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ABSTRACT

Because it was a city begun from scratch in 1699, Williamsburg as a social entity was created by those who subsequently bought, built on, and lived on the city's lots. This study examines two aspects of private land development within the city from 1699 through 1748 (the last year that development was contained within the town's original boundaries) to obtain evidence about the social dynamics in Williamsburg as the community evolved. The first aspect is the formation of neighborhoods, and the second is the opportunity to purchase land in the city, both important indicators of way of life and quality of life in a community.

In the first decade, the city's trustees sold few lots, and development concentrated around the two major public buildings, the College and Capitol. Lot sales boomed in the 1710s, however, and development spread to all parts of the city. By the mid-1720s, virtually all of the city's lots had been purchased from the trustees. The city experienced a marked population increase in the 1730s and 1740s, due mostly to immigration, which created a demand for housing and land.

The original purchasers of city lots founded neighborhoods that were functionally and socially integrated. Business and residential development co-existed in each neighborhood, although some neighborhoods had evolved more toward predominantly business or residential use by the late 1740s. Neighborhoods remained socially diverse throughout the period, however, and no occupational enclaves developed.

Opportunities to buy lots were limited in the 1740s. Owners were reluctant to sell. The gentry owned over half the lots and had no reason to sell either their long-held residences or their many tenements, which provided virtually guaranteed rental income. By 1748 the artisans fared the worst in lot ownership, holding few lots and for the shortest time. Although some lots were for sale in the 1740s, purchase opportunities for many buyers were limited by the lots' prices and/or locations.

Limited opportunity for land ownership undoubtedly influenced the life decisions of some urbanites. The prospect of long-term tenancy for some groups could account in part for the low persistence rates among Williamsburg residents. There is some evidence that those shut out of the land market chose personal goods as an alternate investment to land.

The close residential proximity of the various status groups appears to have engendered a mutual awareness of personal concerns and a degree of interdependence. Members of lower status groups depended upon the wealthier classes for such needs as housing and credit, and in turn, they safeguarded the interests of their patrons (who also benefited as landlords and money-lenders) as long as those patrons could be expected to meet their needs.
PRIVATE LAND DEVELOPMENT IN WILLIAMSBURG, 1699-1748:

BUILDING A COMMUNITY
Introduction

The capital of the colony of Virginia from 1699 to 1780, and the object of a massive restoration and interpretive effort in the twentieth century, Williamsburg is one of the most-studied colonial towns in America. Its economic and political roles have been analyzed. Such diverse subjects as its government, its black population, and its taverns have all received attention. A major research project, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and known as the York County Project, has provided valuable new insights into the demographics, economic functions, material life, officeholding, and real property holding in the community.¹

What is lacking in the study of Williamsburg, however, is an extensive examination of the city's physical development, beginning with its earliest planning. The pace and the character of private land development in the city has not been adequately studied. Aspects of the city's growth have received some treatment. The town plan of

Williamsburg and the erection of its public buildings have been treated most extensively in John Reps's discussion of Chesapeake urban planning. Individual Williamsburg buildings and some of their builders were the subjects of studies by Marcus Whiffen. The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation has produced for its own purposes research reports outlining the title histories and identifying the occupants of most of the lots within the town's original boundaries. My own portion of the above-cited Endowment-funded research project was an investigation of the chronology and geographical pattern of the original sales of city lots by the trustees and, later, by private developers outside the city limits. Yet no study has examined the development of the land within the city by private citizens as a process that would shed light upon the social dynamics of the community.

There are obstacles to a study of this kind. The destruction of the records of the General Court, Williamsburg Hustings Court, and James City

---

2John W. Reps, Tidewater Towns: City Planning in Colonial Virginia and Maryland (Williamsburg, Virginia: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972); Marcus Whiffen, The Eighteenth-Century Houses of Williamsburg: A Study of Architecture and Building in the Colonial Capital of Virginia (Williamsburg, Virginia: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1984); Marcus Whiffen, The Public Buildings of Williamsburg (Williamsburg, Virginia: Colonial Williamsburg, 1958); and unpublished house histories, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia. Some of these house histories contain inaccuracies, and some were written before collections of private papers that have shed additional light on lot owners and occupants became available. I have, therefore, relied more upon primary documents than upon the house histories in my own research.

3Cathy Hellier, "The Character and Direction of Urban Expansion in Williamsburg," portion of final report to the National Endowment for the Humanities, "Urbanization in the Tidewater South, Part II: The Growth and Development of Williamsburg and Yorktown," Project #RO-20869-85, 1989. This portion of the report discussed the development of each section of town by the initial purchasers only, from 1700 to 1780. The present thesis is an expansion upon a part of the research conducted for the above-cited project.
County Court for the colonial period makes it impossible to obtain a complete chain of title for every property in the town. Early information about lot sales and lot purchasers on the James City County side of town is particularly scarce. The earliest extant plans of the city, which appear to date from about 1800, do not include all of the lot numbers, and it is clear upon examining both the plans and existing deeds that lots in certain portions of the city had been renumbered sometime between 1700 and 1800. Fortunately, Williamsburg lay in two county jurisdictions during the colonial period. The deeds and wills in the York County Court records, and deeds and other documents found in private collections supply enough pieces of the puzzle to allow significant conclusions about land development in the colonial capital and its social ramifications.

Because a master's thesis must necessarily be limited in scope, this study does not pretend to be the "extensive examination of the city's development" that is needed. It does not, for example, examine the development of Williamsburg throughout the colonial period. This

---

"The two earliest known plans of Williamsburg are in the collections of the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia. One was drawn by Benjamin Bucktrout in 1800, with additions made in 1803; the other is known as the "College" or "Unknown Draftsman" map and dates from circa 1800.

"Invaluable to this study was the biographical file of colonial York County citizens created at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation by the York County Project. This file contains every reference to each resident of Williamsburg (1699-1780) from the York County Records, from selected private papers and colonial records, and from Williamsburg's newspaper, the Virginia Gazette. The biographical file was created with the help of funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities (Project numbers RS-0033 and RO-20869-85) and from the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. Unless otherwise cited, biographical information and deed references included in the thesis were drawn from this file.
study does, however, look at Williamsburg's development during an especially significant period, from the founding of the city in 1699 until development began to spill outside the original city boundaries in the late 1740s. The chosen end point for the study is 1748 for a number of reasons. First of all, it was the last year that land development in the city was contained within the city's original boundaries. By studying conditions in that year and in the years immediately before, we can better understand the impetus for development outside the city bounds. Second, in that year a census of the city's heads of household was compiled as a means of assessing the effects of the current smallpox epidemic. The census appears to have been taken by neighborhood and, together with the surviving deeds and information from the York County Project's biographical file, allows a picture of the residential character of each neighborhood in 1748. Finally, a population profile, based upon the census, has already been constructed, giving us a fuller picture of the community in 1748. Not only is the time period of this study limited, but the portion of the city studied is limited as well. Only the development of the main portion of the city will be examined. The development of the two small ports appended to Williamsburg, Queen Mary's Port and Princess Ann Port, cannot be analyzed because of insufficient evidence. There is a plat of Princess Ann Port, located in


James City County, but no records of lot sales survive. Although deeds for sales of lots in Queen Mary's Port, located in York County, are extant, there is no surviving plat of that port that would enable one to specifically locate the lots. I have also chosen to limit the aspects of land development with social implications to two: the formation of socially segregated or integrated neighborhoods and the opportunity in 1748 to obtain city land. The social environment of the neighborhood and the ability or inability to "buy into" a community by investing in residential or commercial property appear to me to be two of the most important indicators of way of life and quality of life within the community. Although certain aspects of the study are limited, the information obtained will be nonetheless useful. Although a similar study of land development was conducted for Annapolis, very little work has been done on land development in the urban centers of the southern colonies.

The development of a city's land both reflects and influences the social dynamics and quality of life within the community. As a city created from scratch in 1699, Williamsburg as a social entity was created by those who subsequently bought, built on, and lived on the city's lots. Chapter One of this study traces the chronology and geographical pattern of original lot sales by the city's trustees during this period and places the rest of the study in context. Chapters Two and Three examine two aspects of land development that reflect and dictate community

dynamics. The first is the formation of neighborhoods. Chapter Two discusses whether or not the original purchasers of lots in the city formed class- or occupation-segregated neighborhoods and compares and contrasts this early settlement pattern with the city's settlement pattern in 1748, the year before the first lots outside the city's boundaries were sold. Chapter Three focuses on the availability of city lots in 1748, including who owned the lots, how they were used, and the limitations to opportunities to acquire lots. By examining settlement patterns and landholding opportunity, we can draw some conclusions about the social dynamics in Williamsburg as the community evolved.
Chapter 1
The Direction of Initial Development

Located on the peninsula between the James and York rivers, and first settled in 1633 as a buffer against the Indians, Middle Plantation—the future site of Williamsburg—was described in 1676 as "the very Heart and Centre of the Country," yet it had then little political or cultural importance. In 1677, following the burning of Jamestown by Nathaniel Bacon and his supporters, the Assembly met at Middle Plantation, and the King's soldiers sent to put down the rebellion camped there, but a petition filed by citizens of York County advocating Middle Plantation as the new seat of government was rejected with derision, and the State House was rebuilt at Jamestown. In 1693, however, the monarchs William and Mary chartered a college to provide Virginia with homegrown clergy, and with the Assembly's resolution in 1693 to place the College at Middle Plantation, this amorphously bounded area between Queen's Creek and

---

Archer's Hope Creek became suddenly a place of increased importance, the center of learning in the colony.\textsuperscript{10}

Little is known about the appearance of the place in 1693, but it seems to have been a typical rural area of long-settled, contiguous plantations. Situated along the spine of a peninsula, at the divide between the watersheds of the James and York Rivers, the chief recommendation of Middle Plantation as the site for the College appears to have been that it was the "most convenient" of the four sites considered, which also included Yorktown, York Old Fields, and a site in Gloucester County.\textsuperscript{11} A student speaker at the College in 1699 described it as "the greatest Thorough-fair in Virginia," because the two deep, unfordable creeks that emptied into the James and York Rivers, and almost met at this place, insured that persons going up or down the peninsula had to travel through Middle Plantation.\textsuperscript{12} The road or path which they followed through it must have wound about in order to avoid the springs, rivulets, small creeks, and accompanying ravines that branched out from the narrow divide. Middle Plantation's only public building in 1693 was the Bruton Parish church, completed ten years earlier.\textsuperscript{13}

The founding of the grammar school associated with the College,

\textsuperscript{10}Hening, ed., \textit{The Statutes at Large}, 3: 122.


\textsuperscript{13}Whiffen, \textit{Public Buildings}, p. 75. The church building that now stands on this site was built in the 1710s, with subsequent additions.
probably in 1694, and construction of the brick, three-and-a-half-story College building itself, begun in 1695, marked the beginning of change for Middle Plantation. By the May Day celebration at the nearly completed College in 1699, a student speaker could enumerate the features of the place that he considered to be "great Helps and Advances made already towards the Beginning of a Town": a church, an ordinary, several stores, two mills, a smith's shop, a grammar school, and the College. He also cited "good Neighbourhood of as many substantial Housekeepers that could give great Help towards the Supplying and Maintaining of a constant Market" as an advantage of the place. Clearly Middle Plantation was losing its strictly rural character.

But it was not a town, at least not officially. A movement was afoot, however, to make it not only a town, but the colony's capital. By 1697 James Blair, Commissary and President of the College, was asserting that if the General Assembly would remove itself to the vicinity of the College, the inevitable result would be a successful town. With the burning of the State House in Jamestown in October 1698, and the arrival shortly thereafter of Governor Francis Nicholson, recently experienced in colonial capital-planning in Maryland, the idea gained new impetus. On May Day, 1699, the faculty and students entertained the governor,

---


councillors, and burgesses at the College. These notables heard five student orators, the third of which, quoted above, probably had been coached by Nicholson and Blair. His discourse was a persuasive argument for moving the capital of the colony to Middle Plantation for the mutual benefit of the College and colony. On 18 May 1699 the student's speech was read before the House of Burgesses, and Nicholson recommended to the burgesses that the new state house be built at Middle Plantation. On 7 June 1699, "An Act Directing the Building the Capitoll and the City of Williamsburg" was passed by the Assembly, and on 8 June it received the governor's approval.

The act provided in detail for the construction of the Capitol and proceeded to direct the establishment of a new capital city. The act set aside 283 acres, 35 1/2 poles of land at Middle Plantation for the new city. Of that, 220 acres were allotted for the main body of the town; it adjoined the College lands, and was to be known as Williamsburgh. A total of 15 acres, 44 1/4 poles of land was set aside for a road leading from the town to Queen's Creek (the road to be called Queen's Road), and 14 acres, 71 1/4 poles, were appointed for a port or landing place, to be known as Queen Mary's Port, on the said Creek. Ten acres, 42 1/2 poles of land were set apart for a road from Williamsburg to Archer's Hope Creek, which by the Act was to be called Princess Creek,

17Reps, Tidewater Towns, pp. 141-42.


19The complete text is found in Goodwin, Brief & True Report, pp. 335-49.
with an additional 23 acres, 37 1/2 poles of land set aside for a landing there to be called Princess Ann Port. The road between the town and Princess Ann Port was to be called Princess Street. The act provided that the lots in Williamsburg were to be one-half acre each, but that the lots at the landings were to be no more than sixty feet square. In addition, a portion of the land at each port was to be left in common, at the discretion of the directors appointed by the act. The boundaries of the town, roads, and ports referred to in the act were delineated in a survey prepared by Theodorick Bland and dated 2 June 1699. The plat also indicates the locations of the College, the church, the Capitol site, and the main street. (See Figure 1.)

The act contained building requirements designed both to enhance the appearance of the town and to encourage its growth. Houses built on the main street (called "Duke of Gloucester Street" in the act) were required to be of at least ten foot pitch and were to front six feet from the street line. Purchasers of lots on Duke of Gloucester Street had to build and finish on each lot a dwelling house at least twenty feet wide and thirty feet long within twenty-four months of purchase, or the unimproved lot would revert to the trustees appointed to sell the lots. Building requirements for purchasers of lots on other streets were to be determined by the directors appointed by the act. In order that "the whole Country may have timely Notice of this Act and equall Liberty in the Choice of Lots," the trustees could not begin selling lots before the twentieth of October. This delay probably also served to give the

---

20 This redrawing was taken from Goodwin, Brief & True Report, following p. 16. The original, too stained and faded to reproduce, is housed in the Public Record Office, London.
Figure 1. Re-drawing of Theodorick Bland's Survey of Williamsburg and Ports, 1699
directors time to "make such Rules and Orders and to give such Directions in the Building of the said City and Portes not already provided for by this Act," or, in other words, to fine-tune the town plan and establish additional building requirements.

The law directed the process by which the town lands were to be acquired from the original owners. The sheriffs of James City, York, and New Kent counties were each to choose four freeholders to value the parcel of each man's land to be taken by the city, after which the trustees appointed in the act were to take over the land. The act then provided that at the next session of the Assembly, the colony would pay the respective owners of the land according to the above valuation; subsequently, the trustees would reimburse the public funds from the proceeds of the sales of the half-acre lots.

Thus was a portion of Middle Plantation transformed into the city of Williamsburg, at least on paper. Physically it consisted of no more than those few "Helps and Advances" referred to by the above-quoted student orator. The town plan was not readily visible; for example, John Page's outbuildings stood in the middle of Duke of Gloucester Street. Still, the surveyors' stakes had been driven, and the town was a legislative reality.

Williamsburg's first decade was characterized both by trial and error in planning policy and by slow growth. Inexperienced in town planning on this scale, the Virginians in charge of the project had to backtrack and make modifications as difficulties arose. Portions of the town plan

\[\text{\footnotesize \cite{McIlwaine and Kennedy, eds., Journal of the House of Burgesses, 4: 69.}\]
itself were found to be inconvenient and required modification. The building requirements were reconsidered and modified. Even the payment of the original landowners, which had seemed so straightforward in the act of 1699, was not smoothly accomplished. There was no great rush to purchase lots. Despite the irritating difficulties, however, the town did grow. By the end of 1709, it was a markedly different place than it had been in 1700.

It seems clear that Francis Nicholson, at least in large part, designed the original plan of Williamsburg. Both Robert Beverley, in his History and Present State of Virginia published first in 1705, and the Reverend Mr. Hugh Jones, in The Present State of Virginia in 1724, identified Nicholson as the originator of the town plan. In addition, Nicholson had had recent experience in planning the capital city of Maryland, where he had served as governor before returning to Virginia. That the back streets of Williamsburg were named Francis Street and Nicholson Street is a further indication that Nicholson bore a large part in planning the city.

The original plan of the city, which must have been completed before the sale of the first numbered lot in 1700, does not survive. The only graphic document dating from the planning of the city was the survey prepared by Theodorick Bland and dated 2 June 1699. As indicated above, this survey illustrated the boundaries of the town, of the ports, and of

---

the roads leading to the ports. Located on the survey were the College, the church, the proposed Capitol, and the main street. No back streets, cross streets, or lots were delineated. (See Figure 1.) The survey shows that the 220 acres that comprised Williamsburg were laid out as an eight-sided figure, with the main street, six poles (99 feet) wide, running through the middle of the city's length, nearly due east-west. The westerly portion of this eight-sided figure was a square, 160 poles long on each side, at the center of which stood the church. The rectangular, eastern section of town was eighty poles wide, or half the width of the western portion, and 120 poles long, or one-and-a-half times its width. The distance from the western boundary of the town to the church was eighty poles; from the church to the proposed site of the Capitol the distance was 160 poles. (The Capitol was not actually built on this site, however; the head of a ravine at this spot made it necessary to shift the location of the Capitol eastward.) The baroque predilection for geometrical design is apparent in the planning of Williamsburg.

Several elements besides those enumerated above must have appeared on the first city plan. The axial street now known as Palace Green was almost certainly included, since in 1701 the council discussed the purchase of "about fifty or sixty Acres of land adjoyning to the Lotts assigned in the City of Williamsburgh for a house to be built on for the residence of the Governor...which Land belongs to Henry Tyler."23 Tyler's land adjoined the northern boundary of the city, behind the lots at the head of Palace Green. The marketplace, now known as Market Square, certainly appeared on the plan. The boundaries described in the

earliest extant deed for Williamsburg lots, dated 23 September 1700, begin "at the Market Place."24 The back streets and cross streets probably appeared as they did in the circa-1800 plats, and of course, the original plan must have included the boundary lines of the lots and their numbers.

Evidently the original plan also contained elements that were altered during this decade and the next. Early descriptions of the city refer to elements designed in the form of the initial W or the initials W and M, in honor of King William and Queen Mary. The earliest reference is in Robert Beverley's The History and Present State of Virginia, published first in 1705: "He [Nicholson] mark'd out the Streets in many Places, so as that they might represent the Figure of a W, in Memory of his late Majesty King William, after whose Name the Town was call'd Williamsburg." Hugh Jones also made mention of Nicholson's curious design: "Here [Middle Plantation] he laid out the city of Williamsburgh (in the form of a cypher, made of W. and M.) on a ridge at the head springs of two great creeks ..." Jones, writing in about 1722, described Duke of Gloucester Street in a manner that indicates that the "cypher" may well have affected that street. He wrote, "Fronting the College at near its whole breadth, it extended a noble street mathematically straight (for the first design of the town's form is changed to a much better) just three quarters of a mile in length."25

John W. Reps in his treatment of city planning in colonial Virginia and Maryland makes a strong case that "W and M" cyphers were located at

24 York County, Virginia, Deeds and Bonds 2, 1701-1713, pp. 30-32.

25 Beverley, History and Present State, p. 105; and Jones, Present State, p. 66.
the Capitol Square and the Market Square. Indeed, the plats of Williamsburg dating from approximately 1800 clearly show a pair of diagonal streets in the Capitol Square that, together with sections of Francis and Nicholson Streets, form a W or M. Reps shows, by means of an early twentieth-century government topographical survey and aerial photograph, that traces of a matching pair of diagonal streets on the eastern side of the square survived into this century. It seems clear that Nicholson designed the Capitol Square streets in the form of a "W and M" cypher.

Reps's assertion that Nicholson also designed the Market Square in the form of a cypher is compelling as well. First of all, a similar system of diagonal streets would have prevented Duke of Gloucester Street from being "mathematically straight," as it had appeared in Theodorick Bland's survey in 1699, and as Hugh Jones described it, as altered and improved from the "first design of the town's form," in 1722. In October 1705 the Assembly passed "An Act Continueing the Act Directing the Building the Capitol and the City of Williamsburgh with Additions." Among other things, this act stipulated that the directors were to "enlarge the Market Place and to alter any of the Streets or Lands thereof where the same are found inconvenient," and that "the main Street called Duke of Gloucester Street extending from the Capitol to the utmost Limitts of the City westward till it joyn's on the Land belonging to the College shall not hereafter be altered either in the Course or Dimensions thereof." Clearly there was something inconvenient about the configuration of streets within the Market Place, and Duke of Gloucester

---

26Reps, Tidewater Towns, pp. 154-70.

27Hening, ed., The Statutes at Large, 3: 419-32.
Street was to be straightened.

Additional evidence supports Rep's assertion that there were diagonal streets in the Market Place. The boundaries described in the 1700 deed of sale for lot 43, adjoining the Market Place, indicate that this lot was shorter than the adjoining lot; the frontage of lot 43 was set back from Duke of Gloucester Street.²⁸ It is likely that the other three lots adjoining the Market Place were truncated as well, and Reps asserts that they were set back to make room for diagonal streets across the square. That there was at least one diagonal street crossing the part of Market Square adjoining lot 43 is evinced by a lease for a portion of this ground granted to John Blair by the city's directors.²⁹ The lease is dated 2 June 1746 and specifies the following boundary: "... Runing from the beguinning place aforesaid [on Duke of Gloucester Street] Northerly 80 feet Near a Road which lyes about S.E. . . ." All in all, Reps's assertion that Nicholson included a "W and M" cypher in the Market Place seems highly plausible. Figure 2 illustrates Reps's conjectured locations of both cyphers superimposed upon the town as it appeared in the circa-1800 plats. Whether the instructions concerning the streets and lands in the Market Place were actually carried out during the decade under discussion, however, is uncertain. Robert Beverley in the 1722 edition of his History and Present State of Virginia stated that it was during the governorship of Alexander Spotswood that "the Streets of the Town [were] altered from the fanciful Forms of W" and M" to much more

²⁸York County, Virginia, Deeds and Bonds 2, 1701-1713, pp. 30-32.
²⁹Lease, Directors to John Blair, 2 June 1746, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Figure 2. Conjectural Plan of Williamsburg in 1699
The size of the Market Place seems to have been altered at least once from the original city plan during this decade. The 1705 act that authorized the alteration of the inconvenient streets in that area also instructed the directors to "enlarge the Market Place." The directors apparently accomplished the enlargement by incorporating into the Market Place four truncated lots that adjoined it. (See Figure 2.) The original deed of purchase for lot 43, one of these "short" lots purchased (along with two other lots) from the trustees by Philip Ludwell in 1700, contains on the reverse an undated memorandum written by Ludwell stating that "the Lot next the Marke[t] place [lot 43] was taken away by the Direct[ors] with my consent to enlarge the Market place & make it Square. . . ." Although the memorandum is undated, it seems likely that the directors would have taken such an action shortly after the passage of the 1705 act. By April 1713, however, the directors had again altered the Market Square; in that month the trustees sold lots 43 and 12, the lots bordering the Market Square on the east, to Christopher Jackson. Jackson must have forfeited these lots because they formed part of the Market Place leased out by the city directors at mid-century.

---


31 Lease and release, Trustees to Philip Ludwell, 23 and 24 September 1700, Lee Family Papers, 1638-1867, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

32 York County, Virginia, Deeds and Bonds 3, 1713-1729, pp. 30-31.

33 Lease, City Directors to John Blair, Esq., 2 June 1746, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; Lease, City Directors to John Blair, Esq., 2 December 1746, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; Lease, City Directors to Dr. John Dixon, 3 July
on the west were ever resold by the trustees or built upon.

Not only did the 1705 "Act Continueing the Act Directing the Building the Capitol and the City of Williamsburgh with Additions" authorize the alteration of the original city plan, but it provided for the modification of earlier building requirements as well. No longer were purchasers of lots on Duke of Gloucester Street required to build and finish a dwelling house at least twenty feet wide and thirty feet long on each lot within twenty-four months or forfeit the unimproved lots. According to the 1705 act, a person buying two lots on Duke of Gloucester Street was required within twenty-four months to build and finish one house fifty feet long and twenty feet wide on the lots, or on either of them, to avoid forfeiture; alternatively, a purchaser of two lots on the main street could, within twenty-four months, build and finish one brick house or framed house forty feet long and twenty feet broad, if the house had "two Stacks of Brick Chimney's & Cellers under the whole House," in order to retain title. In addition, a purchaser of two lots on Duke of Gloucester Street and "one or more Lotts or half Acres backward" could preserve his title to all of the lots by constructing within twenty-four months on the main street lots or on either of them, "in ordinary framed Work as much Dwelling Housing as will make five Hundred square Feet superficial Measure on the Ground Plat for every Lott or half Acre taken up," or "in Brick Work or framed Work with Brick Cellars under the whole and Brick Chimney's as much Dwelling Housing as will make four Hundred square Feet superficial Measure on the Ground Plat for every Lot or half Acre taken up." The act further stipulated that every person having a

lot or lots on Duke of Gloucester Street was required to enclose the same with a "Wall Pales or Post and Rails" within six months of satisfying the house-building requirement, or forfeit five shillings a month per unenclosed lot to the directors. The revised building requirements not only encouraged the purchase of multiple lots, but encouraged the construction of more substantial dwellings as well.

The act of 1705 also clarified the rights of those who already had houses upon the land laid out for the city in 1699. The act specified that none of the lots that contained houses when the city was laid out were to be vested in the feofees and trustees of the city but were to remain and continue the proper estate of the owners. These owners were not required to satisfy any building requirements to retain title.

Finally, the act of 1705 appointed new directors to the city and charged them to "settle & establish such Rules and Orders for the more regular and orderly Building of the Houses in the said City as to them shall seem best and most convenient." Either similar instructions to the directors appointed in the act of 1699 had not been carried out, or as the phrase "more regular and orderly" may imply, the regulations established by the first directors were ineffective. In any case, the various provisions made for building in the act of 1705 indicate a concern for the slow rate of growth of Williamsburg but also for the appearance of the capital city. The regulations were intended in part to counteract the "rough and ready" tradition of dwelling-building in Virginia.34

Another wrinkle, the legal transfer of title to the town lands from

the original landowners to the trustees and feoffees, had to be ironed out early in this decade. Though the process had been clearly set out in the act of 1699, difficulties arose. First of all, payment of the landowners was not forthcoming "next Session" as promised in the act; payment was not authorized until October 1701. Moreover, by May 1702, some of the landowners had refused to accept the payment allotted to them, and the Council feared that this discouraged lot sales. Though subsequent records are silent about how it was accomplished, evidently the problem was resolved because the trustees continued to sell half-acre lots, though at a slower-than-hoped-for pace.

Undoubtedly Francis Nicholson had hoped that the public buildings, the focal points of his town plan, would all be in place by the end of the decade, but this was not to be, although the beginning had seemed promising. The Capitol and prison were begun promptly and finished, but Nicholson's increasing difficulties with the Assembly prevented the construction of a governor's house until after his recall in 1705. Not only was the governor's house an unfinished shell in 1709, but the College was a burned-out one. On 29 October 1705, as the Capitol neared completion, the College building burned, leaving only the outer walls. It was not until 8 December 1709 that an agreement was confirmed with one John Tullitt for its rebuilding.

Thus, physically and functionally, the Capitol with its attending

---


prison was a focal point of the community during these early years, both during its construction (which attracted large numbers of workmen) and after its completion. The College was another focal point until its destruction. It is not surprising, then, that the two surviving conveyances of lots dating from the first half of this decade are for lots lying near the middle of town, between the Capitol and the College, though slightly nearer the Capitol. The deeds dating from the second half of this decade all convey lots in the vicinity of the Capitol.

Figure 3 illustrates all of the lots taken up in this decade for which conveyances survive. Four of the lots taken up during this decade were forfeited, but fourteen were built upon and their titles secured. In addition to these eight purchasers, additional persons are known to have owned lots during this decade. In 1704, when John Page's "four old Houses and Oven" that obstructed Duke of Gloucester Street were ordered to be demolished, the salvaged bricks were to be laid "out of the Street on the Lott of the said John Page." The location of Page's lot, other than that it was on the main street, is unknown. Since Page owned much of the land that the city was built upon, it is likely that he was one of those property owners referred to in the act of 1705 who had houses standing when the city was laid out and who benefitted from the provision that the lots upon which these houses stood were not to vest in the Trustees, but were to remain the property of the owners. Specifically mentioned in the act was Benjamin Harrison Jr., Esqr., Clerk of the Council until 1700 and an original director of the city, whose buildings took up four lots when the city was laid out. Later in the eighteenth

Figure 3. Lots known from documentary evidence to have been purchased from the trustees 1700-1709

- Lot taken up, title retained
- Lot taken up, status unknown
- Lot taken up, forfeited
- Public space
century, the Harrison family owned two contiguous lots on the south side of Francis Street, opposite the Capitol. These may have been the remainder of Benjamin Harrison Jr.'s four lots. Francis Nicholson owned "lots" by 1721, and it seems likely that he would have purchased them before his recall in 1705. Their location is unknown. John Brooks owned at least one lot in 1709. Henry Tyler held town property in 1702, but how he acquired it is unknown. Since he owned land immediately adjoining the city's northern limits, perhaps he owned a lot as did Page and Harrison, by virtue of owning buildings on town land.

Finally, in addition to Henry Tyler, ten persons are known to have held lots by unknown tenure during this decade. They include Joseph Mann (tavern keeper), Dionitia Hadley (tavern keeper), John Marot (before his purchase from Shields; tavern keeper), John Redwood (before his purchase from the trustees; tavern keeper), John Bentley, Sidney Rowe (tavern keeper), John Young (tavern keeper), Thomas Wells (tavern keeper), Thomas Jones (merchant), and Peter Finnie (tavern keeper). Whether these persons owned, rented, or occupied their lots by right of someone else is unknown. If several rented, some might have occupied the same lot successively. If the number of lots held by this group is uncertain, so are the locations of most of the lots. Depositions concerning the burning of the College in 1705 indicate that John Young's house and John Marot's were then near the College. Since most of the above group were

---


tavern keepers, it seems likely that most of them would attempt to locate "where the action was" near the Capitol, especially after it had begun to be used by the Assembly and after 1705, when the College was no longer a drawing card. John Marot did, in fact, change his location from the College end of town to the Capitol end in 1707/8 when he purchased James Shields's lot.

All in all, the town seems to have grown more quickly after 1705. Though only two deeds conveying a total of four lots were recorded in the York County Court before 1705, the above evidence makes it clear that other lots were owned and occupied before that time, at least five at the first laying out of the town. Still, the two written descriptions of the town dating from this decade indicate the town's slow start. Francis Louis Michel visited Williamsburg in 1702 and described its infant state:

... It is, moreover, because of the convenient place or situation, and also because of the many springs which are there, a large place, where a city is intended and staked out to be built. There are at present, besides the Church, College and State House, together with the residence of the Bishop, some stores and houses of gentlemen, and also eight ordinaries or inns, together with the magazine...40

Also unimpressed with the new capital was Robert Beverley, no friend of Nicholson's, who published this description in 1705: "This imaginary city is yet advanced no further, than only to have a few Publick Houses, and a Store-House, more than were built upon the Place before..."41 Lot sales and resales recorded in York County increased, however, after the middle of the decade; fourteen lots were conveyed after 1705. It is


41Beverley, History and Present State, p. 105.
likely that both the completion of the Capitol and the easing of building requirements encouraged lot sales.

The above contemporary descriptions, and the fact that thirteen of the twenty-four known lotholders in this decade were tavernkeepers, point to the proliferation of ordinaries as the notable characteristic of Williamsburg's early growth. From one ordinary in 1699 the number had increased, by Michel's account, to eight in 1702. Michel might have overestimated the number of ordinaries. Only three are known to have operated on the York County side of Williamsburg in 1702, but perhaps as many as five could have been licensed in James City County. The number of taverns operating in York County's jurisdiction burgeoned in 1705, when seven ordinaries were open for business on the York side of Williamsburg. These taverns provided accommodations for travellers passing through on their way up and down the peninsula, for public officials and others having business at the Capitol and College, and importantly, for the town-builders. The number of ordinaries on Williamsburg's York County side dropped to four in 1706 and to three for the remainder of the decade. This decline was probably due to the burning of the College in 1705 and to the fact that the House of Burgesses did not meet from June 1706 until October 1710. Still, the number of taverns had increased markedly from the single ordinary necessary to meet the needs of transients in 1699. After 1705 taverns were needed to accommodate the laborers and lot purchasers who were building the town of Williamsburg.

The increased interest in Williamsburg in the final years of its first decade was the first indication of the veritable boom that would occur in the next. Michel's prediction would prove true: "More dwellings
will be built year after year."^{42} Although Williamsburg had gotten off to a slow start during its first full decade, the 1710s witnessed great enthusiasm for the new capital city. The 1710s were characterized by a dramatic increase in lot sales and by widespread construction of buildings, both public and private.

Surviving conveyances show that during the 1710s the trustees sold more than five times as many lots in Williamsburg as they had conveyed from 1700 through 1709. These conveyances represent ninety-two lots sold by the trustees from 1710 through 1719. Six of the ninety-two were regrants of lots granted by the trustees before 1710. All in all, the deeds represent eighty-six "new" lots sold by the trustees during the 1710s. Other documents reveal that at least thirteen additional lots were taken up by individuals in the 1710s, so that the trustees sold a total of at least 105 lots during the decade. Only six of these lots definitely were forfeited and not regranted by the trustees by 1720. A maximum of fourteen more lots could have been forfeited; the incompleteness of the records leaves their status uncertain. Even if all were forfeited, which is unlikely, the forfeiture rate for the 1710s would have been 19.0 percent, far lower than the rate of 28.6 percent for the previous decade.

Not surprisingly, the earliest lots purchased during the 1710s were in the vicinity of the Capitol and prison, as were most of the lots purchased in the previous decade. Figure 4 illustrates the lots known to have been purchased from the trustees during the 1710s and the lots for which the first evidence of their improvement or occupation is found in that decade. (The location of one lot sold by the trustees is unknown

^{42}Michel, "Journey," p. 27.
Figure 4. Lots known from documentary evidence to have been purchased from the trustees 1710-1719, or for which first documentary evidence of occupation appears in the 1710s.
and does not appear on the map.) Almost all of the lots on Duke of Gloucester Street in the four blocks immediately west of the Capitol had been purchased by 1720, and the trustees had sold most of the lots on the north side of Nicholson Street as well. It is likely that Francis Street experienced similar growth. The larger, western part of town began to grow as well, as lots were purchased and homes and businesses constructed. The trustees sold more lots during this decade than they would in any other. In addition, the construction, reconstruction, and modification of public buildings gave definition to the town plan and a sense of permanence to the city. Out of the dust and din of the construction of the 1710s would emerge the mature city.

The pace of original lot sales in Williamsburg slowed considerably in the mid-1720s. Thirteen purchasers obtained twenty-six lots from the trustees in the 1720s, and only one of these lots was purchased after 1725. There are no surviving deeds from the trustees dating from the 1730s. Only five persons obtained deeds from the trustees in the 1740s, and of the eighteen lots represented in these deeds in this decade, eleven were clearly regrants of lots previously obtained by the grantees from the trustees or other persons. Since several of the eleven lots are known to have been developed at the time they were regranted, it seems clear that many of the regrants were intended to assure clear title to the grantee, rather than to give him another chance to develop a lot previously left undeveloped. Other lots granted by the trustees in the 1740s might have been regrants as well. A lot granted to John Blair (number 338) in the 1740s had been claimed by two different persons earlier; it is likely that Blair purchased the lot from one of the disputing parties and wished to assure his title through a grant from the
trustees. Two additional lots granted to Blair in the 1740s (lots 140 and 141) could also have been regrants. Many of his lots lay in the portion of town where the lots had been renumbered at least once by 1800. Some of the lots he purchased in the 1720s cannot be subsequently accounted for under the same numbers, and lots 140 and 141 had not been previously granted by the trustees; perhaps they were regrants of Blair's previous purchases. Therefore, the surviving records indicate a maximum of seven new lots granted by the trustees in the 1740s, and the number might be as low as five.

The last recorded sale of lots by the trustees occurred in the 1750s. In December 1757, Dr. James Carter obtained the two undersized lots east of Queen Street and north of Nicholson Street by trustee deed. He had purchased one of the lots earlier from Benjamin Waller, so that it was clearly a regrant. The other lot had been granted twice by the trustees to other parties and apparently had been forfeited.

The pattern of lot sales evinced by the surviving records for the 1720s through the 1750s indicates that most of Williamsburg's lots were taken up by the mid-1720s. Figure 5 illustrates the lots known from documentary evidence to have been taken up by the end of that decade. The open spaces on the southern half of the map are probably more indicative of the absence of the James City County court records than they are of actual settlement patterns. The York County records and private papers indicate that at least twenty-one more lots were taken up and developed by the end of the 1720s, but the exact locations of these lots are unknown. At least nine of them were in James City County. Of these nine, eight made up one block of contiguous lots and probably were located in the southwest section of the city. If the four lots that
Figure 5. Lots known from documentary evidence to have been purchased from the trustees by 1730

- Lot taken up, title retained
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- Public space
Benjamin Harrison owned in 1699 were on the south side of the Capitol, as seems likely, at least thirteen of the twenty-one lots were in James City County. Thus, the development of the city was both more evenly distributed and more extensive than the figure indicates. The locations of the lots sold indicate that few lots were sold on Duke of Gloucester Street, confirming that most of the lots in that area had been taken up by 1720. Lots sold by the trustees in the 1720s were primarily either clustered loosely around the church, or near the perimeter of the western half of the city. Development in this decade continued to push westward, and outward from the Duke of Gloucester Street to the city limits.

By the time Williamsburg's charter was granted in 1722, then, the town had acquired an obvious maturity. Virtually all of the lots within the town proper had been sold by the trustees. Certainly all of the lots sold in town had not been developed. The relaxed building requirements enacted in 1705 made it possible to retain title to unimproved lots, and members of the gentry/merchant/professional group had purchased whole blocks of lots on the back streets and near the city's boundaries at the western end of town for the purpose of building "seats." These improved blocks in "retired" parts of the city, though not densely developed, must have been impressive in their own way. The 1705 building requirements did serve, however, to encourage the improvement of lots on the Duke of Gloucester Street, and by this time, Duke of Gloucester Street must have been almost fully developed, at least between Market Square and the Capitol. The public buildings, including the College, the Capitol, the prison, the Palace, the new church, the magazine, and the James City County courthouse were all in place by this time and were "justly reputed the best in all the English America, and . . . exceeded by few of their
kind in England.\footnote{Jones, \textit{Present State}, pp. 68-70.} For the amusement of the inhabitants and others, the capital boasted the first theater in British North America and a bowling green, both on Palace Street. From a scattered, rural settlement in 1699, Williamsburg had become in two decades the small city that the charter of 1722 officially recognized, and it must have been an exciting and novel place to rural Virginians.

Clearly, by the early 1720s, though buildings were still being erected, the raw town of the 1710s with the attendant dirt and inconvenience of widespread construction was giving way to a more attractive city with more comforts and amenities. William Byrd's diaries reflect these changes. From 1709 through 1712 Byrd noted few visits to anyone besides the governor, the president, and the commissary, and he and other members of the Council spent many evenings gaming in a public house. When he noted that he walked in town, it was generally to a particular place for a particular purpose. In 1720 and 1721, however, there were more permanent residents and more government officials who had houses in town that they used during public times. The number of persons that Byrd visited was much greater than in the 1710s, and Byrd spent his evenings visiting and gaming in private homes. Also, Byrd seemed more inclined to take walks for the sake of walking, probably because there was more to see in town. He recorded walks to no specified destination, but also mentioned walking out to the landings and to view his brother-in-law John Custis's garden. Although some of his forays were for the purpose of finding women of dubious virtue, most seem to have been for
the simple pleasure of walking about the town.\footnote{Byrd, Secret Diary, pp. 9-572 passim; and William Byrd, The London Diary (1717-1721) and Other Writings, ed. Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), pp. 370-526 passim. Kevin Kelly brought this contrast to my attention.}

As was mentioned above, there are no surviving conveyances from the trustees in the 1730s and few from the 1740s. The late 1740s were a period of crisis for Williamsburg. The Capitol burned on the morning of 30 January 1746/7, leaving only the brick walls standing, the semicircles cracked. The destruction of the Capitol provided an opportunity for some of the burgesses, especially those representing inland counties, to press for the removal of the capital to a point farther west and more convenient for shipping. Even the governor was in favor of the removal, citing to the Board of Trade the cost of rebuilding the Capitol and the expense of maintaining the aging Palace.\footnote{P. R. O., C. O. 5/1326.} On 6 April 1747, the burgesses passed a resolution stating that Williamsburg was "very remote from the far greatest Part of the Inhabitants of this Colony, and by Experience has been found altogether unfit for Trade and Navigation . . .", resulting in the bill "An Act, for Establishing a Town on Pamunkey River; and other Purposes therein mentioned." Happily for Williamsburg, the bill was rejected by the Council,\footnote{McIlwaine and Kennedy, eds., Journals of the House of Burgesses, 7: 242-45; and McIlwaine, ed., Legislative Journals of the Council, 2: 999.} but when Carter Burwell moved for permission to bring in a bill for rebuilding the Capitol, the House defeated the question by a vote of 45 to 26. The House and Council reached an impasse on the issue, and in frustration the governor
prorogued the Assembly.47

The governor had intended that the Assembly be prorogued only until July 1747, but another crisis in Williamsburg prevented the seating of the Assembly until October 1748. From mid-1747 until well into 1748, Williamsburg suffered under a severe smallpox epidemic. Of the estimated 885 inhabitants of the town, at least 754 persons had contracted the disease by 22 February 1747/8, of whom 53 or more died. In addition to, and probably overshadowing for the time being, the fear of the inhabitants for the future of their town, they now feared for their own lives and suffered personal loss and economic hardship in the deaths of children, spouses, and slaves.48 Despite the personal afflictions it caused Williamsburg's citizens, the epidemic was, finally, an agent of salvation for the town as the capital of Virginia.

When the Assembly once more gathered in Williamsburg in October 1748, the governor, according to custom, addressed them and urged their expedition and mutual agreement upon deciding the situation of the capital. No longer, however, did he urge them to remove the capital from the city of Williamsburg. The long suspension of legislative action necessitated by the epidemic had convinced him that keeping the government in Williamsburg, now free from the smallpox, was the surest way of preventing a similar suspension in a new location, with the attendant difficulties of delaying business. The burgesses, however,


were not ready to give up the idea of moving the capital.49 The bill entitled "An Act, for Re-building the Capitol, in the City of Williamsburg" met with no easy acceptance. When it came up for the final vote on 23 November 1748, it passed, but by the slim margin of two votes. The Council agreed to the bill without any amendment, and it received the governor's assent on 17 December 1748.50 The Capitol would be rebuilt in Williamsburg, and the community breathed a collective sigh of relief, but the struggle in the House of Burgesses had been a close call.

Having weathered attempts to remove the capital from the city and an epidemic of smallpox, another crisis faced Williamsburg in the late 1740s—a crisis of space. While most all of the city's lots had been taken up by the mid-1720s, the city had experienced marked population increases in the 1730s and 1740s. Much of the increase was due to immigration, so that there were large numbers of newcomers, many of them artisans, arriving in these decades who needed places to live.51 It is likely that for a time persons willing to take in boarders, and persons like John Blair who had invested in lots as rental properties, could provide housing for the new arrivals. As the 1740s progressed, however, with the population still increasing, and newcomers who had prospered wanting homes of their own, there appears to have been a decided shortage of space within Williamsburg's original borders. Although Figure 6 reflects the lack of surviving documentation for many lots, it shows that

49Ibid., pp. 283-84.
50Ibid., pp. 294-328.
Figure 6. Lots known from documentary evidence to have been purchased by 1750
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the lots in well documented areas of town were virtually all taken up by 1750. In addition, Figure 6 does not show at least twenty-eight additional lots, locations unknown, that had been taken up by the end of the 1740s. Finally, for the first time, in the late 1740s, we have evidence that the city directors were leasing out the land in the Market Square.52 The long-term solution to the land shortage problem, of course, was first implemented by Benjamin Waller who, once it was clear that the town would suffer no decline by a relocation of the capital, recognized a market and sought to fill it by subdividing his land adjoining the city into lots at the end of this decade. Waller's scheme was successful, and he opened the way for others adjoining the eastern end of town to develop their land in this way. For the next three decades, development in Williamsburg was concentrated in the suburbs.

52Lease, City Directors to John Blair, Esq., 2 June 1746, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; Lease, City Directors to John Blair, Esq., 2 December 1746, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia; and Lease, City Directors to Dr. John Dixon, 3 July 1749, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Virginia.
Chapter 2
Settlement Patterns

Because all lots sold by the trustees were offered for sale individually (that is, none were offered solely as parcels of several lots) and because all sold originally for the same price, all purchasers of undeveloped lots in Williamsburg had equal opportunities to buy. All lots were sold by the trustees by means of a conveyance known as a lease and release. The purchaser paid the trustees five shillings for the lease, regardless of the number of lots conveyed, plus fifteen shillings for each lot. Because purchase opportunities were equal, the settlement pattern of those who purchased lots from the trustees should reveal something of the buyers' ideas about how a community should be organized. For example, their purchase patterns should tell us which, if any, locations they conceived to be primarily business or primarily residential. If they segregated their residential neighborhoods by status or by occupation, that tells us much about their social perceptions of community. In this chapter, the occupation/status of the original purchaser of each lot, and the use to which he/she put the lot, if known, will be examined to determine how the original purchasers organized each section of town, practically and socially. The occupation/status of subsequent purchasers of lots in each section of town will be examined to determine possible social change in these areas. Finally, the settlement pattern of the original purchasers will be
compared and contrasted with the settlement pattern in 1748, using a
census taken by neighborhood in that year during the smallpox epidemic,"\textsuperscript{53} to
determine if land use and social composition had evolved in the
various areas of town. Once again, however, the limitations of the data
must be addressed. Because so few leases were recorded in the court
records, it is not always possible to determine the occupant and land use
of tenement properties.

The earliest surviving deed for lots in Williamsburg conveyed to
Philip Ludwell, one of the city's directors, three lots on the north side
of Duke of Gloucester Street adjoining the eastern boundary of the Market
Place. The city directors reclaimed Ludwell's lot immediately contiguous
to the Market Place in order to enlarge that area and make it square. In
recompense, the directors granted Ludwell another lot, the location of
which is unknown."\textsuperscript{54} Ludwell built on his other two lots. Also in 1700,
Scottish immigrant Dr. Archibald Blair (brother of Commissary James
Blair) purchased the lot adjoining Ludwell's easternmost lot, and built a
store. In May 1707, Henry Gill, shoemaker, purchased two lots in the
next block and satisfied the building requirements for each, building a
house on at least one of the lots. He began keeping tavern there in
1709. In August 1708 Richard Bland, former burgess and clerk of Prince
George County court, purchased two lots in the next block toward the
Capitol. He forfeited the western lot, but built on the eastern. By 14
July 1709 he had a store in Williamsburg, but its location is

\textsuperscript{53}"A true State of the small Pox Febry. 22d 1747/8," Virginia
Miscellaneous Manuscripts, Box 1 (1606-1772), Manuscript Division,
Library of Congress.

\textsuperscript{54}Lease and release, Trustees to Philip Ludwell, 23 and 24 September
1700, Lee Family Papers, 1638-1867, Virginia Historical Society,
Richmond, Virginia.
uncertain.\textsuperscript{55} By May 1716 he owned and lived on two other lots on the south side of Duke of Gloucester Street, but when he acquired these is unknown.

On the north side of Duke of Gloucester Street, in the two blocks west of the Capitol, seven lots were sold by the trustees or first known to be occupied during the 1710s. John Brooks, tailor and tavern keeper, purchased lot 51 from the trustees 14 March 1712/3. He improved the lot and in 1724 granted a house and part of the lot to William Prentis. Whether Brooks lived and kept a tavern on this lot is uncertain; he had occupied another house of unknown location prior to his purchase of lot 51, and at his death owned "lots" in Williamsburg. Prentis, who married Brooks's daughter Mary, eventually inherited the rest of the lot; he made his home there until his death. Jacob Flournoy, goldsmith, probably purchased lot 55 from the trustees in the early 1710s; he sold it with improvements to Susanna Allen in January 1712/3, and she subsequently kept a tavern there. Richard Wharton, barrister, acquired and resided on lot 56 by the time he died in 1712. Francis Sharp, carpenter, purchased the two lots adjoining the Capitol Square from the trustees in 1713, forfeited them, and was regranted them in 1717. He retained title to them by building on the lots. From at least the time of his removal to Surry County (after 1726) until his death in 1739, the lots were rental property. Samuel Hyde purchased lot 47 from the trustees in September 1717. He built a dwelling house and sold the part of the lot containing the house to Joseph Freeman, joiner, in March 1718/9, reserving to himself a thirty-foot-wide portion that stretched across the breadth of the north end of the lot. Hyde retained this small portion of the lot

\textsuperscript{55}Byrd, \textit{Secret Diary}, p. 59.
until 1729, when he sold it with improvements to Richard Packe, then-owner of the rest of the lot. Samuel Hyde had inherited a plantation in Yorkhampton Parish, and there is no evidence that he left the country for the town, so he probably purchased lot 47 with the intention of improving and selling one portion of the lot and deriving rental income from the other. Finally, lawyer John Holloway purchased lot 53 from the trustees in July 1719 and made his title good by satisfying the building requirements. It is not likely that he lived on this lot because he had earlier in this decade purchased the block of lots in the northwestern section of the city upon which he would build his home. It is probable that Holloway used this lot on Duke of Gloucester Street as a rental property until he sold it 1724 to Henry Bowcock. Of the six men who purchased lots on the north side of the main street near the Capitol during this decade, three were artisans, two were members of the gentry/merchant/professional group, and one was a planter and the son of a professional. The lots appear to have been put to both residential and business uses, and at least four appear to have been rental properties.

Several lots were sold on the south side of Duke of Gloucester Street between 1700 and 1710. William Robertson, Clerk of the Council, purchased the two lots adjoining the Capitol Square in May 1708 and built himself a residence. By 1707, the two adjoining lots to the west had been purchased by James Shields, tailor and tavern keeper. In May 1707 he sold the westernmost of the two with his "own good dwelling house" to William Byrd, member of the Council and Auditor and Receiver General of the Colony. It is likely that during this decade or the next, Byrd acquired the two lots adjoining this lot on the west. At mid-century he was identified as the former owner of these lots. In January 1707/8
Shields sold his lot between Byrd and Robertson to Huguenot refugee John Marot, a tavern keeper.

On the south side of Duke of Gloucester Street, east of the Market Square, at least two lots were sold by the trustees in the 1710s, and two lots were first known to be occupied in that decade. Orlando Jones, planter and son of the former minister of Bruton Parish, purchased the two westernmost lots in these blocks in October 1716 from the Trustees. He built a house on the lots and ordered the property to be sold in his will. Richard Bland, gentleman, sold the two easterly lots to Nathaniel Harrison in 1716. Bland had "lately lived" upon these lots, before returning to his plantation in Prince George County.56 As noted above, by 14 July 1709 Bland had a store in Williamsburg, but its location is uncertain.57 It might have been located on these lots, on the easternmost of the two lots that he purchased in 1708 on the opposite side of Duke of Gloucester Street, or, less probably, on William Byrd's town property, since Byrd was also concerned in the store. The Jones lots and Bland lots on the south side of the main street appear to have been residential with perhaps a store as well on Bland's lots.

Four lots on Duke of Gloucester Street, between the Market Square and the Capitol, were purchased from the trustees in the 1720s. Christopher Jackson, surveyor and vestry clerk, was regranted two lots that he had purchased in the 1710s. Both lots adjoined the east side of Market Square, one on the north side of Duke of Gloucester Street and one on the south. Jackson probably forfeited these lots because the city's

---

56York County, Virginia, Deeds and Bonds 3, 1713-1729, pp. 118-20.

57Byrd, Secret Diary, p. 59.
directors leased out this portion of the Market Square at mid-century. Samuel Cobbs purchased a lot on the north side of Duke of Gloucester Street, in the block nearest the Capitol, from the trustees in this decade. He owned other lots in town by 1719, by virtue of his marriage to John Marot's daughter and of his own purchase from the trustees. How he utilized the front portion of this lot is unknown, but by 1735 he had erected a tenement at the back of the lot, on Nicholson Street. Michael Archer, gentleman, who formerly owned property on Nicholson Street, also purchased a lot on the north side of Duke of Gloucester Street, which he used as his residence until his death. The evidence is too scant to permit generalizations about how Duke of Gloucester Street lots conveyed by the trustees in the 1720s were used by their purchasers.

The original purchasers of lots on Duke of Gloucester Street east of the Market Square were a social mixture of gentry, merchant/professionals, and artisans. The uses of the lots also varied. Some were tenements, some residential (including gentry residences), and some business. The purchasers remained diverse through the 1740s and included seven gentry (including a gentleman's widow who kept a store), six merchant/professionals, ten artisans, and four tavern keepers. Several lots were tenements, some of which were used as taverns. The area seemed to become progressively more commercial, with fewer lots used strictly for residential purposes. In 1745/6, a lot in the block immediately west of the Capitol was advertised as "the most convenient

---

Spot in this city for Trade."\(^{59}\) The 1748 smallpox census shows only one gentleman (who was also a lawyer) living in this vicinity. He lived on a subdivided lot next to the Capitol.

Tavern keeper and public gaoler John Redwood purchased two lots on the east side of the Capitol Square and two lots on the north side of Nicholson Street from the trustees on 28 April 1708. Redwood probably sought this grant to establish his title to an earlier purchase, because when he sold these four lots to Philip Ludwell on 4 May 1708, the deed stated that the lots adjoining the Capitol Square had built upon them the "now Dwelling house of the said John Redwood and the outhouses thereto belonging." It is unlikely that this construction was accomplished in less than a week. In addition, Redwood's April purchase was not acknowledged by the trustees in court and recorded, so that Ludwell in June 1719 was obliged to forfeit the lots on Nicholson Street (which do not appear to have been built upon) in order to receive clear title to the Capitol Square lots. These two lots remained in Ludwell's family throughout the colonial period and were used as rental properties.

Another purchaser on Nicholson Street was William Sherman. A baker who had been licensed to keep a tavern in 1705, Sherman had purchased two lots adjoining the prison by June 1708, when he sold them to Joseph Chermeson, who subsequently kept a tavern there.

Its proximity to the Capitol and prison also made Nicholson Street, from Queen Street eastward, an area much in demand in the 1710s. Goldsmith John Broadnax, who was the keeper of the public prison and Capitol for most of the decade, had obtained by the time of his death in 1718 or 1719 three lots near the eastern end of Nicholson Street, very

\(^{59}\textit{Virginia Gazette}, 23 January 1745/6.
handy for his public duties. By the end of the decade, the trustees had conveyed at least fifteen of the sixteen lots between the prison and Queen Street. On 14 March 1712/3 tavern keeper John Marot purchased four lots in this area from the trustees, and they remained in his family until 1762. Since he apparently lived and had his tavern on Duke of Gloucester Street, these lots probably were rental property. On 3 April 1713 Christopher Jackson, surveyor and vestry clerk, purchased three lots. Whether he forfeited or disposed of the westernmost of these lots is uncertain, but by 1739 it was owned by Thomas Ravenscroft, carpenter, and had tenements on it. Jackson sold the adjoining lot to Thomas Ravenscroft in May 1715. Jackson's third lot was regranted in 1714 by the trustees to John Pasteur, perukemaker, who lived there until his death in 1741. Francis Tyler, gentleman, purchased the undersized lot adjoining Queen Street from the trustees in November 1715 and sold it with improvements to James Roscow, Esquire, in 1720. Tyler purchased several other Williamsburg lots during this decade, so that the use he made of this lot is uncertain. In November 1716, Thomas Ravenscroft was granted two lots by the trustees. One was a regrant of a lot he had purchased from Michael Archer the previous year, and one was a new grant. These lots adjoined the lot Ravenscroft had purchased from Jackson in 1715. How Ravenscroft used the lots he obtained from the trustees is unknown. Edward Ripping, tavern keeper, obtained three contiguous lots from the trustees on 11 December 1717. This might have been a regrant of a previous purchase because he sold these three lots to Henry Gill, shoemaker and tavern keeper, on 16 December 1717 with improvements. On 3 April 1719 widow Bridget Menetree obtained two lots in this area from the trustees. These lots were two of the four that Philip Ludwell had
purchased of John Redwood in 1708; Ludwell relinquished them to the trustees because Redwood's purchase of these from the trustees had never been formally acknowledged by them in court. Menetree sold the lots in September 1719 to Lewis Deloney, carpenter; how she used them during her brief ownership is unknown. This north side of Nicholson Street, from Queen Street eastward, was virtually all taken up by the end of this decade. Eight purchasers obtained eighteen lots (one of which was forfeited and regranted). Three purchasers were artisans, and one was the widow of an artisan. Two were tavern keepers, though neither appears to have kept a tavern on his lots on Nicholson Street. Only one purchaser was from the gentry/merchant/professional group, and one was a surveyor and clerk. Four of the lots appear to have been residential, and at least four were rental properties, either business or residential. Six lots were purchased and resold quickly, perhaps indicating that they were purchased as an investment. The original owners of virtually all of the lots in this area of Nicholson Street were of middling status, but (for the most part) whether they resided here, rented to others of equal or lesser status, or used their lots for business development is uncertain.

Nicholson Street seems to have maintained its middling character through the 1740s. Subsequent purchasers included six gentry, only one of which definitely lived there. All but one (who had a residence elsewhere in town) lived outside Williamsburg, so it is likely that most of the gentry properties were tenements during their ownership. Other purchasers included seven artisans, a merchant, the public gaoler, and the county clerk. In 1748, the residents included the gentleman, a tailor, a wigmaker, a goldsmith, a merchant (a tenant of another, non-
resident merchant), a joiner, two widows, the public gaoler, and one person of unknown occupation.

Figure 4 shows that beginning in the 1710s, development was not restricted to the eastern end of town. There was considerable interest in the lots at the western end of the city as well, perhaps because the construction and reconstruction of public buildings in that area made it seem more viable, and thus more attractive than it had previously. In the area north of Nicholson Street and east of Palace Street to the city boundary adjoining Queen Street, the trustees conveyed twenty-five of the thirty-two lots available in the area during the 1710s. Only one of these lots was clearly forfeited and not regranted during the decade; the incompleteness of the records makes it unclear whether or not the building requirements were satisfied for three additional lots. In April 1713 Christopher Jackson, surveyor and clerk, acquired one lot in this part of town, along with those he had purchased on Nicholson Street and two lots on Market Square. Jackson forfeited the lot near the Palace, and it was regranted in July 1716 to merchant Archibald Blair, along with three contiguous lots, the four of which Blair used for his residence and gardens. Alexander Spotswood purchased a lot at the corner of England Street and Scotland Street from the trustees in September 1713. When he sold it to John Randolph in 1723, the lot contained a dwelling house or tenement, indicating that the lot was a residential rental property. Daniel Groome, tanner, purchased one lot on Nicholson Street facing the Market Square from the trustees in April 1713. He forfeited this lot, and it was regranted with two contiguous lots at the corner of Nicholson Street and Palace Street to William Levingston, gentleman and merchant of New Kent County, in November 1716. Levingston constructed his residence,
a bowling green, and the first theater in British North America on these lots. The theater was completed by November 1718, when a play was presented in celebration of the King's birthday. In November 1714, the trustees granted to William Robertson, Clerk of the Council, the block of eight lots encompassed by Nicholson, England, Queen, and Scotland Streets. On four of the lots he built a windmill, which he sold to John Holloway, Esquire, in December 1723. He sold two of the lots to Philip Ludwell, Esquire, in December 1715, apparently without having made improvements on them. Robertson forfeited the remaining two lots. One was regranted to John Tyler, gentleman, who had acted as overseer of the construction of the governor's house. Whether he retained this lot and how he used it are unknown. Robertson's other forfeited lot was regranted to Samuel Cobbs, merchant, who sold it with improvements to Christopher DeGraffenried in July 1723. Cobbs owned several lots in Williamsburg, so his use of this lot is uncertain. William Robertson did not live on any of his block of eight lots; he continued to reside on parts of his two lots adjoining the Capitol Square. John Brush, gunsmith, purchased the remaining two lots on the east side of Palace Street in July 1717. He built a residence and lived there until his death. Francis Tyler, gentleman, purchased four contiguous lots from the trustees in May 1717. These lots were on Scotland Street at the terminus of England Street, and were a perfect location for a gentleman's residence. A house placed here would have complemented the town plan by placing a substantial residence at the end of England Street, and from the house one would have had a pleasant view of the ornamental magazine.

---

The "Frenchman's Map" of 1782 shows a large building on these lots, but whether Francis Tyler built a residence, substantial or otherwise, on these lots before he sold them in 1720, with improvements, to Gawin Corbin, Esquire, is uncertain. George Riddell, occupation unknown, in August 1717 obtained from the trustees the lot adjoining the eastern boundary of the Palace grounds and subsequently forfeited it. The lot was not regranted during this decade. Finally, John Tyler, gentleman, acquired from the trustees in November 1719 two lots adjoining his brother Francis's four lots on Scotland Street. Whether John Tyler forfeited the lots or improved them and sold them is not clear, but William Levingston owned the lots by May 1721, when he mortgaged them to Archibald Blair.

For the most part, men who purchased lots in this area of town from the trustees in the 1710s appear to have been of a higher social calibre than those who purchased lots on Nicholson Street in the same decade. Seven purchasers of lots between Palace Street and Queen Street were gentry, professionals, or merchants. Two were artisans, one a surveyor and clerk, and the other's occupation is unknown. Of the lots sold, seven were definitely used for residential purposes, and another four probably were. Archibald Blair's purchase of several lots illustrates the tendency of members of the gentry/merchant/professional group to purchase several contiguous lots in the western part of the city for the construction of a house and gardens; Francis Tyler's purchase of four contiguous lots might have been intended for the same purpose. The four lots upon which the windmill was built were used for commercial purposes, and the three lots containing a theater, bowling green and residence were mixed business and residential. The purposes for which six of the lots
were used is uncertain, and one was forfeited and not regranted during this decade.

Five of the twenty-six lots granted by the trustees in the 1720s were located in the area bounded on the south by Nicholson Street, on the west by Palace Street, on the north by the city boundary, and on the east by the city boundary parallel to Queen Street. Three contiguous lots, including the two undersized lots on the city boundary, were bought by Dr. George Allen and forfeited. There is no evidence of their intended use. One lot, next door to the Palace, was purchased by John Davis, a carpenter/planter of Bruton Parish, who already owned two lots in Queen Mary's Port, upon which he subsequently kept an ordinary. Davis appears to have purchased the lot next to the Palace as an investment; he made improvements on the lot and sold it the following year. The other lot in this section of town purchased during the 1720s was obtained from the trustees by Daniel Pegram, a carpenter, who built his residence on the lot and lived there until his death.

Six lots sold by the trustees in the 1740s were located in this same section of town. Three contiguous lots were purchased from the trustees by Lewis Burwell, Gent., one of which he had previously obtained from the widow of Daniel Pegram, bricklayer. How he used these lots is unknown. William Prentis, merchant, purchased the three lots in this part of town that had been granted by the trustees in the 1720s to Dr. George Allen. These included the two smaller lots adjoining the city boundary. He forfeited the southernmost of the undersized lots, but retained until his death the other small lot and the lot that adjoined it on the west. Prentis's home and store were both located on Duke of Gloucester Street, so these two lots were probably rental properties.
The area under discussion continued to be more "gentrified" than the Nicholson Street area through the 1740s. Subsequent purchasers included four gentry, four merchant/professionals, a carpenter, and a widow. The 1748 smallpox census appears to have left some residents out of this neighborhood, but it lists two doctors, a dancing master, the Attorney General of the colony, and a foreign gentleman, besides two persons of unknown status/occupation as residents. The area seems to have become more residential and less commercial, although the doctors both had their shops in the area. The playhouse had been sold to the city for a courthouse, and there is no evidence that the windmill was still in operation.

At least four of the available lots adjoining the east and west sides of the Market Square were taken up during the 1710s. As noted above, the Market Square area underwent some changes late in the previous decade or early in the 1710s. First the directors appear to have incorporated into the Market Place the four "short" lots that had adjoined it on the east and west. By April 1713, however, the two lots adjoining the Market Square on the east were once again available for purchase; in that month the trustees sold these lots, one on the north side of Duke of Gloucester Street and one on the south, to Christopher Jackson. Jackson was regranted both lots in February 1722/3. Whether he had forfeited his original grant by failing to build, or whether he simply wished to doubly secure his title is unknown, but as noted above, he evidently forfeited this second grant because this part of the Market Square was later leased out by the city. The "short" lots on the west side of the Market Square, however, appear to have remained a part of the Square, and were not resold by the trustees. The two full half-acre lots adjoining the
northwest corner of the enlarged Market Square were sold by the trustees in February 1716/7 to Samuel Cobbs, merchant. He satisfied the building requirements and sold them in July 1719. Because Cobbs owned several lots in the city, the use he made of these two lots is uncertain. Subsequent owners of these two lots were a non-resident gentleman, who probably rented them out, and a gunsmith, who resided and had his business there in 1748.

The area north of Duke of Gloucester Street and west of Palace Street was less densely developed during the 1710s than were the areas along Nicholson and Scotland streets east of Palace Street, but twenty-nine lots were sold here in this decade. In September 1712 William Craig purchased two lots on the city's western boundary, across from the College, and subsequently resided and operated a tavern there until his death in 1720. Benjamin Harrison, gentleman, purchased a lot at the corner of Duke of Gloucester and Henry Streets on 3 March 1713/4 from the trustees. The records for this lot are incomplete, so that it is unknown whether he forfeited or improved the lot. In January 1713/4 John Anderson, formerly a middling planter, purchased a lot in this area from the trustees. Whether he lived there or not is unknown, but he sold it with improvements to shoemaker Thomas Allen in June 1716. John Holloway, lawyer, purchased nine lots immediately west of the Palace in May 1715, built his residence there, and continued to live upon these lots until his death. Richard King, carpenter, acquired a block of ten lots encompassed by Henry, Scotland, Nassau, and Prince George Streets in May 1716. One of the lots was forfeited, and one was regranted two months later to William Timson, gentleman, by the trustees; whether King sold this lot to Timson is unknown. According to King's executor, at his
death King owned six of the lots and resided there; what became of the other two lots between King's purchase and his death is unknown. William Timson was granted two additional lots by the trustees in July 1716. Timson sold all three lots, located on Prince George Street, to James Shields in May 1717, having built upon them. Shields subsequently resided on one of the lots. Barber David Cunningham bought from the trustees on 14 July 1717 two lots adjoining Benjamin Harrison's lot on Duke of Gloucester Street. Cunningham appears to have continued to reside on his lots near the prison on Nicholson Street, however. He sold the westernmost of the two lots on the main street to John Blair in February 1718/9, and Blair built his residence on that lot. The other Cunningham sold unimproved to Timothy Sullivant in June 1718, but it evidently reverted to the trustees because they regranted it to John Holloway on 18 July 1719. How Holloway used the lot is unknown, but it was probably a rental property because his residence was on the group of lots he acquired earlier in the decade. Finally, Ambrose Cobbs, a middling planter, purchased two lots from the trustees in June 1718. Cobbs died before he could improve the lots, but his son was regranted the lots by the trustees on the day his father's grant ran out. Four of the nine purchasers in this area of town were gentry or professionals. Two were artisans, and one a tavern keeper. Two were middling planters from neighboring parishes. At least sixteen of the lots were residential; a lawyer lived on a group of ten lots, and a carpenter lived on a group of six. Two additional lots were used as residences by subsequent purchasers. Two lots were used for a tavern and residence. One lot was probably a rental property, three were forfeited, and the use of the remaining lots remains unknown.
Fifteen of the twenty-six lots conveyed by the trustees in the 1720s were located in the area of town bounded by Duke of Gloucester Street, Palace Street, and the western and northern boundaries of the city. Those purchasers who were designated in the records as "gentleman" or who were either merchants or professionals obtained twelve of the lots sold in this area. Thomas Jones, merchant, forfeited all six of the lots that he purchased in this area of town; Jones's lots were contained in one city block on the perimeter of the city, and were probably intended for a residence. Three of the forfeited lots were regranted to Henry Cary, gentleman, the overseer of several public building projects, who subsequently forfeited one of the lots, which was then regranted to bricklayer David Menetree in this decade. Menetree had previously purchased from Cary the adjoining unimproved lot in this group of three. By the time Menetree sold his two lots in 1736, a rental residence had been created upon them. The uses to which the gentry/merchant/professional status group put its unforfeited lots are, for the most part, uncertain. John Blair, merchant, purchased two lots that were subsequently used as tenements; since he had purchased in the 1710s the lot on which his home would stand, perhaps the other two lots that Blair purchased in the 1720s served as rental properties as well. John Holloway, lawyer, also had purchased his residential lots in the 1710s, so the two lots he obtained from the trustees in the 1720s probably were intended as tenements.

The three remaining lots conveyed in this part of the city during the 1720s were purchased by persons of lesser status. Two adjoining lots in this portion of town were purchased from the trustees by planter Robert Cobbs of Bruton Parish, who appears to have fallen into the rough
classification of "middling." His purchase from the trustees was a regrant of the two lots granted to his father, since deceased. Since Robert Cobbs appears never to have moved into town from his plantation, he probably was eager to keep the lots as an investment. He satisfied the building requirements and probably rented the lots until he sold them, five years after obtaining them from the trustees, to John Blair for eighteen pounds, Virginia currency. The last lot purchased in this part of town in the 1720s, and the only lot purchased from the trustees in the second half of the decade, was obtained by Hannah Shields, widow of tailor/planter James Shields. This lot adjoined the residence that she had shared with her late husband at the time of his death. There is no further evidence concerning this lot. To sum up, it appears that at least eight of the fifteen lots purchased in the 1720s in the part of town north of Duke of Gloucester Street and west of Palace Street were purchased as rental properties, four by two members of the gentry/merchant/professional group, two by a bricklayer, and two by a middling planter. Six contiguous lots near the city boundary were purchased by a merchant, probably for a residence, and subsequently forfeited. The intended uses of the three remaining lots in this section of town remain ambiguous. Two were purchased by a merchant and one by a widow of middling status.

Twelve of the eighteen lots granted (or regranted) by the trustees in the 1740s were in this same portion of the city. Six of the lots went to John Blair, merchant, three of which were certainly regrants. One was subsequently used as a tenement, one almost certainly was, and the other was the lot on which his home stood. The other three lots might have been regrants as well. One (number 338), which adjoined his home lot,
had been claimed by two different persons earlier. He probably had purchased it from one of the parties and wished in the 1740s to make sure his title was secure. Blair's gardens are mentioned as boundaries of lots nearby, so it's likely that at least a portion of this lot formed part of his gardens. The other two (lots 140 and 141), as indicated above, might have been renumbered since they were first obtained by Blair. The other six lots purchased in this part of town in the 1740s were regranted to Dr. John Amson. They were a block of six lots located in the extreme northwestern corner of the city. Amson bought the remainder of a 500-year lease of these lots from Thomas Jones, trustee of John Holloway, at about the same time that he obtained his grant for them from the trustees of the city. It is possible that the trustee deed was obtained to nullify the long-term lease. Amson resided on these lots. Of the twelve lots purchased in this part of town, nine were clearly regrants. All were purchased by two men in the gentry/merchant/professional group, who used at least seven of these lots for their residences and at least one as a tenement.

The subsequent purchasers in this part of town continued to be of varied status/occupation through the 1740s. Most bought single or small numbers of lots since several large blocks of contiguous lots had already been taken up. The buyers included a gentleman, two merchant/professionals, four artisans, a widow, and a tavern keeper (whose tavern was elsewhere). The uses they made of their lots are uncertain, for the most part. A blacksmith made his residence on the lot he purchased, but that is the only certainty. The 1748 census for this part of town is difficult to interpret as well, because it runs into the part of the census that lists the households in the James City County
side of town. It is difficult, therefore, to determine whether unfamiliar listings are poorly documented James City County residents or poorly documented tenants living in the York County portion of town. Those residents listed on the census who can be distinguished as inhabitants of the northwest section of the city include two gentleman, a gentleman's widow, a doctor, a carpenter, and a blacksmith.

The area south of Duke of Gloucester Street and west of Queen Street is in James City County, so that the purchases of lots in that area in the 1710s are not well documented, but private papers have left us some evidence of the pattern of settlement in that area. By the end of the decade, John Custis, gentleman and burgess, owned twelve of the eighteen lots known to have been first occupied in this area during the 1710s. In August 1714 Custis obtained from the trustees three contiguous lots on Duke of Gloucester Street at the corner of King Street. Custis subsequently rented each of these lots. At about the same time he acquired a block of eight lots encompassed by France Street, King Street, Ireland Street, and Nassau Street. By January 1718/9 this block was known as "Custis Square."\(^{61}\) Custis built his residence here and had a notable garden on these lots. Finally, on 13 January 1718/9, Custis acquired lot M on France Street from William Blaikley, who had purchased it from John Tullitt on 7 November 1716, the first date that this lot is known to have been occupied. Presumably Custis derived rental income from this property. In addition to Custis's property in this portion of town, a block of six lots was acquired from the trustees by William Bassett, Esquire, of New Kent County in October 1717. The block adjoined

---

the southern boundary of the city and was surrounded by Ireland, King, and England Streets. Bassett constructed his residence on these lots.

Two lots located on the south side of Duke of Gloucester Street near the College, in James City County, and sold by the trustees in the 1720s were purchased by Thomas Jones, merchant. There is no evidence concerning his use of these lots. A block of eight lots in James City County in 1720 came into the hands of John Pratt via a mortgagor who had foreclosed on the lots when the first recorded owner defaulted sometime previously. He sold these lots to his nephew's widow Elizabeth Pratt, who subsequently married the merchant Thomas Jones. The lots remained the Jones family residence until the early 1750s.

Custis continued to hold his residence and rental properties through the 1740s, and Bassett and Jones maintained their holdings as well. As noted above, the census of 1748 is difficult to interpret for the James City County side of town, but it appears that additional residents west of Queen Street included a merchant, a widow who took in lodgers, a female former servant, a barber/wigmaker, and several persons of undetermined occupation.

Figure 4 shows no new development on the south side of Francis Street east of Queen Street during the 1710s, nor is there documentary evidence of development in this area in the 1720s or 1730s. Because this area was in James City County, it is more likely that apparent inactivity in this area is due to the fact that the records did not survive, rather than to the fact that there was no development here. It is likely that development on this back street proceeded at a similar rate to that on Nicholson Street. Although the 1748 census listings for James City County are sometimes difficult to distinguish, it appears that there were
approximately ten households on Francis Street in that year, while there were nine on Nicholson Street.

The early prominence of the Capitol and its governmental function made the area near the Capitol Square attractive for both business and residential purposes. Many of the gentry who built residences near the Capitol in the early years were colony-level officials who took advantage of the convenient location. This integration of residential and business development appears to have been common among the original purchasers for those areas of town for which we have sufficient data concerning early land use. Although combining a residence and place of business in one lot or building was traditional and common among artisans and some retailers, less expected was the extent to which early gentry residences stood cheek-by-jowl with taverns and tailors' shops. Evidently the arrangement was acceptable to the various status/occupational groups.

Still, some areas of town evolved more toward one use or another. By the late 1740s, the Duke of Gloucester Street east of the Market Square was predominantly commercial. Although many of the business lots contained residences as well, no longer were there many strictly residential lots. Nor were the gentry living here. On the contrary, beginning in the 1710s, the gentry had tended to buy up blocks of two or more lots in the western, more "retired" part of the city for their residences. That part of town was not strictly residential either, but development there was less congested because more people owned multiple lots and few lots were subdivided. Similarly, the area north of Duke of Gloucester Street between Palace Street and Queen Street became less commercial and more residential by the late 1740s than it had been in its early development. Although no portion of town ever excluded business
development, the trend was toward more specialization of neighborhood function.

Neighborhoods remained socially diverse, however, and no occupational enclaves developed. From the earliest years, various status/occupation groups lived side by side, and the passage of time brought no divergence from that pattern. Even Nicholson Street, whose original developers were mostly of the middling sort, and whose residents mainly continued so, had a gentleman and a merchant as residents. The large number of tenements in every neighborhood, which likely supplied housing for the lower-income artisans and some poor, further assured integration among groups on all rungs of the social ladder. Neighborhoods appear to have been more socially mixed in Williamsburg than they were in Annapolis.\textsuperscript{62}

Although various status groups lived side by side, it is unclear how "neighborly" they were.\textsuperscript{63} In the class-conscious eighteenth century, it is not likely that they visited freely with one another. Yet it does seem likely that they were acquainted with one another and (at least by word of mouth) with some of one another's personal concerns. The presentments of the grand jury make it clear that the grand jurymen at least were aware of their neighbors' foibles. The York County deeds contain evidence that less affluent townsmen often went to nearby

\textsuperscript{62}Baker, "Land Development in Annapolis," see maps in appendix.

\textsuperscript{63}Also unclear is how Williamsburg citizens defined "neighbor." Social networking studies are needed to determine the spatial limits of their concept of "neighbor." In the meantime, because Williamsburg was a small community, I have assumed that persons living within roughly half of the length of the town from one another could be considered neighbors or "nearby."
gentry/merchant/professionals for mortgage money, and the wills show that the less-affluent sometimes requested the wealthier to act as executors of their estates. That the gentry served on the vestry also indicates that they must have been aware of the needs of the truly poor living in their vicinity. It is almost certain that in this small town, too, the family and financial concerns of the gentry were discussed by their neighbors. In all respects, Williamsburg's neighborhoods were not as socially segregated as those in most modern cities are.

See, for example, York County, Virginia, Deeds and Bonds 4, pp. 406-409; and Deeds and Bonds 5, pp. 89-91, 102-105, and 113-114. A systematic study of mortgagor/mortgagee proximity in Williamsburg, however, has yet to be undertaken.

See Hellier and Kelly, "A Population Profile," pp. 19-20, for a discussion of the frequency with which the merchants who lived in the city in 1748 played some role in the probates of their neighbors.

Chapter 3
The City Land Market in the 1740s

An examination of the real estate market in 1748 reveals that opportunities to purchase lots were limited for some groups, creating the demand that in the following year brought about the sale of lots immediately outside the city's boundaries. Of course, the limitations of the data prevent us from knowing the complete history of each lot. Of the 273 lots shown on the earliest known plats of the city (circa 1800), sufficient title history survives to identify the owner of 132 lots in 1748 and to document the lot's history from at least 1743 through 1748. Adjustment must be made, however, for the subdivision of some of these lots. Because the actual size of a portion of a lot is not always identified in the deeds, to simplify matters each part of a lot that has been divided into two parts has been tallied as half a lot, each part of a lot that has been divided into four counts as one-quarter of a lot, and so on. Because the owners of all subdivided portions of lots cannot be identified in 1748, those fractions of lots whose owners are unknown have been subtracted from 132, leaving a total of 130.5 lots with sufficiently documented histories, or slightly less than half (48%) of all the lots in town. They are located in all areas of the York County side of town, and some (31 lots, or 24%) are located on the James City County side. Because some means of transferring title to a property, such as inheritance, gift, or even sale to family members or business associates
(in the case of a commercial property), indicate that the property was not available to the general market, lots that remained in a particular family or business partnership were tallied as having only one "owner" until it appeared that the property was offered for sale to the public. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I have assumed that the conclusions drawn from the historied lots are likely to hold true for those lots whose histories were partially or wholly recorded in jurisdictions where the records do not survive.

The title histories reveal that once the 1748 lot owners had acquired their lots, they tended to hold on to them. There was some movement in the market, however. A total of 25.5 lots (19.5%) had been held by the 1748 owner for five years or less. (See Table 1.) Sixteen lots (12.2%) had been held by their owners for six to ten years. Yet the overall impression is one of remarkable stability. In 1748 a total of eighty-eight lots (67.4%) had been held by their present owners for more than ten years. Thirty-nine lots (29.9%) had been held by the owners for over 30 years, and 6.5 lots (5.0%) had been under the same ownership for over thirty-five years. In addition, of those lots held by the owners in 1748 for five years or less, eleven (43.1%) had been held for over ten years by the previous owner. (See Table 2.) Clearly opportunities for lot ownership were limited for newcomers in the late 1740s.

An examination of the lot histories reveals that when the lot owners of 1748 are categorized by status/occupation, it becomes apparent that all groups did not demonstrate an equal tendency to retain their lots. Of the total number of historied lots, seventy-one (54.4%) were owned by the gentry. Only three of these lots were held for ten years or less, and fifty-six were held for twenty years or more. On the opposite end of
Table 1. Years lots held by owners in 1748.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No. lots</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total 110.5 84.6

Note: The numbers of years with a plus sign following represent the minimum years of ownership when the exact years of ownership are unknown.
Table 2. For lots held 5 years or less in 1748, number of years held by previous owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>No. lots</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No previous owner</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous years owned unknown</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the spectrum, only seventeen lots (13.0%) were held by artisans. Of these, none were owned for over twenty years, but fourteen were owned for ten years or less; seven of these were held for five years or less. The merchant/professional group fared only slightly better than the artisans. This group owned 29.5 (22.6%) lots in 1748, only two of which were owned for more than twenty years. Fifteen lots were owned by merchants/professionals for less than five years. Tavern keepers or their heirs owned 9.5 lots (7.3%) in 1748. Of these, four had been owned for over thirty years, two for eleven to twenty years, and 3.5 for less than ten years. Persons of unknown occupation owned 3.5 lots (2.7%), all for ten years or less. The gentry owned the most lots and were the least likely to put them on the market. They came from established Virginia families with dense kinship networks that allowed them to more easily keep lots in the family through inheritance. Although tavern keepers owned the fewest lots of the known-occupation groups, they were proportionally longer-established than either the merchant/professional group or the artisans, probably because tavern keeping tended to be continued as a family business. The artisans fared the worst, owning few lots and being established for the shortest time. Both artisans and merchants often arrived as adults from areas outside Virginia and lacked the local family connections that enabled the gentry and tavern keepers to inherit lots. Yet these figures show that some artisans were able to purchase lots in the 1740s. The artisans who owned lots in 1748 tended to be producers of luxury goods (a watchmaker, silversmith, milliner, and wig maker, for example), although a tailor and blacksmith were included among them.

The uses to which the status/occupational groups put their lots also
varied. Understandably all groups owned residential lots. Forty-two (59%) of the gentry's lots were residential. Gentry owners tended to own groups of lots which they developed as personal residences. Some resided on whole city blocks containing from six to ten lots. Seventeen (58%) of the merchant/professional group's lots were residential, and eight (47%) of the artisans' lots were residential. That figure is a maximum because although the evidence sometimes reveals that an artisan's residence and shop were on different lots, it often does not. Only one of the tavern keepers' lots was strictly residential, probably because the nature of the business made it more convenient to live on the premises. All groups except the gentry owned business or combination business/residential lots. The merchants/professionals owned 10.5 (36%) business or combination lots, the artisans five (29%), and the tavernkeepers three (32%). The gentry also owned the greatest number of income-producing lots, that is, rental properties or tenements. Of their seventy-one lots, twenty-four (34%) were tenements. An additional five lots owned by the gentry were used for unknown purposes, but they may have included some tenements as well. Only two (7%) of the merchant/professional group's lots were tenements, yet the artisans owned three tenements (18%). The extended Shields-Wetherburn tavern-keeping family managed to have acquired 6.5 tenement lots by 1748; at 68% of the total number of lots held by this occupational group, the tavern keepers held the greatest proportion of tenements per total lots owned. Still, the gentry owned nearly four times that number. The gentry's tenements, long-owned and dependably income-producing in a tight real estate market, were not likely to be put up for sale. Yet there was sufficient opportunity in the market for a merchant and two artisans to obtain a total of five
tenements between 1738 and 1748.

An examination of the deeds for properties actually bought and sold during the 1740s reveal that a number of lots did change hands from 1740 through 1749. A total of 32.25 lots were sold during this period, but when the lots or fractions of lots that were sold more than once during the decade are considered, the surviving deeds record 43 opportunities to purchase a lot or a part of a lot during those years. All of the lots were located in York County, so that at least 21.4% of the 151 lots on the York side of town were available for purchase at some time during that ten years. These figures, however, may not represent real opportunities for lot purchase. For example, of the twenty-five deeds conveying lots during this decade, ten represent the sale of two or more contiguous lots. Six deeds conveyed two adjoining lots each, one conveyed three, two conveyed four adjoining lots, and one deed represented the sale of a block of six lots. The recorded prices for these sales ranged from a surprisingly low 43 pounds Virginia currency for the six lots, to 232 pounds Virginia currency; all but two parcels cost over 100 pounds. Multiple lots offered as one parcel were probably prohibitively expensive for many purchasers. On the other hand, the five fractions of lots sold might have been insufficient for buyers seeking residential property. Location also limited opportunities for lot purchase. Figure 7 shows the locations of lots sold during this decade (except for two adjoining lots on Prince George Street that cannot be precisely located). For example, lots on the back streets, far from the Capitol or College, were not desirable locations for many businesses, making these lots inappropriate investments for most merchants and artisans. Finally, the desirability of certain properties and the extent
Figure 7. Lots sold by private parties in the 1740s
of improvements made upon them priced them beyond the range of many would-be lot purchasers. One example is the Raleigh Tavern, a successful concern known throughout Virginia, which was on the market twice during the decade. It sold in 1742 for 250 pounds, and in 1749 for 700 pounds Virginia currency, far beyond the means of most artisans. Other single lots and fractions of lots located on Duke of Gloucester Street in the desirable "business district" near the Capitol sold for 80 pounds, 50 pounds, 100 pounds, and 215 pounds, all Virginia currency. The average price for a single lot on Nicholson Street during this decade, however, was only 40 pounds Virginia currency. These lots appear to have been less extensively improved and their location was less advantageous for trade. Thus, although a number of properties were available for purchase during the 1740s, the factors of price and location limited purchase opportunities for buyers.

As noted above, owners of lots in the late 1740s tended to hold on to their lots. Whether because of an emotional attachment to a residence, especially one that had been in the family for a considerable period of time, or because of the advantages of location for business or other uses, or because of the advantage of retaining tenements in a market where lessees had limited opportunity to escape tenancy, there seems to have been a mentality in Williamsburg in the late 1740s that encouraged lot owners to retain their lots. Although 32.25 lots were conveyed in the 1740s according to surviving deeds, a significant portion of these lots were not put up for sale willingly by the principal owner. For example, 10.75 lots were sold by the owners' executors. An additional six lots were sold by an owner's trustee as part of a bankruptcy settlement, and one was sold by a mortgagee who had foreclosed when the
owner had had financial difficulty. More than half (55.0%) of the lots sold during the decade were not sold voluntarily by their owners.

The picture that emerges of the real estate market in the 1740s is that of a seller's market in which owners were reluctant to sell. Lot ownership was dominated by the gentry, who owned over half of the sample lots and who had owned them for some time. The gentry were in no hurry to sell either their residences or the tenements from which they were deriving a virtually guaranteed income. Although the discussion in the previous chapter indicates that artisans had purchased lots in significant numbers in previous decades, they owned a relatively insignificant portion of the city's lots in 1748. Of the twenty-three deeds executed between 1700 and 1740 (when the gentry were most actively buying lots) that conveyed artisan-owned property, ten (43.5%) conveyed lots to the gentry, three (13.0%) to merchant/professionals, and six (26.1%) to other artisans. The domination of the land market by the gentry and the squeezing out of the artisans also happened in Williamsburg's sister capital in the eighteenth century. In Annapolis the percentage of town land owned by bureaucrats (gentry) and merchants was 70% in 1740, and remained at that level until the Revolution.

Williamsburg's gentry and merchant/professional group owned 77.0% of the historied lots in 1748, but additional opportunities for artisans opened up with the subdivision of lands adjoining the city beginning the following year. The records of sales of lots created from the lands of Benjamin Waller (adjoining the city's eastern boundary) and Matthew Moody (along the west side of the road to Queen Mary's Port) indicate that the lots were purchased almost entirely by artisans and other persons

---

classified as "middling." In these new subdivisions, there were very few
gentry purchasers.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{68}Hellier, "Urban Expansion in Williamsburg," pp. 68-74.
Chapter 4
Conclusion

Although Virginians exhibited an initial hesitation to invest in land in their new capital, most of the lots were sold during the 1710s. Perhaps the long-awaited arrival of a resident lieutenant-governor and the subsequent resumption of regular meetings of the legislature stimulated confidence in the future of the fledgling city.

Surviving deeds indicate that although virtually all of the city's lots had been sold by the trustees by the mid-1720s, there was no demand for additional lots for development until almost 1750. Undoubtedly part of the reason was that the population was not sufficiently dense to "fill up" the town until the late 1740s. In addition, the tendency early in the city's development for the gentry to purchase several contiguous lots for their residences and gardens can help to create the impression that there was a wider demand for lots early on than there actually was. As the population increased in the 1730s and 1740s, the newcomers, many of them artisans who likely could not yet afford to buy developed property, were better served by the numerous tenements in town. In the particularly desirable portions of town, such as near the Capitol, the need for additional residential and commercial space was met by the subdivision of lots. For many reasons, demand was not felt for additional land for development until the late 1740s.

Yet when the need was felt near mid-century, the need was acute. The
real estate market was very tight. The city's directors even began leasing off portions of the Market Square to ease the demand. The gentry owned a majority of the lots in the city, and unless they went bankrupt or their executors elected to sell, there was no reason for them to give up their lots. The gentry, in general, had held their property for many years. They were not likely to give up their residences on several lots in preference to more cramped conditions, nor were they likely to sell off their tenements, which in the tight market were providing them with an almost assured rental income. By gradually acquiring more and more town lots early in the city's development, the gentry edged other status/occupational groups out of the later market. For example, by the late 1740s, the artisans owned few lots and had owned their town properties for the least amount of time in relation to other status/occupational groups, although in earlier years established artisans had accounted for a significant proportion of lot purchasers. By the late 1740s, however, many of the artisans, newcomers in the 1730s and early 1740s and by now ready for lot ownership, found that although there were a number of lots on the market in the 1740s, many were unsuitable investments for them either because of price or location. Their opportunities to escape tenancy and to purchase their own property were limited. Other status/occupational groups found their prospects limited as well, but in general, they fared better than the artisans. It is not surprising, then, that when additional land finally opened up for development outside the city's boundaries, by far the greatest number of initial purchasers were artisans.

Of course, one solution to limited opportunity in a given location is to change locations. Lorena S. Walsh has found that the residential
persistence rate among urban residents in colonial York County was quite low. Of the total number of economically independent adults in Yorktown and Williamsburg in 1725, 59% died in town, moved, or disappeared from the records within 25 years. The rate for the 1750 sample was comparable, 61%. The high death rate in the Chesapeake accounts for a goodly proportion of these percentages, but undoubtedly out-migration contributes a part as well. Among the economically independent adults in Williamsburg in 1725, Walsh found 9% who had definitely moved from the town within the following 25 years and 24% who had disappeared from the records. Six percent of the 1750 population had moved by 1775, and 39% had disappeared from the records. Because the York County Project's research design understandably did not include searching other county records for emigrants from Williamsburg, it is likely that a portion of those disappearing from the records actually migrated to other locations. Although reasons for relocating can be varied, the prospect of long-term tenancy might well have caused some of the emigrants to seek better opportunities elsewhere.

If members of the poorer and middling status groups found themselves unable to buy real estate in the city, how did they spend their money? In a comparison of rural and urban decedents' inventories in the York County records, Lorena Walsh has found a significantly higher percentage of consumer goods among the inventoried property of urban decedents, including the poor and middling. Walsh found that the quantity of amenities owned by poor townsfolk corresponded to that owned by middling rural residents, and the amount owned by the urban middling roughly equal to that owned by the rural elite. Urban poor and middling decedents had

---

spent proportionally more of their wealth upon consumer goods than their rural equivalents. Urban dwellers tended to spend their money on social equipment, such as dining ware, lighting devices, tea equipage, and specialized furniture forms, reflecting the greater opportunity for social activity that urban living afforded. By mid-century even some poor families had invested in such items as china, secular books, clocks, pictures, and tea wares.\textsuperscript{70} Perhaps the poor and middling urban groups had more money to spend on amenities partly because they were in large measure shut out of the market in land.\textsuperscript{71} That the gap between the consumer amenities owned by middling and elite urbanites was much narrower than that between their rural counterparts suggests a greater degree of social emulation among the town dwellers, not surprising considering the close proximity in which persons of all classes lived together in the city's neighborhoods.

Initially, when opportunities to purchase lots from the trustees were equal, the original buyers of town lots formed neighborhoods that were socially and functionally integrated. That is, none of the areas of the city were segregated either by social status or by occupation, and each neighborhood appears to have been given over to both residential and


\textsuperscript{71}It could perhaps be argued that the poor and middling urban groups could not buy real property because they were spending their money on personal goods. In some cases this might have been true. The limited opportunities of these groups in the land market, however, have already been demonstrated. Moreover, there is evidence that some tenants had sufficient capital to erect substantial buildings on the lots they rented. (See, for example, York County Virginia, Deeds and Bonds 5, pp. 535-37; and Deeds 6, p. 162.) It seems likely that if they could have obtained their own land to build upon, they would have done so.
business use. By mid-century, however, the character of some of the city's neighborhoods had subtly changed. The gentry, for the most part, forsook the area near the Capitol, which became primarily commercial, for the western part of the city where they maintained their urban estates. The area between Palace Street and Queen Street became less commercial and more residential. Although business and residential properties continued to co-exist in all neighborhoods, neighborhoods by mid-century tended to serve one purpose more than the other.

Throughout the period under study, however, neighborhoods remained socially diverse. The original purchasers of lots in the city consisted of all status/occupation groups, except the very poor, and they were well integrated throughout the various parts of town. The same was true in 1748, when all neighborhoods continued to house persons of all status/occupational groups. In addition, the tenements found in every neighborhood probably housed lower-income artisans and some poor. Although the class consciousness of the eighteenth century probably prevented intimate friendships between persons of radically different status, this social integration of neighborhoods probably fostered more mutual awareness between social groups than is common today in our less socially integrated urban environments.

The neighborhoods were apparently racially integrated as well. African-Americans, mostly slaves but including some who were free, constituted a significant proportion of Williamsburg's population.72 Although their residential patterns have not been systematically studied

to date, it seems clear that both the social integration of Williamsburg's neighborhoods (making it likely that slaveholders lived in all parts of town) and the practice of hiring slaves out assured that slaves lived and worked throughout the capital city. Not included among the status/occupation groups discussed in this study because they do not appear as either grantors or grantees on any surviving deeds for town lots during the colonial period, and because there are no known black heads of household on the 1748 census,\textsuperscript{73} African-Americans nonetheless were a significant presence in the city's neighborhoods.

The frustration of limited opportunities for some status/occupational groups, plus the dependency of some members of these groups upon the gentry/professional/merchant class for such needs as housing, monetary loans, vestry assistance, and legal aid probably created some resentment by the lesser toward the great. On the other hand, these circumstances probably created a network of dependents who steadfastly safeguarded the interests of their patrons as long as those patrons could be expected to meet their needs. Daniel Fisher, a newcomer to Williamsburg in the early 1750s, found it impossible to advance his own interests in town when they conflicted with the interests of the gentry/merchant/professional class because, as he continually reported, those who owed members of this class favors always thwarted him.\textsuperscript{74} It might be argued that Fisher's own caustic personality stood in his way, yet some incidents that he cites are matters of public record. It appears, then, that social integration led to and reinforced a system of mutual dependence among classes.

Fisher's story, too, might point to a resentment of newcomers in a

\textsuperscript{73}Hellier and Kelly, "Population Profile," p. 3.

\textsuperscript{74}Daniel Fisher, "The Fisher History," pp. 752-812, passim.
town where the population had increased dramatically over the past two decades and land was scarce. Even Fisher's elaborate system of letters of introduction failed to secure him influential friends, except one colonial official, also a relative newcomer. Further study of evidence of interpersonal networking in the county records might shed more light on this possibility.

In any case, the limited possibility for property ownership in 1748 and the anxiety of dependency upon wealthier neighbors created possibility for tension in the community of Williamsburg. On the other hand, the nearness of neighbors in a financial position to offer monetary help or credit and educated enough to offer legal advice, aid in writing a will, or other important services must have been of real comfort. The gentry benefited as landlords and as money-lenders, and they benefited from the services offered them in turn by dependent neighbors. Although this degree of symbiosis might not have been envisioned by the town's initial developers, when opportunities were more equal, by mid-century opportunities were not equal, and the framework for a degree of interdependence was in place. That the artisans and other middling sorts, at least, did not consider the arrangement ideal, however, is evinced by their eagerness to purchase lots outside the city as they became available. That the gentry/merchant/professional group did not attempt at all to monopolize the newly available areas outside the city, expanding their interests, may indicate that they were unwilling to take on more rental properties and extend their patrony duties and obligations. On the other hand, perhaps they intended to leave the initial costs of developing these lots to others and to later purchase the improved lots, but were prevented by the economic and political
upheavals of the 1760s and 1770s. In any case, there were few gentry purchasers in the suburbs during the colonial period.

Further studies of settlement patterns in the city will probably reveal other aspects of social interaction in Williamsburg during the colonial period, and networking studies might reveal other trends, including the presence or absence of a "community spirit" in the capital. The Williamsburg of 1715 was not the Williamsburg of 1748, which was likely not the Williamsburg of 1776. The social and cultural history of Williamsburg, including the private development of its land, is the history of the continual building and rebuilding of the community, physically and socially.
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