table worth another extravagant sum of £243 also came into Edward’s hands. This may have been the silver "table board" mentioned in another inventory. Silver was easily transportable and maintained its value. Of all the decorative arts in colonial America, notes Richard L. Bushman, “only silver led a double life, its use as money equaling its importance” as an art form.  

By December 28, the major decisions had been made regarding how Edward III’s personal estate would be divided equally among the heirs. The ship the Edward and Richard and its cargo were sold and proceeds of the sale at last divided; storehouses were rummaged through and unwanted goods disposed of; bonds were divided by lot; bills of exchange were distributed; and an inventory of the slaves, livestock, plantation tools, household furniture, and plate was drawn up and marked with either heirs’ initials or lot initials.

Chesapeake culture, see T. H. Breen, “Horses and Gentlemen: The Cultural Significance of Gambling among the Gentry of Virginia,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd series, 34 (1977): 239–57. Playing games of chance was a way to resolve disputes and to maintain honor in defeat.

41 The silver tableboard is recorded in the 1770 inventory of Wye Plantation in the Cadwalader Collection. Quotation from Richard L. Bushman, “The Complexity of Silver,” in Jeannine J. Falino and Gerald W. R. Ward, eds., *New England Silver and Silversmithing, 1620–1815* (Boston: The Colonial Society of Massachusetts, 2001), 2. Silver also memorialized family ties and displayed an owner’s lineage when engraved with family emblems. Edward III’s marriage gift to the Cadwaladers included silver engraved with the Lloyd coat of arms (1768 inventory, Cadwalader Collection, series 2). Appendix B offers a list of household furnishings in 1770, based on private inventories in the Lloyd and Cadwalader family papers.
numbers. Here, the written documentation of the heirs’ role in the division largely ends. Meanwhile, for the enslaved people at Wye Plantation, the experience of the division shifted from one phase—uncertainty about its outcome—to the next, the division itself. 42

"Uneasiness and Confusion": The Estate Division among the Slaves

Edward IV may have delayed the division of slaves in the late summer of 1770 not just to have as many hands as possible for harvest but also to forestall major disruption to plantation routines. Nonetheless, the dispersal of slaves devastated quarter communities. Based on later testimony, field hands protested their deteriorated living conditions.

The division of the 174 slaves belonging to Edward Lloyd III among his three children occurred at a time when the plantation was not well managed. The division thus compounded an already difficult situation from the slaves’ point of view. The clerk of Wye Plantation at the time, Charles Gardiner, testified later to the uneasiness and confusion amongst the Familys of Negroes owing altogether to the damaged State they were left in by their old Master [Edward Lloyd III], and not knowing who was to be their Master in the future as they were to be divided by Lots No. 1, 2 & 3.

After the estate division was made (already eleven long months after the death of Edward Lloyd III), there was “discontent” among the slaves who stayed with

---

42 Entries in the Lloyd ledger of 1770–1774, p. 230, indicate that bonds were divided by lot in late December (box 14, volume 5, Lloyd Papers).
the present Colo. Lloyd [which] continued amongst them for two Years at least—during which Time the strictest Authority was obliged to be carried over them to prevent their rebelling against their Master and his Authority.

The division of resources put additional strain on the already stressful conditions on the plantation in 1770. Scarcer resources lowered the quality of life for everyone, and this affected profits:

the Division of the Hands and [Live]Stock, and the Discontent of a Number of the People, was the sole Cause of very indifferent Crops made on said Farms and of course must make worse living for the Negroes…there was nothing but a continual Expense in settling the farms and no profit arising therefrom for the first Two or three years after the present Colo. Lloyd took possession of his Estate.

When material conditions improved, the unrest diminished: “As soon as things came to be changed for the better, Order returned amongst the People.”43

A more detailed picture of the slaves’ experience in the estate division, specifically the identification and treatment of family groups and the division’s impact on slave quarter communities, can be pieced together from the estate division papers and other documents in the Lloyd Papers.44

43 Certificate of Charles Gardiner, in “Treatment of Slaves, 1793,” box 73, Lloyd Papers. Russo suggests that conditions at Wye must have deteriorated during the last few years of Edward Lloyd III’s life, judging from Gardiner’s testimony (“A Model Planter,” 68). In his August 30, 1770, letter to Edward IV, Cadwalader observed that Wye’s slaves were in “miserable condition for want of clothing.” Gardiner’s testimony was one of several certificates that Edward Lloyd IV produced in 1793 from his former and current employees to defend himself against a charge by a local parson that Lloyd treated his slaves inhumanely. In the testimony cited here, Gardiner justified his use of severe physical punishment at a time of stress on the plantation.

44 I am indebted to Jean B. Russo for providing me with a list of slaves by name and quarter during Edward IV’s period of ownership, to supplement my research in the Lloyd Papers.
Consistent with the April 1770 agreement between Edward IV and Cadwalader to divide the slaves into three lots of equal value, a surviving list of slaves shows the numeral 1, 2, or 3 beside each individual slave’s name (Figure 22). Each numeral represented a specific heir. The slaves were listed first by quarter, and second by family group. The person who wrote the list, likely the clerk of the plantation, did not make note of family members or extended kin who lived on other quarters of the same large plantation, which hinders identification of families or kin networks that stretched beyond a single quarter.

To understand the experience of the division among slaves, a profile of the slave population of Wye Plantation in 1770, based on the estate division inventory, is necessary. Wye had close to equal numbers of enslaved adult men and women, as we would expect to see on a large Chesapeake plantation of the mid-eighteenth century. As mentioned above, more than one in three of the enslaved at Wye were younger than sixteen years of age. The slave force was mostly dedicated to raising the plantation’s principal crops of tobacco, corn, and wheat and to tending livestock. Wye had a minimal number of enslaved skilled workers: four carpenters, including one ship carpenter, four sailors, two coopers, a wheelwright, a blacksmith, a joiner, and at least four house servants. Over a third of the slaves lived at “home house,” where the Lloyds’ great house was. The hundred or so other slaves lived on six outlying quarters. 45

---

45 Walsh, From Calabar to Carter’s Grove, 136–45. In Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland, Hoffman offers a profile of the 386 slaves belonging to Charles Carroll of Annapolis according to age and sex in 1773. One-third of Carroll’s slaves lived at the home house quarter, too (250–52). Edward IV, like his father, preferred to hire skilled craftsmen rather than to remove his slaves from field work (Russo, “A Model Planter”). This was the traditional use of slave labor in Talbot County. On the local labor market for
Large estates, compared to small plantations, provided more favorable conditions for slaves to develop and sustain communities based on residence and kin networks. Edward Lloyd III had been master of Wye Plantation for nearly four decades, during which time he accumulated land and slaves. The last major influx of slaves occurred in 1749–1750, when Edward III inherited the residue of Richard Bennett III’s personal and real estate. Given this recent history of stability, the division of slaves between the Lloyd family heirs introduced a new degree of uncertainty about the future.

The recognition of families among the slaves was the one acknowledgment that the heirs made of the field hands’ humanity during the division. Larger slave owners in late-eighteenth-century Maryland and Virginia generally preferred that slaves move in free skilled workers, see Russo, “Free Workers in a Plantation Economy, Talbot County, Maryland.” Two Virginia slave owners, John Tayloe III and Thomas Jefferson, were less opposed to training and maintaining enslaved artisans at their plantations (Dunn, “After Tobacco: The Slave Labor Pattern on a Large Chesapeake Grain-and-Livestock Plantation”; Lucia C. Stanton, “‘Those Who Labor for my Happiness’: Thomas Jefferson and His Slaves,” in Jeffersonian Legacies, ed. Peter S. Onuf [Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1993], 147–80).

46 Charles Carroll of Annapolis was another planter who accumulated slaves on a large estate. Carroll, having no major debts and only one heir, offered his slaves better chances for community stability than most Chesapeake planters did (Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves, 359–71; Mary Beth Norton, Herbert G. Gutman, and Ira Berlin, “The Afro-American Family in the Age of Revolution,” in Slavery and Freedom in the Age of the American Revolution, ed. Ira Berlin and Ronald Hoffman [Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1983], 175–91). Scholarship in Chesapeake history suggests that the majority of slaves on Wye Plantation at this time would have been born on American soil and would be starting to have families of their own. Persons born in Africa were now elderly. Social conditions favoring a more stable family life had been improving in the Chesapeake region since mid-century, though given their status as property, “no slave family could ever feel secure” (Morgan, Slave Counterpoint, 499 [quote], 502–11; Jean B. Lee, “The Problem of Slave Community in the Eighteenth-Century Chesapeake,” William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd ser., 43 (1986): 333–61). See Walsh, From Calabar to Carter’s Grove, chapter 5, for a rich discussion of the cultural implications of a creole slave majority on a Virginia plantation. One of the African minority at Wye in the early 1790s was a runaway named Jack (advertisement, Maryland Herald and Eastern Shore Intelligencer [Easton], November 20, 1792).
family groups when they were transferred to new owners by sale or inheritance. Slave owners considered themselves "humane" for recognizing slave families in the transfer of property, but there were practical incentives as well. Owners recognized that family groups offered a measure of social stability for slaves and an inducement to remain on the plantation, which in turn made for a more reliable workforce. Birth rates were another consideration. Chesapeake planters at this time preferred to rely on natural increase to grow their enslaved workforce, rather than to participate in the African slave trade as their forefathers had.\footnote{Brown, \textit{Good Wives, Nasty Wenches, and Anxious Patriarchs}, 358–60; Walsh, \textit{From Calabar to Carter's Grove}, 41; Morgan, \textit{Slave Counterpoint}, 60–62; Norton, Gutman, and Berlin, \textit{"The Afro-American Family in the Age of Revolution"}, 184–85. For a contemporary example of the recognition of family groups by a large plantation owner in Maryland, see Hoffman, \textit{Princes of Ireland, Planters of Maryland}, 251–52. Richard Bennett III’s will of 1749 asked the executor, Edward III, to keep slave families together as much as possible during the dispersal of his estate: “I do recommend and order that the Families shall go together.” C. A. Cody used records of an estate division to identify family groups in \textit{“Naming, Kinship, and Estate Dispersal: Notes on Slave Family Life on a South Carolina Plantation, 1786 to 1833,” William and Mary Quarterly}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ser., 39 (1982): 192–211. Low-country planters were more likely to retain family groups than their Chesapeake counterparts, Morgan observes in \textit{Slave Counterpoint}, 516–19.}

At Wye Plantation in 1770, the majority (65%) of the slaves who lived and worked on the six outlying plantations, away from the Home House plantation, were recorded as members of family groups. A much smaller proportion of the slaves who lived at Home House (about one-third) lived with recognized families. This discrepancy suggests a higher rate of alienation from families among Home House residents.

More than half of the recorded family groups (57%) at Wye Plantation were adult women with children. Chesapeake slave owners commonly defined slave families along matrilineal lines. Another third (36%) of the recorded family groups were husband-and-
wife couples, most with children but some without. There were also a few recognized
groups of adult men with children (two out of twenty-eight groups).\textsuperscript{48}

For a glimpse of the division’s impact on slave quarter communities, consider, for
eexample, the experience at White House plantation. Out of the twenty-eight slaves who
resided here in 1770, only seven remained after the division. Five of these seven people
were Violet, age thirty-five, and her four children, who were ages thirteen and younger.
Violet and her children made up one of six recognized family groups at this quarter.
Fortunately for Violet, the probable father of at least one of her children was allotted to
the same owner, Edward Lloyd. Violet’s son had the same first and last name as Jack
Cole, the wheelwright who lived at Home House. The practice of naming sons after
fathers seems to have been a hallmark of artisan families in the Chesapeake, which lends
support to the notion that Violet was the spouse of Jack Cole the wheelwright.\textsuperscript{49}

Violet experienced mixed fortunes from the Lloyd estate division: a mother of
several children, she was able to stay in the vicinity of her husband, but she lost the
company of the twenty-one people with whom she lived at the White House quarter. One
White House family whose company Violet lost was another female-headed group:
Rachel Pepper, age forty-five, with Sall Pepper (perhaps her daughter), age twenty-three,

\textsuperscript{48} Of course, how the clerk defined a family group was not necessarily how the slaves
themselves would have defined their families. Extended kin networks were important in
the day-to-day lives of the enslaved. Aunts and uncles, grandmothers and cousins, all
could be called on for help and support during a person’s life. Anthropologist and Talbot
County native Shepard Krech shows African Americans’ continued reliance on extended
kin networks into the twentieth century on the Miles River Neck, Talbot County, in his
oral history, \textit{Praise the Bridge that Carries You Over: The Life of Joseph L. Sutton}

\textsuperscript{49} Walsh, \textit{From Calabar to Carter’s Grove}, 169; Hoffman with Mason, \textit{Princes of
Ireland, Planters of Maryland}, 251–52.
and two children, Jim and Joe, who also had the surname “Pepper.” All were allotted to John Cadwalader and were forcibly removed to the Lloyd-Cadwalader plantations in Kent County, where their names appear in Cadwalader’s probate inventory fifteen years later.\(^{50}\)

The Pepper family story exemplifies the powerlessness of the field hands—the majority of Wye Plantation’s slaves—in the Edward Lloyd III estate division. The Lloyds’ house slaves, on the other hand, had the privilege of requesting reassignment to an owner whom they preferred. This was, perhaps, an implicit acknowledgment by the heirs of the psychological toll of a forced move and a new owner. The granting to slaves of “some latitude in choosing their new owner” was “rare” in the eighteenth century, but there are other documented occurrences. For the Lloyd heirs, it would serve much the same purpose as keeping field hands’ and artisans’ families together during the division: reduce rancor and promote harmony in each of the heir’s reconstituted households. However difficult it was for later eighteenth-century Chesapeake gentry to achieve their ideal of domestic harmony on an everyday basis, the appearance of a well-ordered household for guests was important to the head of household’s reputation.\(^{51}\)

\(^{50}\) The probate inventory of John Cadwalader’s estate in Kent County lists Jim Pepper, age 22, Joe Pepper, shoemaker, age 18, Rachell Pepper, age 52, Sall Pepper, age 36, and additional children of Rachell and Sall who were born after 1770 (taken March 20, 1786, Inventories, Kent County, box 38, folder 57, MSA).

\(^{51}\) Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint*, 512–13 (quote); Lee, “The Problem of Slave Community,” 356. Bayly Ellen Marks mentions that the practice of house slaves choosing a master existed in St. Mary’s County, Maryland, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, but she does not elaborate in her text (“Economics and Society in a Staple Plantation System: St. Mary’s County, Maryland, 1790–1840,” Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 1979), 162, n92. Colonel Landon Carter of Sabine Hall, Virginia, in his will of 1770, granted two of his house slaves the privilege of choosing,
Both the anticipation of the estate division for nearly a year after Edward Lloyd III's death and the division itself had profound, destabilizing effects on the quarter communities at Wye Plantation. Edward IV retained only a third of his father's slaves outright. Over the next several years, he took measures to rebuild Wye Plantation's slave force up to its pre-division size. In 1772, Edward IV purchased Hammonds plantation with its seventeen slaves from his sister and brother-in-law. By 1774, Edward IV acquired, apparently by purchase, over one hundred additional slaves. Though the influx of slaves must have added to the confusion of these first few years of Edward IV's ownership of Wye Plantation, the additional labor helped to return the plantation to something like status quo.52

Portraits of the Heirs Reconsidered

Edward IV strove for continuity during the estate division of 1770. Upon proving his father's will, Edward IV inherited the bulk of his father's land. He pressed for first choice in the division of his father's personal estate, including its slaves. Edward IV's family portrait by Peale, painted in the summer after the division, reflects the intention of the new master of Wye Plantation to keep "name, family, and estate" together. In the picture, Edward IV's figure is the physical connection between the ancestral estate,

each Christmas, one of his children's households to live in (Isaac, Landon Carter's Uneasy Kingdom, 322).

52 The estate papers of Edward Lloyd III document Edward IV's purchase of Hammonds plantation from Elizabeth and John Cadwalader (box 71, Lloyd Papers). According to Russo's research, the slave population at Wye Plantation grew over 200 percent between 1771 and 1774. Edward IV started with 59 slaves from the division in December 1770. Three years later, he had approximately 250 slaves. Given the sudden increase, Russo posits that Edward IV purchased slaves. The Lloyd Papers do not document the source of these slaves ("A Model Planter," 78–79).
symbolized by the image of the mansion house in the background, and his own heirs, represented by his daughter.

At the same time, the portrait’s theme of domestic harmony belies the rocky start to Edward IV’s mastery of Wye Plantation. Cadwalader was vigilant of his brother-in-law’s conduct during the estate division and objected to Edward IV’s arbitrary exercise of authority. Slaves’ uncertainty about their future and the diminishment of plantation resources resulting from the division hurt profits. Edward IV may have learned important lessons about how to lead as a head of household; the ease that he exhibits in his portrait was not altogether natural or unassumed.

From this time forward, Edward IV would increasingly rely on Wye Plantation’s agricultural production for his income. As he began to do in 1770 with Cadwalader’s aid, Edward IV over the next several years disposed of his father’s outlying stores and other mercantile assets. Unlike his father, he did not hold an office of profit in the proprietary government. Nor did he follow his father’s wealth strategy of land accumulation. By 1783, Edward IV had sold approximately 17,000 acres of the land that he inherited, mostly outside of Talbot County. As Jean B. Russo has demonstrated, Edward IV increased agricultural output at Wye Plantation through improved management techniques, and he demonstrated a willingness to adapt to changing market conditions. By the end of his life, Edward IV was more dependent on agriculture with slaves for his income than any former owner of Wye Plantation.53

53 Russo, “A Model Planter”; BDML, 2:538; Legislative History Biographical Files, “Edward Lloyd, 1744–1796,” MSA. In 1776, Edward IV sold to William Hemsley the sloop Betsy for £800 and Wye Mill for £1,000 (Lloyd ledger, 1770–1791, box 14, volume 3, p. 27, Lloyd Papers). By 1780, Edward IV removed himself from the business of his
Richard Bennett Lloyd, Edward III’s younger son, also inherited the status of a landed gentleman, and his portrait by Peale commemorates his recent coming of age. Richard acquired one-third of his father’s total acreage, or over nine thousand acres, in three counties on the Eastern Shore. His older brother provided him with three times as much land as their father’s will of 1751 directed, thereby supplying Richard with an ample means of support.54

Unlike his older brother, though, Richard did not stay in Maryland to personally oversee his plantations. Richard returned to England in the fall of 1771, possibly to continue his education. Soon after landing in England, Richard confessed to John Cadwalader his “mad raging passion” for military life. In 1773, Richard purchased an ensign’s commission in the Coldstream Guards. Two years later, he married an English beauty, Joanna Leigh of the Isle of Wight, and resigned from the British army. Richard mortgaged his Maryland property to finance the marriage settlement.55

Richard Bennett Lloyd inherited 3,218 acres in Talbot County, 3,111 acres in Queen Anne County, and 3,352 acres in Kent County. His marriage settlement, cited above, names each tract and its acreage. Seventy percent of the land (6,678 acres out of the total 9,681 acres) was formerly Bennett’s property.54 Richard Bennett Lloyd to John Cadwalader, London, November 8, 1772, box 4, Cadwalader Collection, series 2 (quote); Schmiegel, “‘Encouragement Exceeding Expectation’,” 64–66. Joshua Reynolds painted a portrait of Joanna Leigh Lloyd in 1775 (David Mannings, Sir Joshua Reynolds, A Complete Catalogue of his Paintings [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000], 81, 309). Richard Bennett Lloyd’s commission is documented in Daniel MacKinnon, Origin and Services of the Coldstream Guards, 2 vols. (London, 1833), 1:490. Another member of the Coldstream Guards was Robert Eden, governor of Maryland from 1768 to 1776 (ibid., 1:488; BDML, 1:299–300). Given the Lloyd family’s high profile in the colony, Eden may have assisted Richard Bennett Lloyd in securing his commission.

father’s stores in Queenstown, Wye Mill, and Wye Town (Russo, “A Model Planter,” 67). The reasons why Edward IV sold most of the land that he inherited outside of Talbot County have not been identified.54
When the Revolutionary War broke out, Richard and his wife remained overseas. After a stay in France in 1778, where they were acquaintances of Benjamin Franklin, the couple returned to England in 1779 and Richard began to make inquiries on how to travel to Maryland to look into his financial affairs. He and his wife arrived in Maryland via New York in 1781. Six years later, Richard died at Bennett’s Point, on the “Bennett” side of Wye River; his wife Joanna was in London at the time.  

The unimproved landscape in the background of Richard’s portrait by Peale hints at his lack of personal interest in plantation management. As a second son, Richard Bennett Lloyd was, in a sense, more free than his brother to pursue his fortunes in England. Richard used his Maryland property as a source of income to purchase a

---

56 Leonard W. Labaree and others, eds., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin*, 38 volumes to date (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959–), 26:343; 27:21, 28; 28:598; 29:301–303, 429–30; 31:350–51; 32:86. Richard Bennett Lloyd wrote a codicil to his will in 1784 at his home at “Bennett’s Point,” Queen Anne’s County (will of Richard Bennett Lloyd, 1787, Queen Anne’s County Wills, box 8, folio 32, MSA). In July 1785, Richard Bennett Lloyd’s close relatives, James and Henry Hollyday (their father was the son of Sarah Covington Lloyd and her second husband, James Hollyday), exchanged nervous letters about Richard Bennett Lloyd’s despondency and reputation for drinking, after Richard’s wife sought refuge at Wye House following a domestic dispute. The couple apparently reconciled after a few days (Hollyday Family Papers, Ante-bellum Southern Plantation Records, Series D, MS 1317, roll 3, frames 603–621). But tension in the marriage may have prompted Joanna’s return to London with her daughter, leaving behind two sons. In a letter from London dated April 6, 1787, James Eames, John Strachan, and others wrote to Edward Lloyd on behalf of Richard Bennett Lloyd’s wife and family, whom Richard “has in a manner totally abandoned” (box 40, Lloyd Papers). Joanna was in London when Richard Bennett Lloyd died later that year (Edward Lloyd to Joanna Lloyd, September 26, 1787, in same). Richard Bennett Lloyd’s land agent at the time was James Hindman, who married Richard’s cousin, Marion Anderson, daughter of Rebecca Lloyd and William Anderson of London. Hindman made his home at Bennett’s Point (Hindman to Edward Lloyd, September 23, 1798, in same). Peale was under the impression that Hindman lived in the house formerly occupied by Richard Bennett III (Miller, ed., *Selected Papers of Charles Willson Peale and his Family*, 5:148).
commission in the British army, to marry a resident of England, and to live abroad. Financial difficulties carried him “home” earlier than he had hoped.

John Cadwalader had spent time abroad as well, but in 1770, he had a young family to support in his home city, Philadelphia. His family portrait by Peale from 1772 depicted the Cadwaladers’ moveable wealth, including visual references to the young couple’s recent furnishing of their Philadelphia townhouse. But the plantations that Elizabeth brought to the marriage were important to the family over the long term. Elizabeth, the oldest of the Lloyd siblings, received no more land than what she and her husband acquired at the time of their marriage, but the couple did receive an equal share of the moveable wealth. As noted above, Elizabeth and John Cadwalader sold Hammonds plantation in Talbot County to Edward IV in 1772. It was easier for them to travel to their remaining land in Kent County. Cadwalader was first elected to represent Kent County in the Maryland Assembly in 1777, an indication of his social presence there as well as his property ownership. Cadwalader spent more time at Shrewsbury plantation after Elizabeth’s death in 1776 and his retirement from military service in 1778. His will confirmed the plantation’s descent through Elizabeth to his three daughters by her. 57

57 Will of John Cadwalader; Bourne, Historic Houses of Kent County, 239–41. Cadwalader did not attend the Maryland Assembly in 1777, and he resigned his seat the following year. He was re-elected, though, in 1780 and held the seat for four years (BDML, 1:183). Demonstrating an interest in farming, Cadwalader was a founding member of the Philadelphia Agricultural Society in 1785 (Lucius F. Ellsworth, “The Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture and Agricultural Reform, 1785–1793,” Agricultural History 42 [1968], 189–99). According to Wainwright, Cadwalader had difficulty maintaining the Philadelphia house after the Revolutionary War. The house was sold out of the family after his death and demolished in the 1810s (Colonial Grandeur in Philadelphia, 68, 76; Jack L. Lindsey, “The Cadwalader Family during the Nineteenth Century,” Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin, vol. 91, nos. 384–85 [1996], 35).
Conclusion

The death of Edward Lloyd III in January 1770 ushered in a stressful period at Wye Plantation. Heirs negotiated the division of his personal property for nearly a year. Meanwhile, the slaves were uneasy about how the division would impact their lives. Living conditions were already difficult before the division broke up quarter communities and diminished plantation resources.

Edward IV took on multiple roles upon the death of his father. As the older son, he was his father’s heir at law, the new head of household, and the next master of Wye Plantation. He pursued the positions of executor and administrator of his father’s estate, in an effort to control its distribution among heirs. Edward IV was responsible for ushering the family’s home plantation to the next generation without loss and, if possible, with improvements.

By combining written and visual evidence, this chapter demonstrates the tension surrounding a transition in plantation ownership. Peale’s portrait of Edward IV and his family represents domestic harmony on a landed estate passed from one generation to the next. During the actual process of inheritance, Edward IV faced contests of his authority and negotiated in order to sustain the connection between family, property, and power.
CONCLUSION

The profits generated by commercial agriculture in the English empire in America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and the decentralization of political authority within that empire, reinforced the development of a planter elite in Maryland. Many of Maryland's elite planters resided year-round at their home plantations and depended on planting for wealth and social position. The histories of these home plantations reflect changing family strategies that were intended to optimize the owners' positions in the colony as political and economic conditions changed.

In this decentralized "agricultural-commercial empire," David Hancock observes, individuals, not the English government, forged the commercial networks that brought raw agricultural products to market and supplied colonists with manufactured goods to meet their "personal and business needs." Hancock's observation also applies to politics: With little interference from England's government, individuals created the political networks along which power flowed. Wye Plantation's history exposes the Lloyd family's use of specific commercial and political networks in colonial Maryland to advance the family's interests.¹

In the seventeenth century, the Lloyd family developed important ties to Lord Baltimore and the Bennett family of Virginia and Maryland. In 1632, King Charles I granted extensive authority over the Maryland colony to the second Lord Baltimore and his heirs forever. The Lords Baltimore, in turn, governed their colony through a patron-

¹ Hancock, ""A World of Business to Do'," 3–5.
client system. Throughout the colonial period, proprietary patronage offered exclusive access to wealth and power in Maryland.

The Lords Baltimore preferred to govern through kin, but they also drew investment in the colony and support for their government with offers of land. Land was a powerful incentive for investors because agriculture was the principal means of generating wealth in the colonial Chesapeake. (If the grantee chose not to use the land that he acquired, he could sell or lease it to other planters.) In addition, land ownership was a traditional marker of status in England.

The proprietor also attracted investors by providing religious freedom. The decentralized nature of authority in the English American empire made this possible: Maryland’s charter gave Lord Baltimore considerable latitude in the creation of the colony’s political infrastructure. Using the “supreme” power granted to him by the king, the second Lord Baltimore avoided the establishment of the Church of England and thereby provided freedom of worship to Roman Catholics, as well as to Protestant dissenters.

Edward Lloyd I was one of Maryland’s Protestant adventurers of the 1640s, 1650s, and 1660s who were willing to invest in the colony and pledge their loyalty to Baltimore and his government in exchange for access to land and religious freedom. Edward I’s nonconformity with the official beliefs and practices of the Church of England had put him into legal trouble in Virginia and severely limited his opportunities for advancement there. Edward I arrived in Maryland in 1649 with several hundred other Protestant settlers from Virginia. Shortly after joining the governor’s council in 1658, Edward I obtained a patent for nearly 8,000 acres on the Eastern Shore, where he
established Wye Plantation. Edward I did not stay in Maryland, however. Following the seventeenth-century model of the successful colonial merchant, Edward I returned to England in 1668, but he remained invested in the plantation. Eighteen years after his departure, for example, he and a business partner owned 20 percent of the plantation’s workforce.

The marriage of Edward I’s son, Philemon Lloyd, to Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett in 1669 helped to make Wye Plantation a successful business venture, in two ways. The union strengthened Lloyd family access to Lord Baltimore’s patronage by providing kinship ties to Maryland’s Catholic gentry. In addition, Henrietta Maria, through her former marriage into the Bennett family, brought to Wye Plantation considerable wealth and valuable commercial connections to London.

Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett was the daughter of James Neale, an English-born Catholic gentleman who obtained a 2,000-acre manor in Maryland during the first decade of its existence. Because the second and third Lords Baltimore favored Maryland’s Catholic gentry in the distribution of offices, the marriage improved the Lloyd family’s long-term prospects in the colony.

Henrietta Maria was also the widow of Richard Bennett II, another of Maryland’s Protestant investors in the 1640s, 1650s, and 1660s. Richard Bennett II was the only son of Richard Bennett I of Virginia, a merchant and planter whom Parliament commissioned in 1652, along with several other men, to govern Virginia and Maryland. Following a brief stay at Harvard College, Richard Bennett II acquired land in Maryland and married Henrietta Maria. Their son, Richard Bennett III, with his inherited wealth and connections, was a major merchant and planter in Maryland by his early thirties in 1700.
Wye Plantation became a joint Lloyd-Bennett enterprise as a result of the marriage between Philemon Lloyd and Henrietta Maria (Neale) Bennett. After Philemon died in 1685, the Bennett and Lloyd family estates remained intermingled during the twelve years of Henrietta Maria Lloyd’s second widowhood and then, after her death, into the early 1700s. The delayed inheritances of Henrietta Maria’s sons, as suggested by the timing of their marriages following their mother’s death, extended this connection as long as practicable. Large-scale agricultural production, made possible by the pooling of family resources, boosted profits. A plat made for “Madam Henrietta Maria Lloyd” from 1695 shows the numerous parcels that made up Wye Plantation at the time. It also shows the Catholic chapel that Henrietta Maria maintained through her personal wealth (Figures 12 and 15). After she died, Richard Bennett III, who married into a household near Wye Plantation across the Wye River, used the considerable financial resources at his disposal through the Bennett family to provide stability to the plantation while his mother’s and Edward Lloyd I’s estates were being settled in the late 1690s and early 1700s.

By the time Edward Lloyd II gained control of Wye Plantation, the political partnership between Protestants and Catholics in Maryland, which the second Lord Baltimore had done much to encourage, had come undone. Following a rebellion against the proprietary government in 1689 and the establishment of direct rule by the crown the following year, Maryland’s Protestant-led government barred Catholics from public offices and “places of trust,” such as on juries and in the militia. The crown, too, restricted its patronage to Protestants.

During the twenty-five years that Maryland was under crown rule, the colony’s royal governors were wary of the Catholic presence in the colony. England fought two
wars against France, Europe’s strongest Catholic power, during this time.

Furthermore, the third Lord Baltimore continued to grant patronage to Catholics in Maryland, which helped to sustain the wealth and influence of the colony’s Catholic gentry. Baltimore lost control over the colony’s government in 1689, but, through a settlement with the crown, he retained ownership of the land and the right to collect certain revenues for his private income. Catholics remained in charge of the proprietor’s land office and the collection of his private revenue from the colony. Richard Bennett III, for instance, had an eight-year contract with Lord Baltimore to collect the rents owed to the proprietor. After paying Baltimore a predetermined sum, Bennett and James Heath, a fellow Catholic, kept the remainder. Later, in the 1730s and 1740s, the Lords Baltimore commissioned Bennett again as a rent roll keeper.

Edward II had local connections that crown officials needed, thus favoring his chances for patronage under the royal government. Through his mother, Henrietta Maria (Neale Bennett) Lloyd, Edward II had family ties to Maryland’s Catholic gentry. He also married into a Quaker family on the Eastern Shore. Quakers’ refusal, for religious reasons, to take oaths of allegiance to the crown, or to contribute to the efforts of royal governors to increase the colony’s military preparedness, led crown officials to question the loyalty of this significant segment of the Eastern Shore’s population to the royal government. Edward II took advantage of his native ties, his membership in the Church of England, and the history of Protestant political leadership in his family to advance within the royal government, eventually reaching the positions of councilor and major general of the Eastern Shore militia by 1707, at the age of thirty-seven.
Edward II’s expansion of Wye Plantation’s trade also helped him to secure crown patronage. Edward II took advantage of opportunities that were new during his generation to trade with London merchants directly, instead of contracting with a merchant’s agent in the colony. Among the benefits of direct trade for planters was the opportunity to develop personal, credit-based relationships with tobacco merchants in London. Credit in London not only helped with the purchase of slaves. London tobacco merchants also exercised considerable influence over political appointments in Maryland while the colony was under crown rule. Edward II’s fashionable household furnishings, his attire, and his coach advertised the overlapping commercial and political ties to London that were an effective means to power during the royal government period.

The key to Edward II’s political career, though, was his ability to gain the support of his peers as well as to be promoted by crown officials. In 1709, when royal governor John Seymour died in office, Edward II’s fellow councilors chose him over a more senior member to be council president and thus acting governor. Edward II held this position for five years while the colony awaited the arrival of Seymour’s successor. Officially restricted by the crown’s instruction to pass only “necessary” laws in the absence of a royal governor, Edward II worked with the assembly to address grievances.

The economy was a persistent concern during Edward II’s tenure as acting governor. England’s latest war against France, which began in 1702, closed European markets for Maryland’s oronoco tobacco. Using Wye Plantation’s existing resources in mixed farming, Edward II increased his involvement in the provisions trade with the West Indies to boost the estate’s income.
When the crown restored the proprietor’s executive authority over the colony in 1715, Lord Baltimore needed allies on the ground again. The fifth Lord Baltimore appointed Edward II’s son, Edward Lloyd III, to the council in 1744. A decade later, the sixth Lord Baltimore commissioned Edward III as his agent and receiver general of proprietary revenue. In this position, Edward III was responsible for collecting land rents and other monies owed to the proprietor and to transfer the sums, up to £12,000 sterling a year, to Baltimore in London. Edward III’s close ties to Richard Bennett III, his Catholic kinsman and neighbor, helped him to obtain this powerful office. Bennett, who had no children when he died in 1749, named Edward III as his heir at law. From his Catholic relative, Edward III inherited more than land and slaves. He also inherited the trust of the Calvert family in their revenue affairs. As agent and receiver general as well as rent roll keeper of the Western Shore from 1753 until 1768, Edward III had extensive power over appointments to office within the proprietary revenue system and opportunities to build his own client network in the colony.

Aided by Maryland’s political stability and economic growth after 1715, Edward III used his status as a trusted client within Baltimore’s patronage network to develop Wye Plantation as a locus of power. He preferred to operate from his seat in Talbot County, ignoring the governor’s repeated requests that he establish a permanent office in Annapolis and spend more time in the capitol. Instead, Edward III built a new house at his home plantation and furnished it lavishly. The fourth master of Wye Plantation resisted other instructions from Baltimore that were intended to make the proprietary revenue system more efficient and increase returns, if the instructions did not meet with his interests. For example, Edward III was criticized for not suing rent collectors for non-
payment, but in a colony that was short in specie, it was in Edward III’s interest to protect personal relationships that were important to credit networks. Edward III had a considerable estate of his own to manage after the Bennett inheritance, but the devolution of authority in Baltimore’s political patronage network also allowed Edward III to exercise a high degree of independence.

Upon inheriting Wye Plantation from his father in 1770, Edward Lloyd IV moved aggressively toward preserving assets that would be the basis of his own independence. He maximized his control over his father’s real and personal estate by combining the roles of heir at law, executor of his father’s will, and estate administrator. Edward IV’s attempts to gain an advantage in the estate division process frustrated his brother-in-law, John Cadwalader, who had his own ambitions as a planter. For example, Edward IV, facing a loss of two-thirds of Wye Plantation’s enslaved workforce from the equal division of slaves among three siblings, claimed first choice of those slaves. Already the fifth master of Wye Plantation was working toward creating a more efficient and productive workforce for tobacco and grain cultivation, in an effort to improve Wye Plantation’s profitability from commercial agriculture.

By ending mercantile trade and operating without political patronage from Lord Baltimore, Edward IV reshaped Wye Plantation’s role in perpetuating the wealth and influence of the Lloyd family in Maryland. Charles Willson Peale’s portrait of Edward IV and his family from 1771 communicated Edward IV’s responsibility, as the heir to Wye Plantation, to maintain the connection between family, property, and power. On opposing sides of Edward IV’s figure in the portrait are an image of a high-style house, representing his inheritance from his father, and a likeness of his child, symbolizing the
family’s future. The strength of the tobacco market, the growth of Philadelphia’s grain export trade at mid-century, and rising land prices on the upper Eastern Shore informed Edward IV’s decision to rely on agriculture with slave labor as a way to maintain the family estate. Two decades later, Edward IV replaced his father’s house with another high-style building.

Plantation ownership remained the basis of social and political authority in Maryland throughout the colonial period. But, as the Lloyd family’s history demonstrates, planters and their family members adapted plantations to meet changing needs. Wye Plantation’s history offers an important window into the complex relationship between planters and their home plantations in colonial Maryland.
Arrow points to location of Wye Plantation.
Figure 2: Detail of Map of the State of Maryland laid down from an actual survey...1794, engraved by J. Thackara and J. Vallance (Library of Congress).

Arrow points to location of Wye Plantation.
Figure 3: Detail of William H. Dillworth, *Map of Talbot County, with Farm Limits*, 1858 (Library of Congress).
Figure 5: Site plan of Wye House and grounds. Drawn by Nancy Kurtz. Published in Michael Bourne, Orlando Ridout V, Paul Touart, and Donna Ware, *Architecture and Change in the Chesapeake: A Field Tour of the Eastern and Western Shores* (Maryland Historical Trust Press, 1998).
Figure 6: Wye House, 1882 (Maryland Historical Society).
Figure 7: Greenhouse at Wye House, 1936 (Library of Congress).
Figure 8. "Captain's House" at Wye House, 1936 (Library of Congress).
Figure 9: Cemetery at Wye House, 1936 (Library of Congress).
Figure 10: Wharf and water fence, Wye House, 1883 (Maryland Historical Society).
Figure 11: View at Wye House, 1882 (Maryland Historical Society).
Figure 12. Plat for Henrietta Maria Lloyd, Sept. 25, 1695 (Maryland State Archives).
Figure 13: Overlay of Plat for Henrietta Maria Lloyd, 1695 (Maryland State Archives) on W. H. Dillworth, Map of Talbot County, with Farm Limits, 1858 (Library of Congress).
Figure 14. Conjectural floor plan of Wye House, 1685–1719, based on probate inventories. Drawn by Michael O. Bourne.
Figure 15. Detail of Plat for Henrietta Maria Lloyd, September 25, 1895 (Mary and State Archives).
Figure 16: History of Landholdings of the Lloyds of Wye, 1650-1796, with Corresponding Owners and their Lifespans

Approximate values based on the Legislative History Project 1 Biographical Files, SC 1138-001-805/817, Maryland State Archives; E. Papenfuse, ed., *BDML.*, 2:534-9; and author’s research.
Figure 17: History of Landholdings of the Lloyds of Wye, 1650-1796

Approximate values based on the Legislative History Project 1 Biographical Files, SC 1138-001-805/817, Maryland State Archives; E. Papenfuse, ed., *BDML.*, 2:534-9; and author's research.
Figure 18: Charles Willson Peale, "The Edward Lloyd Family," 1771 (Winterthur Museum and Library).
Figure 19: Charles Willson Peale, detail from “The Edward Lloyd Family,” 1771 (Winterthur Museum and Library).
Figure 20: Charles Willson Peale, “Richard Bennett Lloyd,” 1771 (Winterthur Museum and Library).
Figure 21: Charles Willson Peale, "John Cadwalader Family," 1772 (Philadelphia Museum of Art).
Figure 22. Page from inventory of Edward Lloyd's Estate, December 1770, for White House plantation, Lloyd Papers (Maryland Historical Society).
APPENDIX A
LLOYD FAMILY GENEALOGY: CHART 1
Line of descent of Wye Plantation highlighted

Richard Bennett I
(c. 1608-1675)

Henrietta Maria Neale
(1647-1697)
m. (1) Richard Bennett II
(c. 1639-1667)

Susannah Maria
(1666-1714)

Richard Bennett III
(1667-1749)

Edward Lloyd I
(c. 1620-1696)
m. (2) Philemon Lloyd
(1646-1685)

Edward II
(1670-1718/9)

Philemon
(c. 1674-1732/3)

James
(1679/80-1723)
7 daughters

See Chart 2
**Edward Lloyd II**  
(1670-1719)  

m.

Sarah Covington  
(1683-1755)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ann Rousby  
(1721-1769)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elizabeth (1741/2-1776)</th>
<th>Edward IV (1744-1796)</th>
<th>Henrietta Maria (1746/7-by 1750)</th>
<th>Richard Bennett (1750-1787)</th>
<th>Joanna Leigh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cadwalader (1741/2-1786)</td>
<td>Elizabeth Tayloe (c. 1750-1825)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Bennett (1750-1787)</td>
<td>Joanna Leigh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
The Lloyd House at Wye Plantation, 1770, based on Inventories

The Room over the Passage
One High Bed & Furniture two window Curtains & six Chairs, £60
One Bottle Stand Bottle & Bason, £4
Two wilton Bedside Carpets, £2
One dressing Table Cover & Glass, £3
One close stool, £4
Six Prints, at 7/6, £2.5.0
One Settee Bed, £16
One Pair of End Irons Shovel & Tongs, One pr of Bellows & one Hearth Brush, £2
[subtotal] £93.5.0

In the Room over the dining Room
One Dressing Table Glass & Furniture, £3
One Bottle Stand Bason & Bottle £3
One Japan Tea Table, £1.10.0
One pr of End Irons Shovel & Tongs, £1.10.0
One old Bedstead, £0.10.0
[subtotal] £9.10.0

In the Room over the Parlour
One standing Bed & Furniture Mahogany Bedstead, £16
One low Bedstead sacking Bottom, £0.15.0
One Dressing Table & Glass, £1.15.0
Six Chairs, at 16/, £4.16.0
One pr of End Irons Shovels & Tongs, £1.8.0
[subtotal] £24.14.0

In the great Passage
Eight flag Bottom Chairs, at 7/6, £3
One large painted Chamber Screen, £20
One smaller ditto, £2
[subtotal] £25

---

1 This is a selective transcription of the two following documents: “Inventory of sundry Household Furniture belonging to the Estate of Edward Lloyd Esqr deceased,” box 71, Lloyd Papers, MS 2001, Maryland Historical Society; and “List of Household Furniture &c belong. to Estate of Col: Edward Lloyd decd 1770,” Cadwalader Collection, Series II, Box 16, Folder 10, MS 1454, Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The lists of silver plate (valued at £1,772.11.4), china, glass, and linen within the inventories are not included in this appendix. Neither document is a complete inventory of the contents of the Lloyd house at Wye Plantation in 1770.

2 The information from this line to the “Nursery” is from the Lloyd Papers inventory.
In the Parlour
1 large pier Glass, £9
1 Chimney Glass and 2 Sconce Glasses, £10
1 Marble Slab, £3
2 window Curtains, £4
1 old Carpet, £8
1 pr End Irons, 1 pr Tongs & Shovel, £1.5.0
1 Fender, £1.10.0
[subtotal] £36.15.0

Dining Room
2 large pier Glasses, £30
2 silk Damask window Curtains & Brass rods, £10
12 Chairs damask Bottoms with Covers, at 30/, £18
4 ps. of paintings, £20
2 fire Screens, £4
1 Tea Table eight square, £4
1 Japan’d do., £1
1 Card Table, £3
1 pr End Irons, 1 pr Tongs & Shovel, and 1 Fender, £8
4 flower Potts & Brackets, £6
[subtotal] £104

Passage
2 Settees & Covers, £14
1 large round Table, £6
1 Tea Table, £0.15.0
1 large old Map, 1 smaller do., £2.10.0
13 ps of Painting, at 30/, £19.10.0
1 pr of End Irons, 1 pr of Tongs, £1.10.0
1 Breakfast Table eight square, £4
[subtotal] £48.5.0

Mrs Lloyds Chamber
1 Mahogany Bedstead with yellow damask Curtains silk. 2 window Curtains, £30
6 Chairs with Damask Bottoms & covers, at 30/, £9
1 Arm chair, £1.10.0
1 Chimney Glass, £1
2 China flower Potts & Brackets, at 30/, £3
1 Japan’d Cupboard, £0.15.0
1 pr End Irons Shovels & Tongs, £1
1 Print of John Wilkes, £0.7.6
1 Mahogany Stand, £0.7.6
1 Fire Screen, £1.10.0
[subtotal] £48.10.0

**Nursery**

2 Pier Glasses, £10
21 Prints, at 5/, £5
4 Chairs, at 2/, £2.8.0
1 Beaureau, £3.0.0
2 window Curtains, £2.10.0
1 pr End Irons Shovel & Tongs, 1 Fender, £2
1 old Clock
1 Glass Lanthorn, £1
[subtotal] £25.18.0

**In the Hall Closet**

[summary: china dishes and plates, decanters, a variety of glasses (for cyder, wine, and “sillabub,” also dessert and jelly glasses), and tumblers]

**In the Colonels Room**

2 Glass Candle Sticks
1 Large Glass with a Glass Top
8 Glasses with Handles, upon the Mantlepiece
2 painted Glass Flower Pots
4 Pictures with Gilded Frames
4 ditto ditto the Seasons
4 ditto ditto Prospects
7 ditto Plain Frames
2 Looking Glasses with Gilded Frames
1 Chest Drawers with 9 Drawers
1 Beauro Table
1 Blue Bed with 4 Window Curtains
4 Chairs
1 Easy ditto
2 Stools
1 pair Hand Irons
1 pair Tongs
1 Shovel
1 Fender
1 little Table
1 Fire Screen

**In the White Room**

2 Cotton Beds with Curtains

---

3 The information from this line forward is from the Cadwalader Collection inventory, which does not provide monetary values.
6 Chairs with Covers
1 White Quilt
1 Cotton Counterpane
2 Feather Beds, 2 Bolsters & 4 Pillows
6 Blankets
1 Matrass
2 Bedside Carpets
1 Mahogany Bottle Stand with China Bottle & Bason
1 Japan’d Dressing Table, Vail & Toilet for the same
1 Looking Glass, 3 Dressing Box & 1 Brush
1 pair Brass Hand Irons, Tongs & Shovell
2 Cotton Window Curtains
6 Framed Prints

In the Blue Room
1 yellow Silk Damask Bed with Window Curtains of the same
3 Blankets
1 Feather Bed
1 Bolster & 2 Pillows to this Bed
1 Cotton Counterpane to ditto

1 Low Bedstead
1 Bed 1 Bolster 2 Pillows, 3 Blankets, & 1 Cotton Counterpane

6 Mahogany Chairs with yellow Silk Damask Bottoms with loose Covers to them
1 Mahogany Bottlestand with 1 China Bason, 1 China Bottle and 2 little Glasses
1 pair Bellows, 1 pair Brass Hand Irons 1 pair Shovel & Tongs
1 Dressing Table with 1 Gauze, 1 Silk, & 1 Flower’d Lawn Toilets for the Same
3 Dressing Boxes, 1 Smelling Bottle & Stand, 1 Lookg Glass
3 Bedside Carpets, 1 Painted Table, 1 Matrass

In the Yellow Room
1 Cotton Bed with Curtains for 2 Windows
6 Mahogany Chairs with Bottoms the same as the Bed
1 Feather Bed with 3 Blankets & a Blue & White Quilt
1 Low Bedstead with 1 Feather Bed 3 Blankets and 1 Cotton Counterpane
1 Dressing Table 1 Looking Glass with a Gilded Bead round it
1 pair Hand Irons, Shovel & Tongs
1 Matrass

In the Yellow Room Closet next to the Little Room
3 doz: & 8 Wine Glasses
2 Cut Glass Tumblers
1 plain ditto
1 Cut Glass Bowl
2 pint Decanters
1 Quart ditto
7 Stone Mugs
5 Pots Sweet Meats
1 Pot preserv’d Tamarinds
1 Pot Palm Oyl
1 Jug Balsom Capcreria
4 Quarts Spirits Wine
3 pint Bottles Citron Water
4 Quart Bottles West India Cordials
17 lb Tea
almost a Barrell Brown Sugar
17 Loaves double Refined Sugar
1 Box dry’d Citron

In the Closet next the Window in the yellow Room
5 China Dishes
2 little China Plates
2 China Patty Pans
4 China Custard Cups
5 Blue & White Chocolate Cups
2 Blue & White China Basons
3 China Scollop’d Shells
6 Delph Plates
1 little Stone Jug
2 Stone Mugs
2 Glass Salt cellars
9 Glass Cups
9 little Deep Glass Saucers
19 Glasses
1 Quart Decanter
1 pint ditto
2 Crewets
2 little painted Glass Bowls
2 Blue & White Flower Pots

In the Chamber over the Parlour
2 Feather Beds, 6 Blankets 2 Quilts 2 Bolsters, 4 Pillows & 4 Window Curtains
1 Dressing Table & 2 Matrass’s
1 Looking Glass & 3 Rush Bottom Chairs

In the Closet in the Chamber over the Parlour
6 Coffee Cups & 6 Saucers
4 Chocolate Cups & 4 Saucers
2 Tea Cups, 1 Glass Tumbler 1 Glass Mug 1 Glass Mortar & Pestle,
6 Blue & White Bread & Butter Saucers
1 Blue & White Flower Pot
10 Quart Bottles with some thing in them
13 Pint Bottles Citron Water
½ Barrel Almonds
1 ½ ditto Rice
1/2 Canister Common Tea
1 Large Box Clay’d Sugar
4 Stone Plates

In Mrs Cadwaladers Room
1 Feather Bed with Curtains 1 Bolster, 2 Pillows, 5 Quilts, & 7 Blankets
1 Matrass
1 Mahogany Looking Glass
1 Mahogany Dressing Table
1 Dressing Table
2 Chest Drawers
1 pair Hand Irons Shovel & Tongs

In the Little Garrett
[contents not transcribed]

In Sarah’s Room 4
2 Feather Beds, 2 Blankets 2 Quilts & 1 Cotton Counterpane
1 Old pair Drawers
10 Soap Jars
2 New Hats with Gold Lace
3 Old ditto with ditto
1 Velvet Cap with Gold Tossle & Band
1 Box Iron
2 Chests Wheat
1 Frying Pan
2 Iron Riddles
2 Watering Pots
1 Mans Old Saddle
1 Spinning Wheel for Linen
1 ditto ditto for Woolen
1 Awning for a Boat with 10 Curtains & Iron Rods
[continued on other side]
1 Bedstead
2 Feather Beds
4 pillows

4 Probably Sarah Furnace, housekeeper at Wye in 1772 (Memorandum Book, 1768–1772, box 14, Lloyd Papers, MS 2001, MdHS).
1 Bolster
2 Blankets
3 Quilts
1 Counterpane
1 pair Table Drawers
1 Table
2 Chairs
1 Mans Saddle
2 Spinning Wheels
1 Bench
1 Beer Tub
2 Tin pudding Dishes in the shape of Musmellons
1 new Bedpan
1 Sail
3 Sieves
2 Box Irons
1 Looking Glass
1 Glass Lanthorn
1 pair small Steelyards
9 Wooden Spoons
7 Milkstrainers
1 Iron Tea Kettle
1 Copper ditto
1 pair [?]
1 Box with 11 Candlemoulds
3 Copper Saucepans
1 ditto Stew Pan
1 Block Tin Cistern to cool Beer &c with 2 Lyon handles
2 hair Sifters
2 S(e?)archers
1 Sifting Tray
1 Awning for a Boat, 10 Curtains for ditto & Iron Rods for ditto
4 Shirts for Bargemen
3 Old great Coats, 2 Old Blue Coats, 1 yellow ditto, formerly belonging to Old David
8 small Jackets for negro Children
6 ditto for ditto ditto
1 Blue Fearnought Boys Jacket
1 pair Leather Bags
1 Portmantua

20 pair Sheets for House use
41 Pillowbers
34 Gentlemens Nightcaps
3 pair Sheets [and] 6 Pillowbers for going by Water
16 Breakfast Cloths
8 Table Cloths, 7 Sideboard Clothes, 30 Napkins, 25 Towels, [and]
12 Oznabrig Cloths for Common Use
16 Old Cloths for wiping things
10 very fine Damask Dining Cloths
7 fine Breakfast Cloths
2 large Shaving Cloths
2 Toilets
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