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ABSTRACT

Launching from the ceramic assemblage derived from the archaeological excavation of the Calvert House in Annapolis, Maryland, this work explores where the Calvert family purchased their ceramics. By broadening the study to look at other contemporary Maryland elite consumers, an effort is made to understand some of the significance these ceramics had for the Calvert family and other wealthy Annapolitans.

The thesis begins with a foundation of current theories about eighteenth-century consumer habits and emulative spending which gave rise to what some have termed a "commercial revolution". Building upon this understanding is assembled the evidence of the Calvert family; a wealthy English clan closely related to the Lord Proprietor, and all of whom served important roles in the colonial Maryland bureaucracy.

Against this information are cast the period documents of the range of retailers in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake. Scottish merchant invoices, Annapolis shop daybooks and exclusive London factors' letterbooks form a matrix for comparison of the Calvert ceramics. The conclusion emerges that the Calverts, as members of the gentry, consciously chose to purchase their goods directly from English agents rather than patronize local shops.

The ramifications of this finding further illuminate the nature of eighteenth-century consumer habits in Maryland and Virginia. In the two decades before the Revolution, local merchants had the capital and the desire to increase the patronage of their shops to the wealthy, but the elite planters eschewed more than a cursory purchase now and then from neighborhood retailers.

In the end, the results suggest that the Calvert family, as wealthy, well-born aristocrats, saw their possessions as necessary for maintaining their existence in the capacity of power and status. Their example was one of the many influences which educated the newly-emerging Maryland gentry as new concepts of elite living appeared in the 1720s and 1730s. And whereas the Calverts were not quite as commanding by the third quarter of the century, they and their class in the tobacco economy clung to the increasingly unnecessary British agent-based consignment system as one method of maintaining their status in a world on the brink of Revolution.
"I WOULD NOT BEGRUDGE TO GIVE A FEW POUNDS MORE"

ELITE CONSUMER CHOICES IN THE CHESAPEAKE, 1720-1785

The Calvert House Ceramic Assemblage
CHAPTER ONE: THE THEORIES

"When our Tobacco then is Sold at home, whatever is the product of it returns not to us in Money, but is either converted into Apparell, Tools or other Conveniences of life."

—Gov. Benedict Leonard Calvert, Esq., 1728

"We are immensly in Debt, and not the least probability of our getting clear."

—Benedict Swingate Calvert, 1765

The yard and basement of the Governor Calvert House in Annapolis were excavated by Dr. Anne Yentsch, then of the College of William and Mary, under the sponsorship of Historic Annapolis, Inc., from 1982 to 1984. From that excavation a fascinating ceramic assemblage of over a thousand vessels used from 1720 to 1785 was recovered. Such an enormous collection of ceramics gave rise to two imperative questions: where did the Calverts purchase their ceramics, and what impact did such enormous numbers of expensive wares have on the family that owned them and the community surrounding the family? These questions resonate with the current issues of consumer behavior in the eighteenth century. Considering that one of the best examples demonstrating the eighteenth-century consumer revolution is in the ceramic industry, the Calvert assemblage provides an alluring chance to examine consumerism using actual artifacts rather than documents only. Specifically, one may ask of the Calvert data to what extent is consumerism evident through analysis of archaeological remains. Can one invert the direction of the standard scholarly approach to
ceramics in the consumer revolution, and start with an artifactual base and work back to the documents and the theories? Presumably, if the theories of the historians of the consumer revolution are accurate, the assemblage of the Calvert site would bear this out in its composition.

The structure of this thesis largely follows the course which I took to understand the Calvert family ceramics and their significance as consumer items. This procedure began in the archaeology laboratory where I served as an assistant, washing and cataloguing the shards. From this direct contact with the artifacts, I began to have a sense for the look and the feel of Calvert cooking, dining, storing and displaying as revealed through these objects, albeit a large dose of imagination was necessary. Since fantasy cannot serve as a footnote, my study had to go further to extract more information from these wares. Thus, I began my preparations to understand the Calverts and their consuming habits with an overview of current scholarship on the subject, which I present here in this first chapter. The next step required greater understanding of the Calvert family; who they were, what could be learned of how they lived and what they did and thought and wrote. With this accomplished, my understanding of the significance of the family's ceramic wares assumed a more three-dimensional quality. The results of my exploration of the family, their documents, and artifacts form the second chapter here. Finally, with an understanding of what scholars say about colonial consumer habits in the Chesapeake and an exploration of the Calverts at home in Annapolis, I branched out more
broadly with an examination in the third chapter of the documents of other elite consumers in the Chesapeake as well as merchant shopkeepers in order to attempt to discern where and how the Calverts made their purchases.

Scholars of the colonial period in Virginia and Maryland discuss consumerism and increased spending power in a number of ways. Lorena Walsh and Lois Greene Carr’s seminal studies draw on thousands of probate inventories. Gloria Main’s work also concentrates on the material existence of Chesapeake planters seen through probate analysis while Edward Papenfuse’s research examines economic growth in Annapolis through merchants’ accounts from that city. Other Chesapeake historians, notably Emory G. Evans, Jacob Price and Timothy Breen have considered planter indebtedness. All of these types of approaches inform this study, but my effort attempts a different approach, one that uses artifacts as primary documents.

Historians working with the colonial period agree that the material possessions of both the English and Americans drastically changed from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century. Indeed, some even venture to label this change as a consumer revolution which embodied more than just a greater selection of material goods, and became a whole new social force based on industrial output, emulative spending, concepts of social decencies, and a new fashion consciousness traceable in nearly all economic levels of English society. In North America, unfettered by the religious constraints found farther north, and encouraged by the spiraling profits on tobacco from 1715 to the Revolution, consumer activity
flourished in the Chesapeake. The availability of vast credit amounts drawn on British firms produced the strongest buying power yet seen, which trickled down to all economic levels.8

To follow the advice of ceramic historian, George L. Miller "to view ceramics in terms of consumption rather than production, technology, or chronology of forms," we must understand the roots of the consumer revolution.9 The explosion of consumable goods caused by the industrial revolution, and in particular the ceramic industry, formed as "the Staffordshire potteries developed from a craft into an industry during the eighteenth century."10 The various new technologies which made the craft an industry included the introduction of calcinated flint, Cornish clays, liquid glaze, plaster-of-Paris molds, steam-powered flint mills and clay-mixing equipment, transfer-printing and the construction of the canals connecting Staffordshire to Liverpool. Miller adds,

"As large factories emerged, generalists became specialized workmen. Potters became throwers, handlers, pressers, painters, printers, slipmakers, dippers, kilnmen, and so on. Specialization broke down what had been a single skilled occupation into many semiskilled jobs. Factory organization, specialization of vessel and ware types all led to an economy of scale, which increased production and lowered costs."11

An understanding of the existing body of scholarly knowledge helps place the Calvert ceramics into the context of the consumer revolution. Foremost is the 1982 work of Neil McKendrick with John Brewer and J. H. Plumb.12 McKendrick creates a forceful argument for the existence of a consumer revolution in eighteenth-century England by presenting a thorough analysis which clearly indicates that spending was expanding rapidly. For example, while the English
population rose 14 percent from 1785 to 1800, tea consumption jumped 97.7 percent, and printed textiles climbed 141.9 percent. Such numbers indicate a rapid development in industrial production and merchandising for products as well as a change in consumer spending.

Changes in fashion were disseminated by the increasing circulation of newspapers and magazines quickly carried throughout England by the new innovations of stagecoaches and canals which began crisscrossing the countryside. By mid-century, ships quickly sent the latest fashions to the colonies throughout the Empire; between 1740 and 1760 "the exports to the colonies took on a new significance". The early periods of the transportation revolution in England gave assistance to the provincial English village shopkeepers who could receive the latest fashion news as well as the merchandise to sell within weeks of the appearance of a new rage in London. And finally, making the rise in consumption possible was the industrial revolution. The boom in manufactory allowed the cheap production of merchandise, and the change in the labor base to a cash/salary system permitted nearly all economic classes to engage in some kind of fashion spending. McKendrick reminds us that "it is often forgotten that the industrial revolution was, to a large extent, founded on the sales of humble products to very large market--the beer of London, the buckles and buttons of Birmingham, the knives and forks of Sheffield, the cups and saucers of Staffordshire, the cheap cottons of Lancashire." Fashion received the blame for the nature of consumer spending in the eighteenth century, and McKendrick's studies substantiates fashion's impact. He notes that "the standards of what Veblen later
called 'pecuniary decency' rose too as succeeding layers of English society joined the consuming ranks."¹⁷ What the royals and aristocrats deemed as fashionable, the lower classes also held as fashion, and members of each economic group attempted to emulate that class just above itself in their efforts at upward mobility.

Similarly, the spending habits for households in the Chesapeake reflect, and even give added emphasis to the consumer revolution in England. The detailed studies of such Chesapeake scholars as Lorena Walsh and Lois Green Carr demonstrate that the material lives of planters in Virginia and Maryland fell far below contemporary English standards in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.¹⁸ However, in 1716 tobacco prices took a sudden upswing which was not followed by a decline; this favorable price trend lasted until the depression of 1773 and the wartime years of 1775 to 1781.¹⁹ Whereas earlier the lifestyles of the elite of the seventeenth-century Chesapeake were more comfortable, they did not differ dramatically from the less wealthy. However, after the financial upswing beginning in 1716, a corresponding change in consumer spending occurred. Walsh notes, "beginning about 1715 the tidewater elite began to acquire a greater array of material goods that facilitated a style of living that more clearly set them off from the ordinary folk."²⁰ The introduction of specialized furniture, ceramics, and utensils, such as card tables, sauce tureens and silver teaspoons, lead to new behavior which required families to learn new patterns of object use and to instruct their children so that household acquisitions of material objects emphasized the family's social standing. As consumer patterns changed, it ushered
in new forms of social behavior which more clearly delineated the "haves" from the "have nots."

A growing colonial bureaucracy built on cash salaries rather than tobacco credit developed in Annapolis and Williamsburg. The result in these towns was "a level of conspicuous consumption almost never matched in the countryside."²¹ Town merchants and tradesmen catered to their urban clientele, often on a cash-only basis, discouraging country planters who required credit to cover their purchases until the profits arrived from each growing season. Furthermore, town dwellers lived a life which offered more opportunity for social interaction on a daily basis than their country cousins living in areas of low population density and constrained by distances. Town spending patterns reflect this. Inventory analysis also reveals that, regardless of wealth, townspeople owned an average of twice the number of chairs and at least triple the number of candlesticks as did corresponding country people.²² With many opportunities to entertain and without intensive capital demands on their incomes for farming and planting needs, town dwellers were able to spend a great deal more on social equipage including tea services, dining wares, and specialized furniture such as tea boards.²³

The dichotomy in spending, therefore, divides between rural sufficiency and urban amenities. Eventually, the pressing demands for luxury items created a milieu in which amenities evolved into essentials for the middling householder and were perceived as potential attainables by the poorer classes.²⁴ The tendency was always for the use of new items to spread downward from the richer to
the poorer. What was an amenity for the wealthy, a luxury for the middling sorts, and undreamt of for the poor at the beginning of the eighteenth century, became a necessity for the poor by the end of the century. New patterns of behavior surfaced throughout society in the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries which were the result of the cheaper availability of manufactured goods which included fashionable metal buttons for men, appearing in vast quantities down the fronts of their coats, and hats for women. Eating and drinking changed substantially in this period as individual forks and knives and individual ceramic plates, cups and glasses came to characterize the modern table, replacing the communal eating bowl and shared cup or drinking bowl previously used in nearly all levels of Chesapeake society during the first century of settlement. Perhaps one of the ultimate expressions of the new behavior created by changes in traditional marketing patterns was the tea drinking ceremony which employed a far-flung trade network for procurement of its material essentials: tea and porcelain teapots and teabowls. Never before had a social function come to be practiced in all economic levels of society with the pervasiveness of tea-drinking by the end of the eighteenth century.

According to Edward Papenfuse's 1975 study, urban spending was a pivotal factor in the development of eighteenth-century Annapolis. Papenfuse finds Annapolis's growth based upon the town's developing political importance rather than its economic function. Interestingly, where Carr and Walsh note consumer spending became heavier starting about 1715 because of the rise of tobacco prices, Papenfuse discovered that the return of the proprietorship to
the Calvert family in 1714 began a new era in the city. By 1715 Lord
Baltimore began forming a bureaucracy in Annapolis to collect
quitrents and hogshead duties, grant land patents, and handle the
administration of his prosperous colony. Government was a big
business; in 1754, the first year with surviving records, the salary
budget for public officeholders amounted to £4,565 sterling, while
the of building a ship cost £1,200 Maryland currency, or £800
sterling.²⁸

Papenfuse divides the colonial period in Annapolis into three
periods. The first was the uncertain years from 1684 to 1715,
followed by a period of industrial expansion and bureaucratic growth
from 1715 to 1763. In the third period from 1763 until the outbreak
of the war in 1775 the flourishing economy and government spending
created a period of great affluence; what Papenfuse refers to as the
"townhouse era."²⁹ From 1763 to 1774, wealthy Annapolitans built a
number of luxurious houses, visibly marking the golden age of
Annapolis.

The years of steady economic development produced a prosperous
merchant class who thrived because of the rather unique fact that
Annapolis, unlike the rest of the Chesapeake, was a tiny
cash-on-demand island in the sea of long-term credit based on tobacco
sales in London. Papenfuse charts the development of a merchant
class in Annapolis by those advertizing drygoods in the Maryland
Gazette. In the surviving issues from 1728 to 1734, only one
merchant appears in the papers; between 1745 and 1753, three
merchants grew to twelve, and the number was twenty-two by 1774 and
growing.³⁰ Papenfuse also describes in detail the enormous
exchange of money between the community and merchants, concluding that, "there is no question that the rich spent a great deal on themselves."  

Exactly how did Annapolitans spend money in the shops of the town? An examination of the Chesapeake merchants' account books in Chapter 3 helps answer that question. Yet, the truly great planters and government officials—the "townhouse class"—of Annapolis were too rich and too important to purchase luxury items for their houses in stores where government clerks and shipyard workers also spent their hard-earned pence on new creamware teapots. If the whole premise of the significance of Georgian architecture as expressed by such scholars as Cary Carson, James Deetz and Rhys Isaac was to increase the distance between public and private spaces, then one assumes elite families such as the Dulanys or the Lloyds would not have cared to reveal their personal tastes to petty bureaucrats, nor share their decorative schemes with the blacksmiths of Annapolis. Such a scheme simply would not have suited their lifestyle which demanded visual, fashionable acquisitions as markers of their station in life.

Historian Gordon Wood warns that the work of the old Progressive Historians, such as Charles Beard, Issac S. Harrell and Lawrence Henry Gipson, whose economic determinist theories reduced the big planters to crude materialists still has merit. Big planters were, indeed, very materialistic. In Timothy Breen's study of wealthy Virginia planters he found that planters took a great pride in their relationships with their London agents, or to use the words of Richard Corbin, their "Commercial Friendship". Breen
demonstrates the depth of the relationship between planter and London
agent by recording its continued existence through the middle years
of the eighteenth century after Scottish factors or similar middlemen
assumed most of the tobacco trade with poorer Chesapeake planters
starting in the 1730s. The wealthier planters continued to sell on
consignment with their London firms, despite the fact that Scottish
factors provided two enormous benefits that London agents did not:
Scottish factors could offer immediate cash for a crop as well as a
store full of British manufactured goods for purchase. The
effect was double-edged; creating a social distinction between
greater and lesser planters based on who bought a planter’s tobacco
for sale in Britain, a London firm or a Scottish factor; thereby
establishing where a planter’s credit source was based, in Britain or
in the Chesapeake. In particular, as ceramic historian Regina
Blaszczyk notes, “The Scots gained control of trade in many areas of
the Chesapeake by designing a commercial system that satisfied the
needs of rural consumers faced with a shortage of cash and
commodities while laden with an abundance of tobacco.” When the
less wealthy sold to local store keepers or Scottish factors in the
Chesapeake, they established credit in those shops. Conversely,
when the elite continued the grand old tradition of a consignment
system with a London agent, the agent also served as a planter’s
credit source, and functioned as his purchasing agent. A mercantile
relationship with a London factor was, in one sense, the economic
badge of a gentleman.
By the 1760s in Annapolis this mercantile framework was fully established and operating. Whether or not it was part of a consumer revolution, the ceramic industry in England permitted the introduction of a new range of wares into the burgeoning shops of the little city. In these shops, salaried petite bureaucrats, local artisans, and lesser planters from the eastern and western shores purchased delft punch bowls and stoneware mugs. Wealthy planters in Annapolis for the "Season", and elite government officials also filled their townhouses with elaborate goods from Staffordshire, Yorkshire and the Orient. They, however, seldom purchased from local merchants at all, preferring to give their patronage to the exclusive shops of London by means of their London agents.

Sources are varied for historians who study questions of consumer purchasing patterns. McKendrick principally draws on the Wedgwood papers for his discussion of the ceramic industry. Papenfuse does not look at the manufacturers, but rather at the local retailers who imported goods for their stores in Annapolis. Carr and Walsh explore probate inventories to see the end result in the possessions of the consumers. Other historians have combined these methods in various ways. Yet, despite the useful work of ceramic historian George Miller, which is based on merchant records and specific ceramic types, archaeological evidence has not made an impact as an independent data source useful in studying eighteenth-century consumer purchases. A rare example is Arlene Plamer Schwind’s 1984 article about colonial New York City merchant Frederick Rhinelander which makes references to ceramic types and forms stocked by
Rhinelander, but her documentary evidence is confirmed by artifacts from excavations dating back to 1929.\textsuperscript{18}

More recently, Sherene Baugher and Robert Venables discussed ceramics as status and class indicators in eighteenth-century New York State.\textsuperscript{39} They relied on four sites (either middle or upper class, with two in upstate and two on Staten Island) which could be linked to a specific family with a documented history. All four sites, however, included only those artifacts from sheet scatter deposits in yard areas alongside the houses; no artifacts from features were used. The size of sherds in sheet refuse deposits is small, and hence their analysis depends more heavily on the presence/absence of specific ware types. Not surprisingly, the authors concluded that "ceramic assemblages are not dependable as the sole or primary indicator in determining the status of the site’s residents. The percentage and variation of archaeological artifacts surviving at a site may not accurately reflect the quality and quantity of ceramics used by the past residents."\textsuperscript{40} This sounds like a truism, and as a blanket statement made based on four digs with no features represented in any of the four, it is, perhaps, a bit too hasty.

No reasonable archaeologist should ever insist that a ceramic assemblage should constitute the primary factor for asserting wealth or status. But because of the various formation processes involved in yard scatter, this source of information surely gives shaky data. Features such as wells, privies, trash pits, or builder’s trenches comprize the principal locations of short-term, rapid depositions in the eighteenth century, and thereby present a more accurate
archaeological narrative, albeit indicative of short, versus long-term, artifact use. In conjunction with family documents, merchant records, and the existing body of secondary sources about consumerism, artifact assemblages from features, especially when analyzed as sets of minimum vessels, presents highly useful evidence about a family and its consumer history.

Because of the large size of its ceramic artifact collection, the Calvert House site in Annapolis offers the opportunity to test the fit between prevalent ceramic consumer theories and in-the-ground data. The house site on State Circle was owned by the Calvert family from 1727 until 1802, and the artifacts found there reflect an early consumer period (circa 1730) through the eighteenth century. As a unit, the Calvert artifact collection offers the scholar an overview of sixty years of ceramic acquisitions by an elite family (circa 1725 - 1785). Casting the information of ceramic artifacts from the site against merchant accounts, known trade patterns, and theories about consumerism reveal facets of elite spending in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake.

Through the medium of the physical remains of an elite family’s consuming history, the patterns of the wealthy’s choices emerge and stand in contrast to the range of forms, types, and volume available in the standard stores of the period. In the next chapter the Calvert family’s history and their minimum vessel count are presented and analyzed within their own context. This permits the development of the basic intrinsic data available about the Calvert family as reflected through the artifacts. Following that in chapter three, merchant records from Annapolis and other Chesapeake stores are
examined, and then reflected against the ceramic analysis for the Calverts so that a greater body of information, the extrinsic data, is revealed. The result delineates the difference in the range of choices made by consumers of varying economic levels in the eighteenth century, where the different choices were available, and hopefully establish a framework to study the relationship between tastes and status in the Chesapeake for this period.

2 ibid., p. 261.


4 Lois Greene Carr and Lorena Walsh, "Inventories and the Analysis of Wealth and Consumption: Patterns in St. Mary's County, Maryland, 1658-1777." Historical Methods, 13/2 (Spring 1980) 81-104.


8 op. cit., p. 108.


10 ibid., p. 2.

11 ibid., p. 2.

12 McKendrick, op. cit.

13 ibid., p. 29.

14 ibid., p. 104. Wedgwood saw naïve Americans as the perfect market for those lines not selling as well in Britain and the Continent, noting in 1767, "I am rejoiced to know you have ship'd off the Green & Gold--May the winds & seas be propitious, & the invaluable Cargo be wafted in safety to their destin'd Market, for the emolument of our American Bretheren & friends, & as this treasure will no longer be locked up or lost to the
rest of the world, I shall be perfectly easy about the returns, be they much, little, or nothing at all." cited in Ivor Noël Hume, Pottery and Porcelain in Colonial Williamsburg’s Archaeology Collections (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation) 1969, p. 21.

15 McKendrick, op. cit., p. 91.
16 ibid., p. 53.
17 ibid., p. 53.

19 ibid., p. 84.
20 ibid., p. 110.
21 ibid., p. 112.
22 ibid., p. 113.
23 ibid., p. 113.
24 ibid., p. 119.


27 Papenfuse, op. cit.
28 ibid., p. 12. Note that the official exchange rate in the mid-eighteenth century valued £1 British Sterling to £1.5 Maryland Currency.
29 ibid., p. 6.
30 ibid., pp. 14, 15, 33.
31 ibid., pp. 26-27.


35 ibid., p. 38.


37 ibid., p. 36.


40 ibid., p. 51.
CHAPTER TWO: THE EVIDENCE

"You cannot expect from me in this Unpolished part of the Universe any Entertainment worth your Consideration."

--Gov. Benedict Leonard Calvert, Esq., 1729

"Many of the principal families have chosen this place for their residence; there are few towns of the same size in any part of the British dominions that can boast a more polished society."

--William Eddis, 1769

Resulting from the anti-Catholic backlash following the Glorious Revolution, Calvert influence had ceased in Maryland by 1691. From that point, the family retained only personal estate proprietorship in Maryland, stripped of all official and governmental functions. Charles, the Third Lord Baltimore, fought from 1691 to 1715 to retrieve political power over his colony. Moreover, he feared losing his remaining rights to colonial income to the Board of Trade, and thus determined to sell off his rights in Maryland before all perks disappeared. Annoyed by this, his son Benedict Leonard [the elder] prudently and pragmatically sidestepped the whole issue by converting his religious affiliation from Rome to Canterbury in 1713, and thereby received the approbation of the Crown followed by the return to full proprietary rights at his father’s death in 1715. The new Lord Baltimore enjoyed this distinction for just under two months, dying in April and leaving his sixteen-year-old son, Charles, as the fifth Lord, under guidance of a guardian, Lord Guildford.
The early approach to governing Maryland while Lord Charles was under age was to maintain status quo. Under the waning Royal Charter, the Crown had placed John Hart as governor in 1714, and the youthful Lord proprietor left him there. Hart proved well-intentioned, but sadly ineffectual, in addition to becoming ill; a doubly recurring pattern of illness and ineffectuality that was to mar the next two administrations in Maryland. Charles, Lord Baltimore, upon attaining the age of twenty-one, began asserting himself in his province, and dispatched a new governor, "our Cosen Calvert". Cousin Charles, a captain in His Majesty’s First Regiment of Foot Guards, received his appointment as governor of Maryland on 17 May 1720. He arrived in Annapolis at the end of that summer amidst the fanfare and entertainments credited a new governor and a relation of the Lord Proprietor.

For a sophisticated Englishman, Charles Calvert was more fortunate to have arrived in Annapolis in 1720 rather than 1710. By no means was the little capital a charming place at his arrival, but just as recently as twelve years earlier in 1708, tobacco factor/poet Ebenezer Cooke observed that the village was but:

A city Situate on a Plain,  
Where scarce a House will keep out Rain;  
The Buildings fram’d with Cypress rare,  
Resembles much our Southwark Fair;  
But Stranger here will scarcely meet  
With Market-place, Exchange, or Street,  
And if the Truth I may report  
‘Tis not so large as Tottenham Court.

By 1720, however, a growing number of the governmental bureaucrats had relocated into Annapolis. Already, powerful men such as Benjamin Tasker, Amos Garrett, Samuel Young and Thomas Lloyd were living in
town, and the Daniel Dulanys moved in that same year. As historian Aubrey Land notes, most officials still remained more attached to their country seats as their permanent homes, but Annapolis was nevertheless "taking on an air of a community of official-class residents."  

Into this moved the new Calvert governor, launching the Social Season of 1720. Land goes on to point out that the Season that autumn revolved around the succession of royal and proprietary birthdays occurring in the fall, but the arrival of the new governor made the Season particularly brilliant. This was accompanied by balls, parties, dinners and races at the September Fair. Two years later in November 1722, Calvert created another big social splash by marrying Rebecca Gerrard, a daughter from an old Maryland planting family. This popular wedding helped cement bonds between the English Calverts and their Maryland subjects.

While the Captain governed Maryland through the rapidly developing financial boom of the 1720s, the Peer and his siblings were growing up and coming of age in England. There were seven children born to the Forth Lord Baltimore and his wife, Lady Charlotte Lee: Charles, born in 1699; Benedict "Ben" Leonard [the Younger], in 1700; Edward "Ned" Henry in 1701; twins Charlotte "Lot" and Cecil in 1702, Jane in 1703, and Barbara in 1704. From their letters, the family appears to have been fairly close, and snippets of their personalities come to light. Charles seemed stiff and rather formal, perhaps from the grooming that prepared him for the peerage. Ben, on the other hand, was a bon vivant, helping himself to long periods of time off from Christ's Church College, Oxford, to
take the waters at Bath and several extended trips to Europe to pursue his love of antiquities. Lot loved London and the opera and wrote very sweet letters to her brother Ben, whereas Jane appears a little dull, though successful, settling for a big marriage in St. Paul’s and both a London and a country house. Ned was a bit of a scamp, giving the family a great deal of consternation over his affair and eventual elopement with a girl named Margaret Lee, called Peg. Cecil, who would become his brother Charles’ private secretary, exhibited his way with words and wit in a series of witheringly dry letters to his brother Ben, full of family commentary.9

From Cecil’s letters we discover that Ben was earmarked by the family to learn to take some responsibility as the second son, and to go to Maryland to replace Cousin Charles Calvert as his weak governorship faltered.10 Ben had no intention of going to Maryland until directly ordered, preferring to frolic on the Continent with his friends, fueling his passion for antiquities, and leading a decadent life that included flaunting his Anglicanism to the Vatican and daring the Inquisition by receiving Holy Communion at St. Peter’s in Rome. Finally, begrudgingly, Ben put an end to his second Grand Tour, lasting two and a half years, and returned to England in the autumn of 1725. There he dawdled and procrastinated over his farewells for roughly another year and a half, during which time he failed to please the family with any marital interests. Finally, in the spring of 1727, his brother, Lord Baltimore, herded poor Ben onto a ship for Annapolis.11 Ben’s administration would prove to be five stormy, frustrating, unhappy, unhealthy years.

Ben’s arrival met with the displeasure of Charles Calvert, who
doubtlessly was unwilling to turn over the governorship to this
twenty-six year old fop who had a passion for Roman statuary. Nor
were the Marylanders pleased with Ben’s arrival, preferring much more
the local flavor of the Captain, whom they knew and trusted to be
ineffectual, as well as a rapidly assimilating Marylander, thanks to
his marriage to a local girl and his plantation in Prince George’s
County. Ben, on the other hand, did little to win over the hearts of
Marylanders, as his successor, Governor Samuel Ogle, later commented
to Lord Baltimore in 1732; "I have with every body else endeavoured
to carry myself as evenly & civily as possible without showing the
least disregard to any set of people whatsoever which your Broz
would have had me do."12 Despite fighting with his cousin and the
chilly reception the native Maryland planters gave him, Ben attempted
to make the best of the situation; he moved into the house with his
cousin Charles and proceeded to remodel the Captain’s moderate house
into a larger, more fashionable townhouse for themselves on the
southeast side of Statehouse Circle. Ben thus further distanced
himself from the already hostile locals.

This construction predates the great townhouse-building era of
Annapolis as identified by Edward Papenfuse by some thirty-five years
or more, essentially starting after the Seven Years War ended in
1763.13 And whereas the Calvert House would seem small and
old-fashioned compared to its neighbors in the 1760s, in the late
1720s it clearly had set a precedent for the ostentacious lifestyles
that would flourish by mid-century. Ben had rebuilding in his blood;
in the mid 1720s his sister Lot and her husband made extensive
changes to one of the Calvert houses in England, Horton, while their
brother, Lord Baltimore, almost entirely rebuilt his seat, Woodcote, in Epsom, Surry, and progress reports in family letters flew back and forth across the Atlantic.\(^{14}\) As a brick "Great House," in Maryland, the Calverts erected their home during the first period of rebuilding in the Chesapeake when wealthy planters began constructing substantial dwellings for themselves on their plantations. The general populace, however, continued to huddle in the crude, ground-fast structures that were nearly identical to that of the seventeenth century, and which persisted throughout the rest of the Colonial period.\(^{15}\) The renovated Calvert House may have been one of the first elaborate brick houses in Annapolis, pre-dating the era when the town was the social center of Maryland. Early eighteenth-century Annapolis was, after all, still a provincial town principally concerned with the annual convening of the court, and as a loading point for tobacco.

In rather stark contrast to a muddy little hamlet of ground-fast clapboard houses and some middling-sized bureaucrats' houses, the Calvert House in brick with its symmetrically set glazed windows loomed just below the roof of the State House on the hill above the harbor. Interestingly, Ben Calvert did not place the principal façade facing the State House and the Circle, but instead made that the service yard façade, and used the opposite face of the house fronting the river as the primary entrance. From the Calvert front door, a vast formal garden rolled down the hill toward the village, the Severn River, the Chesapeake, the Atlantic and beyond that England. The house gazed not at the locus of power in Maryland, which indeed, it turned its back to, but rather the mansion gazed
directly to the Baron proprietor. As archaeologist Anne Yentsch observes, the Calverts did not choose this domestic arrangement for its grand vista alone. Instead, the house and its gardens,

"rested slightly below the crest of the State House hill with its small, brick capital building and less than a hundred feet from the Treasury. As one lifted one's eyes to view the capital, one also saw the Calvert home. Its location and surrounding gardens served as symbols of regal power based on two principles of Renaissance thought: association through contiguity and medieval concepts of correspondence, analogy and resemblance."\(^{16}\)

Perhaps young Benedict felt lonely for urbane companions in the little village of Annapolis, or perhaps the Proprietor had political aspirations for his other brother, Edward Henry, and his wife-by-elopement, Margaret. For whatever reasons, Ned and Peg arrived in Annapolis in 1729 and apparently moved in with the Captain and his family and Ben in the Annapolis house, with Ned functioning as the Commissary General and a member of the Council. Despite politics, the Calvert family was entertaining the local gentry well by this time; the Maryland Gazette reported Ben's party in March for Queen Caroline's birthday with, "a very handsome entertainment at dinner" followed by "a ball at the Stadt House."\(^{17}\) The next month the papers reported the brothers attended a "plentiful dinner" for the Feast of St. George. After the dinner, "all the royal healths and that of the Proprietary and all his family were drunk."\(^{18}\) Still, the Calverts were not acclimating well to Maryland, as their sister Lot observed in her letter dated 10 November 1729; "I am sorry for
Dear Neds indisposition, & likewise your collicks' attacking you again, but I fear more for Neds intemperature, I hear they drink verry hard in those parts." Yet, regardless of ill health, as the Maryland Gazette documented, the Calverts obviously maintained a strong social life.

Maryland provided many new experiences for the Calverts, as Lot notes in the same letter:

"I hope Peg by this time has quite got over the continual apprehensions she lay under of the Negroes, & ye by us your town will prove equally easy & agreeable as the Mell or any other parts of London. She Speaks much in favour of the Ladies, but not once mentions the Gentlemen. So I conclude they are creatures."

Perhaps Annapolis in the late 'twenties fell short of reminding the homesick Calverts of the fashionable Pall Mall section of their adored London. However, they made the most of their station with the great house, rolling gardens and entertainments for the likes of Pennsylvania Governor Patrick Gordon in June 1729.

The Calverts added to this splendor with the virtually unique construction of an orangery in the late 1720s or early 'thirties. This may be the earliest documented orangery in North America; Virginia Governor Spotswood is rumored to have installed one in Williamsburg before the 1720s, but it never has been fully confirmed either historically or archaeologically. The effect the Calvert orangery had on Marylanders at this time can not be underestimated. It was, perhaps, one of the most ostentatious displays of power and wealth in its day. In an era when most people living in the Chesapeake dwelt in a one or two room post-in-hole wooden house, the Calverts erected a brick addition to the already substantial house
which sported a wood-fired hot air hypocaust, or furnace, on the Roman plan, which permitted the year round production of exotic fruits such as oranges and lemons. Everything about the orangery spelled "power": exotic fruits and flowers, many expensive bricks and glass panes, gardeners tending plants and the furnace, cords of firewood burned solely for the comfort of trees, and apparently the Calverts' ability to place man above nature, and eat an orange in January.21

What the Calverts strongly assisted introducing into the Chesapeake was the "Georgian World View," as James Deetz has styled it.22 In Annapolis, the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries still belonged somewhat to a late medieval tradition, rather than a more modern understanding of the world. Beginning about the 1720s, accompanied by economic, material and social change, the Chesapeake elite began to lead a lifestyle more closely related to that of the English gentry. The contrasts were often dramatic, such as poorer sorts living in the rustic "forced sociability" of a one or two-room house versus the "social insulation" provided in a compartmented Georgian house enjoyed by the wealthy. In the new style of the Georgian dwelling symmetrical façades revealed nothing about the uses of the different rooms within, and doors and hallways provided buffers to more intimate rooms where the family could remain detached from the staff and callers.23 And whereas this was a fully accomplished transition in England where the Calverts had lived, Annapolis still struggled into the Georgian world. The presence, lifestyle and actions of the sophisticated Calverts could not have failed to assist with this transition.
Above and beyond the coincidental rise of the Georgian mind-set and the consumer revolution in the Chesapeake, the Calverts of Maryland did not merely import luxuries from London with instruction books about proper social usage. Instead, the Calverts arrived in Annapolis as polished, finished English gentlefolk -- the fifth generation of the Baltimore Barony, great-grandchildren of King Charles II and the Duchess of Cleveland, and grandchildren of the Earl of Lichfield -- with all the background and expectations of that class. They served, therefore, as role models for Maryland’s locally grown elite families who wished to assume the savoir faire of the gentry. Given their social and political position, and their wealth, the Calverts must have been role models of sophisticated gentry living, even if they did not directly instruct Annapolitans in new metropolitan styles and tastes. Still, in a world organized on a traditional, hierarchical structure, most Maryland men were subordinated to Lord Baltimore and his kin, and thereby paid attention to the Calverts’ actions and possessions. Necessary, of course, for this display of gentility and refinement were the material implements and props which created such statements.

No other display of Calvert position, wealth and influence rivaled the visitation of Lord and Lady Baltimore in the autumn of 1732. During their six month stay they addressed a growing number of problems in Maryland, including the seemingly unending boundary dispute with the Penns, and the anti-proprietary faction party which had grown in response to the ineffectual administrations of Governors John Hart, Charles Calvert and Benedict Leonard Calvert, particularly because of the latter’s mishandling of the sensitive subject of
proprietary, palatinate rule in the age of Locke. Cleverly, the young, attractive Baltimores seemingly breezed into the midst of the Annapolis Social Season and dazzled all. Lord Baltimore adroitly laid down policy, placed it into the very capable hands of his newly installed governor, Samuel Ogle, Secretary Edmund Jenings and Councilman Benjamin Tasker. His powerful persuasiveness proved indomitable; he plucked opposition party leader, Daniel Dulany, right from its ranks and made Dulany his Maryland agent, which soon was followed by the offices of Attorney General and Judge of the Court of the Vice-Admiralty. With this tidy bit of work done, the now very popular Lord Charles and Lady Mary climbed aboard a ship bound for England in the spring of 1733.

The influence of the Calvert women, though harder to trace than that of the men, was important as a conveyer of English fashion. In a letter written in 1731 to an Annapolis lady, Mrs. Ross, by Widow Margaret Calvert soon after she and her baby had returned to London, the author tells of London clothing and hair fashions. Further, she adds, if Mrs. Ross wants to know more, her maid was returning to Maryland and could provide further information on the latest fashions. Perhaps even more significant is a second letter by Margaret in 1732, shortly before Lord Charles and Lady Mary left for their trip to Maryland. Peg notes

"and for fashions I will say nothing of them, for Lord and Lady Baltimore is coming over who will bring you all y’ new ones much better than I can writ them, I am sure you’ll all Like her Ladyship Extreamly for indeed She [is] a very agreable woman, and very obligeing."

Defining the status and influence of the Calverts in the early
eighteenth century is problematic; a likely document such as the Maryland Gazette, begun in 1728, and with few surviving issues prior to 1735, carries only occasional tantalizing glimpses of the social and ceremonial roles of the Calvert family. Fortuitously, one of the very best views of the Calverts in this period comes from probate inventories. Four important inventories survive, three of which are for the Annapolis townhouse. The first records the belongings of Edward Henry Calvert at his death in 1730, followed by that of Governor Benedict Leonard Calvert in 1732, and the other two account for the estate of Captain Charles' Annapolis house as well as his plantation in Prince George's County at his death in 1734. One notices a strong resonance between the 1730 estate of Ned and that of 1734 belonging to Captain Charles.

After a long sickness, Ned died at the age of twenty-nine in 1730 leaving his young wife, Peg, presiding at "1 large tea table & frame" complete with "1 suit Damask Napkins & Table Cloaths" and thirty-two pounds of Green tea, thirty-two pounds of Pekoe tea and 140 pounds of sugar, according to his probate inventory. With £52.09.01 worth of silver plate and another five dozen drinking glasses, six decanters, three dozen wine glasses and seven dozen pewter plates, Ned and Peg must have enjoyed some heady entertaining at the State Circle house. Their ceramics reflect a sociable existence, with "8 china cups, 8 saucers, 1 slopbason, 1 sugar dish, 1 teapot, 2 plates and 6 cups with handles, 2 punch bowls, 2 flint milk pots and 11 china plates." In earthen and stone wares there was a range of mugs from half pint to two quarts, four pitchers, three stoneware bowls, six white stoneware plates and saucers, a dozen coffee cups, six
teapots, two slop basins, two sugar dishes, and a milk pot. A host of the household ceramics accompany these consumption and serving pieces, including twelve large chamber pots, basins, hand basins, patty pans, hand pans, and "a parcel of earthen panns." Perhaps Peg was still not comfortable in Annapolis because she apparently relinquished everything to Captain Charles and his wife, Rebecca, and returned to England with her baby, Frances Maria, where she later remarried.

Along with pining for home, Ben continued to work under very poor health. When finally, in 1732, Governor Ogle arrived as his replacement, Ben boarded a ship returning him to his beloved England. He sickened further and died at the age of thirty-one; he was buried at sea. His will left £10 to the poor of Annapolis and his love of education was reflected by leaving a third of his estate to Annapolis's King William's School (now called St. John's College). A probate inventory was not filed until a year later for Ben, and one must question the completeness of it after the remaining family members continued to make use, and perhaps assumed ownership of the late governor's possessions, hence explaining a net worth of only £51. Nevertheless, Ben's inventory shows a range of luxury items, from a bedstead with red watered curtains worth £3.10.0 to an "India Tea table" at £2 and an older tea table for ten shillings. If an Oriental export tea table cost £2, we must wonder what a splendor was "One very Large China Punch Bowl" which was valued at £1. Also included were one smaller punch bowl at 10 shillings, and a china teapot, sugar dish and two large saucers set at six shillings. No earthenwares appeared, though a dozen copper patty pans for nine
shillings was included.

Ned’s and Ben’s inventories contain significant signs of elite living and sociability for the 1720s in the Chesapeake, but careful consideration of the contents finds holes in the completeness of their households. Bachelors, such as Ben, frequently had sparse probate inventories because they almost invariably lived with someone else. But why, for instance, would a couple such as Ned and Peg own a total of seven teapots and have sixty-four pounds of tea in the larder and yet own no more than twenty cups and saucers? The answer must lie in the nature of the arrangement of perhaps all three of the Calvert men and their wives, Ned’s baby and Charles’ two little girlsliving together. One must assume that after Ned’s death the family, especially Peg, retained their own possessions from Ned’s estate.

This hypothesis of family shared-ownership is substantiated with Charles Calvert’s probate of January 18, 1734 following an early senility and his untimely death at about the age of forty-two. With his two cousins dead, Captain Charles’ inventory probably reflects more accurately the interior of the Annapolis house. This is evident when considering that Ned’s estate was appraised at a mere £388, and listed no livestock or negroes, whereas Charles was appraised for £1649 for Annapolis and £594 for Prince George’s County, and a list of animals and slaves was added. How much was reserved for the widows and Charles’ daughters, Anne and Elizabeth, is unknown but the inventoried estate was sizable. Charles had thirty-one slaves in Annapolis, and twenty-four more on the plantation. His personal estate, when combined with his real estate was valued at over £4000
in a period when only some ten percent of Anne Arundel County
decedents owned property valued at £1000 or more.\textsuperscript{31}

Charles' probate inventory lists more ceramics than Ned's
inventory had four years earlier. More so than Ned's, Charles'
inventory indicates a high degree of sociability. With such things
as £192.06.00 worth of silver plate, 154 jelly [i.e., dessert]
glasses, four dozen "biskett pans" and six dozen patty pans, both for
baking, one might conclude that the equipage allowed for an extensive
and showy display of food, wealth and entertainment. As early as the
first years of the 1730s, the Calvert household sported such luxuries
as an already "old Leather Sedan" and three "Mahogone" tables, one of
which was a card table with "Fishes and Counters," (and not the only
card table in the house). The presence of mahogany gaming tables and
sedan chairs at this date almost conclusively indicates English
origin; since none of these type manufactured goods were being
produced locally so early.\textsuperscript{32} These furnishings further demonstrate
the Calverts' integral role in introducing English metropolitan
styles to Annapolis.

The ceramics assembled from the inventory indicate a more
complete picture of the Calverts' social life, and much less of the
kitchen aspect. Appraised were "1 tea table, a sett of Chinea and
cover," plus another two "tea table[s] with a sett of china" and a
"tea pott and Stand." The equipage for the tea drinking ceremony was
copious. Other porcelain for entertaining includes "3 punch Bowles,
the largest broke," three more china punch bowls and one small
porcelain bowl, six dishes, and twelve plates and a basket. There
were some fancy pieces, perhaps rather extraordinary for the
Chesapeake in the early 1730s, such as "4 china Scollept Shells," "2 china chamber pots" and what may possibly be ceramic figures named as "12 fruit pieces" and "12 flower ditto." These may be ceramic garniture or decorative pieces because they are listed in conjunction with other fairly fancy items; preceding these pieces are two carpets, a bureau with books, and three pair of sconces, and listed below were ten mezzotints and two more in frames, more porcelain punch bowls and chamber pots, a fiddle and two flutes. Another somewhat mysterious entry is "1 pr. of tyles" which may well be delft tiles.

Domestic ceramics are amazingly absent. Biscuit pans (which may have been metal), and patty pans constitute the total. A possibility also is sixty-eight bottles, but they undoubtedly are glass given their proximity to a listing for nineteen gallons of arrack, two pipes of madiera, and a cask of rum of about 110 gallons. Furthermore, archaeological excavations unearthed enormous quantities of broken glass bottles which were used as base drainage in the garden beds. Strangely absent then are pots, pans, porringers, jars, crocks, jugs, mugs, pitchers, butter pots, milk pans, basins, galley pots and chamber pots. Obviously, no household ran without these necessities, and very possibly they were reserved for the surviving relations' use in the Annapolis house. A little less evident, but similarly related, is the absence of the entertainment and consumption pieces including platters, tureens, condiment cups, sauce boats and stands, soup plates, custard cups, and coffee and chocolate pots.

After Charles' death, his widow, Rebecca, quickly followed him to
the grave. Her will specified that her two little girls, Anne and Elizabeth, be raised by family friends, Onorio and Elizabeth Razolini. The Razolinis held a prominent place in Annapolis during their stay there from the 1720s to the late 1740s or early 1750s when they returned to Italy. By Rebecca Calvert’s will, any perishable property such as livestock, slaves or unused land could be sold off for the money to be kept in trust for her daughters. Though probably empty, the Annapolis house was maintained, but it is doubtful that many improvements or new acquisitions were made after Rebecca’s death in 1734. This changed fifteen years later.

In 1745, Charles Calvert, the Lord Baltimore, sent his twenty-one year old natural son, Benedict Swingate Calvert, to Annapolis as the Collector of Customs for the Patuxent River. Benedict was shown great favor by Lord Baltimore, who never revealed the identity of the boy’s mother. In a letter to his father in November 1746, by which time he had been appointed to the Governor’s Council, Benedict closes with the filial words, "Most obed.t & affectionate Servant and Son, Bened.t Calvert." Benedict enjoyed a special political position as the son of the proprietor, and wielded great influence in the colonial government and bureaucracy. Naturally, Benedict, who was something of an opportunist, sought out his cousin Elizabeth Calvert, his sole living Maryland relation, and an heiress now that her sister Anne had died. Benedict therefore added greatly to his social cachet in April 1748, at the age of twenty-four, by marrying Elizabeth Calvert when she reached the age of eighteen. To this socially prominent marriage Elizabeth brought along a large dowry including her town house on State Circle, and enormous tracts of land in Anne
Arundel and Prince George’s Counties.

Perhaps Marylanders welcomed the resurgence and continuation of the Calvert family on Maryland’s shores because the wedding was very popular as it joined the only remaining child of the well-loved Captain Charles with the first son of the proprietor. A long poem commemorating the wedding appeared in the *Maryland Gazette.* During this period Benedict enjoyed great patronage from his father, and the social and political life of the State Circle house blossomed again. Unfortunately for Benedict and Elizabeth, the fifth Lord died in 1751, and his eldest legitimate son, Frederick, assumed the title and proprietorship.

The records are not completely clear at this point, but clearly Benedict was not nearly as popular with his half-brother as he had been with his father. Relations between the two branches of the family collapsed, and Frederick attempted to revoke lands given to Benedict by their late father. A letter from Benedict in 1765 to his Uncle Cecil Calvert, Secretary to his Lordship, indicated some reluctance on Benedict’s part to force the matter into the courts, and begged Cecil to intervene on his behalf. Additionally, Benedict wondered, might Secretary Calvert induce his Lordship to release two remote manors in Frederick County for the use of Benedict’s younger sons? Pulling all the punches, Benedict played the sycophant and reminded Cecil that he had named his youngest son in the Secretary’s honor, and shamelessly whined for assistance, a ploy he frequently used in his letters.

With failing patronage from his half brother, Benedict Calvert stepped back somewhat into the shadows. He resigned from the City
Council in 1762, and appears to have almost solely resided with his wife and twelve children on their plantation, Mount Airy, in Prince George's County. The family retained the house in Annapolis, only used on those occasions when Calvert came to attend the Governor's Council, in which he continued to sit until the Revolution. In the 1783 tax list for Annapolis, Calvert's city holdings were valued at only £150; the house was small and old fashioned by then in comparison to the great piles of the Pacas, Lloyds and Hammonds, and very probably rundown.34

This is not to say that the Calvert family disappeared into poverty or infamy. Along with the Governor's Council and the very profitable position as Collector of the Patuxent, Calvert was made a Judge of the Land Courts in 1773. Indeed, a series of portraits by John Hesselius of some of Benedict and Elizabeth's children in 1761 demonstrate the family's ongoing sense of position and dignity. The full-length portrait in the collection of the Maryland Historical Society of their oldest son, five year old Charles, (who would die at seventeen while attending Eton) with a little slave boy and the rolling Maryland countryside especially demonstrates the Calvert concept of their position in life. Furthermore, the family's continued political influence is reflected in subsequent generations; a son who served in the State Legislature, a grandson who served in both the State and U.S. Houses, and a daughter named Nelly Calvert Custis.

Nelly's engagement to John Parke Custis in 1773, and her father's subsequent letters to John's step-father, George Washington, offers much of our understanding of the Benedict Calvert family. Calvert,
in 1773, was enjoying a sizable income from his political posts as well as his income from Mount Airy. Yet, he took great care to inform Washington that, "from the largeness of my family (having ten children) no very great fortune can be expected." Nevertheless, Mr. Washington assured Calvert that "Miss Nellie's amiable qualifications stands confess'd at all hands; and that, an alliance with your Family, will be pleasing to his."  

Calvert's own position in Maryland society was augmented by his half-sister Caroline Calvert's marriage to Sir Robert Eden, Frederick Calvert's governor from 1768 to 1776. Calvert and Eden functioned well both as powers in Maryland and as brothers-in-law. All three of Calvert's known letters to Washington make reference to Eden, frequently in a familiar way indicating a strong connection between the three men and their families. In August of 1773, Calvert apologizes to Washington, "I was in hopes to have had the pleasure of attending the Govr to Mt. Vernon; but some business at my Office on the Eastern Shore obliged me to set off on Sunday." 

While the Maryland Calverts continued as a prosperous gentry family, its true brilliance in Annapolis lasted from about 1720 to the 1760s or early 'seventies, with possible occasional use of their house after the Revolution, though that is doubtful. Within the period of 1720 to the Revolution, the principal periods of heavy social function at the State Circle house fall between 1720 and Rebecca Calvert's death in 1735, and from Benedict and Elizabeth's wedding in 1748 throughout the 1760s, and to somewhat of a lesser degree in the 1770s.

Artifacts from the archaeological excavation of the Calvert
house, not surprizingly, reflect these periods of time. Much of the very best porcelain dates to the 1720s and 1730s when the Calverts were his Lordship’s governors, and representatives of the Proprietary. Many fine things appear from the 1750s and early ’sixties when Benedict and Elizabeth were sprucing up the neglected house, and entertaining in a manner befitting Benedict’s position as an important office holder, politician, and son of Lord Baltimore.

The archaeological excavation conducted by Anne Yentsch explored the foundations of the house as it still stands today as well as yard areas fairly near the house. These areas comprise only a fraction of the total complex as it existed in the eighteenth century, with the house commanding large gardens full of the orangery and other dependencies and the parterres which descended the hill towards the river. Still, that which was excavated produced over two hundred features. Of principal importance were the following features: the fill over the orangery foundation, the fill over the brick-paved kitchen courtyard and the fill over the well, in addition to the builders trenches and post holes which provided diagnostic data for the dating of the site’s history.

In the period of about a decade before the War for Independence, the gardens of the house were allowed to deteriorate, and apparently the free-standing wooden orangery was pulled down. Garbage and construction debris were deposited in the foundation, which became neatly sealed when Benedict erected an addition to the main house extending over the orangery, erected shortly before the Revolution. This period of refurbishing may coincide with Governor Eden’s arrival in 1769 with Benedict’s half-sister, Caroline Calvert Eden.
The kitchen yard which faced State Circle accumulated household and kitchen refuse, then it too was neatly sealed off at the same time as the orangery in the late 1760s or early 1770s. Just as the house had turned its back to the Statehouse during the heyday of Calvert power, following the War the main façade was returned to face the Statehouse as the locus of power shifted. The kitchen yard was moved elsewhere on the property and the old yard was buried and created as a new, highly-ordered front yard within a brick semi-octagonal forecourt. Similarly, the well was cleaned in 1752 or shortly thereafter, as evidenced by a coin of that date found in its sandy bottom fill. The contents of the full column of fill indicate that the well was abandoned in the 1760s, perhaps as Benedict’s position with his half-brother deteriorated, and the family stayed more permanently at Mount Airy. Later, in 1784 - 1786, the abandoned well was completely filled as the house and lot were subjected to the overhauling the whole town underwent following its military use during the Revolution.

From the Calvert House excavation thousands of ceramic sherds emerged. Archaeologists have assembled a profile of the ceramic belongings of the Calvert family. Creating a Calvert profile necessitated ignoring those objects which dated to periods following Calvert occupation of the site as well as some of the sheet scatter in the yard areas which may have indicated general community deposition. From the more reliable features, including a well, a trash midden, the crawlspace under the existing house and the hypocaust of the orangerie, a ceramic minimum vessel count could be
generated for ceramics which were more likely Calvert-owned. The minimum vessel count groups all sherds which are from a single vessel to give more reliable figures than that of a simple count of sherds. From these figures, the Calvert assemblage offered some very notable data.

First, whereas the surviving Calvert inventories contain real gaps in the ceramic possessions of a fully functional eighteenth-century elite household, the minimum vessel count more accurately reflects the numbers and range of ceramic wares present. The picture of the Calvert’s cooking, storage, serving, consumption and decorative ceramics expands and deepens with the data from the minimum vessels. [see Table 1] Secondly, there is an astounding amount of porcelain. Of the 1078 vessels identified, fully 22.5 percent, or 243 vessels, were porcelain. If anything points to a strong dedication to entertainment, to sociability and a conspicuous consumption, it is the ratio of porcelain vessels. When one figures in that the other refined wares comprise 31 percent (creamware, 9.6 percent; tin-glazed, 14.2 percent; pearlware 3.2 percent; other refined earthenwares, 2.2 percent, and refined stonewares, 2.0 percent), thus giving a total refined percentage of over fifty percent, becoming unmistakeable that serving and consuming pieces occupied a great position in the Calvert House.

The porcelain collection is varied, and of high quality. A great number of the porcelain vessels date to the 1720s and early ‘thirties when the Calvert governors were alive. A second major collection of porcelains corresponds to the late 1740s and 1750s when Benedict and Elizabeth were newlyweds, and resuscitating the social-life of
### TABLE 1: GOVERNOR CALVERT SITE MINIMUM VESSEL COUNTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PORCELAINS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Chinese export</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. European soft-paste</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARTHENWARES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Delft (tin-glazed enamel)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Whieldon-Wedgwood Type</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Creamware</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Pearlware</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other Refined wares</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Slip decorated wares</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Coarse Earthenwares</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STONEWARES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Fine White Salt Glazed</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Dry-Bodied Refined</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Slip-dipped</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Coarse Stonewares</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPOLOGY TERMS:**

**PORCELAIN:** First discovered by the Chinese and introduced to the Europeans by Marco Polo, this ware is a vitrious ceramic made of highly fired white kaolin clay with feldspar which makes a fine white glassy ceramic, extremely strong, capable of very delicate potting. Usually decorated with underglaze blue penciling and capable holding bright overglaze enamels and gilding, porcelain was the most expensive ceramic. The Europeans created a similar porcelain in the early 18th c. called soft-paste porcelain.

**EARTHENWARES:** Made of a low-fired clay and water-permeable, this ware runs a range of quality levels. Plain, lead-glazed wares were common kitchen and dairy wares. The refined earthenwares were intended to emulate porcelain, first by delft with an opaque tin glaze and blue or polychromed enamels on the surface. The mid 18th century saw a range of refined, lead-glazed wares introduced by Josiah Wedgwood that were finely potted and with varying degrees of success of cheaply simulating porcelains.

**STONEWARES:** Similar to earthenware, this is more highly fired and is semi-vitrious and watertight without glazing. Common for storage vessels, it was made in quantities by the Germans, English and Americans and all are found on American sites. Varying types of more thinly potted, refined wares were popular mock-porcelains. Usually slightly more expensive than earthenwares.
the Calverts' Annapolis townhouse.\(^3\) \(^8\) Two notable absences in the porcelain artifacts are: (1) the more unusual forms associated with elite consumption, such as asparagus stands or even tureens, and (2) armorial patterns. Armorial patterns were popular with wealthy porcelain patrons in the eighteenth century, and one would expect they were with the proprietor's family. In fact, other armorial items have surfaced, including buttons and glass, so the absence of armorial ceramics may be attributable to the fact that archaeology only accounts for that which was both discarded and retrieved, thereby allowing for the possible existence of items not found in excavation. Above all, we must recall that ceramics would have occupied a secondary role on the Calvert table, especially in the first half of the eighteenth century. Hundreds of pounds worth of silver found in the inventories would have filled many of these gaps and perhaps provided some truly extraordinary forms. Likewise, pewter also occupied a strong part of the dining wares. Whatever the case, the ponderance of porcelain vessels is a dramatic statement about the Calverts' enormous consumer behavior.

From the early period of Calvert occupation of the Annapolis house site, 1727-1735, a varied and sophisticated set of patterns and forms surfaced which speak of a highly sociable profile. Serving pieces in porcelain include the general range of table wares one finds in eighteenth-century inventories, with the exception of tureens. Excavation revealed serving bowls and dishes as well as dessert dishes. There are platters, sauce and butter boats, condiment and custard cups, salts, pitchers, punch bowls and garniture. Consumption pieces include dinner, soup and twifler
plates, and drinking bowls. The full assortment of teawares is represented; tea pots, sugar bowls and dishes, cream jugs, tea bowls, tea cups, saucers, slop bowls and coffee cans, as the straight-sided cappuchine was known at the time.

Much of the porcelain is underglaze blue decorated, though a small percentage is polychromed enamel with gilding, including some substantial pieces such as large platters [MV.37, MV.164], a polychromed and gilded octagonal stand from the 1720s or thirties [MV.86], and several large polychromed punch bowls from the 1750s [MV.35, MV.93, MV.96]. Other decorative types appear, including Imari and encre de chine.

Other refined wares (tin-glazed enamel, white salt-glaze, and refined stonewares and, during the 1760s Whieldon-Wedgwood and creamware) account for a greater variety of forms than found among porcelain. Among the tin-glazed enamel there are basins, fireplace tiles, salts, mugs, many galley pots, large quantities of plates and even more punch bowls in all sizes. White salt-glaze stoneware offers tea wares, plates, pierced fruit baskets, condiment cups, sugar bowls, and a coffee or chocolate pot. There are teapot lids in both refined and dry-bodied stonewares. Whieldon-Wedgwood wares, only eleven vessels, were virtually all tea wares except for a possible salt and one other unidentifiable hollow-ware. One piece of red earthenware, dating to the 1720s, was in the form of a lady’s shoe [MV.376], and utterly useless except as a charming bit of whimsy; indicative of a discretionary budget that provided for fripperies.

From the second major period of Calvert occupation of the
Annapolis house site, 1745-1776, more porcelains were purchased to supplement existing services, and perhaps to accommodate newer fashions in ceramics which the previous generation had not exercised. These new porcelains include polychrome pieces, and most noticeable are the large size of the forms which were intended for serving, including platters, punch bowls and serving dishes, as porcelains began assuming a role on the table formerly held by silver and pewter. The real innovation for Benedict and Elizabeth was the purchase of creamware, which accounts for twelve percent of the total vessels, presents the widest range of forms, including all the tea ware types, punch bowls, chamber pots, dishes, platters; dinner-, soup- and twifler-plates, dessert dishes, mugs, salts, sauce boats, pitchers, and two scalloped shell sweat-meat dishes. With creamware, which graced a spectrum of tables from Catherine the Great to middling sort shopkeepers, a qualitative statement about its significance to the Calverts is much more difficult. However, first one notes that most of the Calvert pieces are of a very high quality; generally finely potted in a light cream-color, with graceful Leeds-type handles with embossed leaf mounts, and beaded rims, even on several chamber pots.

Decorated creamwares cost more, and therefore serve as a small factor in the qualitative comments on an assemblage. One Liverpool-type transfer print punch bowl depicts a foxhunt with hounds and horses, and recalls the enduring passion for good horses and hunting among the Maryland elite. A fine piece of gilding appears on a teapot lid, and a gilt and enamelled tea pot and several other hand-painted hollow-wares, saucers and punch bowls indicate a
better than average table. An intriguing pedestal base survives, leaving one to wonder what surmounted it. Compared to forms 1 and 3 in Plate 1, and form 5 in Plate 2 of Wedgwood’s Catalogue of creamware in 1774, the possibility of at least one tureen for this assemblage arises.

From the kitchens, pantry and dairy come a wide range and ponderous numbers of coarse earthenwares and utilitarian stonewares necessary to operate a large, elite, socially-eminent townhouse. An impressive array of pans, bowls, cook pots, baking pans and storage jars, bottles and pots attest to diverse and heavy entertaining expected of the Lord Proprietor’s governor and kin, as well as the larger than average servant/slave presence in the household. The coarser wares in the kitchen are associated with storing, mixing and baking; earthen cook pots only represent four of 111 total coarse earthen vessels. Probably the more expensive and culinary superior metal pipkins, saucepans and skillets made up the bulk of vessels on the Calvert kitchen hearth. One must also take into account the widespread use of pewter, as well as other metals, in the early eighteenth century, especially with a wealthier class, or as Mary Beaudry states, "one realizes that ceramics were not de rigueur among the rich in the early Chesapeake." Ned Calvert’s "seven dozen pewter plates," serves to underscore the strong importance of metal in the Calvert home.

From this discussion of the Calvert position and influence juxtaposed against their ceramics as understood both from their inventories and their house site, we being to understand the strength of their social standing in Annapolis in the first half of the
eighteenth century. After mid-century there were much wealthier and more important men in town than the Benedict Calverts. Before that time though, the stature and display the family paraded before early Annapolitans set a standard and measure which native elite families emulated, and ultimately surpassed.
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"I am informed the China set down in the inclosed list may be bought in London for 12 Guineas—but however—in order to have it handsome & good I would not begrudge to give a few Pounds more tho’ I would not have you exceed 15 Pounds."\(^1\)

--The Hon. Charles Carroll of Carrollton, Esq. 1772

"I should be glad to have such a Supply as will Command some respect to this store and enable me by the Sale of them to help pay for the Charge of Storekeeping...."\(^2\)

--Scottish Factor Alexander Hamilton, 1774

Chapter One presented the general ideas currently held about the nature of consumer spending in the Chesapeake in the eighteenth century. Regardless of whether or not this period of ever-increasing consumption constituted a revolution, historians agree that most levels of society enjoyed a broader range and larger number of ceramics in their homes.\(^3\) This was made possible by the combination of superior manufacturing methods, increased transportation technology, and an advancement in the use of advertising and hawking these wares which gave rise to a pervasive fashion-consciousness in English-speaking settlements. Chapter Two discussed the ceramic assemblage from the Calvert family’s townhouse in Annapolis which the Calverts owned from the 1720s until about 1800. The large variety and quantity of refined wares and porcelains used in their household attest to the Calverts’ position and role as an elite family. In comparison with the minimum vessel counts for other Chesapeake sites such as St. Mary’s City, Oxon Hill, Governor’s
Land and the Clifts, the large numbers of refined wares on the Calvert site demonstrates the luxurious nature of Calvert consumption and taste. In this chapter the fit between modern theories about eighteenth-century consumption and the material remains of the Calvert family’s purchasing is explored as a means of examining patterns of consumer purchasing practiced in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake. This provides a basis which better enables us to understand the Calverts’ consumerism, and to see how the remains of their ceramic vessels constitute an example of elite spending patterns.

The Calvert assemblage’s role in defining elite consumerism also serves as supporting documentation about the eighteenth-century consumer revolution. The results complement Neil McKendrick, who argues,

"the fact that during the last fifteen years of the [eighteenth] century the consumption of excised commodities in mass demand, such as tobacco, soap, candles, printed fabrics, spirits, and beer, was increasing more than twice as fast as the population, makes acceptance of rising patterns of consumption difficult to avoid."

Obviously the English earthenware industry developed well enough that the wares of Staffordshire appeared in the far-flung provinces such as Maryland and in the very best houses of Chesapeake families such as the Calverts, Carrolls and Pacas. Cheaply manufactured items could be, and were, marketed to the wealthy as well as to the less fortunate. Likewise, the Calvert data supports the findings of Carr and Walsh and others that after 1715 purchasing power increased dramatically in the Chesapeake, allowing for the material and cultural differences between the classes to broaden and further separate the lifestyles of the wealthy from the poorer sorts in the eighteenth
century. Similarly, the high percentages of refined serving and consuming ware, and the relative lack of dairying utensils at this urban site, support Carr and Walsh’s analysis of the division between urban necessities and rural amenities.

Difficulties emerge, however, when the archaeological data is placed next to the documentary evidence to see if it coincides with the general theories about ceramics’ role in consumerism. For the most part, discussions concerning consumerism, fashion and urban spending are viable. However, notions concerning from whence and from whom the elite were purchasing their ceramics in the tidewater region must be considered anew in the light of both archaeological and documentary evidence. Similar to McKendrick’s conclusion that better transportation allowed the rise of provincial peddlers and shopkeepers to act as disseminators of fashion items to country people in England, many historians have too readily connected the rise of the Scottish factors’ store system and the increase of goods on the shelves of stores in the region to indicate the source of new consumer habits in Maryland and Virginia. And, indeed, that is true to an extent. However, one studying Tidewater consumerism must temper this with an admonition. The question arises as to whether the upper classes were content to shop for their goods shoulder to shoulder with lower classes. In a society which strove so hard to arrange the barriers between classes in everything from posture and clothing to architecture and land use, standards would not have been relaxed for this one function of consumerism. Would the elite mingle with common rabble in local shops, purchasing identical items for similar prices?
Some of the confusion about the patronage of local stores has developed from recent work in which scholars have found Chesapeake merchants' accounts to be an exciting source for examining material culture in Maryland and Virginia in the eighteenth century. For instance, extending from the Winterthur and Hagley conference of April 1980 on marketing ceramics came four fine papers which later appeared in the Winterthur Portfolio XIX. There Regina Lee Blaszczyk explored the Chesapeake through three Scottish factors' accounts, while Arlene Palmer Scwind similarly concentrated on the New York merchant, Frederick Rhinelander. The on-going work of George L. Miller reinforces this very important source of economic information as a means of approaching the subject of the names, types and prices of ceramics offered as well as those purchased in the eighteenth century, and his work has become a standard against which archaeologists measure ceramic assemblages. More narrow in focus but filled with great insight, Edward Papenfuse's book centers on the significance of the merchant in colonial Annapolis. All the above important research offers the scholar a valuable view of the general range of goods available locally in the eighteenth-century Chesapeake.

As importantly though, is the distinction between what was available, how it was priced, and for whom. For example, while Blaszczyk admirably portrayed the role of the Scottish factor and his store in Maryland after 1740, she did not make a distinction between where the Scots' influence was felt, whether they were urban or rural, or the division of wealth of the market segment of their customers. Somewhat oversimplifying, she quotes Philip Fithian, "I
observe that all the Merchants & Shopkeepers in the Sphere of my acquaintance and I am told it is the case through the Province, are Young Scotch-Men." Papenfuse points out, however, that the Scots' influence was never felt in Maryland as it was in Virginia. The Scots only managed to corner thirty percent of the total Maryland tobacco trade. Indeed, in the Annapolis district only sixteen percent of the tobacco went to Glasgow in 1772, or 1,107 hogsheads out of 7,070; the principal Scottish hold was near the Virginia border along the Potomac River and on the Eastern Shore.

Many scholars have dealt in other ways with the division of wealth, and its effect on social practice. Rhys Isaacs portrays this through a discussion of how the elite wielded institutions such as the county court, parish vestry and colonial militia to maintain status. In his book, Tobacco Culture, Timothy Breen explores what he considers the "tobacco mentality" which establishes the culture of the wealthy planters. Important to the wealthy class's elitism was a division in the way tobacco was marketed to Europe after the Tobacco Inspection Act in Virginia in 1730 and in Maryland in 1747. Though the locally operating Scottish factors rapidly began to claim the trade for the lesser planters, the wealthy maintained long-established relationships based on a consignment system with their London agents. Additionally, Daniel Blake Smith in an analysis of the juxtaposition of the internal family structure and the external public face in the "great houses" in the tobacco belt finds the same divisions between the social practice of elite and commoner. These sentiments are reflected again in Jan Lewis's work. Each drew the same conclusion: the Chesapeake gentry
established barriers against lesser classes for nearly every facet of life, including consumerism.

In ongoing work at the Office of Archaeological Excavation and Conservation at Colonial Williamsburg, George L. Miller and Ann Smart-Martin are examining merchant accounts in Maryland and Virginia to establish a typology, cost index values and popularity profiles for ceramic vessel forms and wares. Within their joint paper presented at the Society for Historical Archaeology meeting in 1985, Smart pointed out that "several distinct systems were at work in the tobacco trade," noting that the consignment system was generally replaced by the retail business during the second half of the eighteenth century. She notes some large consignment firms, such as the House of John Norton and Sons, did survive until the end of the century catering to the large York River proprietors who continued to consign their premium tobacco for a premium price.\(^\text{15}\)

It is important to recognize that the function and relationship of the London agent for the elite planter was not purely economic. Samuel Rosenblatt, in his study of the Norton papers, observes that planters turned to agents with political matters and as wards for their young studying in England. The favor was returned, he adds, when planters interested themselves in the agents' affairs, even involving extending financial aid. This is the reverse of the usual situation in which the agent acted as the planter's personal banker.\(^\text{16}\) The relationship between an elite planter and his London agent was one of interdependence, friendship, mutual concern, and above all, financial reward. The planter desperately needed to be able to rely on his agent in business matters; and therefore the
successful agent strove to accommodate. Noting this, John Norton wrote "the Profit does not arise altogether from the business done, but how well done."^{17}

The gentility of the great planter and his agent in a "Commercial Friendship",^{18} as one contemporary styled it, struggled after 1730 in competition against the system of direct purchase made by local factors, Scottish or otherwise. Unlike the London agent system, Chesapeake direct-purchase merchants permitted immediate credit, cash flow, and goods for the small planter; providing an attractive package for the capital-poor planter in need of quick turn-around time for the receipt of profits on his crop. Small planters simply could not afford the long wait after the harvest while a crop was sent to Britain, subsisting until it could be sold, manufactured goods purchased, and the both profits and goods shipped back to the Chesapeake. Initially, small planters relied upon the "goodwill, whim, and fortunes of the major landholders" to purchase their tobacco and provide the goods and services they needed. This was replaced by the more accommodating, canny local merchants, mostly from Scotland, who arrived after 1730.^{19}

By 1740 a very clear dichotomy emerged in the ways tobacco was sold, cash and credit extended, and merchandise obtained. Whereas in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries the difference between the greater and the lesser planters was not in their possessions, but rather in their relative comfort, during the Golden Age of the tobacco era in the eighteenth century, nearly unbridgeable gaps in marketing and consumption distinguished classes. The middling and poorer planters depended entirely upon the quick turn around of
credit and the immediate availability of local merchandise; this formed the primary characteristic of more common spending. Elite consumerism was qualitatively different as the wealthy were graced by the luxury of resting on their capital holdings until the slow consignment system returned their investment accompanied by sumptuous articles purchased for them in London.

The pattern, however, was contradicted whenever a great planter shopped in a local store, in which case these social distinctions would dissolve. Whereas one might understand the occasional purchase in a local shop by a wealthy citizen, a repeated, extensive account for a great planter or elite government official would negate the whole understanding of elite consumerism, and destroy its effectiveness as one means of separating socially distinct groups. Yet Edward Papenfuse found records for elite Annapolitans such as Walter Dulany that initially suggested he was an avid shopper in Nathan Hammond's Annapolis store. Papenfuse writes, "Walter Dulany purchased £1,731 worth of goods at Nathan Hammond's store between 1764 and 1767, an average of £433 per year (7.2 times the yearly income of the typical Annapolis craftsman)." Papenfuse attributes Dulany's expenditures to the fact that he was building a new townhouse. A closer inspection of these records, however, revealed that Dulany used Hammond almost solely as a source for cashing in bills of exchange. A total of £1481.0.1 worth of bills of exchange account for 85.55 percent of Dulany's transactions with Hammond, and therefore are not purchases at all. Indeed, supplies for his townhouse do account for a great deal of the remaining 14.45 percent of his account, consisting largely of items such as nails and
lumber. Of the remainder, only £3.8.0, or 0.2 percent of the total, was spent by Dulany in four years on ceramics. These were utilitarian wares; the only Chinese porcelain was a bowl purchased for 14 shillings, and half a dozen cups and saucers at 10 shillings.21 My analysis of Dulany’s accounts with Hammond reveals that Dulany indeed did not abandon his class and give his custom to a local retailer. Clearly from the records, Dulany and also others of his class may have done as Papenfuse says and "spent a great deal on themselves," but certainly not in Annapolis stores.22

Since one example does not prove a point, further inspection of the expenditures on ceramics by other elite in Hammond’s store revealed the same pattern occurring repeatedly. Many wealthy Annapolitans, including the Brices, Catons, Tilghmans, Talbotts, Warfields, Worthingtons and Pacas, and some of the Ridgelys and Carrolls purchased no ceramics, though accounts for all the above were shown on Hammond’s books. Indeed, neither Mr. Rezin Hammond nor Colonel Charles Hammond shopped for ceramics in their relative’s store, though Rezin spent £171.8.1 in the single year between August 4, 1764 and August 7, 1765, and the Colonel purchased a great deal of fabric, as well as nails, salt, sugar and rum; items requiring constant replenishment in a well-stocked, well-maintained household. "His Excellency, Horatio Sharpe, Esquire," the colonial governor, kept an account with Hammond for similar domestic needs; thread, nails, nutmeg, tea, buttons, paper and ink powder. Sharpe’s ceramic acquisitions consisted of the most prosaic earthen and stonewares except one large China bowl; one jug, two earthen pans, three chamber pots, and two mugs. Most elite accounts look like Caleb Dorsey’s,
filling an entire page of the ledger with entries mostly for rum, madeira and sugar. Dorsey’s only ceramic purchase was one jug for one shilling, six pence, while Samuel Chew purchased no ceramics, though he did buy six pewter chamber pots at six shillings, six pense apiece. Samuel Middleton, the renowned tavernkeeper, purchased only six chamber pots, two dishes, and a milk pot. Andrew Buchanan is the only elite name appearing who actually spent much on any porcelain, purchasing "1 doz. Chainea plates and 2 bowls bought at Thompsons’ for £1.17.0", which was a set Hammond had picked up at a public vendue or an estate sale which he sold to Buchanan. And finally, there was the signer of the Declaration, Samuel Chase, who bought neither cup nor bowl, yet from November 1765 to August 1766 bought eighteen and a half gallons of rum!23

Understanding the merchandise available in the local stores of the Chesapeake illuminates the consumer choices of some of the above elite Annapolitans. The ledger from Nathan Hammond’s Annapolis shop for 1764 to 1767 cited above survives, as does a small one for fellow Annapolis merchant, William Coffing, for 1771. Ledgers are instructive for their information about who purchased what, and when since they serve much the same purpose as today’s cash register tape. However, ledgers are notoriously sparse on details about the items purchased, and they only allow an impressionistic view of what was offered in a store; that is, they reveal only that which was sold as opposed to that which was offered for sale. Because scholars have noted the marvelous consistency in merchandise stocked in eighteenth-century stores24, three more merchant accounts were studied to add dimension to those of Hammond and Coffing. The more descriptive and
encompassing records of annual inventories and shipping invoices from London permitted a fuller understanding of the wares available in Annapolis. The books of Alexander Hamilton of Piscataway, Maryland for the years 1769 to 1774 were compared to those of two Virginians: William Allason of Falmouth for 1759 to 1773, and Edward Dixon of Port Royal for 1767 to 1774. [see Tables 2 and 3]

Exploration of these records makes it soon apparent that the stores purposefully opted for a middle market. All the merchants, save Coffing, show porcelains in their stocks (and possibly so did Coffing without selling any in 1771, which is entirely likely as we shall see). The quantities and forms, however, reveal that those porcelains available were only a cursory nod to that product when compared to the full line of available forms. Hammond only sold china cups and saucers, china bowls and only one china teapot between 1764 and 1767 in Annapolis, and one wonders if he even carried any other vessel forms. Hamilton in Piscataway similarly stocked bowls ranging from three quarts to one pint, and a number of tea and coffee cups and saucers in his store. In 1774, the last year of his inventories, he added a single pint mug and a single quart mug. Similarly, Dixon in Port Royal only offered the same range of bowls, and cups and saucers for tea and coffee.

Only William Allason in Falmouth ventured more extensively into the porcelain market. [see Table 4] In 1764, the first year he introduced porcelain to his shelves, he was offering the formulaic assortment of cups and saucers and only one bowl. Two years later records show he had added a dozen plates, a pint bowl, and a two-quart bowl, two cream pots, two one-quart fluted mugs and five
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>CALVERT</th>
<th>ALLASON</th>
<th>DIXON</th>
<th>HAMILTON</th>
<th>HAMMOND</th>
<th>COFFING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tureen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platter</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salad Bowl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauce Boat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter Boat/Plate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickle Stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Dish/Basket</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustard Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper Caster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Cross (Cat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Cellar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teapot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/Chocol. Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Pot/Cream Jug</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Bowl/Dish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Box</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slop Bowl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch Bowl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punch Strainer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Pitcher</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSUMING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner Plate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soup Plate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessert Plate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twifler Plate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Plate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacup and Saucer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Cup/Can</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breakfast Cup</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup/Mug</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Bowl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Cup</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porringer</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these purposes, only form and not ware type is explored. Data are based on archaeological evidence for Calvert Site, annual store inventory for the shops of Allason (Falmouth, Virginia), Dixon (Port Royal, Virginia), and Hamilton (Piscattaway, Maryland), and store ledgers for Hammond (Annapolis, Maryland) and Coffing (Annapolis, Maryland).
TABLE 3
COOKING, STORING AND OTHER CERAMIC FORMS AVAILABLE IN
CHESAPEAKE STORES (1759-1775) AND LOCATED AT THE
CALVERT SITE, (c. 1720-c. 1790)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>CALVERT</th>
<th>ALLASON</th>
<th>DIXON</th>
<th>HAMILTON</th>
<th>HAMMOND</th>
<th>COFFING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COOKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pudding Pan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatty Pan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pie Pan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jug</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar/Cannister</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickle Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venison Pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Pan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wash Basin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galley Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pill Slab</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tile</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Pot</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garniture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolls' Dish</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these purposes, only form and not ware type is explored. Data are based on archaeological evidence for Calvert Site, annual store inventory for the shops of Allason (Falmouth, Virginia), Dixon (Port Royal, Virginia) and Hamilton (Piscattaway, Maryland), and store ledgers for Hammond (Annapolis, Maryland) and Coffing (Annapolis, Maryland).
TABLE 4

Chart showing the estimated sales of Chinese porcelain vessels by William Allason of Falmouth, Virginia, 1766-1774

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VESSEL TYPE</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>1766</th>
<th>1767</th>
<th>1768</th>
<th>1769</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1771</th>
<th>1772</th>
<th>1773</th>
<th>1774</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INVC</td>
<td>INV T</td>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>MNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAWARES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups &amp; Saucers #1</td>
<td>3/4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cups &amp; Saucers #2</td>
<td>3/4d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cream Pots</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cream Jugs</td>
<td>8d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER BEVERAGES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choc Cup &amp; Saucer</td>
<td>4/4d</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluted Mugs, 1 qt.</td>
<td>2a/4d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEVERAGE/SERVING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, 1 pt.</td>
<td>9d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, 1 qt.</td>
<td>1s/6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls, 2 qt.</td>
<td>3s/6d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enam'd Fruit Dish</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD CONSUMPTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plates</td>
<td>8d</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY

INVC - "Invoice", amount received into stock
INV T - "Inventory", amount shown in annual inventory of stock on hand
MNS - "Minimum Number Sold", number derived from the reduction of the inventory from one year to the next
* - Indicates an anomaly in the records. No record of this amount could be found in the invoices.
and a half dozen chocolate cups and saucers. Interestingly, these additions were made without having sold any of the existing cups and saucers. Eventually, sluggishly, Allason moved the porcelains out of his shop. For instance, the dozen plates sat untouched on the shelves for the rest of 1766, through 1767 and 1768, and only half their number were sold in 1769. The remaining six plates were still accounted for in the last annual inventory of 1774. Of the new shipment in 1766, Allason sold within the year the two bowls and two cream pots, and he sold the two fluted mugs the next year. Accordingly, the shipment Allason received from Scotland in 1772 reflected those porcelain forms which sold well, and thus contained a dozen pint china bowls, a dozen quart bowls and six cream pots, along with three dozen tea cups and saucers. Still, in the three remaining years of business before the advent of hostilities in 1775, none of these items sold very well.

Whereas porcelains sold slowly in Chesapeake stores, and those that did were simpler items such as teacups intended to permit poor and middling customers a chance at emulative spending, other ceramic wares did sell well. The introduction of creamwares to the Chesapeake in the late 1760s and early 1770s especially demonstrates market stratification. Hamilton, Allason and Dixon all offered creamwares, and sold forms such as plates, dishes and teawares easily and in quantities. Larger and fancier, and thereby more expensive creamware forms, were not so quick to sell.

From these data we see that elite customers could not have fitted out their tea and dining tables from the local shops since the merchandise simply did not exist. The reason a diversity was not
offered was the shopkeepers’ understanding that the elite would not avail themselves of the goods even if they were able. The standard porcelain forms available in eighteenth-century Chesapeake shops permitted middling and perhaps even poor customers to expend a little discretionary income to purchase a punch bowl or half a dozen tea cups and saucers and thereby include themselves in the fashionable habit and exotic display of punch, tea, coffee and chocolate drinking. The inclusion in the fashion was dependent upon the beverage and some of the forms. Only one of the five merchants studied offered china tea pots, and whereas William Allason included cream pots, he still did not stock sugar boxes and slop bowls which the elite would have seen as mandatory teawares. 

By the 1760s and 1770s, Chesapeake factors were ready to expand to a larger market than the poor and middling planters. William Allason attempted as much with a more expanded offering of porcelains, only to be let down in the sluggishness in those sales. Perhaps he felt much the same sense of aggravation as Alexander Hamilton in Piscataway, Maryland, when he wrote to his Scottish agents in 1774:

"It is true I have a great many Goods on hand, but they are not Such as I want or Such as I can sell at this time." ... "You will see by the Inventory that it will take a Considerable part of my scheme to assort [i.e., give variety to] the Store & that Large Quantity of Goods on hand is much owing to many unsaleable goods...."

Old habits were slow to die in Maryland and Virginia, and the elite population’s persistent attachment to the consignment method continued to plague local merchants eager to expand their markets. Hamilton fretted in the same letter,
"The price of Tobacco will not be high and there is a great many ships in the Patuxent and this River [Potomac] on Consignment from London, and which will be a great inducement for people to Ship Rather than Take a low price."\(^2^7\)

Despite the fact that Hamilton offered immediate cash for crops, the offset of a greater price from London by means of consignment would, he agonized, result in "the Loss of some very Considerable Customers."\(^2^8\)

Local storekeepers simply could not afford the overhead and the risk of keeping high-end goods in stock when the clientele were of a middling and lesser financial sort. By choice, the elite preferred the aggravation and anticipation of waiting for the return of their orders from London, perhaps as much as a year later from initial placement.\(^2^9\) Rather than shop in the local stores, an elite planter could order through his agent literally anything available to the London market. His only bounds were the limits of what he could or would spend. Consequently, enormous orders for china floated from the Chesapeake to the Thames, much like that from the Gloucester, Virginia lawyer, Peter Lyons, who requested from the firm of John Norton and Sons a "Compleat Sett of Table China" which consisted of 127 pieces.\(^3^0\) Similarly, Beverly Dickson from Williamsburg wrote to Norton in 1771, requesting "1 Hhd. [Hogshead] Queens China, Best Sort." Dickson's Invoice of Goods runs a very fat eleven pages long and covers an incredibly wide range of manufactured and luxury goods, as well as fairly commonplace items. Obviously, much was not obtainable in stores in Virginia, however, Virginia merchant accounts reveal that Dickson certainly could have found "12 Sets Cups and
Saucers." Thus, despite living in an urbanized environment, Dickson preferred to deal through the prestigious House of Norton for virtually everything he purchased.31

The Norton papers reveal, furthermore, that a fairly sophisticated sense of merchandise and quality was understood by the Chesapeake elite. John Armistead of Yorktown wrote in 1768, "The inclosed is an Invoice of goods I shall esteem it a particular favour if you would have the things bought of the Tradesmen I have mentioned in my invoice & send by the return of your ship." The lengthy invoice is fully annotated, especially with wearing appral, as to the shops the Armisteads preferred. Armistead closes with a post script, "Mrs. Armistead desires her shoes to be made by Gresham in Convent [sic] Garden the smallest size for a Woman." Also, numerous references in the letters from Virginia to Norton identify Mrs. Norton's seminal role and personal touch in shopping for goods to be returned to the Chesapeake. Beverly Dickson acknowledges the receipt of the articles listed in his long invoice of 1771; "Your Favour per Capt Danby came safe to hand as likewise the Goods sent by him[.] My Mother is extremely obliged to Mrs. Norton for choosing her things so well."32

From Virginia to Maryland the manner of elite spending through agents differed little. Charles Carroll of Carrollton, writing from Annapolis in 1772, orders through Messrs. West and Hobson an astounding service of porcelain consisting of 166 pieces. He indicates that he is willing to spend between twelve Guineas (£12.12.0) to £15.0.0, demonstrating his familiarity with London prices. Also, in the same year, Carroll writes his agents requesting that they:
"deliver the inclosed letter to Mrs. Lee, Mr. James Russell's daughter who married Mr. Phil. Lee of this Province--The letter is from Mrs. Carroll requesting the favor of Mrs. Lee to buy a few articles for her in London of which she has sent Mrs. Lee an Invoice inclosed in her Letter. Those things may amount to 15£ Sterling which sum I beg you will send to Mrs. Lee whenever she calls for it to pay for the above mentioned Articles."

In this letter we see the Carrolls' dependence upon the London agent for business matters and the extension of credit, and the continuation of a desire to have goods purchased in the English metropolis.

Like Dickson in Williamsburg in the autumn of 1771, Carroll also wrote from Annapolis in the same year to his agents requesting such luxuries as "6 Blue & White Oyster Scallops", probably unobtainable in Annapolis. However, he also asks for such mundane pieces as "1 Gro[ss] Earthen milkpans sorted" and "6 Doz. 2 quart stone bottles" which the records of Annapolis storekeepers reveal were indeed on their shelves. Any argument for rural sufficiency and urban amenity does not enter here; conscious choices were made by elite urban dwellers, like Dickson and Carroll, to purchase through London agents for nearly everything, just as the great plantation owners did from their far-flung rural seats. The numbers of items ordered from London gives one the impression that a bulk order was intended to get a large household through the year until the next fall ordering season. Thus Carroll ordered in 1772 "24 white stone Chamber Potts" and "24 strong course do. for servants" and Dickson ordered an entire hogshead of creamware dishes. The occasional utilitarian purchase from local retailers by elite customers were those times demanding an item before the next ordering season. This could include everything
from the highly necessary purchase of a chamber pot to a Chinese export porcelain punch bowl, a form frequently used as a presentation piece. 34

By the years immediately preceding the War for Independence from Great Britain, a tension existed in the commercial world of the Chesapeake. On one hand, the elite maintained time-honored ties with the consignment system of marketing their tobacco to Britain in return for credit and goods through a merchant house agent. On the other hand, a new system of stores kept by supercargos with ties to powerful and innovative houses in Glasgow, Liverpool, Bristol and other port cities grew on the shores of the Chesapeake in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, providing the planters with options of immediate cash, credit and European manufactured goods. As the century progressed, these stores became stronger and more capable of supplying the broad spectrum of society. Nevertheless, by the 1770s, records reveal that the wealthy only made tentative ventures into these shops to purchase occasional items. Generally, the local storekeeper served as a bill-cashing bank teller, and a source for liquor and some supplies. Despite the obvious convenience of local stores, the elite seldom availed themselves of the full capabilities of shops in the Chesapeake, as they tenaciously maintained their London agents.

No real logical answer exists for why the Chesapeake gentry foreswore local shops, with the exception that British agents offered the highly desirable service of banker. Still, local retailers had the capital to supply sumptuous services of china in their stores for the elite by the 1770s; Wallace, Davidson and Johnson opened their
Annapolis store with £8,300 worth of goods, an astounding sum; and the Alexandria firm of Hooe, Stone timidly offered two experimental sets of creamware of 240 pieces each in the early 1770s. But these efforts met with no success in alluring the elite. Perhaps the elite's tenacious grip on the traditional method of conducting business had a symbolic meaning for them. Rhys Isaac, in stating that the staple crop was sent to Britain in exchange for manufactured goods, noted that "Material reliance entailed also cultural and psychological dependence. With goods came tastes, standards, and a whole set of assumptions about the proper ways of ordering life." If the colonial gentry in the Chesapeake truly permitted a materialistic determinism based on consumption to assist in creating structured social distancing, then undoubtedly they clung to the consignment method beyond its usefulness.

How did the elite handle the same distancing outside the Chesapeake? In deficiently-soiled New England, the only recourse for advancement was through mercantile activity, not planting as in the South. Therefore, an extensive direct trade with Britain developed in the seventeenth century. The middle colonies, with better farming advantages, were slower to catch on, but direct merchant activity centering around New York and Philadelphia appeared shortly after 1700. In his study of maritime commerce, Arthur L. Jensen speaks of northerners' "aversion ... to selling goods on commission for English merchants, and aspired to deal in the 'aristocrat' of trades, the English dry goods market, because the profit mark-up was so good." The Pennsylvania Gazette records these merchants and their wares. By the 1720s, shops with well-stocked shelves were regularly
advertised in the pages of the newspaper. One notable advertisement, placed by Peter Turner on March 1, 1739, lists over a hundred goods ranging from "Broad-Cloths in Suits with Trimmings" to The Duke of Marlborough's Life, from cupboards, chests of drawers and desks, to "a large Sortment of Iron Ware", "a large Sortment of Chymistry and Druggs, also, a handsome Parcel of English Periwiggs, with many other Goods, too tedious here to mention, at very reasonable Rates." 0

Therefore, while the great planter-merchants in Maryland and Virginia sent their tobacco on consignment to a merchant house in London, and in exchange occasionally operated a store with limited articles on consignment from Britain, the merchants of Philadelphia, New York, Newport and Boston launched full force into the trade. Based on their own capital, northern merchants shrugged off dependency from London houses, while maintaining a strong interrelatedness. But whereas the Chesapeake planters seldom deviated from the British trade, the northern merchants became heavily involved in the whole Atlantic market. Despite the restrictions of the Navigation Acts, the northerners ran a plethora of ventures, such as those of Philadelphian Richard Wain. Along with his principle deals with Harford and Powell of London for manufactured goods, Wain shipped Pennsylvania pork and flour in exchange for Barbadian rum and lumber, and concocted deals in Bristol for hats. He ran business ventures in Halifax, the Carolinas, Norfolk, Barbados, Jamaica, Lisbon and Liverpool. 41

Richard Wain built a considerable fortune for himself, but others went even beyond him. In the partnership of Abel James and Henry Drinker, also of Philadelphia, an enormous trade was carried on with
a number of London merchants. James and Drinker served as middlemen between London suppliers and Pennsylvania retailers, a practice of many Philadelphia merchants who encouraged retailers in scattered trading centers such as Trenton, New Jersey; Wilmington, Delaware; Elkton, Maryland; Lancaster, Pennsylvania; and the piedmont of Virginia and the Carolinas.\textsuperscript{42} The size and importance of the trade carried on by James and Drinker was summed up in their indignant retort to a proposal made by Hyde, Hamilton and Hyde of London in 1766, in which they sarcastically inquired "Or do you ship upon the same terms to Shop Keepers & all others as you do to us?\textsuperscript{43} Their contempt for mere shopkeepers indicated the large gap between retailers and the merchants.

Strangely enough, with this kind of thinking and mercantile opportunity in Philadelphia, why did Marylanders and Virginians continue to rely on consignment? James and Drinker stressed to the London firm of Neale, Pigou and Booth the undesirability of consignment, stating flatly "We may assure you that Consignments of Dry Goods were always unacceptable things to us." They went on to point out that they had "rejected Several proposals made us by Considerable manufacturers in England for selling goods for them, as it is what we have an aversion to and really injures our other business."\textsuperscript{44}

Because the answer does not appear to be of a rational, economic need for the maintenance of the consignment system, then what? The gentry's solid stance behind the superannuated consignment method is summed up by George Washington who maintained the consignment status quo until the political calamities of 1774, yet as early as 1766 had
been reminding his London agent that he could shop more cheaply and satisfyingly in local shops. Washington was merely posturing and threatening in this statement; the documents prove that. But his frustration is palpable and thus places the attraction of personalized selling, purchasing and banking (being a mark of distinction and class) over the difficulties of shopping through a British agent.

This concept of institutionalized class hegemony is not new to colonial American history. Robert St. George found Connecticut River Valley gentry families who, during the course of the eighteenth century, began to lose their power and status in the region. The result was a preference for a very staid, conservative house interior, with fancy architectural façades on the exterior giving "increasingly false images of authority." In a similar motif, the Chesapeake gentry retained a staid and conservative mercantile system which brought them fancy luxuries from Britain, and thus stated their preëminence in society. This notion slides easily into step with Rhys Isaac’s demonstrations of how the gentry dominated the institutions of the county court, parish vestry and colonial militia to maintain status. Thus, the geographical pocket centering around the Chesapeake where the consignment was preferred by the elite was one more attempt of the wealthy to remove themselves and control commoners.

Again and again, when studying the elite in the colonial Chesapeake, a British agent is associated with virtually every great planter. While specific examples exist demonstrating that the elite did make occasional purchases from local retailers, the overwhelming
evidence shows a clear demand for the British agent’s services right up to the crisis of the war, and the subsequent cessation of trade with Britain. Without access to a London agent, elite Marylanders and Virginians began to make more use of local shops out of necessity. One European observer noted in 1784 that,

"Of the European merchants established here before the outbreak of the disturbances, and as British subjects compelled to leave during the war, divers came in the spring and summer with cargoes for Virginia, hoping to trade as before with their old friends and acquaintances. The government of Virginia, still full of bitter spleen, forbade them to land and obliged them to go elsewhere with their goods and seek other markets, which they soon found and not far off. Virginia then began to suffer for lack of European wares, and had to fetch them from Philadelphia and Baltimore the very same it had at first prohibited."  

After the war, despite difficulties, many gladly did resume with their British agents, but not in the numbers that had existed before hostilities. The war taught Marylanders not to be afraid to venture into the merchant world on their own, and suddenly the great merchant houses of Baltimore, Alexandria, Norfolk, and to a lesser degree, Annapolis, appeared in the 1780s and 1790s. But from the viewpoint of the 1760s and early 1770s, only the democratizing effects of a revolution could slay the old snobbish dinosaur of consignment.
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The purpose of the research which informed this thesis was two-fold, and grew from the necessity to explain the origin of ceramics at the Calvert site, as well as what these wares had meant to the Calvert family and to the community of Annapolis. The archaeology staff working under the direction of Dr. Anne Yentsch asked where the Calverts purchased their ceramics; exclusively from London, or perhaps over the years increasingly from Annapolis shops, or maybe a strong mixture of locations? Secondly, we asked what these ceramics had meant to a number of people: to the Calvert family; to the Maryland gentry privileged enough to be invited to the Governor’s table; to the servants handling the wares, often using the chipped and discarded pieces no longer suitable for the family; and finally, what did these wares mean to the largest portion of Annapolitans who never saw the Calvert porcelains, except perhaps as broken pieces in the rear yard, and from that imagined the fabulous table behind the blind stare of the glazed windows? One slice of these questions, namely, the Calverts’ methods of consumerism and the impact on Annapolis elite in the 1720s and 1730s became the focus for my research.
Answering the first question, determining the origins of the ceramics, proved more elusive than guessed, and required an exploration of how the elite in the Chesapeake went about making their purchases before the Revolution. I hope that I have demonstrated well enough several points in that regard: (1) before the 1740s, sufficiently stocked shops did not exist to answer fully the gentry’s needs; (2) after the local shops appeared, the elite made a solid stance behind their British consignment agents, and (3) the lack of wealthy support for Maryland shops made it impossible for storekeepers to have stocked the voluminous, expensive sets of porcelains and other goods requisite for elite dining and tea drinking.

Thus, the theories about consumption discussed in Chapter One are born out, at least within the narrow scope of the Calvert example, and presumably for other elite Annapolitans. The combination of Calvert ceramics from the archaeological record and supporting documents from the era prove that the Calvert family owned great numbers of luxury goods, obtainable only from channels open to the rich. This purchasing pattern in Annapolis, lead by the Calverts largely, made the town "after New York ... in a class of its own: a rich tobacco economy with direct sailings to and from London [which] supplied a sophisticated city quickly adopting to the latest fashions from England" early in the eighteenth century before the rest of Maryland was aware of such luxuries. Later, as the industrial and commercial revolutions merged forces, less wealthy Annapolitans found these objects obtainable through the innovation of the local shops. Fearing blurred lines in class distinctions, the wealthy
consumers such as the Calverts bought more, in larger quantities and in places still unobtainable by the middle class and the poor.

With these observations already set down in an earlier draft of this thesis, I luckily happened across the slim little copy book in which Governor Benedict Leonard Calvert recorded his income during his stay in Maryland from 1727 to 1732. The little account book revealed that Ben Calvert maintained a connection with the prestigious London house of John and Samuel Hyde. Whereas to state this fact is almost a truism because in the early eighteenth century almost all consumption of English goods was conducted through an agent, it is, nevertheless, important to note that the Hydes were considered the preeminent merchants dealing in the Maryland market in the 1720s and 1730s. Moreover, tantalizingly yet unproved, many indications lead one to believe that Captain John Hyde, the merchant, was the same man as, or related to, the Captain John Hyde [1695-1746], also known as Colonel Hyde, a London merchant who married Ben’s sister Jane in 1720. Regardless, Ben Calvert’s account book survives in which he recorded his annual salary of £1,000 plus the three pence per ton of tobacco paid to him by the Assembly, as well as “How the Said Moneys are Disposed of her or in whose hands lodged in England.” While this little account book is not highly illuminating for purchases, but merely indicates money collected or disbursed, it does form a wonderful record of his dealings in buying and selling bills of exchange in Maryland, England, Pennsylvania and Delaware. We never learn what exactly he purchased through the Hydes, though we see glimpses, such as that noted on August 14, 1730 recording that he “Gave my Sister [in-law] Margarett Calvert an
Order on Capt. Hyde for Eighty Pounds Sterling." Calvert's reliance upon the prestigious house of Hyde was important to him in his elevated position in Maryland, especially if a marital bond existed, thereby uniting the family's financial gains from the province both politically and commercially, and assisting the establishment of his high station in Maryland. This connection is further strengthened by a letter written by Lord Baltimore to Captain Charles Calvert just after Ben's death in 1730, in which he instructs the Captain, "You are to send 50£ a year out of yr office to Messr' Hyde & Comp'y for my Order and use." The letter clearly indicates that both Lord Baltimore and Captain Charles corresponded with the prestigious Hydes, even after Ben's death.

With the late encouragement of finally locating a family agent for the 1720s and 1730s, I redoubled my efforts to located a similar shred of evidence for Governor Ben Calvert's nephew, the Honorable Benedict Swingate Calvert. This was the greater challenge because Benedict had all the opportunities his uncle did not to stop by a local shop and make more substantial purchases, though it seemed unlikely. I poured over the archival accounts of Maryland merchants which recorded for whom they had cashed bills of exchange, and on which British house the bills were drawn, but to no avail. These lists of Annapolitan Thomas Hyde (who may have been a relation of British agents John and Samuel Hyde) read like a Maryland Who's Who, but Calvert was not in the ranks. Similarly, the lists for bills paid to Wallace, Davidson and Johnson ran on for pages, but maddeningly proved useless in my search for Calvert, even though he obviously knew the firm well, to the point that he wrote a letter of
recommendation to their London creditors during the financial panic of 1773.\textsuperscript{10}

Through circumstancial evidence, one might argue that Benedict Calvert may have given some business to the firm of Wallace, Davidson and Johnson in the four brief years of that company’s existence before the Revolution, though that still does not account for the bulk of Benedict Calvert’s consuming life. Calvert knew John Davidson as a clerk in his Custom’s Office, and later Calvert entered a partnership with Davidson in a land venture in Frederick County.\textsuperscript{11} The firm of Wallace, Davidson and Johnson formed up in 1771 and Benedict let out his yard and outbuildings for their first sale of goods that autumn, and he stood them credit during their troubles in 1773. However, none of the firm’s extensive papers reveal any mercantile activity with Benedict Calvert. Possibly Calvert encouraged local merchants, but he apparently was dealing with some other agent, doubtlessly British. Interestingly, after the Revolution, when the firm of Wallace, Davidson and Johnson dissolovled, Benedict Calvert appears in the ledgers of John Davidson’s Annapolis store, making occasional purchases, and using Davidson as a banker -- paying his son Neddy’s school tuition through Davidson -- just as he would have done with a London agent before the Revolution.\textsuperscript{12}

Benedict Calvert is a strong example of the new method of purchasing ushered in after the War for Independence: rich, prominent, and conservatively loyalist, Benedict Calvert, the son of the proprietor, found direct trade with London more difficult in the 1780s, and resorted to the convenience of at least some substantial commerce with an Annapolis merchant.
Hopefully I have now established that the first generation of occupants most certainly purchased their ceramics, as well as other luxury goods, from a London merchant house. And whereas no documented proof exists, it is highly improbable that the second generation of Calverts at the Annapolis house could have done more than scanty shopping in local stores before the Revolution. Next remained the question of what these ceramics meant to the Calverts, and what their effect was on other elite Annapolitans. If anything, the enormous sets of china were somewhat of a comfort to the Calverts in the 1720s and 1730s. Because of his murky history, we cannot be as sure of Captain Charles Calvert's expectations from life, but we might safely assume that they were fairly elevated. Certainly, his cousins Benedict Leonard and Edward Henry Calvert came from a very wealthy, prominent family. Ben, forever looking for some refinements in Annapolis, doubtlessly saw even the small effects, such as the gilded and enamelled porcelains as some small comfort for his homesickness in this crude town that appalled him so. Ben showed this disapproval of Annapolis in the letters he and his sister Charlotte exchanged at such a furious rate; she would distract him from his miseries by keeping him abreast of such English refinements as the opera. Charlotte Calvert Brerewood read of her brother's discontent in letters from Maryland, and she replied in 1728, "I had allways a bad Iddea of those parts, but Now a Worse Since your description of them Both as to the company and your Station."¹³

We must only guess what "the company" -- a coarse, pioneer gentry -- thought of the Calverts as they observed the affected, Oxford-educated Benedict Calvert setting about creating enormous
garden parterres, erecting an orangery with a hypocaust to warm the lemons, and decorating the house with sumptuous luxuries shipped directly from London full of Chinese porcelains, silks, books, pictures, and other effects. Their contempt for him ran fairly strong; after all, this was the man who had hautly informed both houses of the Assembly that "I have the honour to descend from those who were the nursing fathers of this colony when I may say it was yet at the breast." Perhaps the local gentry raised their eyebrows, but they did not scorn, for it was during the Calvert years in Annapolis, 1720-1734, that the Maryland gentry began to move into the city and to hold a Social Season, complete with dancing assemblies, horse races and dinner parties. The effect of the premier family, very much true English gentrymen, on Annapolis was unmistakable, and clearly the Calverts assisted in ushering in a new cosmopolitanism to the little capital. Proof of this was demonstrated when the news of Ben's death at sea reached Annapolis: the Maryland Gazette fondly eulogized him, recalling:

"When Gaily dress'd, to Grace the Publick Ball
He to soft Music mov'd around the Hall;
His Artful Step, his Unaffected Air,
His Easy Grandeur, Charm'd the Circling Fair;
Each Dancer his Superior Skill Confess'd,
And Pleasure Glow'd in each Spectator's Breast." 

Undoubtedly, the combination of Calvert power and wealth and Calvert manners and possessions assisted in establishing a more urbane society in early eighteenth-century Maryland.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1678 - 1721</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lady Charlotte Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced in 1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarried in 1719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1680 - 1715</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedict Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Lord Baltimore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1692 [? ] - 1734</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cosen&quot; Capt. Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov. of Md. 1720-1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebeka Gerrard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706 - 1735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1723-1724</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1726 to before 1748</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1724-1728</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1722 = = = = =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lady Charlotte Lee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lady Mary Janssen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 - 1770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1724-1768</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Harford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Lord Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Natural Son)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietor of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Proprietor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1732 - 1771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. 1753, div. 1756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady Diana Egerton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1731-1798</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1746</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benedict Swingate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1768-1830</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1725</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Parke Custis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1731</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Stewart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1733</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Celia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1732-1771</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Brerwood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1747</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1754-1811</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1774</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Parke Custis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1755 - 1781</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Parke Custis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1756-1773 at Eton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1780</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1780</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1786-1846</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1788</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1798</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1846</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1850</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1899</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1924</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Henry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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