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ABSTRACT

The last proprietary governor of Maryland, Sir Robert Eden (1741-1784), boarded the H.M.S. Fowey and left Annapolis on June 26, 1776, with every expectation that the Maryland Council of Safety would honor their promise that Eden would maintain ownership of his colonial property. However, when Eden returned after the war in 1783, he found his former house and possessions owned by the state and occupied by the acting governor, as it would continue to be for nearly one hundred years. Even after his death, Eden’s memory and reputation were inextricably tied to objects, and memories of the moment on the Annapolis pier in 1776 when he parted from his belongings became part of the American Revolutionary War’s origin story in Maryland.

This thesis examines Robert Eden’s world prior to and after his confiscation case to suggest a more nuanced understanding of the so-called “Loyalist experience” during the American Revolution. Previous scholarship has oversimplified both the circumstances of confiscation and what it meant to be a Loyalist. Eden, like many others, has long been grouped as a Loyalist, and his belongings have been interpreted as nothing more than commodities confiscated for their financial value. Instead, his objects were enmeshed in the complex personal networks that transcended political values and strict designations of Patriot and Loyalist. Robert Eden’s objects and
material world were more than commodities, they were active agents in Revolutionary Annapolis that shaped experiences of Eden, his wife and family, enslaved people, servants, politicians, and other individuals in America, England, and beyond.

Robert Eden’s experience is a relevant case study because it exemplifies some of the key issues of the Revolutionary War and Loyalist identity that need to be addressed in contemporary scholarship. For Eden, the confiscation of his Annapolis estate was catastrophic to the identity he sought to build. He was an active participant in the colonial material world and relentlessly socially aspirational; however, his inability to appropriately perform as the social and political head of Annapolis marked him as an outsider from colonial genteel society even prior to the war. His branding as a Loyalist by his contemporaries has further clouded his actual experience for modern audiences, as it is often insinuated that all people defined by the tenuous criteria of “Loyalism” experienced confiscation in the same way. So intense are the relationships between humans and their narratives of wartime loss that historians have had a tendency to incorrectly build myths and accept misattributions around them without critical examination. This is certainly the case for Robert Eden and his material world.
TIMELINE OF EVENTS

1741  Robert Eden is born in Durham, England.

1755  Robert Eden Sr. dies, leaving behind a wife and eleven children.

1765  Robert Eden marries Caroline Calvert, younger sister of Frederick Calvert, 5th Lord Baltimore.

1768  Frederick Calvert appoints Robert Eden governor of Maryland.

1769  Eden purchases his Annapolis house from Edmund Jennings in March. He and his family arrive in Annapolis, MD that summer.

1774  The revolutionary government, the Annapolis Convention or Assembly of Freemen begins meeting. Eden prorogues his government’s assembly, which never meets again and effectively loses control of Maryland’s government.

1776  Robert Eden leaves the colony on June 26, leaving behind most of his belongings. He arrives in London in September of that year and receives the title Baronet of Maryland.

1781  Maryland’s Confiscation Act passes in February.

1782  Maryland Senate passes an act to confiscate Robert Eden’s house for the use of the state governor.

1783  George Washington resigns his commission as commander-in-chief in Annapolis, MD. Robert Eden and Henry Harford are in attendance, after returning to Annapolis the previous summer.

1784  Robert Eden dies in Annapolis, MD.
1788 Maryland’s General Assembly decides not to grant Eden’s heirs any claims on confiscated property. The same year, British commissioners on Loyalist confiscated property also determine not to continue Robert Eden’s allowance to support his widow and children.

1795 The state of Maryland concludes investigations and distribution of finances by the committee, Saleable of Commissioners to Confiscated Property.

1869 The state of Maryland sells the Governor’s House and land to the United States Naval Academy.

1902 The Eden-Jennings House is demolished by the USNA. Bancroft Hall is constructed in its place.
EDEN FAMILY TREE

Information on life dates from *The Peerage and Baronetage* (1963) and Eden family letters. Not all family members are represented here.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

It is December 21, 1783 in Annapolis, Maryland, the temporary capital of the new United States of America. The Treaty of Paris will be ratified in less than a month, officially ending the Revolutionary War. Two days from now, George Washington will resign his commission as commander-in-chief at the Maryland State House, affirming the democracy long desired by supporters of the Continental Army. Congressmen, war heroes, and members of Annapolis society have much to celebrate this evening as they climb the front steps into the state’s Governor’s Mansion to attend a ball hosted by Governor William Paca. In the crowd, two men stand out among the rest. First, the last proprietor of the colony of Maryland, Henry Harford, crosses the threshold, young and flamboyant, but a social outsider on his first visit to the former colony. The last proprietary governor, Robert Eden, follows at a slower pace. Perhaps it strikes Eden as uncomfortable that he is attending a ball in the house that he once owned, remodeled, and where he raised his young family. James McHenry, a young congressman for Maryland, muses:

Sir Robert Eden would have persuaded one by being of the party, that he had lost all remembrance of his having been the owner of the house in which he danced, and late governor of Maryland – but the thing could not be, where every person he met, and every picture and piece of furniture he saw, served to remind him of the past, or brought up the recollection of pleasures he could no longer repeat. The state had taken
away his property, and a libertine life his constitution. He finds himself a dependent on persons he despised, and insignificant on the spot where, but lately he was every thing. He sees his old parasites and companions enjoying places under the present government, and devoted to new interests. He is without a train of followers obedient to his pleasing will. He perceives, that even the hearts he is said to have subdued by his entertainments or warmed by his gallantries have altered by time or submitted to other seducers. If we look for the cause of his return to the place in her pride – that would not suffer him to sue for favors, from men he so lately considered as rebels. If in his interest, he will be blamed for meannesss. If in his poverty, he is certainly to be pitied. So situated and circumstanced I could neither believe him happy or at his ease, unless I had supposed that, with his estate and constitution he had lost his sensibility.1

The events surrounding the confiscation of Robert Eden’s property provide a revealing case study that can tell us much about readings of Loyalist identity in the years surrounding the American Revolutionary War.2 This thesis aims to engage with dispossessed objects associated with revolutionary conflict. I assert that even when the owner and object are separated, the association between that object and its former owner endure not in spite of, but rather, because of the intensity of the wartime separation. The confiscated objects take on multiple identities, weaving through Patriot and Loyalist networks, and illustrating the complex relationships of their


2 A note on terminology in this thesis: the “Revolutionary War” is used to describe the period of fighting between 1775-1783 that encompasses part of the greater “American Revolution.”
owners. They are active agents in the Revolutionary War because of the multiple interpretations put upon them by various owners, which continue to impact our perceptions of Loyalism today.³

First, we must continue to construct a more nuanced understanding of what it means to be a “Loyalist.” Though Eden did not self-identify as a Loyalist until filing for compensation for lost property after the war, he has nevertheless been dismissed into a nebulous group, encompassing royal governors, civilians, and escaped enslaved laborers, united not by a belief, but rather a reaction against one. Currently, the oversimplification of Loyalism results in a narrow interpretation of wartime confiscation cases. I aim to complicate existing concepts of dispossession in the Revolutionary War as acts targeting almost exclusively high-value objects and conducted solely via legal motions, auctions, or riots.⁴ While these interpretations are true in some respects, they do not take into account some of the lesser known

³ The concept that objects are active agents moving both in and out of the commodity process in relationship to people within their situational context arises from Igor Kopytoff’s essay, “The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process” in Arjan Appadurai ed., The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 64-91.

circumstances of Loyalist confiscation and the ways in which these actions personally impacted their owners’ perceptions of their identities. Robert Eden, a so-called Loyalist particularly concerned with his confiscated property, is a relevant case to address these key issues in Loyalist scholarship. Long forgotten and understudied, Eden was never fully successful in his social and political aspirations, even prior to the war. While he at one point owned his belongings, Eden never had ownership of them. His relationship to property both prior to and after confiscation reflects larger questions. What does Loyalism mean and how do modern historians continue to interpret Loyalist identity through objects?

In what would be remembered as one of the most climactic moments of his life, Robert Eden, the last proprietary governor of Maryland left Annapolis on June 26, 1776. His departure was unique among the colonial governors categorized as Loyalists. Despite attempts by Charles Lee and Baltimore Patriot Samuel Purviance to forcibly remove Eden on the claim that he was conspiring with British Secretary of State George Germain to send military assistance to the colony, Maryland’s delegates continued to stall on his dismissal. The Continental Congress, shocked by the colony’s hesitation, passed a resolution ordering Eden’s correspondence to be published and applied increasing pressure on the colony’s delegates to dismiss the governor. Charles Lee erupted in frustration, “What poor mortals are these Maryland Council men! I

---

hope the Congress will write a letter to the People of that Province at large advising 'em to get rid of their damn'd Government. Their aim is to continue feudal Lords to a Tyrant." Finally, two days after reprimanding Purviance for his attempted kidnapping, the president of the Maryland Council of Safety, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, invited Eden to leave the province. Jenifer’s dismissal of Eden was a tactical maneuver that pacified radical Maryland Patriots. By organizing the departure on his own terms, Jenifer emphasized the authority of the Council of Safety in Maryland.

After several months of what amounted to house arrest and nearly two years of effectively no political power, Eden agreed to leave on the understanding that he would be able to keep the furnishings left behind in his fashionable Annapolis home, later known as the Eden-Jennings House. The Royal Navy warship H.M.S. Fowey, traveled up the Chesapeake under a white flag of truce to fetch Eden. The morning of June 26, 1776, Eden departed his house and descended the hill to the dockside, where members of the Council of Safety met to see him off. Enslaved workers trailed Eden with the baggage he intended to bring with him to London, likely clothing and


7 The house did not have an official name in eighteenth-century documents. It is primarily referred to as the Governor’s Mansion from Eden’s predecessor’s occupation until its demolition in 1902. However, historians have named it the Eden-Jennings House because of its original construction under the ownership of Edmund Jennings and later architectural alterations made by Robert Eden. Throughout the thesis, the house will be referred to as either the Eden-Jennings House or the Governor’s Mansion.
personal mementos, such as a pastel of his wife, Caroline, and their young son completed by Charles Willson Peale several months previously. The smaller belongings traveled up the plank with him as he boarded the *Fowey*, which fired a 13-gun salute in his honor. Eden met with the captain and settled into his lodgings, leaving his more unwieldy belongings on the dock to be fetched in the morning.  

The evening after he boarded the *Fowey*, two runaway enslaved workers and a young deserter from the First Maryland Regiment’s Seventh Company who was a former servant of Eden’s sought refuge aboard the ship. Like many other enslaved people, the two runaways intended to join the British Army in exchange for their freedom, per Lord Dunmore’s Proclamation. In the morning, the *Fowey* sent four empty hogsheads to the dock to be filled with drinking water in preparation for its journey to New York. The hogsheads were left on the dock unfilled, to the captain’s confusion, until the issue of the escaped enslaved laborers and military deserter was

---


9 That the two refugees were enslaved people is clear from the reaction to their arrival on board the ship. Eden promised that he would “not receive any runaway slaves on board.” When these two individuals arrived, the Council of Safety protested that he violated this assurance. Eden did have enslaved residents in both his townhouse and plantation, all of which were included in the confiscation of his estate and some of whom were named in the documents. Within his home, there is evidence that Eden also employed non-enslaved house servants as well. Ronald Hoffman, *A Spirit of Dissension: Economics, Politics, and the Revolution in Maryland* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 152. Robert Eden to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 24 June 1776, Gratz Autograph Collection. HSP. The deserter is documented in Maryland State Papers, *Red Books*, vol. 12, 44, MdHR 4753, MSA S989-17. Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, MD.
raised. First, the Council of Safety demanded Eden release the enslaved people, but Eden wrote back that the Fowey’s captain was the authority on the warship and deferred all decisions to him. Angered by the behavior of the Marylanders, Captain Montague refused to return the refugees to their Patriot masters. Correspondence flew between the conflicting parties, published in the Maryland Gazette. After three tense days during which neither the captain nor the Maryland Council of Safety budged, the Fowey retrieved its empty hogsheads and bid a hasty retreat down the Chesapeake, leaving Eden’s personal belongings behind.

By the time Eden returned to Maryland in the fall of 1783, many of his possessions had disappeared. The Eden-Jennings House, where he had carefully carried out architectural renovations during his governorship had been confiscated by the state. More than that, the confiscated house became the new state governor’s mansion. It would hold this distinction until 1869, when it was sold by the state to the United States Naval Academy, who demolished the structure in 1902. The Eden family would never receive compensation for their confiscated house and furnishings.

This is not the end of the story. On the day of his departure, Eden’s secretary, Robert Smith, took a comprehensive room-by-room inventory of the Eden-Jennings House that was later used by Eden in his case with the Committee for the Claims for Loyalist Confiscated Property in London. Over the course of more than ten years,

10 AO 13/60, pt.1, Claims, American Loyalist Series II, Temporary Support, Maryland, 196-207. Public Record Office, National Archives, UK. A transcription of
representatives of the state took two more inventories of the house on May 17, 1781 and April 8, 1789.\textsuperscript{11} These three inventories provide documentary evidence that objects disappeared, moved, and were added to the Eden-Jennings House between the time of Eden’s departure and the state’s 1782 resolution to confiscate the property.\textsuperscript{12} Over the years surviving objects supposedly connected to the case and held in museums around the state of Maryland have contributed to the dramatic narrative surrounding Eden’s furnishings, turning objects with sometimes dubious provenances into revered relics.

Though Eden and local historians would remember the event for the belongings dramatically left on the dock, it was the empty hogsheads that merited recording in the \textit{Fowey}’s captain’s and master’s logs, and the enslaved people who were the focus of attention in the \textit{Maryland Gazette}. Unlike the cases of other colonial governors, whose homes became victim to mob violence, the Maryland Council of

\begin{quote}
the inventory is also available in Graham Hood, \textit{The Governor’s Palace in Williamsburg} (Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1991), 299-302.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{11} Both later inventories were taken by the Maryland state government. “An Inventory of Household Furniture the property of Sir Robert Eden, Baronet, left in the possession of his Excellency Thomas Sim Lee Esqr.” Maryland State Papers (Red Books) S989 MdHR 4557 Book 1, Item 7. MSA. See also the second copy of the inventory dated May 17, 1781, SM148, 57. The third inventory, taken by Charles Wallace, Thomas Hyde, and John Randall is titled “Valuation of Sir Robert Eden’s Estate in Annapolis £2744.15.0,” Maryland State Papers (Scharf Collection), 1789, S1005-96-14256, MdHR 19,999-88-87. MSA.

\textsuperscript{12} Votes and Proceedings of the Senate, SCM3185, 537. Resolution, 7 December 1782. \textit{Archives of Maryland Online}. MSA.
Safety halted the would-be rioters to the Eden-Jennings House, and the eventual confiscation of Eden’s property was not prompted by organized personal retaliation towards the governor. The stand-off, at its core, was about portable water and human property, with Eden’s belongings in the crossfire, and the governor a resolutely passive party in the standoff. Yet today, the story is told as Eden’s and the objects he left at the dock take center stage. The shift in which material possessions have taken the central role in the narrative indicates how perceptions of objects and their meanings have changed since the events on the dock over two hundred years ago.

Robert Eden is a compelling case study to investigate questions regarding Loyalist confiscation due to his intense awareness of the relationship between the material world and personal identity. Born in 1742 in the northern county of Durham, England, Robert Eden was the second son of a baronet with a small fortune but stylish tastes. After building a military career in the Coldstream Guards, Eden retired upon his advantageous marriage to Caroline Calvert in 1765. Caroline was the younger sister of Frederick Calvert, the fifth Lord Baltimore and proprietor of Maryland. Through his marriage, Eden achieved not only greater social standing and connections, but also the potential for monetary wealth. Calvert appointed Eden as governor to Maryland, forming an alliance between both men which Eden believed would lead to his inheritance of the proprietary title and the substantial income that would come with it. In 1769, Eden, his wife, and two young sons arrived in the Annapolis harbor and
purchased a Georgian town house from its original owner, Edmund Jennings. During the seven years that Eden spent as governor, Annapolis was a city of high fashion. Eden enthusiastically participated, becoming an honorary member of the exclusive Homony Club and hosting frequent dinners at his home, which he expanded under the builder, Robert Key. Through his participation in gentlemanly pursuits - an aspect of his identity he sought to reinforce in the creation of a tasteful home - Eden made himself at least superficially popular among colonial elites. His desire to be accepted into the colonial genteel community motivated his selection of objects. Their confiscation marked him as an outsider.

Maryland’s confiscation resolution for the governor’s house was not passed until 1782, yet evidence exists that Eden’s objects were relocated, sold or moved as early as 1776. It begs the question of what objects left the house through sale by the state, by Eden, or by theft. Furthermore, historians must look at these confiscation


15 Architectural scholarship suggests that the Eden-Jennings House may have had additions built by William Buckland or, more likely, Annapolis architect Joseph Horatio Anderson, but more work would be required on this account before confident assertions can be made.

16 Votes and Proceedings of the Senate, SCM3185, 537. Resolution, 7 December 1782. Archives of Maryland Online. MSA.
documents and ask whether the value of these commodities is derived solely from their economic value to fund the war effort, or possibly also as objects of political and personal significance to both Loyalists and Patriots. Eden furnished his home in a way that captured his identity, but in his absence, his furnishings became representations of himself and were repurposed without his agency. While he is the embodiment of many characteristics associated with the wealthy and flamboyant Loyalist stereotype, unique elements of Eden’s story beg the question: are they revealing previously under-studied circumstances of Loyalist confiscation cases?

HISTORIOGRAPHY

In scholarship, the Loyalist experience has been a largely understudied aspect of the American Revolution. After the ratification of the Treaty of Paris, nearly one hundred years passed before Lorenzo Sabine published his biographical index on known Loyalists.\(^\text{17}\) In the wake of the Bicentennial, Wallace Brown and Mary Beth Norton wrote definitive texts still referred to by modern scholars that employed numerical assessments of the American Loyalist Claims series at the British National Archives in order to identify who made up the nebulous population known as

\(^{17}\) Lorenzo Sabine, *Biographical Sketches of Loyalists of the American Revolution with an Historical Essay by Lorenzo Sabine* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1979), vol. 1, 402. It should be noted that biographical errors are made in Robert Eden’s entry that are perpetuated in later scholarship regarding Eden. Robert Eden’s brother, William Eden, one of the Commissioners to America in 1778, is confused with his son Frederick Morton Eden and conflated with his two other brothers, Thomas and Frederick. This is not unusual: the Eden brothers, John, William, Robert, Thomas, and Frederick, are frequently confused in scholarship.
Loyalists. Still, scholars have long since disputed Brown and Norton’s analyses as too narrowly focused on those Loyalists who were able to file claims (an action that would require money, connections, and a proximity to the claimant office in London), rather than analyzing the group as a whole. These general studies, however, still take for granted that the individuals discussed would have considered themselves foremost as Loyalists and could all fit within a single definition, over-simplifying the diverse groups and motivations that made up this reactionary party.

In the past few years, a revival in scholarship on the American Revolution has generated renewed attention towards the Loyalist narrative. Historians such as Maya Jasanoff and Andrew Jackson O’Shannessey have composed scholarship on the British resistance to rebellion on both a military and social-historical level. Yet, despite these new and significant analyses, scholarship continues to remain restricted


19 Eugene R. Fingerhut, “Uses and Abuses of the American Loyalists’ Claims: A Critique of Quantitative Analyses.” *The William and Mary Quarterly* vol. 25 no. 2 (April 1968), 245-258. Fingerhut reminds the reader that reliance on the American Loyalists’ Claims series neglects consideration of claimants’ motives in order to be rewarded as much money as possible as well as those Loyalists who were unable to file claims.

to the field of history. Loyalist studies have developed outside of scholarship on eighteenth-century conceptualizations of property and confiscation, and, with the exception of Katherine Rieder’s dissertation in 2009, material culture has been ignored because of the limited amount of surviving objects with identified Loyalist provenances.\textsuperscript{21} Confiscation is considered oftentimes abstractly by documents rather than the objects and buildings that functioned as actors.

This tendency towards generalization is likely due to the difficulty of answering the question: who are the Loyalists? Often pictured in the minds of early scholars and laymen as the wealthy whose interests were in preserving the empire, the answer is much more complex. Loyalist ideology was a reaction, not a belief on its own, against the concept of independent rule via war.\textsuperscript{22} Very little other than a shared reactionary thought united the group. They were far-reaching across classes and races, encompassing both wealthy royal governors and enslaved people who were promised freedom for their support of the anti-Revolutionary effort. Discrepancies between who

\textsuperscript{21} Katherine Beatrice Rieder, “‘The Remainder of our Effects We Must Leave Behind’: The American Loyalists and the Meaning of Things, 1765-1800” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2009).

\textsuperscript{22} “Ultimately choices about loyalty depended more on employers, occupations, profits, land, faith, family, and friendships than on any implicit identification as an American or a Briton. At the start of the war, colonists often saw themselves both as American, in the sense that they were colonial residents, and as British, in the sense of being British subjects. What truly divided colonial Americans into Loyalists and patriots was the mounting pressure of revolutionary events: threats, violence, the imposition of oaths, and ultimately war.” Jasanoff, 24.
identified as Loyalist and who remained neutral fueled further confusion. We cannot give a headcount for this side of the war.

However, those who Patriot governing bodies identified as Loyalists at the time of the American Revolution can most generally be identified through their confiscated property. Yet even in this aspect, Loyalists employed different strategies, with mixed results, to protect their possessions. Many evacuated the colonies during the war, some sold their property to Patriot relatives in the hopes they would protect it from confiscation, and many more left their wives behind to guard the estate.23 Few, such as John Ridout of Annapolis, managed to stay in the colonies and protect their estates by signing oaths of loyalty and remaining quiet throughout the war.24 Others were property themselves and escaped enslavement to fight in the British Army in exchange for freedom, as declared in Lord Dunmore’s Proclamation.

Despite all of this, Robert Eden’s confiscation case remains unique in the context of studied Loyalist figures. Like Philadelphia’s Loyalist tastemaker and Anglophile, William Hamilton, Eden sought to gain acceptance via a display of style. However, unlike Hamilton who ultimately regained a place in society after the war,

______________________________


24 “John Ridout,” Oaths of Fidelity or Oaths of Allegiance, 1775-1778, MS 3088. MHS.
Eden’s participation in the eighteenth-century code of conduct known as sensibility still resulted in a polite form of social exile.25

Unlike most claimants who relied on memory to list their confiscated belongings, Eden’s 1776 inventory was taken in-person, likely by his secretary, Robert Smith. Unfortunately, despite the amount of scholarship conducted on contemporary colonial governors, such as Lord Dunmore in Virginia and Massachusetts’ Thomas Hutchinson, very little work has been done on Eden. There are only two published articles focusing on him: one by Bernard Steiner in 1898, and another fifty years later by Rosamond Randall Beirne. Neither work has been re-examined in recent decades and both are strictly biographical accounts.26

METHODOLOGY

Dispossession is a term that will appear frequently in this paper and a word with a wide breadth of significance and meaning. For the purposes of this case study, I refer to dispossession in both the literal context of separation of an owner from their property, as well as the figurative significance of the word. The latter form speaks to the less tangible losses that come with the removal of property and fortune:


specifically, loss of relationships, personal identity, and control over how one is remembered. Other terms that I will grapple with were ones of personal significance to Eden: taste and sensibility. For Eden, his belongings were tangible pieces of evidence of his place in a world of eighteenth-century sensibility via presentation of his taste. He demonstrated knowledge of social codes for aristocracy and presented himself, perhaps aspirationally, as the pinnacle of a social hierarchy concerned with politeness, appearance, and prescribed behavior. To Eden, exhibition of taste (the aesthetic presentation of sensibility) and sensibility (the behavior enacting social codes of eighteenth-century gentility) were the keys to political power and his navigation of these behaviors were important measures of his response to the loss of his objects.

To examine the political implications of the movement of his furniture, the intentions behind them, and how the Annapolis elite perceived the objects, several documentary sources were consulted. My argument was first inspired by the inventories produced by Eden and the state government during his confiscation case, now preserved in the American Loyalist Claims series at the British National Archives at Kew, and in legislative documents at the Maryland State Archives. However, during my research, I uncovered correspondence regarding Eden’s property in relationship to himself and his contemporaries from the Eden family’s private archives, as well as an affidavit at the Barker Research Library in Durham, England, documenting transactions relating to the furnishing of Eden’s Annapolis house. These two sources have become my primary evidence for investigating perceptions of Loyalist identity in
the eighteenth-century material world. A final and significant piece of evidence were the handful of objects that survive with oral provenances connected to Robert Eden.²⁷

Earlier scholarship in American material culture has been heavily dependent on inventories as a means of assessing objects that no longer exist and their prevalence in various communities. However, the practice has been considered flawed in recent years. Numerical analysis of communities solely via their inventories tends to overlook individual differences in class, religion, and other circumstances.²⁸ In reaction, scholarship like James Deetz’s *In Small Things Forgotten* (1977), pushed for a move towards materiality in scholarship and examining what survives. This has

²⁷ The research is further set within a theoretical framework motivated by the work of Ian Hodder, who grappled with the *Entangled* (2012) nature of humans and objects, and Arjan Appadurai’s *The Social Life of Things* (1986) which urges consideration of an object as more than commodity. I also draw upon historians who have since joined the discussion of material culture theory. Giorgio Riello’s call for framing new historical arguments (“Things that shape history: material culture and historical narratives,” 2009) that incorporate objects and theory to reveal new information and Amanda Vickery’s practice of this to make new statements on the everyday tactics of privacy in the eighteenth century in *Behind Closed Doors* (2009, 28-38) have particularly influenced my argument. They support the broadest, most theoretical question of this thesis: how are humans and their possessions still tied to each other when they are separated? I do not presume to answer this question completely, but rather consider it a theoretical undercurrent throughout my argument.

²⁸ One example concerns southeastern Pennsylvania Quakers in the eighteenth century. While inventory analysis would indicate that Quakers all lived in simply decorated, sparsely furnished homes, it only reveals general trends among the average. When more unique cases are taken into account, as they are by Emma Lapsansky-Werner in her study of southeastern Pennsylvania furniture in *Quaker Aesthetics* (2003), the story becomes more complex and the group more diversified than the oversimplification that results from drawing conclusions from regional averages.
become the overriding method for material culture studies and has been undoubtedly beneficial to the study of objects. However, materiality has occasionally come at the cost of overlooking the objects that do not survive. Through the objects in Eden’s inventories, I hope to join recent scholarship calling for further study on the things that no longer exist, and entangle the study of house inventories and archival documents with surviving objects to glean new insight into the complex relationships and evolving perspectives of the American Revolution.

To Robert Eden, his Maryland home was intended to be a public display of his power and inclusion within the circles of the colonial elite. To the Council of Safety, the Eden-Jennings House was a symbol of a neglectful proprietor and a saleable resource to fund an army. For the state of Maryland, the Annapolis house was again a seat of power, but one owned both symbolically and literally by the people rather than by an individual. For scholars today, the house is a memory, but continues to live on through legends inspired by objects with real or imaginary ties to the last proprietary governor and a romantically prosperous colonial era. The objects, their placement and their movement, elicited even more interpretations than those outlined here depending on their spatial and temporal arrangement, in other words, their situational meaning.

Much like the Loyalists whose objects were taken from them, material culturists must engage with property on a similar plane, accepting that the materials no longer exist for them either. In all its connotations, Robert Eden’s property is a case study that merits more attention than it has received in the past century, both as a means of contributing to the study of Loyalists in the Revolutionary War, and even
more largely within a theoretical framework that critically acknowledges and interrogates issues of dispossession in the era of the American Revolution.
Chapter 2

“THE BEST HOUSE IN ANNAPOLIS”: FURNISHING THE GOVERNOR’S MANSION, 1769-1776

The governor's house is most beautifully situated, and when the necessary alterations are completed it will be a regular, convenient, and elegant building. The garden is not extensive, but it is disposed to the utmost advantage; the center walk is terminated by a small green mount, close to which the Severn approaches; this elevation commands an extensive view of the bay and the adjacent country. The same objects appear to equal advantage from the saloon and many apartments in the house; and perhaps I may be justified in asserting that there are but few mansions in the most rich and cultivated parts of England which are adorned with such splendid and romantic scenery.

When William Eddis, the Surveyor of Customs, wrote his description of the Eden-Jennings House between 1769 and 1770, the recently-appointed 27-year old governor of Maryland was in the early stages of crafting a residence appropriate for his position in the colony. Throughout his tenure, Eden intended the Governor’s Mansion to be the central domestic stage for both social and political events in Annapolis. In doing so, he was successful in his creation of a mansion appropriate to the position of governor that would be repurposed by the state for the same use during and after the Revolutionary War.


30 When meeting on State House grounds, Eden would meet in the council chamber, described as “a detached building, adjacent to the former on a very humble scale. It contains one tolerable room for the reception of the governor and his council, who meet here during the sitting of the assembly, and whose concurrence is necessary in
This chapter will examine the architectural renovation and furnishing of Robert Eden’s town house to emphasize the relationship between displays of taste and his personal identity. His alterations of the Governor’s Mansion challenge the notion that all Loyalists saw their objects as only commodities of financial value. Under Eden’s governorship, the objects in the Eden-Jennings House were consciously arranged to perform an identity in line with eighteenth-century concepts of sensibility for a colonial audience.  

The attack on his property, defined as the removal of his house and furnishings from his ownership, was an attack on his person.

I argue against previous interpretations that Eden’s expensive furnishing and architectural campaign was solely an unmotivated product of a young and reckless man.  

Rather, evidence suggests the Eden-Jennings House was furnished to match passing all laws.” The Governor and Council would also meet in Eden’s residence while the State House was under construction in the 1770s. Ibid.

Theories tying owners with the homes they helped to create are not new. Architectural books during the Enlightenment continually characterized owners with their materials, particularly those desiring ornamented homes. “Magnificence and Decoration were the Result of long Refinement, and designed to flatter the Ostentation of Owners…” James Ralph, Preface to The Builder’s Dictionary (1734) in Caroline van Eck, ed., British Architectural Theory 1540-1750: An Anthology of Texts (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003), 46.

Ronald Hoffman, A Spirit of Dissension (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), 123-124. These interpretations are prompted by descriptions of Eden such as: “With an income of three or four thousand pounds a year he was always in debt: and though he had great quickness of parts, and a large experience of the world, he was a bad politician, as being not sufficiently stead and firm. In this respect my connexion with him, instead of all those advantages both public and private which it seemed to hold out to me, became the source of infinite disadvantage to me.” Jonathan
Eden’s career aspirations, and a future as proprietor that he assumed was assured. As not only the governor, but as the future proprietor of Maryland, Eden wanted to design a house that was worthy of its resident with the highest status in the colony. He sought a structure that was a marriage of an English estate and the most fashionable mid-Atlantic creole town houses. 33 Above all, Eden sought to become a tastemaker of American society, and achieved some success. However, his knowledge of sensibility was derived entirely from English forms, and subtle differences prevented him, even as governor, to be fully fluent in colonial modes of taste or completely accepted into Annapolis social circles. Through the furnishing campaigns of his house, we can examine exactly how Eden tried to construct his role as tastemaker and later relied on acceptance into the colonial community as his primary defense for his property at the outbreak of war.

Eden’s contemporaries approved of his material surroundings and read it as a marker of the governor’s gentility. For instance, when Thomas Jennings wrote a poem


33 American Loyalist Claims, AO 13/60, pt. 1, Case of Thomas Eden Executor of Sir Robert Eden, 22 July 1787, p.192. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR. The colonial definition of creole encompasses any person descended from European settlers born in the colony. European perceived creole colonists as influenced by the oftentimes warmer climates they lived in, and consequently adopting a hybrid personality and style from their European ancestors and native populations. While the climate did not enforce changes in personality or culture, it did encourage practical alterations to architecture and furnishings for availability and ease of living in a less temperate climate. *Oxford English Dictionary*, 3rd ed., s.v. “creole.”
about Eden for the socially elite Homony Club in Annapolis, he complimented the governor with the illustration of a man well-educated and mannered:

Me thinks I see with slow and solemn pace
The grave Sir Robert take his place;
His courtly bow and unaffected air,
The high-bred man of quality declare,
Kind, lavish nature did to him impart
Endowment proper for dancing art;
And all must own that ‘tis to his address
Our club’s admired so much for politeness.  

Jennings’ description of Eden paints the picture of a man embodying the eighteenth-century concept of sensibility. It is a flattering poem that would have been pleasing to Eden, who sought the appearance of a gentleman and tastemaker to gain social power. For Maryland’s new governor, crafting the Eden-Jennings House into a home fit for leading political and social figures was paramount. To do so, the presentation and aesthetic quality of his home was intended to fit a social code expected by

34 Robert Gilmor Jr. Papers, c.1770, MS 3088. MHS.

members of colonial gentility. This act entailed both actions and a setting to perform them in. Eden knew the appropriate qualifications: he was educated in the cultural arts as proper for a gentleman; to construct the right set, he needed objects of high-fashion that indicated his status as a member of the landed gentry.  

BUILDING EDEN’S HOUSE

Higher offices in colonial Maryland were saved for English acquaintances who knew the Calverts personally. The fifth Lord Baltimore was too disconnected from Maryland to be aware of colonial-born residents who had spent their lives in colonial office; they were overlooked in favor of people to whom he could entrust management of his inheritance with little supervision. Consequently, many past Maryland governors had no intention of becoming permanent residents of Annapolis, expecting to return to their friends and family in England upon completion of their term. Thus, they had little incentive to invest in Maryland real estate and would frequently lease their town properties. Those who did stay spent their wealth on country estates for

36 Shields, 301, 307.


38 Research by Paul J. Fitzpatrick indicates that likely none of the governor’s residences in the colonies had been constructed by the Crown and governors had the choice of purchasing their own homes or leasing properties. Paul J. Fitzpatrick, “Royal Governors’ Residences in the Original 13 American Colonies,” Social Science vol. 46 no. 2 (April 1971), 71.
retirement and leisure. In the case of Eden’s predecessor, for instance, Horatio Sharpe leased the Eden-Jennings House, but invested his finances into the construction and furnishing of his country estate on the western shore, Whitehall.\(^\text{39}\)

In his management of property, Eden was unique. While he did have a country residence called Homony or Hemming Pot sixteen miles outside of Annapolis where the bulk of the enslaved labor under his ownership resided, he and his companions mentioned it rarely in their correspondence.\(^\text{40}\) Instead, several months prior to his arrival to Annapolis in 1769, he purchased the town house, then still being rented by Horatio Sharpe, from its original owner, Edmund Jennings.\(^\text{41}\) This purchase and the subsequent expensive architectural renovations of the house suggested an intention to settle in Annapolis.

To pay for his property, Eden relied primarily on the money provided from his wife’s family and Maryland’s proprietors, the Calverts. Eden also had to enlist the financial assistance of business associates like William Perkins, Thomas Buchanan, William Brown, and Henry Holland. He took out loans that required the help of both

\(^{39}\) Paul H. Giddens, “Governor Horatio Sharpe Retires,” *Maryland Historical Magazine* vol. 13 no. 3 (September 1936), 223.

\(^{40}\) The claims case asserts that the plantation was given to Robert Eden by Frederick Calvert, Lord Baltimore. American Loyalist Claims, AO 13/60, pt. 1, 189. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR.

\(^{41}\) Provincial Court Deeds (Deed Book), 1768, liber DD no. 4, MdHR 17267, 582. MSA.
Calverts, Edens, and close friends to help pay. The merchants listed above, along with Ann Calley, widow of Oliver Calley, appear in a series of early 1769 deeds regarding the sale of the house in which ownership moved several times between Robert Eden and his business associates. The web of credit that Eden created in 1769 emphasizes not only the significance of personal relationships in an eighteenth-century individual’s financial network, but the significance of more distant connections in property furnishings. These complex networks of debt reveal a pattern among the eighteenth-century upper-class to overspend. To the Revolutionary-era gentleman, debt was a necessary evil to craft the material world appropriate to one’s social status.

Through his own family, Eden did not inherit enough money to maintain the lifestyle he created in Annapolis. His salary as governor of the province alone would not be enough to support his family. Therefore, he relied on his marriage settlement

42 These transactions were completed to manage the investment of the property. Eden Papers, Bunch 83. PGL. At first glance, Calley, a resident of Overtown House in the southern county of Wiltshire, has little connection with Eden, but assessment of his papers suggest he earned the bulk of his professional fortune through similar real estate deals. Calley would invest in a property, selling it cheaply to the intended resident, who would then owe Calley the cost of the house with interest. The Perkins, Buchanan, & Brown account with Eden in this period reveals that the governor did not just strike this deal with Calley, but owed multiple people interest on similar, though less high-value deals. “Will of Oliver Calley, Gentleman of Wroughton, Wiltshire,” PROB 11/1000/105. NA. Further work can be done on Calley’s transactions in the “Business Papers of Oliver Calley, Attorney of Overtown House in the Parish of Wroughton (1710-1774).” Wiltshire and Swindon History Centre.

and provisions made by the Edens and Calverts, and supplemented this with a financial web of gentlemen’s agreements and debts. The extremity of Eden’s debt and reliance upon the Calverts as the political head of the colony indicate not only a familial, but also a financial allegiance to the proprietor. Even in a society where gentlemen such as George Washington or Thomas Jefferson accumulated enough money to participate in a lending economy that promoted considerable debt, Eden’s total spending was incredible. To avoid debtors’ prison or similar shames, Eden relied on the support of his personal networks, interweaving business, friendship, and politics.

Through these financial networks, Eden gathered enough money to purchase and furnish the residence rented by his predecessor, Horatio Sharpe. Both Sharpe and Eden’s choice of residence was a pointed one. The colony of Maryland had a property intended to be the residence of governors, known as Bladen’s Folly, overlooking the Maryland State House on what is now St. John’s College campus. Lack of funds

44 Ibid.


46 Andrew Burnaby described Annapolis and Bladen’s Folly in 1775: “The Town is not laid out regularly, but is tolerably well built, and has several good brick Houses in it. None of the Streets are paved, and the few public Buildings here are not worth mentioning. The Church is a very poor one, The Stadt-house but indifferent, and the Governor's Palace is not finished. This last-mentioned Building was begun a few Years ago; it is situated very finely upon an Emininece, and commands a beautiful
meant that the house was uncompleted for the duration of the eighteenth century.

Sharpe and Eden had to find a makeshift mansion, and Jennings House had an appealing location. On a hill crest in the city, the house was prominent and convenient, forming an almost perfect diagonal line from the two central points of Annapolis, St. Anne’s Church and the State House, from which all the streets emerged like spokes (fig. 1). The chosen residence was visible from both water and land, and acted as a constant reminder of the governor’s presence to visitors and residents alike.

Prior to Eden’s alterations, Edmund Jennings’s property was constructed following a developing mid-Atlantic urban style. Anglican minister Jonathan Boucher recalled of Annapolis,

> It was then the genteelest town in North America, and many of its inhabitants were highly respectable, as to station, fortune, and education. I hardly know a town in England so desirable to live in as Annapolis then was.

---

**View of the Town and Environs.** It has four large Rooms on the lower Flow, besides a magnificent Hall, a Stair-case, and a Vestible. On each Side of the Entrance are four Windows, and nine upon the first Story; the Offices are under Ground. It was to have had a fine Portico the whole Range of the Building; but unluckily the Governor and Assembly disagreeing about Ways and Means, the Execution of the Design was suspended, and only the Shell of the House has been finished, which is now going to Ruin.” *Derby Mercury*, 17 February 1775. *British Newspaper Archive*.

47 The spokes described here are indicative of Annapolis’ baroque plan, unique in colonial city planning. Anne Elizabeth Yentsch, *A Chesapeake Family and Their Slaves: A Study in Historical Archaeology* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), 275.

48 Boucher, 65.
The original floor plans of the Eden-Jennings House indicate a closed hall-passage plan. This layout was similar to the ground floor of many colonial Annapolis homes including the extant William Paca House (1763) and Ridout House (c.1765). These houses faced a large back garden with a picturesque view towards the back. When the front and back doors of the house were open, air could circulate throughout the house. The structure of these floor plans controlled the flow of both occupants and visitors of the home. Stairs off to the side of the house restricted visitor movement to the ground floor, and doors to rooms off the hall could be opened or closed at will. Business between servants, enslaved residents, and anyone the owner did not wish to welcome further could be conducted in the central hall, with more private rooms or even semi-public spaces accessible by the permission of the home owner. This spatial arrangement kept power in the hands of the master and mistress of the house and reinforced societal expectations in the intensely hierarchical colonial capital.

Whitehall, named by architectural historians as one of the most quintessentially Maryland houses, mirrors the typical layout of many colonial residences still found in

---


50 Ibid.

51 Anne Elizabeth Yentsch and Mark Leone, The Archaeology of Liberty in the American Capital (University of California Press, 2005).
Annapolis (fig. 2).\textsuperscript{52} The original floor plans by Joseph Horatio Anderson, one of only a handful of professional architects in Annapolis, reveal a central hall-passage plan as the main body of the house. Wings stretched out from either side of the central structure, connecting to an outer-most building on each end. The final product is known as the Chesapeake five-part house plan.\textsuperscript{53} While seen in Maryland’s colonial plantation houses, like Whitehall, it was also adopted to the urban landscape. Extant examples include the Hammond-Harwood House (1773) and James Brice House (1766) in Annapolis. It is not, however, duplicated by Eden in his expansive construction of the Jennings House.

In August 1768, the owner of Whitehall and then lieutenant-governor, Horatio Sharpe, received a letter from Frederick Calvert. Despite Sharpe’s popularity, the Lord Baltimore decided to replace him with his young brother-in-law, Robert Eden, whose family connections would assure loyalty to the Calverts.\textsuperscript{54} Only a few months later, Sharpe heard rumors that not only had the town house he was residing in been sold, but that he would soon be in a construction zone. He wrote to a friend,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{52} Katherine Scarborough, “White Hall Maryland’s Typical House” in \textit{Baltimore Sun}, 29 June 1930. Papers of the Whitehall Estate, Col. 205. JDC.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{53} “By the end of the eighteenth century, the ground-floor chamber had moved to the upper floor or to a wing, which afforded more space at greater distance from the public rooms than had been possible in conventional houses.” Wenger, 146.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{54} Joshua Sharpe to Horatio Sharpe, 6 August 1768. Ridout Papers, D373 #184. MSA.
\end{flushright}
I understand from Mr. Bordley that he has received a Letter from Mr. Edmund Jennings advising him of Captain Eden’s having purchase the House in which I live & that some Workmen are sent from England to repair it against Captain Eden’s arrival, I shall therefore begin to remove my Things out of it immediately that the Workmen may not be delayed, for really they have a good Deal to do, the House wanting many Repairs & the Offices being in a very ruinous Condition.  

Thus, Eden arrived in Maryland to an unfinished house. While evidently fashionable enough for Sharpe to rent it between 1753 and 1768, the structure was several decades old and competing with an ever-growing number of fashionable neighbors who had recently contracted the help of the famous architect William Buckland to construct the Hammond-Harwood House and the Chase-Lloyd House (1769). Even prior to seeing his house in person, Eden knew the Governor’s Mansion required updating and redesign to aid in constructing his image.

The new governor enlisted the help of Annapolis builder Robert Key to make several sizable alterations, most notably the addition of the Long Room to the back of the house, which would serve as the main space for dancing and public dinners (fig. 3a-d). As governor, Eden hosted elaborate parties that required the employment of

55 Horatio Sharpe to Lord Hillsborough, 30 October 1768. Correspondence of Governor Sharpe vol. 14, p.534-537. MSA.

56 Rosamond Randall Beirne, “Two Anomalous Annapolis Architects: Joseph Horatio Anderson and Robert Key” in Maryland Historical Magazine vol. 55, no. 3 (September 1960), 184.

57 Ibid., 196.
multiple rooms on the first floor, making use of the card tables in the parlor and space for dancing in the Long Room. An earlier account described the social significance of the Governor’s Mansion to the genteel Annapolis community:

The occasion of such meeting was what they call a Rout, an entertainment at which eight of the principal families in Town, taking it by turns, meet every Friday during the winter at each other’s houses, where they amuse themselves with cards, generally making two or three sets at whist, and one at Quadrillo. The treat, besides wine and punch, is tea, chocolate and queencake. The company meets about six o’clock and continues till ten, and sometimes later, and when it is the Governor’s Rout, there is an invitation given to all the genteel families in Town, so that besides two or three card-tables, there was a set of eight or nine couples to dance.

Young and social, Eden used his house to enhance his social position at the center of the Annapolis scene. His enemies condemned the lavish nature of his gatherings, yet still attended the raucous assemblies in the house. One of his most vocal opponents, Charles Carroll of Carrollton gossiped, “…rastiling at the Governor’s…drunken frolic…so much alarmed [Mrs. Eden]…that she miscarried.”

________________________


60 This is the only contemporary source to discuss a miscarriage by Caroline Eden in Annapolis. It is possible that there is some truth in it, but Carroll’s dislike of Eden indicates that the account may be exaggerated. Charles Carroll of Carrollton to Charles Carroll, Barrister, 9 August 1771 in *Maryland Historical Magazine* vol. 32, 200-201. Aubrey C. Land, *The Dulanys of Maryland: A Biographical Study of Daniel Dulany,*
Through his architectural and landscape changes with Key, Eden created a hybrid building, a typical Annapolis property that had distinctly fashionable English additions. The architecture and the furnishing of the first floor echoed English furnishing trends: a series of social spaces adjoining one large hall to facilitate new forms of “assemblies” within the house.\(^{61}\) The addition of large rooms for balls was reaching an unprecedented height at the time of Eden’s departure from England.\(^{62}\) By adding the Long Room to the back of the building facing the Severn River and garden, Eden created a space fit for a governor who sought to be the center of both a political and social sphere.\(^{63}\) Through the Long Room and its adjoining spaces, he created a large public gathering space, unmatched in Annapolis for its great size. Members of Annapolis society looking for a large ball would only have the public Assembly Rooms or Eden’s home to choose from for such large, formal affairs. As master of this space, Eden constructed a pseudo-court around himself.

---


\(^{63}\) Beirne, “Two Anomalous Annapolis Architects…,” 196.
However, not all of Eden’s alterations were successful. The addition of the Long Room cut off the center passage’s access to the garden, thereby halting the means of circulation in the hot summer months. This architectural faux-pas demonstrates Eden’s lack of knowledge of the Tidewater climate and his determination to construct something that resembled an English country estate. The result was a presumably stifling room in the summer, which would only exacerbate the heat of a crowded ballroom. Records of Eden’s large gatherings from members of Annapolis society, however, suggest that not only did the Long Room continue to be used, but it was used extensively to accommodate a high-volume of guests. Despite, or perhaps because of, Eden’s lack of adherence to a regional architectural pattern, he was accepted as a social power in Annapolis society. Local elites may have viewed their young governor as a supplier of the most current English fashion to a capital that already saw itself as the cosmopolitan center in taste for the colonies.

Eden’s interest in maintaining a fashionable home suitable for a governor and future proprietor may have been influenced by his past residences. As a child in Durham, a city in northern England dominated by wealthy bishop-princes, the Edens were an established unit of the local elite, but not particularly affluent. The family had a taste for fashion but no coal mines, a rapidly expanding and significant industry in eighteenth-century Durham, to maintain their fortune.64 Yet Eden’s father, also named

Robert Eden, seemed to have shared his son’s taste for “castle building.” Robert Eden Senior expanded the family country estate, Windlestone Hall, in addition to purchasing and constructing a town house for the family almost directly across the street from the Norman cathedral that marks the Durham skyline. Called Haughton House, it was one of the only Georgian homes built in the old city, where most residences were improved medieval structures. Though much of Haughton House was renovated in the twentieth century, the original staircase (fig. 4) and enough plasterwork (fig. 5) remain to suggest a highly fashionable interior. The exterior (fig. 6) on the street side was stone with Palladian symmetrical construction. There were keystones over the windows and a stone baroque arch surrounding the door. The back and sides of the building, less visible to passers-by, were completed in brick. By the time Robert Eden Senior died, leaving the eleven-year old future governor and his ten siblings to the care of their mother, he had imbued his children with a sense of the significance of appearance. Whether he directly emulated these houses from his youth or not, Eden certainly had exposure to high-style architecture and a desire to gain social acceptance through demonstration of taste that he carried with him to Maryland.

65 Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, 20 July 1783. Box 3/1. EFP.

66 Roberts, 119.

67 Derby Mercury, 4 July 1755. British Newspaper Archive.
In his alterations of the Eden-Jennings House, however, the most significant influence on Eden was a house in Surrey he first lived in with his wife Caroline Calvert Eden after their marriage in 1765. Later correspondence between the couple suggests that both Edens had a strong connection to their newly-wed home, Ashtead House (fig. 7). The house was located near Caroline’s family estate, Woodcote Park, an elaborate mansion ornamented with Grinling Gibbons carvings and baroque panels on nearly every surface. Unlike her husband’s upbringing in a medieval city far from London, Caroline was raised near the town of Epsom, among fashionable country estates belonging to prominent figures like Frederick, Prince of Wales. During her childhood, Woodcote Park was in the final stages of a multi-decade renovation that updated the structure into a fashionable Georgian estate. Reminders of Caroline’s family ties to the proprietorship were everywhere, including wainscoting supplied by Maryland walnut trees, a decorated “Maryland Parlor,” and the crest of Maryland, which ornamented a writing desk. On Woodcote Park’s 380 acres, Caroline had a

---

68 The builder Robert Key was also an English immigrant. Rebecca Key, “A Notice of Some of the First Buildings with Notes of Som of the Early Residents” in *Maryland Historical Magazine* vol. 14 (1919), 270.

69 “Woodcote Park, Epsom; Sale Particulars,” 1911, SHC 233. SHC. Though much of the interior was destroyed by a fire in 1934, one of the drawing rooms is installed in the galleries at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

70 Anne Elizabeth Yentsch, *A Chesapeake Family and Their Slaves* (Cambridge University Press, 1994), 100-104. Yentsch also argues that these renovations influenced the Annapolis’ Calverts’ architecture and layout of their Maryland homes.
privileged childhood alongside her older brother, Frederick, Lord Baltimore, and a younger sister Louisa. The area was a nostalgic one for Caroline, and, after the Edens’ departure from Surrey, she would miss it for the rest of her life.

When Frederick Calvert sold Woodcote Park in 1768, the Edens left their estate for Annapolis, but as Caroline noted in her letters to Eden, Ashtead House remained the place where they were happiest. Like Jennings House, the purchase of Ashtead, even with the financial assistance of his brother-in-law, required some financial maneuvering between Eden, his brother William, and William Brown of Perkins, Buchanan, and Brown. The house was a small property and its floor plan bears some resemblance to Eden’s additions in his Annapolis home. Its exterior was


Louisa Calvert married John Browning, who would take charge of her accounts and inheritances after she was declared insane. Frederick, Lord Calvert was also known for an eccentric lifestyle. He spent the last several years of his life traveling continental Europe with several mistresses after a self-imposed exile from England as a result of accusations against him of rape.

Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, 6 April [1775?], Box 3/1. EFP.

Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, 13 July 1783. Box 3/1. EFP.

Deeds, 3434/25/1-23. SHC.
brick, laid in a Flemish bond, with a slate roof that covers a baroque gentleman’s manor house and a later kitchen extension. Besides his societal and political aspirations, it was first and foremost a family residence for Eden, his wife, and their two young sons. While Eden was arranging for the purchase of Jennings House in Annapolis in March 1769, he also came to an agreement with a gentleman, John Durand for a year-long lease of Ashtead House. Ultimately, Durand seems to have occupied the house until at least 1786 and Eden never returned, but the original arrangement suggests some hope of maintaining the English residence where he first established his young family. While this may indicate that Robert Eden had some initial doubt about the duration of his tenure in Annapolis, it is clear from the work on Jennings House that once he was in Maryland, he intended to stay for a significant time.

Personal relationship to past properties was not the only model on which Eden based the design of the Eden-Jennings House. To create a home of taste, Eden was aware that he needed to look towards regional sources that Tidewater residents would consider fashionable. Annapolis’ Eden-Jennings House exhibits some influence of another Chesapeake town estate, the Governor’s Palace in Williamsburg, Virginia, where Eden made several visits during his own furnishing campaign. At

75 Deed between Robert Eden of Ashtead and John Durand, Esq., 3434/25/3a. SHC.
Williamsburg, the palace mirrored diplomatic state spaces in England, expanding upon the typical layout of a Tidewater house to be a progression of rooms. The first space, the hall, was the most public and the last, the ballroom on the ground floor and state rooms on the second, the most exclusive. For Eden, his addition of the Long Room and perhaps intended inclusion of six glass chandeliers resembles Williamsburg’s ballroom, which in turn was influenced by English spaces like the popular Bath Assembly Rooms.  

By stylistically arranging his spaces in relationship not only to English precedent, but to rooms the Chesapeake gentry would have seen themselves, Eden drew a relationship between the social power of Maryland and neighboring Virginia.

While a case could be made that the Eden-Jennings floor plan bears resemblances to general fashionable English country estates, the closest comparisons are found in the small-scale English gentlemen’s houses like Ashtead House. Eden may have expected visitors to read the house as distinctly English, mimicking the rising fashion of smaller country estates appropriate to his social rank as a minor lord,  

with high colonial rank, but always subservient to higher English titles. The buildings Eden shaped only reflect a portion of his integrated plan. To understand his vision more completely, we must look inside the home.

BUYING FOR THE JENNINGS HOUSE

To furnish his house, Eden spent a considerable amount of money and utilized a variety of shopping methods to craft a high-style interior space. Substantial accounts regarding Eden’s purchases suggest that he executed a large re-furnishing campaign of his home, but there is reason to suspect that Eden had also inherited some objects from the house’s previous inhabitants. Some items, like a portrait of Charles I from the studio of Anthony van Dyck which hung in Eden’s best staircase, may have been in Annapolis prior to his arrival. Another set of eighteen chairs (fig. 8) survives with provenance suggesting they were once in the Annapolis Governor’s Mansion. Stylistically, this set connects to known objects created by local craftsmen in the

---


79 As court painter, van Dyck painted many portraits of Charles I, several of which were distributed to courtiers, public buildings, and English colonies as a visual reminder of the power of the monarch. As a Catholic colony named for Charles’ consort, Henrietta Maria, and sympathies to the crown during the English Civil War, Maryland had a historic loyalty that makes an earlier migration of Charles I’s portrait to Annapolis possible. Jane Roberts, *The King’s Head Charles I: King and Martyr* (London: The Royal Collection, 1999), 16.
middle of the century, prior to Eden’s arrival. Out-of-fashion items like the chairs may have been relegated to less public rooms, but could still have been used to supplement higher-fashion objects.

Eden also patronized auctions locally after his arrival to Annapolis. In a 1771 sale by the Lloyd family, Eden was a buyer along with other local craftsmen and merchants. The auction included primarily non-furniture objects including “textiles, kitchen utensils, chinaware, foodstuffs, and furniture, although only a ‘looking glass’ was specified.” Hence, for some items at least, Eden was participating in local trade networks. Rather than importing all items of his home, with an end result of an English estate mired in shipping costs, Eden repurposed items from long-residing Tidewater families like the Lloyds and added a sort of colonial patina to both himself and his home.

What was most striking about Eden’s furnishings, however, was their fashion. “The best house in Annapolis,” as it was frequently described, appears to have been

80 The eighteen chairs are scattered in several institutions including Winterthur Museum, Garden, & Library and Colonial Williamsburg as well as private collections. Suggestion of style sources from examination of the two chairs in the Winterthur collection between author, Mark Anderson (Senior Furniture Conservator, Winterthur Museum, Garden, & Library), and Josh Lane (Lois F. and Henry McNeil Curator of Furniture, Winterthur Museum, Garden, & Library), 31 August 2016.

overwhelmingly furnished with new and old imported English objects. Eden, like many wealthy families in the mid-Atlantic, purchased through merchants with established connections between Annapolis and London. Some of the furniture - insured for £1000 and shipped in 1769 on the Lord Baltimore under the charge of James Mitchell for Eden’s house - may have come from Eden’s previous properties. However, the fact that Eden primarily rented his earlier English homes fully-furnished implies that Eden made new purchases between 1769 and 1772.

This assertion is further supported with an excerpt of the Perkins, Buchanan, & Brown account book, included in a 1773 affidavit to the Mayor of London for Eden’s debt via the bankrupt firm, and recently discovered in the Eden Papers at Durham University. The excerpt includes Eden’s accounts with the firm from March 1769 until October 1772, while he was furnishing his Annapolis property. The document includes

82 American Loyalist Claims, AO 13/60, pt. 1, Case of Thomas Eden Executor of Sir Robert Eden, 22 July 1787, 192. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR.


84 Affidavit sealed and certified by the mayor of London (23 April 1773) swearing authenticity of an account book from London merchants Perkins, Buchanan, & Brown, 31 March 1769, 23 May 1769. Eden Papers, Bundle 83. PGL.
everything from money lent by his brother, William Eden, to orders for Madeira, lemons, and oranges shipped to Annapolis, stays for Caroline Eden, and shoes for the family, all orders intended for London tradespeople. “Goods Furniture & Carriages” were insured on shipments to Annapolis, often through Captain James Russell on the Richardson (£100) or James Mitchell on the Lord Baltimore (£1000 with an additional shipment of £156.15.[illegible] on March 4, 1770), but also shipments on the Frederick by Samuel Nicholson (£26.4.0 on August 1), Good Intent by Mr. Carrington (£25.14.6), Lord Camden by Mr. Johnstown (£272.2.3 on August 15), and the Polly by John Kilty (£97.1.[illegible] on March 20,1770), all within the first year of his arrival. Typical of the era, one of the couples’ most expensive London investments for their home was in the form of textiles, in particular, a long-standing account they held with linen draper Andrew Barlow of Barlow & Wigginton and another account worth £290 with London textile manufacturer John Davenport.

85 Affidavit, 23 April 1773, 4-8. Transactions referenced include “1770 Jul 6 By Cash of Wm Eden Esq. 63.15.0”, “1769 Apr 25 Joseph & Thos. Balmer for Lemons & Oranges in full 4.17.0”, “1771 Jany 21 Andrew [Henshaw?] Stays for Mrs. Eden 5.8.0”. Eden Papers, Bundle 83. PGL.


87 “1769 December 26 his bill 23 March to John Devonport 290.0.0.” Ibid., 6.
The bulk of Eden’s purchases are recorded in expensive accounts for thousands of pounds worth of furnishings provided by mercantile firm, Perkins, Buchanan, & Brown in March and May of 1769, in preparation for his arrival in June of that year.88 While William Perkins managed the firm’s London business, his partners Thomas Buchanan and William Brown moved to Maryland, facilitating communication on both sides of the Atlantic, and no doubt competing against the well-known firm Wallace, Davidson, & Johnson, also of London and Annapolis.89 Neither Buchanan or Brown were born in the colony, and Brown, who personally conducted business with Eden most frequently, may have been from Durham, merging a personal and professional network for the governor. By 1772, after only three years, Eden’s total unpaid costs with the firm amounted to approximately £6157.1.3.90 This was nearly triple the initial cost that he paid for the Jennings House. His debt financially damaged the company and in August 1773, they officially declared bankruptcy.91

88 Ibid.
89 Ibid. The Wallace, Davidson, & Johnson business papers, including account books, order books, ledgers, and letter books, survive in the collection of the Maryland State Archives, MSA S528-15 – S528-46. The firm’s Annapolis building (26 Market Space) is still extant, despite a large fire in 1883. See also: Joshua Johnson’s Letterbook, 1771-1774: Letters From a Merchant in London to his Partners in Maryland (London: London Record Society, 1979).
90 Affidavit, 23 April 1773, 1. Eden Papers, Bundle 83. PGL.
Perkins, Buchanan, & Brown were not the only company to do business with Eden for the furnishing of his house. Utilizing personal networks, Eden also likely arranged for the importation of objects through his merchant brother, Thomas Eden, who arranged for the shipment of a whale boat to a Virginia planter, George Washington, on Eden’s behalf. 92 However, Eden’s extravagance and debts were known between gossiping firms, possibly limiting professional networks he could draw from. Merchant Joshua Johnson warned his partners, Charles Wallace and Jonathon Davidson, that working with the governor could lead to their own firm’s bankruptcy:

I presume it will not be amiss to caution you against running too deep with Governor Eden; he owes very large sums here. They tell me [his debt to] Perkins, Buchanan, & Brown amounts to £5,000. Take the hint and get out as soon as you can for fear of the consequences. 93

The financial cost of the young governor’s intent on building his position in a foreign society impacted more than his relationships with colonial business associates. Though Eden arrived in Annapolis with his wife and two sons, letters and accounts


suggest that he was the primary designer of the furnishings of the residence. His wife, Caroline, was unhappy to leave England for Maryland.\textsuperscript{94} Her disinterest may have resulted in her minimal involvement with the design of the Jennings House. In later years, Caroline’s primary concern for their Annapolis home was the amount of debt it cost the family. Writing to her husband after the war, she remarked,

\begin{quote}
How can I at all depend on your prudence, who have led us all to the very brink, and yet till the last moment did not seem to feel the necessity of a change of conduct…Do you think it possible for you to give up all but quiet harmless amusements? and not find fault with an humble dwelling an humble fare and a little Society? without noise and dissipation…\textsuperscript{95}
\end{quote}

She, as well as her children, left the colony after only three years in the house.\textsuperscript{96} In effect, Caroline and the children were the first part of Eden’s Maryland life to move outside his reach. A few short years later, even more of Eden’s once-hopeful Maryland world began to erode around him.

In 1775, Maryland’s Council of Safety passed an act that all must swear fealty to the state’s Revolutionary government except for those in the Governor’s

\textsuperscript{94} “Mrs Eden decoy’d [sic] hither [Maryland] [g]reat[ly] against her inclination.” Jonathan Boucher to George Washington, 5 March 1772. \textit{Founders Online}.

\textsuperscript{95} Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, 13 July 1783. Box 3/1. EFP.

This transition marked a change in the occupants of the house. No longer filled with a wife and young children, Eden’s home was occupied by his friends loyal to the crown, including his secretary Robert Smith, merchant Joseph Court, and William Eddis. This was not a particularly uncommon practice among colonial governors. Members of the Royal military joined Governor Tryon’s New York household prior to its destruction by fire in 1773.

The shift in residents in Eden’s house and political climate in 1775 and 1776 altered the Governor’s Mansion from a social center to a political shelter for Eden’s allies, members of the court party. The alteration in purpose of the house, however, did not change the movements of the other residents of the Eden-Jennings House, the servants and enslaved laborers. For these members of the household, the high-fashion objects in the mansion versus the utilitarian ones they encountered daily marked a visible dividing line between the public and private spaces of the Annapolis residence. These spatial diversions were vital to preserving the appearance of a high-style Tidewater estate.

97 Eddis, 24 August 1775, 116-117.

98 Ibid.

99 “Col. Fanning’s Bed-Chamber” in “An Inventory of the Furniture which was Destroy’d in His Excellency Governor Tryon’s House in Fort George in New York the 29 December 1773.” Hood, Appendix 6, 304.
LIFE IN THE GOVERNOR’S MANSION

Looking inside each room of Eden’s house, it is possible to observe how Robert Eden attempted (with some but not total success) to not only architecturally renovate but also re-furnish the Eden-Jennings House as a Tidewater palace appropriate for a colonial governor. An analysis of values given to furniture in the home in the June 26, 1776 inventory reveals the prioritization of objects in Eden’s interiors (Appendix E). Approximately three quarters of the total of Eden’s goods are valued below £1.0.0, and over nine tenths are worth less than £5.0.0. The bulk of these goods are utilitarian items, including cookware, tools, and necessities like lighting fixtures. Meanwhile, objects intended for the enjoyment of Eden were valued most highly: single objects valued above £100.0.0 were entirely recreational goods.

Tracing where Eden spent the bulk of his money in the house helps expose the social implications of Eden’s furnishing plans. The governor’s objects reveal how Eden saw himself and how he encouraged others to view him. With the highest value placed on gentleman’s recreational goods, such as a billiard table, equal altitude instrument, and jockey equipment, his material goods tell the story of a man preoccupied with gentlemanly and expensive pursuits. Eden crafted a uniquely luxurious environment with items not commonly found in even the wealthiest Annapolis homes. Equipment for horse racing bought Eden access into an exclusive

---

social network, allowing him to form friendships with elite figures of mid-Atlantic society, such as George Washington.\(^{101}\)

However, the highest quantity of objects in the home did not circulate in the domain of Eden and his high-society guests, but in work spaces belonging to servants and enslaved workers. The house’s layout is a manifestation of these interwoven lives. Higher-level servants in the Eden-Jennings House possessed private, comfortable rooms. The housekeeper received not only her own room and bedstead, but also a trunk, which provided her with a private space for her possessions in a house crowded with servants, enslaved occupants, and genteel Maryland Loyalists.\(^{102}\) Interestingly, the inventory of the trunk in 1776 suggests servants’ spaces were not totally without interference from the homeowner, with objects belonging to Eden, such as a marquee tent, finding storage locations in the seemingly private spaces of his servants who lived in the house. The tent is a reminder of the entire residence as the primary domain of the governor; even so, small forms of ownership continued to exist outside of

\(^{101}\) “…the only reference I have to Eden's racing in my own records is from a race in Philadelphia in 1773, in which he was represented by a white jockey, Anthony Cragg (whose brother John was a jockey and trainer for John Tayloe and then Edward Lloyd). Cragg conspired with another white rider, Robert Gay, to rig the race and prevent the slave rider aboard Lloyd's horse from winning. Cragg got caught and was banned for life from racing. At the same race meeting, I know Eden dined with G. Washington…” Kenneth Cohen (Associate Professor of History, St. Mary’s College of Maryland) e-mail exchange with author, 14 October 2016.

Eden’s purview. Even as owner of the property and furnishings, he did not have full ownership over servant and enslaved private lives, kept secreted in small locked boxes or under sleeping mats.  

Enslaved people owned by Eden would have been housed in less private spaces within the property, including outbuildings and kitchen spaces. While there appears to be no designated space for enslaved laborers inside his town home, specific vernacular structures may have been created outside the central building. This is supported by a c.1800 drawing by Benjamin Ogle depicting the Governor’s Mansion (fig. 9) from the water with the rooflines of the dependencies visible. While the wharf had been destroyed during the war, and may appear in ruins to the right of the pyramid-roof structure outside the walls (which may have functioned as storage for Eden’s extensive fishing equipment), other structures from Eden’s time still survived when Ogle completed his sketch. A record of Eden’s property by local cabinetmaker John Shaw for the state in 1782 includes a wash house, garden house, 

103 Ibid., 38.  
104 “A List of Necessary Repairs Wanting for the Govr’s House &c,” Maryland State Papers (Series A), December 1782, MSA S1004-55, MdHR 6636-41-85A. MSA.  
105 “Annapolis has assumed a very different Appearance since your Excellency left it. They have formed a Battery from Mr. Walter Dulanny’s Lot round the Water’s Edge to the Granary adjoining your Garden, the Cannon are mostly 18 Pounders, the Works appear strong, &, I am told are so from your Wharf to the Hill where Callihorne lived, they have thrown up a covered way to communicate with that part of the Town adjacent to the Dock.” William Eddis to Robert Eden, 23 July 1777. Box 2 Volume 7, MS 360. MHS.
Most strikingly, the layout does not appear ordered in straight lines or right angles. The rooflines and building shapes are disordered and, if considered in conjunction with an 1846 bird’s eye map of the city (fig. 1), are arranged in a V-shape. The final appearance would have been a uniform, ordered property that would not obscure the view of the Severn River from the Long Room. Thus, the landscape of work in the backyard of the governor’s house could function while still appearing genteel to members of the Annapolis taste-making class.

Within the main house, the servants and enslaved workers had access to the highest quantity of objects that Eden purchased for the home. The commodities in the servant’s quarters were the least valued in the 1776 inventory, but functioned to aid and maintain the grandeur of the public spaces. Many of these objects were tools that remained in the realm of the servants and enslaved, used to clean furnishings, store goods, or produce food for the household. Others were transitory goods, like

---

106 “A List of Necessary Repairs wanting for the Govr’s House,” John Shaw, December 1782. Maryland State Papers (Series A), MdHR 6636-41-85a. MSA. While the sketch is not detailed enough to allow for confident attributions of the buildings to be made, the smokehouse may be the pyramid building within the walls without a chimney. Slave quarters may also be visible in this image under one of the chimney roofs. Consultation about this image with Dr. Michael Olmert, Peter Pearre, and Dr. J. Ritchie Garrison, e-mail exchanges with author, 10 February 2017. See also Michael Olmert, Kitchens, Smokehouses, and Privies: Outbuildings and the Architecture of Daily Life in the Eighteenth-Century Mid-Atlantic (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).
queensware dishes, which were stored in work spaces, but served their primary function within the fine public interiors in the house.

Despite being highly invested in the furnishing of his home, extant documents suggest Eden was an uninterested participant in the daily running of the house. With Caroline Eden departing with their children only shortly after their arrival, Eden lived in Annapolis for the most part as a bachelor. The result was a house largely under the management of his housekeeper, whose two rooms included furnishings like a mahogany writing desk and four-post bedstead with blue and white check textiles that established her ranking above many of the other servants. A list of servants’ occupations in Eden’s Annapolis property further reinforces this hierarchy. His staff included a tailor, gardener, waiting man, and blacksmith, none of whom are listed with their own spaces within the household. Since their departure from the Eden-Jennings House, some went under the employ of James Galloway. Most interestingly, “John Nottingham a young English Lad about 10” who disappeared after running away from his master, Captain Scott, is the same deserter who boarded the Fowey the night of Eden’s departure from Annapolis. Nottingham’s escape, whether motivated by loyalty to Eden or desire to return home to England, ultimately contributed to costing his former master his property.

107 “List of Gov. Eden’s servants and occupations,” n.d. Scharf Papers, MSA S1005-122-16540, MdHR 19,999-108A-179. MSA. The names on the record appear to be mostly servants because of the inclusion of surnames in their listings. None of the names are valued as property either.
Eden was dependent on his senior staff for household management, and some servants or enslaved people saw small opportunities to benefit from Eden’s disinterest in their lives by repurposing his objects to their benefit. The record of poor servant behavior marked Eden as an ineffective master of the house. While he could furnish a respectable home, the sometimes-chaotic running of the Eden household was yet another way to denote the young governor as an outsider. This tradition of inattentiveness continued in England. Mr. Crowther, who leased Eden’s Langley property in Surrey in 1782, was appalled to move into a house in chaos. He reported a long list of loss and damage of Eden’s household objects caused by ill-trained servants, reporting that they had lost a hatchet, a japanned tray was “taken away by mistake,” and there was damaged furniture in both public and servant spaces. Crowther complained, “[My wife] came into an Empty Dirty House not a Room to sit down in.” Apart from the damaged property, the list also reveals a social network between the servants connected through trade and occasionally outside of the rules of the household. The coachman damaged the orchard on his frequent visits to his wife. When Crowther attempted to prevent this, he was thwarted: “I had put Barrs on the Top of the Gate to prevent any Body going in which was soon taken off.” He also reported, “My Brewing Tubbs are very much damagd by being left for a long time in the Water which the young Gentleman and the Black Boy made use of for Boats.”\(^\text{108}\)

While irritating to Crowther, the repurposing of the brewing tubs by two of the

\(^{108}\) Mr. Crowther to Sir Robert Eden, 12 November 1782. Box 3/2. EFP.
servants in England indicates the multiple functional uses of objects within the household. While to higher-ranking members of the property, the brewing tubs were significant for their function as a manufacturing tool, the two boys saw them as toys and, despite very different backgrounds and ranking in the house, interacted together through the recycling of Eden’s property that they made their own.

Despite being a poor supervisor of his properties, Eden demonstrated an understanding of appropriate divisions of public and private space. While the working spaces in the Eden-Jennings House were furnished for efficient running of the household (even if this was not always practiced), Eden’s public rooms were constructed to impress the Tidewater elite. His ball room, best staircase, and parlors, were arranged to be used as political and social spaces. For the rare official meeting, Eden and his council had the choice of cramming into the tight confines of the Council Chamber on State House grounds or meeting to discuss matters at Eden’s house over dinners and card games. ¹⁰⁹ Eden’s home therefore shows his awareness of its function as a political space. Portraiture of Eden, the monarch, and likely the proprietor, fall into the category of military portraiture rather than familial and are displayed in semi-public space as a reminder of official power and hierarchy within the colony. ¹¹⁰ Other


images, like that of the proprietary arms, decorate spaces as a constant reminder to both Eden and his guests, of his professional role within the colony.

The furnishing of Eden’s home reveals what must have been a grand interior to any who entered it. Eden’s architectural and furnishing alterations were drastic to the Eden-Jennings House between 1769 and 1772. The changes reflect an awareness of English design trends, but a lack of familiarity with the practical considerations of mid-Atlantic architecture. Rather than a center-periphery relationship between England and Annapolis, Eden melded the two to, in his mind, the greatest advantage for a home that symbolically served as both the social and political capitol.

Eden altered the house from a fashionable, but outdated Annapolis residence to a colonial iteration of an English estate worthy of a wealthy colonial governor and future proprietor. When Frederick Calvert, Lord Baltimore died in Italy in 1771 without surviving heirs, the assumption on both sides of the Atlantic was that Eden, husband to Calvert’s favorite sister, would be the primary inheritor. Newspapers prematurely reported, “The late Lord Baltimore has, we hear, bequeathed his immense property in Maryland to Mrs. Eden, his sister, lady to Robert Eden, Esq; present Governor of that province, subject only to the payment of a few legacies.”

---


111 Caledonian Mercury, 19 October 1771. British Newspaper Archive.
However, Eden would not receive the proprietorship. Upon Frederick Calvert’s death, the inheritance Eden and his wife sought instead went to Calvert’s illegitimate son, Henry Harford. Jonathan Boucher recorded the couple’s surprise in a letter to George Washington,

I hardly ever have seen a Man bear the Shock of ill news with such Composure as the Governor: undoubtedly, nothing was remoter from his Expectations, than so absurd & reproachful a Distribution of so immense an Estate, which He had been repeatedly assur’d wou’d belong to his Family. Mrs Eden indeed is more affected. She well may, having been tormented by him thro’ the whole Course of her Life, & at last, most villainously dup’d & cheated. Cajol’d by his specious Assurances, the Govr was tempted to give up his Prospects in the Army, which were flattering; & Mrs Eden decoy’d hither [g]reat[y] against her inclination.

In a life and house shaped by gossip, this news was one of the most sensational surprises to the young governor and his circle. Eden was left with a highly-fashionable home, considerable debt, and a new proprietor he would have to support despite his own disappointment to gain the £10,000 Calvert promised upon Eden’s acceptance of

112 Legal inquiries by Frederick Calvert throughout the 1760s and 1770s suggest that he always intended to pass the title to his illegitimate son. The recent evidence uncovered that the Edens had considered themselves the rightful future proprietors suggests that the couple may have been misled. Vera F. Rollo, *Henry Harford: Last Proprietor of Maryland* (Lanham, MD: Maryland Historical Press on behalf of the Maryland Bicentennial Commission, Harford County Committee, 1976), 40.

113 Jonathan Boucher to George Washington, 5 March 1772. *Founders Online.*
Harford as the legitimate heir.\textsuperscript{114} Though he spent considerable energy and finances into crafting a residence appropriate to his status as symbolically the highest political and social power in the colony, Calvert’s dismissal of his promise to Eden and the colonists’ resistance towards a full social acceptance of the governor indicates that he was considered an outsider even prior to being branded as a Loyalist.\textsuperscript{115} Unfortunately, Eden’s luck would only continue to fail him with the outbreak of the Revolutionary War.

\textsuperscript{114} Rollo, 65-66.

\textsuperscript{115} While Eden continued to host dinners in his home among members of the General Assembly, he had effectively lost power in 1774 during the Annapolis Constitutional Convention. The house was symbolically a political center, but not necessarily in practice after 1774.
Chapter 3

A HOUSE AT WAR: THE ACT OF CONFISCATION, 1776-1783

The day prior to Robert Eden’s departure from Annapolis in 1776, the Maryland Council of Safety ordered his secretary, Robert Smith, to deliver “all the Provincial arms & accouterments which were heretofore entrusted to the care of his Excellency Robert Eden” to Colonel for the Continental Army, William Smallwood.\(^{116}\) When Smith failed to do so, Smallwood and his troops entered the Governor’s Mansion and searched the property. Little is known about what they found or took on this mission. By the time the house was inventoried again in 1781, prior to new governor Thomas Sim Lee’s tenancy, enough objects had disappeared, moved, or been damaged to suggest that the house had not spent the war unoccupied.\(^{117}\) This is a legally complex observation because the state of Maryland did not officially confiscate the property from Eden until 1782. Even in wartime, eighteenth-century property law shaped confiscation. Until the state’s confiscation act was passed, the Governor’s Mansion was occupied illegally.\(^{118}\)


\(^{117}\) Maryland State Papers (Red Books) S989 MdHR 4557 bk.1 item 7. MSA. See also SM148, 57 which copies and dates the inventory to May 17, 1781. MSA.

\(^{118}\) William Kilty, *The Laws of Maryland, 1785-1799* (Annapolis, MD: Printed by Frederick Green, 1800), October session 1780, chap. XLV. See also February 1781.
I argue that there are a variety of motivations for the invasion into Eden’s home. Confiscation does occur, but it was enacted by a variety of different people on several separate occasions. Depending on the actor who was removing the object and their situation, the various acts had the capability to either empower or depower Eden and/or the actor. By reading between the lines of archival documents and the 1776 and 1781 inventories taken of Eden’s house, a case can be made for expanding the list of forms in which confiscation took place during the American Revolution, and how this contributed to ever-shifting power dynamics during the war.

Previous scholarship on confiscation in American wars has focused on violent or intentional acts of home invasion. Massachusetts Governor Thomas Hutchinson’s house in Boston is a popular example that has been repeatedly symbolically assessed for the meaning of objects in political power dynamics. More well-documented than Eden’s case, a mob attacked Hutchinson’s house in 1765. Specific objects and actions taken upon them are described in accounts:

```
enter'd in a Voyalent manner, broke the Wainscot, partitions, Glasses, &c.; broke & distroy'd every Window, Broke, tore or carr[i]ed of[f] all
```


the Family's Apparel, Jewels, Books &c. and Carr[i]ed off about £900
Sterling in Cash, they worked hard from 8 O'Clock on the House,
Fences &c. till about 12 or one O'Clock; when they got on top of the
House and cut down a large Cupola, or Lanthorn which took up their
Time till near Daylight, leaving the house a mear Shell. 121

Despite the difference in confiscation method, Hutchinson’s case reflects a dramatic
example of what Eden’s house would have experienced. The mob first destroyed the
exterior, breaking the vulnerable parts of the house such as the windows and thus
destroying the understood boundary line of Hutchinson’s private property. Access into
Eden’s house, while not as violent, merits consideration because there is still evidence
of penetration of space, disrupting eighteenth-century notions of rights to privacy and
property ownership, but via more subtle actions. 122 People identified as Loyalists
feared dispossession not only for its financial cost but because intrusion, destruction,
and confiscation upturned carefully constructed identities and sense of belonging
within a community.

As an example of current perceptions of confiscation in Revolutionary
scholarship, scholars frequently argue that the most valuable, stylish objects are the
first to be taken. Robert St. George’s consideration of the Hutchinson raid notes that
the valuable objects are removed, leaving only the most basic furniture, in a sense
economically leveling Hutchinson to the same amount of furniture owned by his

121 Ibid., 264-265.

122 Amanda Vickery, Behind Closed Doors: At Home in Georgian England (New
Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 33.
lower-class subjects. In her book on mahogany, Jennifer Anderson maintains this assertion that the mahogany furniture was the first to be removed from the house in such mob raids of Loyalist homes.

In Loyalist properties where object removal was undocumented, the opposite appears to be the case. Eden’s utilitarian goods disappear while his most valuable objects remained untouched. After the Council of Safety resolved that Robert Smith must deliver the weapons to Smallwood, a rumor arose that Eden had hidden more arms in the Governor’s Mansion, which prompted a government-sanctioned raid. Further evidence that some sort of ambiguously legal search of the house took place is apparent later in the American Loyalist Claims accounts in which an unsigned witness, most likely Robert Smith, reported:

…the Governor was at Liberty to depart the State, saving his property which consisted as appears in the Claimants Schedule of a House, Ground, and Wharf in Annapolis and Articles of personal Property in Furniture….the State either executed his Effects or administrated to them – or sequestered them – if this Transaction by whatever Name it is called is justified by an Act of Assembly, as a publick Act, it must appear in the Volume of Laws transmitted – The Fact is, that the House is appropriated to the Use of the Gov. for the time being …when I saw

123 St. George, 290-291.


this House, there were some small pictures in it, and a room locked up in which it was said some Furniture was deposited.\textsuperscript{126}

The locked room is a rare description of any possible effort made by Eden to conceal his property. Departing Loyalists often made some attempt at protecting their belongings prior to their escape from the colonies. Whether leaving wives and daughters behind to guard the house or burying small valuables somewhere on the property, Eden’s seemingly trust in the Council of Safety’s promise is peculiar.\textsuperscript{127} Rather than secreting away his belongings, he leaves them with little protection, making his primary defense of his property a belief in appropriate social conduct.

While historical scholarship on Loyalist confiscation does not align with Eden’s behavior, contemporary anthropological studies of dispossession display evidence of more subtle tactics used to demonstrate power.\textsuperscript{128} My assertion, related to this anthropological scholarship on loss, suggests that the quiet confiscation of Eden’s

\textsuperscript{126} American Loyalist Claims, AO 12/80, 151-154. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR.


property is worthy of study to complicate Loyalist and Patriot relationships to property in the Revolutionary War. By combining studies in history and anthropology on dispossession, we can apply power dynamics and the significance of surviving accounts to determine what objects receive a narrative history, which ones disappear between archival documents, and the significance of who tells their story. Previous scholarship on Loyalist confiscation would lead a reader to believe that the action takes places in two main forms: either through laws or through riots. However, between these two forms, Eden’s case argues for another form of “quiet confiscation,” in which objects left unoccupied Loyalist properties without documentation because it both operated outside of the legal boundaries of eighteenth-century wartime dispossession and was a case that did not merit enough animosity to form a riot from neighboring Patriots.

My argument rests in situational meaning theory, or the concept that objects have different significances depending on their setting, the time, and the person interacting with them. In turn, the object’s situational context is most often altered as a result of interaction with the human, perpetuating the relationship of confiscation to the entanglement of humans and objects. Anthropologist Ian Hodder wrote, “Things depend on people when they are procured, manufactured, exchanged, used and

129 “Presence of place is relational; it relies on associations found within the rooms and furnishings of buildings and, in telescopic fashion, on the associations between buildings and their settings on a larger geographical scale.” Bernard L. Herman, Town House (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 3.
discarded but in particular they depend on people to maintain them if they are to remain as people want them…Their connection with other things and their maintenance depend on humans.\textsuperscript{130} The concept that things rely on humans for their identity is further reinforced by Arjan Appadurai’s discussion of de-commodification.\textsuperscript{131} Using these theorists as a framework, we see that the acts of confiscation upon Eden’s estate interrupted the expected future of these objects. Confiscation required human attention to Eden’s furnishings, which ultimately saved them from degrading due to neglect. However, it also de-commodified them and changed their situational context. By taking the interpretation of the objects’ meanings from their owner, the confiscators gain symbolic power over Eden.

After Eden’s departure, Robert Smith remained in Maryland until April 1780, during which time he attempted some guardianship over Eden’s house. However loyal Smith proved to be in the confiscation case, his extended residency in Annapolis may not have been intentional as his efforts to leave Annapolis in August 1777 were stopped by illness. By the time of his departure, Smith no longer lived in Eden’s house, instead residing with a member of the Calvert family in town.\textsuperscript{132} However,

\textsuperscript{130} Ian Hodder, \textit{Entangled} (Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 85-86.


\textsuperscript{132} Council of Safety Proceedings. S74, vol. 16, 339-340. \textit{Archives of Maryland Online}. MSA. See also account of Robert Smith’s health in letter from J. Brookes to Hugh Scott, 20 August 1777. “Poor Smith was so ill when the ships came up that he
other friends of Robert Eden appear to have replaced Smith to guard the property. The 1781 inventory changes the name of one of the 1776 inventory’s guest bedrooms to “Mr. Court’s room.” This implies that Joseph Court, a relation of merchant Christopher Court, who was closely tied to Thomas Eden’s firm, may have moved into the house in the late 1770s.\textsuperscript{133}

Despite the ambiguity of whether the house was truly unoccupied in the early years of the war, or just seemingly so, its guardianship by Loyalist sympathizers was refuted by Patriot supporters who saw the house as already under the ownership of the state. By the time the second governor of the state of Maryland, Thomas Sim Lee, officially moved into the Eden-Jennings House in 1781, signs of occupancy and wear were present. In fact, the state may have to some extent considered the house legally Eden’s, suggested by an unsigned receipt from January 1783 for “Rent paid Sir Robt Eden’s attorney from March 1780 to December in the same year & by the attorney paid over to Mr. Clark…£125.0.0.”\textsuperscript{134} This confusion over the property and the legal owner of the furnishings meant that objects left the house with uncertain ownership status, through a variety of methods that remained accordingly open to interpretation.

\textsuperscript{133} Provincial Court (Land Records), 1774-1777, CM22-31, Liber DD 6, 198-200. MSA.

\textsuperscript{134} The Outerbridge Horsey Collection of Lee, Horsey, and Carroll Family Papers, SC 1848. Item 1974-280, 12 January 1783. MSA.
INVENTORY ANALYSIS AND CONFISCATION STRATEGIES

A noticeable difference between “traditional” Loyalist confiscation cases and Eden’s case is the number of high-value items in the Eden-Jennings House that remained *in situ* throughout the Revolution. Whether due to their fragility, mobility, or general practicality (they are frequently dishes or cookware), glass and ceramic objects in the Governor’s Mansion experienced the greatest numerical loss. Furnishings valued more highly individually, but less mobile like lighting fixtures and wood furniture mostly remained within the house (fig. 10), while expensive but fragile objects like textiles largely did not survive. Recreational luxury goods like a billiard table, among the most valuable objects in the house, and iron spits, washing tubs, and other tools, the most useful, had completely disappeared by 1781.

Despite the relative mobility of many of these objects when compared to the furnishings that did leave, portraiture and almost the entirety of Eden’s bedroom including the mahogany furniture, French commode rosewood table, and white dimity textiles, remained not only intact but unmoved. Unlike the other bedrooms in the house in which pieces of furniture were lost or moved, suggesting occupation and/or

135 American Loyalist Claims, Series II, AO 13/60, pt.1, 196-207. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR. A complete list of objects in “His Excellency’s Bed Room” in the 1776 inventory is as follows: mahogany chair and stool, large white counterpain, mahogany night table, hair mattrass, large elbow chair with stuff back and Elbows, pair of White Dimothy window Curtains, Large Feather Bed, bolster and pillows, Mahogany dressing Table with Glass Compleat, French commode Table with rosewood & brass ornaments, mahogany bookcase, Mahogany 4 post Bedstead with white Dimothy furniture ornamented Cornice with Vases compleat.
use, the Eden bedroom seemingly remained unoccupied. Furthermore, the chamber retained its name as “His Excellency’s Bed Room” throughout all the inventories. In leaving alone the owner’s room and private objects, perhaps some Marylanders still considered the Eden-Jennings House to be the property of Robert Eden until its official confiscation by the state legislature in 1782.\footnote{The Council of Safety passes a general act of confiscation, determining “That all British property confiscated in virtue of this act…shall be subject to the disposal of the general assembly.” In 1782, they specifically confiscate Eden’s home for the use of the state governor. Council of Safety Proceedings. Resolution, October 1780, ch. 45, XVII, S74. MSA. See also Votes and Proceedings of the Senate. Resolution, 7 December 1782, SCM3185. MSA.}

The belief that the house still belonged to Eden in the early years of the war is supported by letters of prominent Annapolitans, most often addressed to Robert Smith, endeavoring (with varied success) to buy the property. Rather than approach the state for these goods, Maryland delegate to Continental Congress, Samuel Chase offered to purchase the Eden-Jennings House from Robert Eden for £3000.\footnote{“Mr. Chase will give Sir R. Eden £3000 Sterling for his House and the two lots, and a reasonable Sum for the Furniture, the value of which best known to Mr. Smith - considerable [illegible] and wanting. Mr. Chase would wish to hear from Sir Robert as soon as possible. Mr. Chase will secure payment to Mr. Dulany and Mr. Calvert.” 1780. Copy available in American Loyalist Claims, AO 13 Bundle 60 I, 192, 196. NA. Microfilm available at UD and DLAR.} Considering Eden’s purchase of the property for £2500 and later improvements upon it, amounting to a debt of at least £8,000 and possibly as high as £15,000, Chase’s offer was an insulting figure to the governor. Even so, Eden and his supporters would later use
Chase’s bid in his confiscation claim to attest that the property during the early war years still belonged, at least legally to Robert Eden. In March 1779, Edward Lloyd IV valued the house more highly than Chase and speculated in a letter to his brother, Richard Bennett Lloyd:

The House & Lots which Govr. Eden has in Town may I think be had on very reasonable Terms & would suit you well. Had you not better make a purchase of it before you leave Europe I think it wou’d be a good bargain at three thousand five hundred pounds Sterling...

Both Edward Lloyd and Samuel Chase were involved in Maryland’s wartime government and their correspondence suggests uncertainty even within the state over the Eden-Jennings House availability for sale and ownership status.

This confusion did not end with the official confiscation of the house in 1782 for the use of the state governor. Annapolitans who sought repayment of debts owed them by Eden turned to the state rather than the former governor, who granted repayment depending on the time and circumstances in which the money lending took place. For instance, James Hutchings requested repayment by the state for a debt owed to him by Eden for £3,132.2.4, but would never see compensation for what he was

138 Ibid., AO 12/80, Case 15, 151-154.

owed. Hutchings lent the money in 1780, after the war began, causing the state of Maryland to consider it then money lent to a “British enemy.”

The character of William Fitzhugh presents yet another example of the confusion surrounding the ownership of Eden’s property. Formerly a good friend of Eden’s, Fitzhugh believed that the governor owed him a considerable amount of money. Upon Eden’s departure and seeing no possibility of repayment, Fitzhugh decided to occupy Eden’s plantation, Homony Pot, for the duration of the war, taking control of his enslaved laborers on the property and whatever else remained. To Fitzhugh, he was taking property from Eden rather than the state, even when he continued to occupy the land after the 1782 confiscation act on Eden’s property.

The deposition of Eden’s enslaved workers as confiscated property is one of the most complicated elements of his Maryland claims case. In fact, more attention

140 Maryland State Papers (Series A), 1792-1795, Saleable of Commissioners of Confiscated Property, S1004. MSA.

141 Eden’s supporters criticized Fitzhugh’s conduct in their testimonies in the claims case. In a letter to John Fontes on November 10, 1788, Thomas Eden wrote, “He had indeed heard mentioned a Claim of Col. Wm Fitzhugh’s, but always understood it was what he had no Right to make, & what he never would have done had Sr R. Eden lived.” The next day, John Clapham issued a similar statement to Eden in a letter: “That Mr. Fitzhugh’s arose from a Space lent and for which Mr. Fitzhugh was accountable to the province at that period as Treasurer of the Western Shore. He was indulged to lodge the Money in the public Treasury as a place of safety, from whence he drew it Officially by his signature. I am satisfied he has never paid the present Government such public monies, neither has he given Credit for 1500 Acres of Land since patented to him by assignment from R Sprigg who held it in [First?] for your late Brother which alone is of equal value to his Claims.” American Loyalist Claims, AO 12/80, 202-203. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR.
was paid to this aspect by the Maryland Commissioners for Forfeited Estates than Eden himself or the British claims commissioners. In 1776, the enslaved members of the household were listed in one line alongside sundry furniture, plate, books, and wine valued together at £1500.142 Apart from the enslaved population informally confiscated by William Fitzhugh on Eden’s Homony Pot estate, Eden’s attorney, likely Robert Smith, used the enslaved people as property to settle Eden’s debt when other collateral was inaccessible. When attempting to use Eden’s remaining bound labor to settle his substantial debts, the Maryland Commissioners reported:

The Commissioners have received Information that the Negroes which belonged to Governor Eden & which you were authorized to sell, were regularly sold & conveyed by his Attorney to James Hutchins Esq of Q. Anne’s County, for the Payment of a Debt due, before the 1st day of December 1779, by Governor Eden to Mr. Hutchins. Under these Circumstances the negroes are not liable to Confiscation, you will therefore be pleased to postpone the sale until the Board shall be fully satisfied of the Truth of the above Information, when you will receive further Instructions. I am Sorry to give you this Trouble, but was not apprised of this State of the Case until this Day.143

This report suggests a relative inattention by the Maryland Commissioners paid to the enslaved laborers under Eden’s care until 1781, over five years after Eden’s departure. Furthermore, the implication that Robert Smith, keenly aware of the market value and

142 Ibid., AO 13/60, pt.1, 196-207.

143 The Commissioners for Forfeited Estates, Annapolis, to Major Joseph Bruff, 11 August 1781. Proceedings and Correspondence of the Council of Safety, S74, 556. Archives of Maryland Online. MSA.
mobility of enslaved labor, could have been operating extra-legally to settle Eden’s affairs reinforces the indistinct boundaries of property in cases of unofficial confiscation.

To restrict the potential confiscators to the Annapolis gentry, therefore, would be an oversight. Discussed in Chapter 2, the Governor’s Mansion was run by a number of servants and enslaved peoples, and Eden’s disinterest in the management of his household resulted in at least one case of possible servant theft, just a few months after his arrival in 1769. According to the *Maryland Gazette*,

The same Evening, a Man, supposed to be a little intoxicated, went into a House in this City, where Rum is sold by retail, and insisted on having some Grog, which being refused, he immediately drew a Sword out of a Cane, put out the Candle, and stabbed one Mrs. Cumberford in the Thigh, which cut the Arteries in such a Manner, that she bled to Death before any Relief could be obtained. – A large Knife has been since found in his Pocket very blood, so that its supposed he perpetrated the above horrid Act with it, and afterwards broke the Sword to Pieces.  

The man, later identified as Michael Mitchell, the governor’s cook, is of note here because of his use of the sword cane, an often-expensive weapon. It was a fashionable, specialized accessory favored by gentlemen in the eighteenth-century, rather than a

144 “ANNAPOLIS, October 26,” *The Maryland Gazette*, 26 October 1769, 2. *Archives of Maryland Online*, 172. MSA. The cook, Michael Mitchell (“alias Michael Hewitt”), who is listed with such under occupation and under Eden’s employ in court record, was ultimately discharged from prison and pardoned due to lack of evidence. Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 25 November 1769, lib. CB no. 20, 332-333. *Archives of Maryland Online*. MSA.
highly-functional weapon like a knife, which Mitchell ultimately used to complete the murder. 145 Meant more for the symbolic gesture of dueling than as an actual weapon, they were both too costly and socially aristocratic for Mitchell to have owned, and therefore may have been stolen from Eden. If this was the case, Eden lost ownership of objects he legally owned even before being branded as a Loyalist.

Other subversive actions by members of various classes and backgrounds took place throughout the house as well in the aftermath of 1776. A cracked dressing glass in Eden’s bedroom, which is otherwise entirely undisturbed suggests minor aggressions taken out on the property, rather than one organized, documented riot. This could be conducted by any number of actors. Throughout the war, Annapolis was home to soldiers of local regiments who made changes to the urban landscape in order to build defenses for the city. Eden’s neighbor and Loyalist sympathizer John Ridout wrote to former Governor Horatio Sharpe, “Annapolis many of its Houses having been shamefully destroyed by the Soldiers who were quartered here at times during the war…seems to be sinking into ruin.”146 The Eden-Jennings House was not excepted from the city’s wartime occupation. In a letter to Eden, William Eddis reported:

145 Ann Wagner (Curator of Decorative Arts, Winterthur Museum, Garden & Library), e-mail exchange with author, 10 February 2017. Erik Goldstein (Senior Curator of Mechanical Arts & Numismatics, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation), e-mail exchange with author, 3 March 2017.

146 John Ridout to Horatio Sharpe, 22 June 1783. Horatio Sharpe Papers, Mss. 1722. LOC.
They have formed a Battery from Mr. Walter Dulanny’s Lot round the Water’s Edge to the Granary adjoining your Garden, the Cannon are mostly 18 Pounders, the Works appear strong, & I am told are so from your Wharf to the Hill where Callihorne lived, they have thrown up a covered way to communicate with that part of the Town adjacent to the Dock. ¹⁴⁷

Once the social and political center of colonial Annapolis, Eden’s property transitioned to a military tool to further the Patriot cause.

Whether from neglect, vandalism, military destruction, or all the above, Eden’s house was one of many that were damaged in the war. Three days after Eden’s property officially became the state governor’s residence in December 1782, the Maryland House and Senate resolved to carry out repairs of the Governor’s Mansion. ¹⁴⁸ A report was taken up by Annapolis cabinetmaker John Shaw to document the most necessary repairs needed. ¹⁴⁹ Shaw found a house wrecked by war and sporadic, rough use. Exterior steps were severely damaged or entirely gone, a rotten pump languished in the scullery, the leaking roof caused plaster damage

¹⁴⁷ William Eddis to Robert Eden, 23 July 1777. Fisher Transcripts, box 2 vol. 7, MS 360. MHS.

¹⁴⁸ Regardless, many of the first governors wrote multiple letters to the Senate complaining of the house’s state. Votes and Proceedings of the Senate. Letter to the Senate, 10 December 1782, SCM 3185. MSA.

¹⁴⁹ “A List of Necessary Repairs wanting for the Govr’s House,” John Shaw, December 1782. Maryland State Papers (Series A), S1004, MdHR 6636-41-85a. MSA.
throughout the interiors, and several locks were out of order in the scullery, where the six chandeliers once sat.

While few direct claims can be made about the identity of those who took belongings from the Eden house, the high volume of utilitarian goods taken is indicative of something separate from confiscation tactics discussed in previous scholarship where high-value items were the first to leave Loyalist properties. In Eden’s case, we should not make the assumption that there is any specific class of people removing objects from the house. Instead, evidence suggests a variety of actors and motivations. Confiscation may have taken place for financial gain, to assert power over the enemy in wartime, or even to collect a souvenir out of a sense of nostalgia for pre-Revolutionary Annapolis.

Unfortunately, objects cannot speak to narrate their own story or claim their identity. Eden’s furnishings have long been lost to time and whether some may survive, unattributed and forgotten in the back of an auction house or attic, cannot be known. Similarly, it is impossible to tell the exact whereabouts of Eden’s objects, who removed the furnishings and why, and the exact day that the house was unofficially repurposed as the state’s Governor’s Mansion. The documents recording this information are not known to exist. However, the 1776, 1781, and 1789 inventories do indicate that re-occupation and confiscation in some form did take place. Furthermore, evidence from oral histories suggest motivations for why Eden’s

150 Sir Robert Eden, Governor of Maryland, #3107100126340. FAR.
confiscation may have been ignored in newspapers and legislative documents. To investigate this, a study can be made in the case of the missing chandeliers. In the Servant’s Hall of the 1776 inventory, a notation of “6 Handsome Chandeliers in packing Cases the cost of same in London and charges here - £285.0.0” was the source of multiple conflicting claims. Rebecca Key, several decades after the war ended, recalled,

Governor E[den] regretted he could not pay [builder Robert Key], but left him the chandeliers which he himself imported at £1200 sterling to sell and remunerate himself. The Committee of Safety seized them and appropriated them. A rumour without foundation stated that arms were secreted in the Governor’s house. In searching for them the chandeliers were found and taken.  

This oral history, should it be true, would make the chandeliers one of the first objects to leave the home, likely when Smallwood entered the house only a few days after Eden’s departure. With only this hint of information, it is tempting to speculate. Perhaps the Council of Safety saw an opportunity to utilize the chandeliers and light the interior spaces of public buildings. The Maryland State House, whose Old Senate Chamber would later be described as “the prettyest in America,” was not yet completely furnished and long sessions of the General Assembly stretched into the

151 A Notice of Some of the First Buildings With Notes of Some of the Early Residents" *Maryland Historical Magazine* vol. 14 (1919), 270.
evening, requiring some form of lighting. Amateur historian George Forbes photographed a glass branch (fig. 11) one hundred years later that he identified as a fragment of the chandelier under which George Washington danced with Mrs. Maccubbin. His dance partner, reported by contemporaries, would date the event to Washington’s resignation ball in 1783, and place the chandelier in the Maryland State House. A study of Eden’s chandeliers concludes that they were glass and perhaps Forbes’ glass fragment was part of the six lustres once intended to adorn Eden’s home.


153 The chandelier branch in the Forbes photograph was taken in the late nineteenth-century and depicts a cut-glass branch with a replaced iron drip pan and candle holder, as well as a brass or cement socket. The wider and slighter curve of the chandelier arm points stylistically toward the later half of the 18th century. The blunt cut of the glass rather than molded further point to a 1760s-1770s creation, after molded glass had faded from fashion, and just before cut glass was mastered to the point of a sharp effect. Independence National Historic Park confirmed that the Forbes image of a chandelier does not match the photograph of another glass branch relic from the Assembly Rooms. Karie Diethorn (Chief Curator, Independence National Historic Park) email to author, 4 March 2015. George Forbes Collection, SC 182-01-515. MSA.

154 The six chandeliers in the inventory were valued at £285.0.0, making each chandelier worth approximately £48, significantly higher in value than advertisements for brass chandeliers in the colonies, and closer in price to a £47.10.0 receipt for a 1763 6-light lustre ordered by the Countess of Egremont. Their packing cases further suggests a specially made shipping crate, whereas a brass chandelier could be transported in a barrel. Eden may have been inspired to buy glass chandeliers after seeing the Maydwell and Windle (active c.1751-1778) six-branch lustres ordered for
Rather than valuing the chandeliers for their aesthetic qualities, perhaps the Council of Safety desired the income they would provide and sold them to fund the war effort. Throughout the war, the Continental Army was often suffering from lack of funds to pay its troops or provide them with basic necessities and colonial governments redirected funds earned from selling Loyalist property towards state regiments.¹⁵⁵ Despite the commonality of this, a survey of chandeliers in private homes in Annapolis and the surrounding area reveals almost nothing. The one exception is Henrietta Ogle’s 1815 inventory of Ogle Hall, less than a ten-minute walk from the Eden-Jennings House, which included one “beautiful glass lustre” worth £12.¹⁵⁶ As the only known chandelier listed in Annapolis probate from this era, one of Eden’s lost lustres may have called Ogle Hall home.

Whether the chandeliers ended up in a private house, public building, or neither, documentation suggests the diversity of motivations and tactics behind the act of the Governor’s Palace in Williamsburg. See: Martin Mortimer, The English Glass Chandelier (ACC Distribution, 2000), 118. Hood, 191.

¹⁵⁵ Ousterhout, 330.

¹⁵⁶ Anne Around County Register of Wills (Inventories), 1815, C88-11, lib. JG8, 402. MSA. Henrietta Ogle’s letter to her mother-in-law in February 1776 that, “It would be horrid provoking to have our House beat down now we have almost finished it….most of our Furniture sent to Bel Air…” indicates that the Ogle chandelier, if it dates back to the first generation of the home’s furnishings, would have been most likely installed at Ogle Hall before or around winter 1775-1776, during which time the Eden chandeliers were still under the proprietary governor’s ownership. Ridout Papers, SCM 290, no. 115. MSA.
of confiscation. Rather than Eden’s case being an example of mob violence or public auction, his house was still host to intrusion and loss of property through more subversive tactics and subtly-enacted motivations. It makes Eden’s case peculiar among scholarship of Loyalists in the same economic and social class. While other cases are covered extensively, no mention of Eden’s property is made in the Patriot-leaning *Maryland Gazette*. The lack of documentation and multitude of ways that his inventories can be read together begs the question of how Eden’s case functions in the greater narrative of Loyalist confiscation.

Eden’s high-status ranking in the political and social hierarchy of Maryland makes it even more intriguing that a public confiscation never took place. In a similar case, Philipse Manor Hall in Yonkers, New York, the family was likewise told they would be able to settle their own property after Frederick Philipse’s arrest because of his Loyalist affiliations. He was released by the Continental Army to settle his affairs, but they used the opportunity to escape to England via Loyalist-occupied New York City. To make an example of them, the estate and all its furnishings were publicly auctioned off by Patriot commissioners to the benefit New York’s government and military. This was not an unusual tactic, and one employed locally in Annapolis, as in the case of Eden’s fellow Loyalist, Daniel Dulany. Dulany, after his departure to

---


158 Ibid.
England, was publically condemned in the *Maryland Gazette* and lost the entirety of his Maryland fortune. The auction of his goods was advertised and documented, with multiple sales featuring his different collections.¹⁵⁹ Cynthia Wall in her work on auctions, emphasized the popularity of household auctions in the eighteenth century for members of all society. Witnesses may have been potential buyers, while others attended for “simple entertainment - no purchase required.”¹⁶⁰ Whether taking place due to death, bankruptcy, or war, the household auction inverted concepts of privacy by emptying the contents outside the house for people of all backgrounds to see. For the Maryland wartime government, the auction was an advertisement of victory over the former Loyalist owner and redistribution of goods from the enemy to Patriot families.¹⁶¹ By not advertising Eden’s estate, the state’s Council of Safety may have been exercising discretion for their own profit. To appear legitimate themselves as well as win the war, Maryland’s government needed to furnish unfinished public buildings, establish a residence for the governor, and sell the remaining belongings to fund regiments in desperate need of food, weapons, and shoes. In avoiding public,

¹⁵⁹ One example is the auctioning of Dulany’s library. Mentions of sales of Dulany’s property are also included in the *Maryland Gazette*. Other high-ranking local officials, including Baltimore sheriff, Robert Christie Jr., experienced similar scrutiny. Maryland State Papers (Series Z - Scharf Collection), 28 June 1782, S1005-96-14247. MSA.


¹⁶¹ Ibid., 166.
legal confiscation, they could have seized Eden’s house and furnishings quickly and efficiently without the approval of the General Assembly. No matter their motivation for doing so, it came at the cost of an opportunity to declare the Council of Safety’s power over Maryland’s highest-ranking Loyalist resident.

For a man deeply concerned with his social clout in colonial society, perhaps one of the most challenging exertions of power over his Annapolis property came from the social sphere. By confiscating objects of personal meaning or interest, such as Eden’s jockey goods and portraits, the actors - no matter their motivation - initiated a direct attack on Eden and his aspirations. Similar tactics were employed by both sides during the war. During British officer John André’s occupation of Benjamin Franklin’s house in Philadelphia, he confiscated both Franklin’s portrait and scientific instruments. By making “a Prisoner of [Franklin’s] Portrait,” André was not attempting to financially benefit or shame the enemy. Rather, André may have

_____________________

162 “I found your house and furniture upon my return to Town, in much better order than I had any reason to expect from the hands of such a rapacious crew; they stole and carried off with them some of your musical Instruments, viz: a welch harp, bell harp, the set of tuned bells which were in a box, Viol de Gambo, all the spare Armonica Glasses and one or two of the spare cases. Your armonica is safe…Some of your electric Aparatus is missing also. A Captain Andre also took with him the picture of you, which hung in the dining room, the rest of the pictures are safe, and met with no damage except the frame of Alfred, which is broken to pieces.” Richard Bache to Benjamin Franklin, 14 July 1778. *Founders Online.*

163 “Our English Enemies when they were in Possession of this City and of my House, made a Prisoner of my Portrait, and carried it off with them, leaving that of its Companion, my Wife, by itself, a kind of Widow.” Benjamin Franklin to Marie-Anne
considered them as souvenirs and an expression of admiration for Franklin and his fame. The action is a testament to the variety of motivations and objects that play roles in confiscation, yet all had similar impacts on the former owner who considered dispossession a direct attack on their person. The act of seizing personal objects as souvenirs continues to mirror St. George’s conception of “attacking houses” where the objects stand in for the body of the person.\(^{164}\) By taking the objects most associated with the occupant, the occupier takes the essence of the person. Despite the difference in intentions between André’s souvenir-hunting and the Massachusetts mob’s destruction of Hutchinson’s house, both Franklin and Hutchinson experienced similar senses of disquietude.

Finally, the subtle acts of confiscation against Eden’s estate suggest a power of economy exercised by the actors. Whether they were enslaved residents, Patriot civilians, or newly-appointed governors, any individual or group who repossessed the property of Robert Eden financially benefitted. By taking the object from Eden’s home and placing it in another location, the result was a literal transfer of economic value from Eden to the confiscators.

Eden’s confiscation case, while fitting somewhat within the lexicon of confiscation tactics employed during the Revolutionary War, is currently unique in

---


St. George, 284.
Loyalist scholarship. Rather than a single attack, like in the case of Hutchinson’s house, or a legal confiscation, as took place with many Pennsylvania Loyalist properties like Joseph and Grace Galloway’s, the dispossession Eden experienced was enacted in multiple, largely unrecorded acts. Like these other confiscation cases, Eden’s property stood in for his person. The subversive confiscation techniques in Eden’s case and their impact merits further attention in scholarship on the American Revolution. Unlike Hutchinson’s house, which St. George noted, “Ruination made the wrecked mansion an instant tourist attraction,” Eden’s property experienced quiet, sustained attacks, largely ignored by historians. We will likely never know if the lack of publicity Eden’s confiscation had was intentional or not, but in a Patriot government that relished the public auction, it is likely there was an unwritten motive to not advertise the victory. Eden’s careful craftsmanship of the identity of a governor

165 “Technically, the state had confiscated Joseph Galloway’s life interest in the land. Grace noted in her diary the explanation she received. ‘This estate, so acquired by wedlock, the gentleman can sell. It may be seized by creditors and applied to their relief; And it may be lost by attaint, and then it devolves to the publick as a forfeiture. But the moment the husband dies it returns to the widow, or if she be deceased to her children or other heirs.’ Grace Galloway died in 1782 after willing her confiscated estate to her daughter, Elizabeth, who was in England. Elizabeth finally sued in Pennsylvania courts for return of the lands, and the courts ruled that her father’s attainder could not affect her claim to her mother’s estate once the father was dead...Pennsylvania did protect women’s property rights by granting them a pension if the woman petitioned following confiscation of the estate, but the woman had no control over use or abuse of the property.” Joan R. Gunderson, “Independence, Citizenship, and the American Revolution.” Signs vol. 13 no. 1 (1987): 59-77.

166 St. George, 265.
reflected in the appearance of his home ironically made it a tempting resource for establishing the Governor’s Mansion of the new state of Maryland. To Eden’s Patriot acquaintances, the confiscation was not personal, but for a colonial governor who sought social power and belonging, neglect was an even crueler method to incur his material loss.
Chapter 4
THE BLEAK HOUSE: TACTICS OF RECLAIMING A MATERIAL WORLD, 1783-1789

On the day that Robert Eden boarded the Fowey under a flag of truce and overcast sky, the ship fired a thirteen-gun salute as the governor and some of his personal baggage followed him on board the ship. ¹⁶⁷ While we can never know exactly what Eden chose to transport with him, scholarship on Loyalist cargo suggests items of personal value. Paintings with little financial worth on the market but high emotional significance to the owner, like a pastel portrait of Eden’s wife and son that remained in the family, were no doubt in the possession of the evacuees.¹⁶⁸ Like many Loyalist families, Eden’s personal baggage would be the only things from his Annapolis mansion that remained in his possession. While the Fowey would continue to New York, Eden boarded the Roebuck off shore of Tangier Island near the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay less than a week after his Annapolis departure, his baggage did not join him on board the schooner until July 10. Eden and his luggage moved again at sea to the Royal Navy frigate, the Levant and finally crossed the Atlantic to

¹⁶⁷ Captain’s Log, Fowey, 23-26 June 1776. ADM 51/375. NA. See also Master’s Log, Fowey, 23 June – 10 July, 1776. ADM 52/1749, ADM 52/1749. NA.

Portsmouth. When Eden first left England in 1768, he was preparing for a role as the political head of the colony framed by a fashionable material world. On his return in 1776, he had no real authority and very few possessions.

For the Loyalists whose property was confiscated, the impact of dispossession lasted long after the war. The loss of objects had an economic, emotional, and political effect on the original owner. Material culture theorists reinforce this concept of meaningful human-object relationships and the impact of object loss. We grieve at the loss of objects. Drawing on the scholarship of Arjan Appadurai’s *The Social Life of Things*, objects in cases of dispossession undergo a process of involuntary commodification. For Eden, the alteration of his personal belongings to saleable commodities affected his family for at least two generations. Without the furnishings intended to support a genteel identity (discussed in Chapter 2), the Edens needed to find alternate routes to maintain social and political clout in elite society. Following the claims case from Eden’s perspective, a case will be made for the overarching


impact and reciprocal entanglement that ensues after a person and their possessions are parted.

After his departure from Maryland in 1776, Eden never succeeded in reclaiming a significant place within society. He returned to London for the duration of the war, while his wife settled in Brussels with their children. Increasing debt continued to loom over the family, so Eden boarded a ship bound for Maryland in summer 1783 in an attempt to reclaim his property. He re-entered, to some extent, Annapolis society during some of the most pivotal months in the city’s history while the Continental Congress resided in the city: attending the resignation of George Washington as commander-in-chief and parties at the Governor’s Mansion (his former home). Finally, in September 1784, Eden died at the age of 42 of an unknown illness in Maryland, to little notice. His wife and children, returning to London just before his death, spent the rest of their lives recovering from the financial and emotional trauma caused by the confiscation case.

ROBERT EDEN’S CLAIMS CASES

While in England, the Edens joined many other Loyalist families in their pleas for compensation from the crown for lost colonial property. In Benjamin West’s portrait of commissioner John Eardley Wilmot, he included a sketch of Britannia welcoming the Loyalist refugees. The Loyalists are weak, poor, and starving; Britannia is their salvation and hope. The sketch captures the mood of Britain and the consequential choices made by the American Loyalist Claims Commissioners in Parliament over the next decade following the Revolution. In what would become one
of the first national efforts to support refugees of war, the commission was formed in response to the harsh terms of Article VI of the Treaty of Paris, which permitted former colonies to largely ignore compensation claims filed by Loyalists now living in England. Still, the American Loyalist Claims Commission was considered a charity, not an obligation for the British crown to fulfill.

Eden’s was one of 3,225 Loyalist claims filed between 1783 and 1790 in England and Canada. Though the total compensation granted amounted to a considerable £3,033,091, it was only a small portion of the £8,216,126 requested by the total number of claimants. One Samuel Curwen complained:

Those who bring property here may do well enough, but for those who expect reimbursement for losses, or a supply for present support, will find to their cost the hand of charity very cold; the latter may be kept from starving, and beyond that their hopes are vain.

---

171 Maya Jasanoff, *Liberty’s Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2011), 79. See also Article 6 of the Treaty of Paris (1783): “That there shall be no future confiscations made nor any prosecutions commenced against any person or persons for, or by reason of, the part which he or they may have taken in the present war, and that no person shall on that account suffer any future loss or damage, either in his person, liberty, or property; and that those who may be in confinement on such charges at the time of the ratification of the treaty in America shall be immediately set at liberty, and the prosecutions so commenced be discontinued.”


173 Ibid., 42. See also Jasanoff, 133 in which she summarizes one claimants’ difficulty: “After some further bickering, the secretary officiously accepted the papers, told Smith that probably ‘it would not be taken into Consideration for 2 years,’ and sent him away.”
Curwen’s despair was justified. After a long, complicated filing process, a claimant needed to find witnesses to testify to the amount of compensation requested. The total number was often arrived at arbitrarily by claimants who either estimated their losses too low or too high in order to get the most money to recover what they could of their lost property and support their displaced families.\textsuperscript{174} With the documentation assembled, the commissioners then began their investigation. They reviewed inventories (often compiled years after the claimant had left the colonies) and attempted to set prices for object and property worth as they would be in 1776. The value of the objects was then considered alongside the claims’ veracity, means of confiscation, and the individual’s ties to the crown to arrive at the total the claimant would be awarded.\textsuperscript{175} The total process took years.

Further trouble with the claims issues revolves around the expense of the case itself. The commissioners would not examine claims without the claimant appearing before them in person, oftentimes requiring Loyalists to either balance the expenses of

\textsuperscript{174} Norton, 194.

\textsuperscript{175} “Only four categories of acceptable claims remained. The first, and one that encompassed most of the eligible memorials submitted, the commissioners described as losses of property within the United States ‘sustained by Persons of undoubted Loyalty’ who had lived outside the United States before or during the war, when those losses could be ascribed to their ‘Loyalty and adherence to the British Government.’ The other three admissible classes were losses of life appointments or positions held during the pleasure of the king, if those posts had been acquired before the war; losses of professional income to which the claimants had been accustomed before 1775; and claims submitted by heirs of Loyalists, if the heirs were also loyal.” Ibid., 201.
living in London on no income or frequent transport to and from the city.\textsuperscript{176} By the time Eden filed his claim, he was already showing signs of the illness that would lead to his death.\textsuperscript{177} The commissioners noted that Eden’s “Health has been very bad & precarious for this last twelve month,” adding that “His Circumstances urgently require some immediate appliance, either which he has no prospect but Absolute Pain.”\textsuperscript{178}

Unfortunately, Robert Eden required compensation and quickly. He employed tactics used by other claimants, attempting to draw sympathy from the commissioners through an illustration of his dire circumstances. Citing his wife and three children as claiming “a much better support than I can give them”, Eden begged of the claimants, “It must be obvious to you, Gentlemen, how much the sudden and unexpected loss of the above recited property must embarrass the little Fortune I had left in this Kingdom, which was always small and, for obvious Reasons, very far from being clear.”\textsuperscript{179}

As a former governor, Eden was entitled to receive some of the highest compensation and pension claims; however, as a proprietary governor and therefore

\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., 52.

\textsuperscript{177} In fact, Eden’s health had already begun to ail him as a governor in Maryland. He excused himself from meetings in the Homony Club on account of illness. Conversation between author and Glenn Campbell (Historian, Historic Annapolis, Inc.), 17 October 2016.

\textsuperscript{178} American Loyalist Claims, AO 13/40/8. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR.

\textsuperscript{179} Ibid., AO 13/40/9-11.
not directly employed by the crown, his position was not entitled to pensions received by Thomas Hutchinson or Lord Dunmore, royal governors of Massachusetts and Virginia, respectively. Ultimately, Eden was granted an allowance of £500 annually.\(^\text{180}\) Though significant when compared to other government-employed claimants who often received no allowance with their compensation, this was not enough to support Eden’s family or pay back the debts he incurred in Annapolis because, “He spent all the income of his Govt upon the hopes that Lord Baltimore would leave him a considerable fortune.”\(^\text{181}\) Eden hoped for much higher, arguing that his estate was “so much incombered that he has no resources or income – but what arrives from this Provision,” even begging for future positions directly under the crown to support the family, reporting that he “should wish to go out to the East Indies as one of the new Council, if there should be a vacancy.”\(^\text{182}\) His secretary supported this notion, claiming that the warm weather of the unpopular location would benefit Eden’s failing health.\(^\text{183}\)

---

\(^\text{180}\) “Decision: Sir Robert Eden was only a proprietary Governor, but as he lost property in Maryland to the value of about £10000 Sterl We think he should have some Allowance as other Governors Vizt £500 p Ann.” Ibid., AO 12/103/104.

\(^\text{181}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{182}\) Ibid.

\(^\text{183}\) Ibid., AO 13/40/8. Had he succeeded, Eden would have joined a community of other serially-appointed British officials, namely acquaintance John Murray, Lord Dunmore who, after appointments as colonial governor of New York and Virginia,
One of the most illuminating elements of a claims case was the individual’s economic and personal network which reveals itself through witness testimonies. Apart from Robert Eden’s personal statements, his case was supported and continued after his death by friends and family members with vested economic interest in compensation. His younger brother, merchant Thomas Eden became the lead correspondent in the case. His wife, Caroline Eden, needed the compensation more than anyone. She made a notable appearance in testimony after Eden’s death, where she described the situation of the family:

There are some particular circumstances in [the case] which press upon me at present, & which therefore I hope you will excuse my troubling you with again. My three Children being now all pretty well grown up, must, in some way or Other be now introduced to the World, & put into some Capacity are long, if possible, of assisting themselves. This has obliged me to abandon my system of burying myself in obscurity abroad, where alone I could live in any such stile of cheapness, as was suitable to my scanty Income. But now that I am here in England, I find calls coming upon me on the Score of my Children, calls both prudent & just, with which alas in my present Circumstances I see no Possibility of complying, and you not to have them complyed with may be the Starving & destroying all the fair Hopes of my very promising Children for ever.  


184 “Will of The Honorable Dame Caroline Eden formerly Caroline Calvert, Widow,” 15 April 1805. PROB 11/1390/304. NA.

185 American Loyalist Claims, AO 13/137/157-162. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR.
Caroline’s testimony reflected her precarious position as a widow without income of her own. Alone and encumbered with her husband’s debt, she was forced to rely on the commissioners and a network of allies. Besides immediate family members, Eden’s secretary, Robert Smith, friend Jonathan Boucher, and Jonathan Chalmers made frequent appearances in testimony. Like Eden, all three were Maryland residents prior to the war and prominent members of Annapolis’ political court party, of which Eden was the center. All of them suffered some loss of property and filed for confiscation claims. Smith and Boucher remained in contact with the family on personal and financial levels after Eden’s death, most actively taking an interest in raising Robert’s oldest son, Frederick Morton Eden. Their continued ties to Eden’s family reflect ongoing community Loyalist networks, connected by the shared experience of property loss. To receive only a portion of compensation rather than

---


187 Boucher especially continued to support the Eden family, both socially and financially. Several years after the death of Eden, Boucher wrote, “Mr. Harford, the natural son of Lord Baltimore, to whom in an evil hour I had become security for the late Sir Robert Eden in a Bond for twelve hundred pounds, now called upon me for payment of principal and interest, amounting in all to fifteen hundred pounds. After infinite difficulty and vexation I at length borrowed of a Mr. Pagett of Warwickshire a thousand pounds, which Mr. Harford was graciously pleased to accept of in lieu of the whole. Mrs. James…happening since to have a thousand pounds to lend out, I have borrowed that sum of her on bond at 4 1/2 per cent and have repaid Mr. Pagett. This was a heavy blow, and it fell on me, if not unpitied, yet certainly unassisted, by all the
the specific objects or land had ramifications for Eden’s sense of belonging in elite society, prompting an identity class crisis for the family and those financially and socially entangled with them. It was a crisis experienced by most high-ranking Loyalist expatriates.

RECREATING A MATERIAL WORLD IN LONDON AND BRUSSELS

Upon his return to England in September 1776, Eden reunited in London with his wife and three children and moved to a house in Clarges Street, a short road in the fashionable district of Mayfair that runs perpendicular to Green Park and Buckingham Palace. His house’s proximity to the court’s primary urban residence suggests Eden’s continued desire to position himself in the center of networks and regain some political and social influence. He was successful to a limited extent and appeared at court a handful of times. King George III rewarded Eden for his efforts at reconciliation of the colonies with the title of Baronet of Maryland. However, though given a British title, he still had no actual power over the colony that had rejected him and now possessed his property, either as governor or baronet, and was largely overlooked on matters concerning the Revolutionary War.

Eden family, great and powerful as they all are.” Jonathan Boucher, Reminiscences of an American Loyalist (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1925), 188.

188 Printed notice of the sale of Sir Robert Eden’s House, 1787. Box 2/5. EFP. Eden’s secretary, Robert Smith, and brother William Eden had London houses on the opposite side of the city, in Grey’s Inn and Lincoln’s Inn Fields, respectively.

Despite this brief success in court and society, the cost of the Revolution hung heavily. Caroline Eden expressed the hope that her husband would retire from society and live an economical life, remarking that he might be able to “rest content without Castle building.”[^190] The Edens, post-dispossession, faced sometimes insurmountable financial troubles. Loss, intertwined with the pressure to perform within society had an impact on the material world they reconstructed during Robert Eden’s final stay in England, between 1776 and 1783.

Though physically separated from his property and colonial rank, Robert Eden and his family remained invested in the future of the American colonies and maintained social, political, and economic ties with those on the other side of the Atlantic. Only a few days passed after Eden’s arrival in London in 1776 before he publicly recommended peaceful reconciliation with the colonies.[^191] When William Eden crossed the Atlantic as a peace commissioner in 1778, Robert wrote a letter of introduction from Clarges Street to his old friend, George Washington.

“Notwithstanding the different Parts, Sir, that we have taken in the unhappy differences…I flatter myself there yet remains a mutual Share of Esteem between Your Excellency and me,” he wrote, reminding us of the personal relationships that

[^190]: Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, 20 July 1783. Box 3/1. EFP.

[^191]: “Sir Robert Eden, late governor of Maryland, we hear, recommends a reconciliation with the colonies.” Kentish Gazette, 18 September 1776. British Newspaper Archive.
sometimes transcend war.\textsuperscript{192} His brother, Thomas Eden, continued his transatlantic mercantile firm without pause. His older brothers joked, “Tom [Eden] is as violent a patriot as any,” as the captain and merchant continued trade with Annapolis during wartime.\textsuperscript{193} Like other Loyalist exiles in London, Robert Eden and his family maintained the colonial ties that were interrupted by war and dispossession.\textsuperscript{194} Eden spent almost a decade in Annapolis endeavoring to build a position within the community; his continuation of these relationships may have been a bid to keep from losing everything he had in Maryland while crafting a temporary life abroad.

Part of this temporary life Robert Eden constructed in London included many similar tactics of presentment that the former governor used in Annapolis. Once again, to gain acceptance into London society, Eden needed to surround himself with objects

\textsuperscript{192} Robert Eden to George Washington, 17 April 1778. \textit{Founders Online}. George Washington replied via William Eden, “The one from your Brother Sir Robert, gave me particular satisfaction, as it not only excited a pleasing remembrance of our past intimacy and friendship, during his residency in this Country, but also served to shew that they had not been impaired by an opposition of political sentiments.” George Washington to William Eden, 25 June 1778. \textit{Founders Online}.


\textsuperscript{194} “The Enterprize privateer of London, Captain [Thomas] Eden, has taken in the North Seas the Revenge, of 12 guns and 50 men, loaded with 130 hogsheads of tobacco, bound from Baltimore in Maryland, to Amsterdam.” \textit{Caledonian Mercury}, 18 September 1780. \textit{British Newspaper Archive}. For further reading on Annapolis trade during the American Revolution, see: Edward C. Papenfuse, \textit{The Pursuit of Profit} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975).
depicting himself as a man of taste. A portrait by Nathaniel Dance-Holland (fig. 12), painted during Eden’s final stay in England, depicts a man untroubled by his losses in Annapolis. In an uncharacteristic pose for Georgian portraiture, Eden slouches forward, relaxed in his damask-upholstered armchair, with his head lazily resting on his right arm and legs angled to the side. With a piece of parchment splayed across the table and an inkwell propped on a stack of books, it gives an impression of a man interrupted in the middle of his work. A personal touch is added with a dog in the lower-right corner of the frame, a King George Spaniel, both a popular breed for the elite and perhaps a personally meaningful pet for both Eden and his wife, who took special provisions in her will for the care of her spaniel, Taffy. Dance’s portrait represents Robert Eden as a man of learning, surrounded by books, wealth, and fashion; here, he is the vision of the portraits of the professional middle-class, a

195 Fitting most closely into the category of “domestic portraiture,” Eden’s posture is not in keeping with the description of the genre in which men prefer to look respectable as “men of learning.” Desmond Shaw-Taylor, The Georgians: Eighteenth-Century Portraiture & Society (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1990), 81. See also Wendy Bellion (Sewell C. Biggs Chair in American Art History, University of Delaware) and Amy Torbert (Barra Fellow, Philadelphia Museum of Art), e-mail exchange with author 20 February 2017, 23 February 2017.

196 “Will of The Honorable Dame Caroline Eden formerly Caroline Calvert, Widow,” 15 April 1805. PROB 11/1390/304. NA.
different message than his military full-length portrait painted by Charles Willson Peale in Annapolis (fig. 13), surrounded by classical motifs indicative of power.

To commission two full-length portraits when already in debt seems excessive, but, with his Peale portrait across the Atlantic, perhaps Eden felt that the expense was necessary. Without his furnishings, Eden needed to replace them with objects that suited a man in society rather than a leader of it. While the Dance portrait invites the viewer to gaze closely into the interior of Eden’s home, the portrait shares a similar backdrop and furnishings to some of Dance’s other portraits, namely M.P., *George Hardinge*, author *Tobias Smollet*, and *Bartholomew Burton*, Governor of the Bank of England. The men are often depicted against a similar library as Eden, in a red-upholstered damask chair, sometimes with gold thumb tacks visible, and a rounded crest rail. A further comparison of the portraits suggests that Dance often preferred arranging his sitters in uniquely relaxed positions. His Eden portrait then, may have

---


199 *Maria Walpole* (c.1766) by Nathaniel Dance, RA. University of Virginia Art Museum, Charlottesville, VA.
been painted in Dance’s studio, using props, and an arrangement directed by the artist. With his investment, Eden deceived the viewer into believing a studio set was his library. Much like the objects Eden chose for furnishing the Eden-Jennings House, the Dance portrait mimics Eden’s desire to always rise into higher society by adopting the appearance of a tastemaker.

In reality, Eden was overcome with the expenses of life in London. The Edens suffered similar problems to many other Loyalist expatriates; staying in London was expensive without income.\textsuperscript{200} Even while trying to create a material world that could serve Eden as an entry to London society, financial constraints prevented a successful portrayal via property. By July 1783, Eden sailed for Annapolis to reclaim his property, leaving Caroline to sell “the pictures” and their house in London. Even in a house that he had the time to leave in an orderly fashion, objects were left behind. His wife chastised him:

\begin{quote}
do you know that you carelessly left a strange Bottle with strange directions in one drawer...& all of the Bills of receipts in confusion, I distroyed what I was ashamed [William] Eddis or any one wd find and gave a sigh at the thoughts how much the wicked world could corrupt a good head and heart.\textsuperscript{201}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{200} Despite his English roots, Eden was one of many who fit into Norton’s description: “The loyalists’ difficulty in finding jobs in England, combined with their assumption as to the brevity of their stay, ensured that most of them were never gainfully employed during at least the early years of their exile.” Norton, 52.

\textsuperscript{201} Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, 13 July [1783?]. Box 3/1. EFP.
Despite his wife’s pleas, Eden continued to spend beyond his means. Upon the discovery of a tailor’s bill he secretly charged, Caroline exploded in frustration:

You have no idea how much more you torture my mind and alarm me by always concealing than you would do by openly telling me the worst... for how can I at all depend on your prudence, who have led us all to the very brink, and yet till the last moment did not seem to feel the necessity of a change of conduct, for now you must seriously give up your former way of life and be content with little, for much you must not now expect the golden opportunity is lost and we are both too far advanced in life to form new scheme.  

Caroline’s letters reflect a primarily financial concern with their confiscated property, an understandably overwhelming anxiety for most Loyalists. Unlike Eden, who had seen Maryland as his chance to finally achieve social prominence, Caroline still yearned for the stability she had last experienced at Ashtead House. She concluded, “I am resolved not to return to this life till you are clear” and completed the letter with a reminder, “Write on a single large sheet because of the postage.” While Eden crossed the Atlantic, hoping to reclaim property, Caroline, her children, and some of the portable furnishings from London, moved to Brussels. She hoped they could live cheaply there, reporting to her husband, “if all I am told is true you may expect to hear of my saving when I am once settled.”

\[202\] Ibid.

\[203\] She would lease the house for £90 a year. Caroline Eden’s letters to her husband, though filled with stress and frustration, also gave glances of a couple otherwise well-matched. The conclusion of the letter ends with a postscript where she joked, “I think I
Brussels in the late-eighteenth century was a popular destination for members of English society like Caroline Eden who could not afford a life in London or Paris. As wealthier Loyalist expatriates made communities in London neighborhoods, other families of more modest means did the same in Brussels. There, Caroline may have reunited with Edmund Jennings, the original owner of the Eden-Jennings House. During her stay, her letters became tranquil as financial constraints eased, believing that she was in “the best, pleasantest and cheapest town in this part of the world.” Caroline took her daughter to court balls and gossiped about her English neighbors, adding that their London furniture accommodated the small family well in their Brussels house. Away from immediate financial pressures, Caroline Eden imagined she had successfully reclaimed the material environment appropriate to her station.

It is important to contrast the material comfort Caroline felt in Brussels to the material identity Eden sought in Annapolis. While Caroline sought objects for

shall like being here very well don’t be surprised if you find me grown a fat comely old Woman.” Ibid.

“Do you know any thing of Brussels? The people here tell me all things are dear there…tell me can one live comfortably there upon two Hundred pounds a year?” Emma Thompson to Benjamin Franklin, 5 February 1777. *Founders Online.*

Edmund Jennings relocated to Brussels from Paris in 1780, and remained there for the next several years. See correspondence describing Brussels: Edmund Jennings to John Adams, 19 February 1780 and 12 September 1782. *Founders Online.*

Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, January 1784. Box 3/1. EFP.
financial stability, Eden wanted them to perform a social role. Together, the Edens provide a fuller picture of the multitude of reactions Loyalists felt towards their confiscated property. To better understand the relationship between lost objects and identity, we must return to Robert Eden. As the Revolutionary War reached its conclusion, he left Caroline in England to return to his former colony, in the hopes of procuring compensation from the government who now held his property.

EDEN’S RETURN TO ANNAPOlis

On August 15, 1783, the Maryland Gazette reported, “In the Harford came passengers the right honorable Henry Harford, esq. (proprietor of Maryland prior to the late revolution), sir Robert Eden, Robert Smith, and John Clapham, esqs.”207 It would be a month before the signing of the Treaty of Paris and another five months before the document’s ratification, officially ending the war. The Continental Congress, who once ordered the publication of Eden’s correspondence in newspapers and argued for his dismissal, would arrive in Maryland’s capital that fall. Eden and his companions, still branded as Loyalists, were taking a significant risk returning to their former colony. Reports circulating in England gossiped that returning Loyalists would be “whipt Imprisoned Fined – or Hanged.” Contemporary accounts confirm varying degrees of hostility waiting for Loyalists upon their arrival, particularly those, like

207 Maryland Gazette, 15 August 1783. Archives of Maryland Online. MSA.
Eden and Harford, who were returning not to call the new nation their home, but to claim the property they lost and return to England.\(^{208}\)

When Eden arrived, he found his former house under the occupation of the state’s governor, William Paca, and his property lost. He bemoaned to William Eddis,

> I know only in fact of 1500 acres of my back Lands (which is a tract here) that I shall be able to dispose of to any advantage to myself, and on rendering the amount of my Claim; and two Negroes with three Children even my Little plate at Calverts Has been taken and sold, but my Lands, Houses, Lotts, &c. have never been Sold so as to enable me to fix any Value on them.\(^{209}\)

Specifically highlighting some of his most economically valuable property, humans and silver, Eden’s financial concerns become particularly apparent in this letter. His loss fully realized, along with failing health, caused a change in behavior in Eden that his former friends observed. John Ridout, the new owner of Whitehall, reported:

> S[ir] R[obert] is I observe still fond his Glass & is I think exceedingly altered for the worse as to his person since he left Maryland. He seems pretty sanguine in his hopes that what property of his hath been

---

\(^{208}\) Norton, 244. In a letter to Franklin, Harford lies about his arrival in the colonies, perhaps to protect himself: “I wish to become a Citizen (if I may be allowed the expression) of that country which was not in my power till lately or I undoubtedly should have sought the honor sooner.” Henry Harford to Benjamin Franklin, 7 June 1783. *Founders Online*.

\(^{209}\) Here, Eden may only be describing his backlands property, which was originally 16,000 acres. Robert Eden to William Eddis, 19 November 1783. This record was later used as evidence in 1787 in Eden’s confiscation claim, AO 13/60 I, 187. NA. Microfilm at UD and DLAR.
confiscated will be restored or a compensation made, I can’t say I am of that opinion.  

Ridout’s wife, Molly, wrote in a letter to her mother, “"Sr R. Eden seems in bad health he does not flirt now."”

However, many of the remaining written accounts of Robert Eden come from his final visit to Annapolis between 1783-1784 were written by former enemies or even political allies who disliked him personally prior to the Revolutionary War. Despite exhibiting Loyalist sympathies and serving in Eden’s relatively inactive government, John Ridout was a close friend of Governor Horatio Sharpe, who he felt had been mistreated in Lord Baltimore’s prompt dismissal of Sharpe in favor of his brother-in-law. Other members of society disagreed with Eden’s enemies. For instance, Henrietta Hill Ogle remarked of the former governor, “Our friend was there

210 John Ridout to Horatio Sharpe, 16 August 1783. Ridout Papers, SCM 290 no. 115. MSA.

211 Mary Ridout to Anne Tasker Ogle, 16 January 1784. Mrs. James N. Galloway and Mrs. Frederick G. Richards Collection, SC 358-1-2. MSA.

212 Ridout arrived in Maryland as Sharpe’s secretary and remained close with the former governor throughout his life. He likely echoed similar beliefs as Sharpe’s brother on the last colonial governor: “Lord Baltimore….declared you had acted as a good Governor & that he was sorry any thing should part you & him but that Capt Eden that married his Lordship’s sister had by extravagant living & gaming run himself into such streights & difficulties that he could not well continue longer here, & that they had no other means of providing for him but by appointing him Governor of Maryland….the captain is a very polite gentleman at the same time very young, raw, & unexperienced, very expensive & addicting to gaming…” Joshua Sharpe to Horatio Sharpe, 6 August 1768. Ridout Papers, SCM 290 D373 no. 184. MSA.
in scarlet and gold. You know I always thought him superior to most. We supped with him two nights ago at a snug party.\textsuperscript{213}

What the accounts do confirm is Eden’s participation in Annapolis society.

The uniqueness of Eden’s case is remarkable. In 1783, few Loyalists ventured back to their former colonial residences, and those that did found themselves at best excluded from a society whose memories of war were still fresh. Though Eden still circulated through Maryland estates like he did as governor, accounts reveal that the social dynamics had shifted. Post-war Annapolis society, like pre-war Annapolis discussed in Chapter 2, still operated on expectations of politeness, sensibility and taste. It was polite for Eden’s former friends and political allies to recognize him in society. However, by acknowledging that he was “still fond of his Glass,” his companions subversively acknowledged that Eden no longer fit into the modes of acceptable behavior. Without political power, economic power, or a house of his own to demonstrate social power, Eden was forced into the position of the party guest rather than the host, someone reliant on others for respectable places to stay, and no longer a true fit for genteel society. The change in popularity was not lost on the former governor. While staying at Sotterly Plantation, home of George Plater, a member of Eden’s colonial government who turned Patriot during the Revolutionary War, he was impressed with his former friend’s apparently genuine care when he was taken ill.

Eden wrote to his friend, John Clapham, “I…beg to be remembered loudly to Mr. Harford and all enquiring friends, the number of whom that are really so is not very large.”

Despite Eden’s awareness to his social position, he continued to participate in society, perhaps in the hopes that a former ally would help to press his claim for compensation from the state government. In the fall of 1783 until spring 1784, the Maryland State House was the seat of Congress. During their residence, Congress accepted the resignation of George Washington as commander-in-chief and ratified the Treaty of Paris, making Annapolis the first peacetime capital of the new United States. While Eden stayed in town at the house of Loyalist-sympathizer Upton Scott, the city appeared to be a hotbed of patriotism, but one that was fueled by social networks of former Patriots, Loyalists, and neutral parties in the war. Eden attended the resignation of his old friend George Washington, and participated in the ball held in honor of the General in the Annapolis home he once inhabited.

James McHenry’s letter describing the party frames Eden almost as a tragic figure, whose fall was entangled with his property. McHenry imagined that “every

---

214 Robert Eden to John Clapham, 12 July 1784. EFP.

215 Ibid., 300.
picture and piece of furniture he saw, served to remind him of the past.”

In contrast, Eden’s companions; Harford, Smith, and Clapham, were mentioned in passing, the focus on their social interactions with people rather than with any objects in the space, Harford “seen sometimes chatting with the ladies and sometimes with himself.”

While Eden was known to the guests of the party, Harford was entirely an outsider and consequently received a less sympathetic description by McHenry. These men were defined by their relationship to society, but Eden's societal role was affiliated more directly with his relationship to his former objects.

Two days after the party in his former house, just before noon on a chilly day in an unusually cold winter, Robert Eden and Henry Harford crammed into the doors of the Maryland State House with nearly two hundred other people. Annapolis society, members of Congress (including future presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Monroe), and former soldiers filled every available space of the Senate Chamber to witness George Washington resign his commission as commander-in-chief of the Continental Army. For an event that would be remembered as a pivotal moment in the establishment of the United States as a democracy, it was an unusual one for the last proprietary governor to attend. Almost ten years previously, Eden had laid the


217 Ibid.
cornerstone to the building Congress now occupied, and it is tempting to speculate whether this fact struck him while he watched among teary-eyed spectators the brief ceremony. Despite Eden’s participation in a historic event for the new republic, the superficial acceptance of his former political allies indicated only a pretense, not a reality, of any social power.  

Just before Eden departed for Annapolis, he wrote his will, suggesting that he may not have expected to return to England. By July 1784, his condition had worsened and in a letter to John Clapham, Eden joked its sole purpose was “so that Mr. Harford and you may see that I am not dead yet.” On September 2, 1784, Eden died at the home of Upton Scott. His death merited a short mention in the *Maryland Gazette*. His wife would not be aware of his passing until nearly a month later, when John Shuttleworth gave an account of Eden’s final hours. Shuttleworth’s frustration with Eden’s friends, genuine and fake, is apparent in his letter:

> I am sorry to say, and wish I could conceal it, but it will out, that since my arrival here, he had been but severely treated by Harford and his 

____________________

218 Later paintings of the resignation do not include Robert Eden in the scene. This point is expanded upon in Chapter 5.

219 Sir Robert Eden to John Clapham, 12 July 1784. Box 3/2. EFP.

220 John Shuttleworth gave a more poetic report to Eden’s wife. Writing to Caroline, “we may say with truth what Hamlet says of his father, ‘He was a man, take him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again! But he is gone! And may the Father of mercies have mercy on his Soul, and upon all our Souls.” J. Shuttleworth to Lady Caroline Eden, 4 December 1784. Box 3/3. EFP.
crew, one man I am sorry to criminate… the sad conduct of Col. [Robert] Smith to him while living and his apparent demeanor to some people respecting his death, are such contradictions as time only can unravel.

On the Saturday preceding the death of my poor dear friend, I saw there was no possibility of his recovery, and requested the Colonel to desire him to nominate somebody to act for his family here, and to ask him whether he wd not like to receive the sacrament – for what reasons I do not pretend to say, but neither request was mentioned to him until Monday, when I was obliged to mention them myself; He was very desirious of receiving the sacrament, and I took it with, none of the Gentlemen in the House chosing to communicate – In half an hour afterwards he lost his senses and never recovered them. I had advised him to nominate Harford as his attorney, as being the most responsible person for I had well founded reasons to prevent Col. Smith exercising any such power…they had all behaved ill, yet some had behaved worse, and Mr. H was the only man that had money. I had neither money nor a horse…

Taking into consideration personal biases, Shuttleworth’s account paints a portrait of the dying former governor as a man isolated and abandoned, even by those who he had believed to be his true friends, particularly his secretary, Robert Smith. Not only an outsider superficially accepted into Annapolis society, Eden had fallen in Loyalist society as well, being “severely treated by Harford and his crew.” For a man so concerned with displaying himself as a member of the social elite, there is a sense of tragedy in how much of an outsider he had become. Throughout the account of his final hours, property and money continued to loom largely over everyone. Upon Eden’s death, pressure immediately began for Caroline to continue proceedings on the family’s claims case for Annapolis property from Eden’s friends, many of whom,

---

221 Ibid.
including the former proprietor, disappeared from Annapolis society accounts and failed in their efforts to reclaim property.  

Eden asked to be buried in Annapolis’ Episcopal churchyard at St. Anne’s, a request that was deemed impossible in the city’s political climate. Only months after the ratification of the Treaty of Paris, the burial of Maryland’s last proprietary governor in the capital’s central church could have been seen as an open acceptance of British Loyalists returning to reclaim property. Instead, Eden was buried outside the city in St. Margaret’s Parish Church, which later burned down accidentally in 1803. Knowledge of his body’s location quietly disappeared in a way not unlike his Annapolis possessions. Eden remained forgotten for almost 200 years, until the Colonial Revival movement sparked a successful search for Eden’s body and prompted its reburial in St. Anne’s on June 5, 1926. His new tomb (fig. 14) was designed by Howard Still and architect J. Appleton Wilson, who also worked on the

222 Ibid. Newspapers did not cover the death until November. For information on Harford in Annapolis after Eden’s death, see Vera Foster Rollo, “Henry Harford – One of Maryland History’s ‘Lost Ones’ for 200 Years,” in *Maryland Historical Magazine* vol. 80 no. 2 (1985), 193.

223 St. Margaret’s Church burned down three separate times in the nineteenth century. Eden was buried in the churchyard of the 1731 structure known as St. Margaret’s Church on the Severn River. After the 1803 fire, the congregation moved to the Broadneck Peninsula in 1827 in a new building, which burned again accidentally in 1851. A brick church replaced it, but also succumbed to fire in 1892. “History/Archives,” St. Margaret’s Episcopal Church Website. http://www.st-margarets.org/history-and-archives.html; last accessed: 16 February 2017.
restoration of the State House’s Old Senate Chamber. Even in death, Eden would always be tied to the material world of Annapolis.

GENERATIONAL IMPACTS OF DISPOSSESSION: THE EDEN FAMILY
CONTINUED

For Caroline Eden and her children, Robert Eden’s untimely passing in Annapolis left them without property or immediate support. Even in his report of the death, Shuttleworth’s comments to Eden’s wife inevitably turned to the Maryland claims case, acknowledging a rumor that the state’s General Assembly considered settling Eden’s case a week after his death (though ultimately it would not be resolved for several more months). Shuttleworth advised Caroline to write to the commissioners herself and emphasize her helplessness and care for her children, but offered no hope on the Maryland case because, “Harford after all his expense has been able to get no one thing favorable to his interest done, nor will, people dislike him.”

Almost immediately, merchants descended on Eden’s widow, requesting payment on bonds, and ignoring pleas of postponement. One wrote, “I am not more satisfied with your Letters of the 5th Instant, than I was with your former,” adding, “I must conclude you have no intention of doing credit to your husband’s memory” if the

224 As far as their claim went, “The death or departure of a recipient became an automatic excuse for ceasing or lessening the support allotted to his family, and once a name had been removed from the list it was practically impossible to persuade the Lords to restore it.” Norton, 112.

225 J. Shuttleworth to Lady Caroline Eden, 4 December 1784. Box 3/3. EFP.
bonds were not paid.226 Caroline sold the London house on Clarges Street three years after Eden’s death. Merchant Jonathan Davison, the author of the threatening letter, was listed as one of the sellers, suggesting that he had taken part of Eden’s property as compensation.

In her letters to her husband during his lifetime, and in the proceeding legal documents, the case of Caroline’s lost Annapolis property and income loomed largely over the rest of her life. Caroline turned to others for survival, staying with her sister-in-law at Lambeth Palace, or apartments in Hampton Court. Apart from her continuation of the claims case discussed earlier, Caroline replaced Robert Eden in the social and economic networks, particularly among his witness claimants, Jonathan Boucher, Thomas Eden, and Robert Smith, all of whom loaned the family money and assumed guardianship or mentorship of the Edens’ three children. All three men later acted as executors in her will, and were referred to as “assured friends.”227 Beginning the same year as Eden’s death, Caroline’s accounts are a comparably meticulous record of spending. Though the British claims commissioners refused to continue Robert’s allowance after his death, Caroline received £10,000 upon Henry Harford’s award of £70,000 for property loss in Maryland. She spent the minimum of the allotment required for maintaining her position in society, including £1,000 of which

226 Jonathan Davison to Lady Caroline Eden, 15 July 1785. Box 2/5. EFP.

227 “Will of The Honorable Dame Caroline Eden formerly Caroline Calvert, Widow,” 15 April 1805. PROB 11/1390/304. NA.
for herself to procure a house in Bath and furnish it. Caroline invested most of it in stock and spent the final years of her life arranging for the future financial security of her children, ultimately leaving each £8,000. Caroline’s experience compliments previous scholarship on Loyalist confiscation claims primarily concerning the lost property’s financial value. She did not view her identity as personally connected to Maryland, but Robert Eden did. While the former governor no doubt also felt the financial ramifications of the confiscation, the loss of the objects he associated with his identity expand our notions of the diverse impacts of Revolutionary confiscation.

The effects of dispossession did not end with Caroline and Robert Eden. Their oldest son, Frederick Morton Eden, kept a journal throughout his life that revealed the generational impact of the dispossession case. In his assessment of the journals, the current Lord Eden commented, “Interestingly, on the pages facing the diary entries there is recorded every single penny of expenditure incurred during that particular week.” Mirroring his mother’s careful monitoring of the family’s diminished expenses, Frederick Morton Eden grew up to be an economist whose 1797 pamphlet, “The State of the Poor,” reflected his sympathy for familial economic collapse. The son’s life would be more reserved than his father’s. He and his wife lived modestly in England with their children. One of their sons would later inherit the family title and Windlestone Hall, uniting the Eden family wealth and finally aiding in the financial recovery of Robert Eden’s descendants.

However, the impact of the dispossession case and decisions made between Robert and Caroline Eden did continue for at least another generation in the family. In an 1810 chancery case, Eden v. Eden, between Frederick Morton Eden’s children, a South Seas Annuities investment made as a gift from Frederick Calvert upon the marriage of his sister and Robert Eden had made impressive returns. The children, to justify their individual rights to this investment, used personal property they received that once belonged to Robert or Caroline Eden as justification, including the portrait of Caroline Eden and her son completed by Charles Willson Peale that once hung in the Annapolis house. Though Frederick Morton Eden had maintained a relationship with Robert Smith, remembering him again in his own will, his children had distanced themselves from this connection. They suggested that Smith had not fully carried out his duties as executor of Caroline Eden’s will, an assertion Smith’s surviving brother disputed. To the new generation of Edens, the personal networks


230 Ibid. Quoted from the will of Frederick Morton Eden: “To my Brother I bequeath my father's Portrait in small full length the Picture of my Mother and Sister in Crayons...To my Sister I bequeath...the Miniature of my Father which I request she will leave at her Death to my eldest Son who may be then living...”

to people had dissipated. However, the connection between the family and their lost objects remained consistently strong over the course of several generations.\(^{232}\)

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the Edens resumed their ties to Annapolis. In 2017, the portraits of the Lords Baltimore were installed in the Rotunda of the Maryland State House. Descendants had sold the portraits in the early twentieth century, but, according to the state’s President of the Senate on the occasion of their installation, their prominent place in Maryland’s seat of government was inspired in part by the Eden family.\(^{233}\) From Robert Eden to his descendants, the Edens’ continued involvement, whether in reclaiming property or the material culture of Annapolis, proposes multi-generational entanglements between humans and dispossessed objects.

\(^{232}\) From Sir Timothy Eden’s attendance and remarks at Sir Robert Eden’s reburial in 1926 to Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden’s visit to Annapolis over twenty years later, bonds between family and a place inhabited by an ancestor for less than a decade marks a personal impact of the lost possessions, long after the financial recovery of their economic value had occurred. “Mr. Eden’s Speech,” Aberdeen Press and Journal, 17 April 1943. British Newspaper Archive.

\(^{233}\) Thomas V. Mike Miller, Jr., Maryland Senate President, “Dedication of Lords Baltimore Portraits” (speech, Annapolis, MD, 24 March 2017).
Chapter 5
REMEMBERING EDEN: OLD OBJECTS, NEW NARRATIVES

In her article on the interpretation of an English country house demolished in 1953, Karen Fielder argued:

More than 60 years after the demolition there is still a palpable sense of the absent building, even without formal interpretation. This derives not only from physical signals but also from more intangible prompts to the imagination. Perversely, I suggest it is the presence of the absent building that invites a particular kind of engagement with this house and its narratives.

Much like Fielder’s argument on memory as interpretative narrative, the Eden-Jennings House in Annapolis survives through the pieces that remain; architectural ruins for Fielder, confiscated furnishings for Eden. The temptation for humans to find material souvenirs reflects a desire to remember, even if it is a memory that is altered by acts of distortion like demolition, confiscation, or censorship.

Portraits, a bookplate, and a sedan chair, all with oral histories tying them to Robert Eden, carry meanings and interpretations that evolved over the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries. By examining objects that have either lost their connection to Eden or now claim a relationship to the proprietary governor, an epilogue to the entanglement of owners and their objects in cases of dispossession

completes the study of his confiscation case. Unlike other colonial governors who
developed their reputation through political action, Eden engaged mostly with the
material world and is consequentially remembered primarily through it. Through
studying how he is interpreted in contemporary museums, we can add to the
complexity of the American view of a Loyalist narrative, and raise questions about
relics that invoke nostalgia for the losing side of the war.

In the new United States after Eden’s death, the man, his family, and his
belongings disappeared into history. Perhaps it is an unsurprising result of a “quiet
confiscation,” an informal series of illegal confiscations of Loyalist property that was
unpublicized.235 He may have been forgotten by many nineteenth-century Marylanders
because they had no tactile object to remember him by. Even his house, intended to
symbolize his social and political power, overshadowed Eden with the image of the
state governor as the head of the state. Finally, in 1902, Eden’s house was demolished
by the United States Naval Academy and, with it, the most prominent material
memory of the former governor. However, beginning with Bernard Steiner’s 1898
article published in *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political
Science*, an unexpected resurgence in interest in Eden and his property occurred.
Tabulating the number of times Robert Eden is mentioned in *The Maryland Historical
Magazine* after it began publication in 1906 reveals rising and falling interest in Eden
throughout the twentieth century to coincide with the Colonial Revival and the

235 Confiscation tactics in the American Revolution are discussed in Chapter 3.
Bicentennial (fig. 15). In an era of American antique collecting, interest in Eden and his material surroundings resurged in academia and local history. However, with few actual artifacts belonging to Eden known to survive, Colonial Revival collectors paid him less attention than other colonial governors. The desire to associate relics with individual figures persisted, however, and when Maryland historians began to turn their attention to the last proprietary governor in the early twentieth century, objects of dubious provenance began to surface as well.

My assertion that Eden’s memory as a Loyalist has been misrepresented by his relics is situated in object narrative theory, or the concept that things have the power to author history. Historians like Giorgio Riello argue that things *cum* artefacts (a transition from used to venerated that happens at a certain point in some objects’ history) are primary texts. When they are incorporated with methodology and the historical narrative, objects can reveal significant stories. However, while objects

---

236 When I describe my research on Maryland’s last proprietary governor, people frequently assume I am working on Eden predecessor, Horatio Sharpe. Robert Eden is still rarely the first governor to be recalled in the popular mindset of Maryland historians and enthusiasts. Historically, Sharpe was a more politically-involved and effective governor, but this does not seem to entirely answer why he would overshadow Eden in a chronological line-up. I hypothesize that it may be because of lack of surviving property. Items belonging to Sharpe, including the set of chairs discussed in Chapter 2, his sword, and, most of all, his country estate, Whitehall, keep a tangible link between living Marylanders and their past, via Sharpe.

can tell some stories, they inevitably mask others in the process. What is unsaid when we interpret an object? Through misattribution or reattribution of Eden’s furnishings, humans and things worked together to craft new narratives, creating a focused lens on one aspect of the past.

Eden’s early-twentieth century champions, namely biographers Bernard Steiner (1867-1926) and Rosamond Randall Beirne (1894-1969), created object narratives through romanticizing the past or “relic-izing” objects relating to the governor. Steiner concluded his 1898 biography with nostalgia for the forgotten governor, remarking on his lost grave, “The church long since was burned, and in the cemetery there, in an unknown grave, lies that true gentleman, the last Provincial Governor of Maryland.” Steiner required objects to paint the picture of the man. He corresponded with Eden descendants, who searched Windlestone Hall for likenesses of the governor or any of his belongings (apart from the Charles Willson Peale portrait, they were unsuccessful). Later, Rosamond Randall Beirne focused on Maryland architecture, and attempted to bring attention to Eden’s house, establishing it as a lost masterpiece by architect William Buckland.


239 Beirne later disagreed with herself on this assertion. Her work is published in *Maryland Historical Magazine* (see bibliography for article citations). For more information on her life, consult the Papers of Rosamond Randall Beirne (MC 826). Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University, Boston, MA.
acknowledged the loss of his objects, while still attempting to prescribe object narratives. Their concluding notes on Eden focused on the tragedy of his lost grave and his lost house; in short, his lost property.

THE GOVERNOR’S MANSION

While Eden may have spent the bulk of the nineteenth century in obscurity, his house continued to serve as the state governor’s mansion until 1866. Ironically, it functioned as a symbol of the state. First Lady Esther Lowe, who lived in the house from 1851 to 1854, recalled:

Never can I forget our entrance into that grand old colonial mansion . . . situated upon Annapolis Bay just where the beautiful Severn joins it. A broad expanse of water as far as [the] eye could reach was the view from the spacious back porch; only the outlines of Kent Island to interrupt it. The structure was built of English brick; a main building and at each end a wing—-one used as a breakfast room, the other as library. A large hall of entrance separated dining and drawing rooms and at the end of the hall a large semi-circular room, extending the entire width of the building, was used on special occasions—-such as State dinners given each week—-necessarily requiring a spacious room. The garden sloping gradually to the water was most attractive. Two immense fig trees, so large that children, and even grown persons, could sit in their branches. Bushels of figs were gathered from these trees and supplies sent to friends in Baltimore who like ourselves enjoyed the luscious fruit.  

Much of Eden’s original landscaping remained intact during Lowe’s tenure. The function of the rooms described in Chapter 2 also remained the same; the two most

public spaces appeared on either end of the hall, and the Long Room, or “large semi-circular room” by Lowe’s description, continued its purpose for large, public functions. Later photographs of the house suggest that the state made few alterations to the exterior. In total, thirty-one governors and their families lived in the Governor’s Mansion after Eden’s departure.

In 1869, the state sold the colonial building to the United States Naval Academy. The academy was established in Annapolis in 1845, and after the Civil War, a new superintendent launched a campaign to restore the expanding grounds. The USNA’s purchase of the governor’s residence caused very little public attention and the state promptly began construction of the current governor’s residence, a Colonial Revival structure near the Maryland State House. Meanwhile, the Eden-Jennings House at last underwent dramatic structural interior changes, both exterior (fig. 16) and interior (fig. 17), serving as the Superintendent’s Office and Library for the USNA.

At the time, Eden’s residence was not the only colonial structure to undergo a sizeable renovation in Annapolis. The Old Senate Chamber in the Maryland State House underwent a similar landscaping in 1769. “The garden is not extensive, but it is disposed to the utmost advantage; the center walk is terminated by a small green mount, close to which the Severn approaches; this elevation commands an extensive view of the bay and the adjacent country.” William Eddis, Letters from America (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1969), 12.

Paul J. Fitzpatrick, “Royal Governors’ Residences in the Original 13 American Colonies” in Social Science vol.46 no. 2 (April 1971), 76.
House, where Eden once attended his friend, George Washington’s resignation, lost many of its original architectural features in what would be known to Colonial Revival architectural historians as “the desecration.” The fashionable city with a building boom in the 1770s underwent another reconstruction campaign almost exactly one hundred years later. These alterations triggered regret and a local early acceptance of the Colonial Revival movement. By this time, Eden was already a nearly-forgotten figure. Early efforts to save structures focused on those that fit into the founding fathers’ legacy. The Eden-Jennings House did not receive the same sort of attention, and, ultimately, was demolished by the United States Naval Academy in 1901 because “it interfered with the Academy’s General Plan.” It was replaced with one of the largest dormitories in the country, Bancroft Hall, constructed in the Beaux Arts style present throughout the rest of the grounds.

EDEN’S OBJECTS: LEGACY RELATIONSHIPS

With his house demolished, it is Eden’s personal possessions that provide the most intriguing discussion on dispossession and object-owner entanglement. Since the confiscation of his Annapolis property, Eden’s furnishings have fit into three large

---

243 Riley, a local historian, called the renovations "an act of historic sacrilege" and "stood in the midst of the Chamber, when the desecration was in progress, and declared: 'This ought not to be done.'" Elihu Samuel Riley, *A History of the General Assembly of Maryland, 1634-1904* (Baltimore: Nunn & Co. Publishers, 1905), 391.

244 Fitzpatrick, 76.
themes: new objects reproducing original Eden belongings, old objects that have lost their ties to Eden, and old objects that have adopted the Eden provenance as their own.

Representations of Robert Eden in portraiture reflect themes of objects reproducing artefacts actually owned by the governor, referred to here as “legacy objects.” Four portraits survived in the family until at least 1809, when they were described in Frederick Morton Eden’s will: both Charles Willson Peale’s and Nathaniel Dance’s full-length paintings of Robert Eden, Peale’s miniature of the governor, and the pastel of Caroline Eden. However, even with the original objects no longer in existence, reproductions or new artistic interpretations have since taken their place to preserve and archive a memory of the objects.

The Charles Willson Peale full-length portrait of Robert Eden that once hung in his Annapolis mansion was last documented in possession of descendant Frederick Morton Eden (1829-1917) in York. It was rumored to have since been destroyed during World War II, a tragically fitting end for an object whose creation began in the tensions of war. However, the Peale portrait has since become one of the most artistically influential images of Eden, reproduced in at least three different formats in

---


246 Last known provenance: “F.A. Morton Eden, York, England (damaged in World War II and whereabouts unknown).” Sir Robert Eden, Governor of Maryland, #3107100126340. FAR. Previous research by author in 2014-2015 did not reveal evidence that the Peale portrait or the Dance portrait remained in any direct branch of the Eden family.
the twentieth and twenty-first century. Prior to the portrait’s disappearance, Bernard Steiner requested a stereoscopic reproduction from Frederick Morton Eden to publish in his 1898 article, an image recreated, and now preserved in the Frick’s Photoarchive in New York.247

One of the most influential reproductions of the portrait occurred in 1914. The Maryland Board of Public Works was in the beginning stages of adding to their state art collection, employing various artists to travel to institutions holding original images of Maryland founding fathers and paint reproductions of the images throughout most of the twentieth century. However, for one of their first commissions, the Senate did not elect a portrait of a Patriot hanging in Peale’s former museum in Philadelphia, but rather turned back to England and the Peale portrait of their last proprietary governor (fig. 18). Florence MacKubin, the first female artist commissioned by the state, was charged with the task.248 Rather than copying Peale’s image exactly, MacKubin’s final product was a quarter-length portrait of Eden in his Coldstream Guards uniform. He looks younger than in Peale’s portrait and his friendly appearance renders him nearly cartoonish. The subject sits in front of a brown,

247 Ibid. See also Robert Allan Eden (1839-1912) Correspondence with Dr. Bernard Steiner, 1893-1909, MS 2805. MHS.

248 Along with the portrait of Robert Eden, MacKubin was commissioned to replicate two portraits of the Lords Baltimore. All three paintings were located at Windlestone Hall. "MacKubin, Florence". The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography (1916), 293.
nondescript background rather than the stormy classical scene Peale selected in 1775. MacKubin’s background adds to the approachability of the subject, who no longer looked down on the viewer, but vaguely at them like an equal; rather than calling up his hierarchy and military power, the sitter could be anywhere. On an upper-right corner of the portrait, she added the crest of the Eden family, in a fashion adopted from English court portraiture in the seventeenth century, but one Peale, the avid Patriot, would not have chosen for his own portraits.  

MacKubin’s portrait, as the only known surviving image of Robert Eden, attracts interest among a new generation of Revolutionary historians and curators. In the 2015 restoration and exhibit of the Old Senate Chamber, Eden’s MacKubin portrait was exhibited alongside Maryland war heroes, and directly across from a newly commissioned image by Kenneth Woest of the resignation, featuring Eden in his Coldstream Guards uniform. It is a recognizable visual to a contemporary viewer of a character now reassessed and reintegrated into the history of colonial Maryland. Though a reproduction, Eden’s sole surviving likeness is the MacKubin portrait and, as such, it has the power to influence contemporary reinterpretations of Eden.

______________________________


EDEN’S OBJECTS: DISASSOCIATION

Not all of Eden’s objects were so prominently associated with the historic figure. Most objects associated with Robert Eden’s Annapolis house hold no firmly identifying factors of past ownership and, like many antiques, have long-since lost their provenance. These objects represent a second history to Robert Eden’s memory: what has been forgotten.

To return to the world of paintings, while Robert Eden is depicted in the Kenneth Woest mural of George Washington’s resignation, the three other images of the event pointedly do not include Eden: John Trumbull’s General George Washington Resigning His Commission (1824), Edwin White’s Washington Resigning His Commission (1858), and Francis Blackwell Mayer’s George Washington Surrendering His Commission (1883). While Mayer’s crowd is blurred and largely indistinguishable, Trumbull and White both followed their commission instructions to include figures thought to be in attendance. All the subjects, including those who were historically present like Thomas Jefferson and Charles Carroll of Carrollton and those who were not like Martha Washington, were figures of importance to the Patriot cause.

and “founding father” mythology that gripped a nineteenth-century audience in the thrall of history paintings and literary romanticism.

Trumbull’s painting became the central image associated with the resignation and the identified characters are still overwhelmingly considered by the public to be the people who were actually present. Commissioned for the United States Capitol Rotunda, Trumbull was aware of the need for an accurate representation of the event. He visited the Old Senate Chamber in 1822 and completed a sketch of the room, even noting on the back of the sketch “Eden – 35 / Harford – 27”, an (inaccurate) record of their ages in 1783 (fig. 19). Eden and Harford were the only names recorded on the document, yet Trumbull did not include either. Instead, figures who were not historically present but were more recognizable, like Martha Washington and James Madison, replaced them. The characters Trumbull chose to depict were written into a scene whereas Eden was literally painted out.

The gap in history in which Eden is largely ignored makes the appearance of Eden objects – whether reproduced like the MacKubin portrait or supposedly surviving originals - in the twentieth century unexpected. The associated nostalgia

\[252\] Study of the State House at Annapolis (verso), 1822. Yale University Art Gallery, New Haven, CT.

\[253\] Trumbull justified the inclusion of these characters to Madison, “that I may have all the Virginia Presidents, I have taken the liberty…of placing you among the Spectators – It is a Painter’s licence, which I think the occasion may well justify.” Helen A. Cooper, John Trumbull: The Hand and Spirit of a Painter (New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 1982), 89.
between Eden and his objects is even more surprising when only a small percentage of furnishings in his inventories could be quantified as “personally identifiable,” or representative of Eden in some unique way. What is to be remembered when the objects disappear? Labels and provenance are significant to historians and material culturists, but interpretation of Robert Eden seems to be an outlier. While objects with little connection to Eden derive their primary interpretation from their relationship to him, others, like a bookplate with known provenance remain little-known or regarded.

While Eden’s furniture had no obvious distinguishing factors marking his claim of ownership, a case study of his disassociated property can be found in the bookplate collection of early twentieth-century collector William Augustus Brewer, now at the University of Delaware. Brewer purchased or removed bookplates from their books, valuing them for their marks of ownership or artistic merit. His collection reached across all professions of notable people and items of artistic interest, with its strength being in nineteenth-century British cultural figures like Charles Dodgson or Charles Dickens. One of Brewer’s bookplates, however, is an engraving of the Eden coat of arms and a printed signature underneath of “Robert Eden Bar[one]t.” (fig. 20), suggesting that it was added into Robert Eden’s library after his return to England in 1776 when he received his title. Ever the product of Brewer’s wife, Augusta LaMotte Brewer also collected bookplates after her husband’s death. Of their acquisition habits, she explained, “My collection was acquired largely through gifts and exchange.” “City Woman’s Rare Book Plates Acclaimed,” 30 March 1940. Sunday Morning Star, Wilmington, DE. William Augustus Brewer Bookplate Collection File. UD.

---

254 Brewer’s wife, Augusta LaMotte Brewer also collected bookplates after her husband’s death. Of their acquisition habits, she explained, “My collection was acquired largely through gifts and exchange.” “City Woman’s Rare Book Plates Acclaimed,” 30 March 1940. Sunday Morning Star, Wilmington, DE. William Augustus Brewer Bookplate Collection File. UD.
eighteenth-century genteel society, Eden was known for an impressive library of French books and an interest in learning. A single 1775 letter by Eden to the Colonial Office included references to philosophers Montesquieu, John Locke, and Sir William Blackstone.

Presumably then, his library would be an object tied to the former proprietary governor. However, in this case, Eden’s signature is not enough. Though the bookplate is the only known object in public circulation with a definitive tie to Robert Eden, it is one of the least known and least considered. For contemporary historians and museum goers, the bookplate is less appealing than objects that do not have as clear a provenance. It is not the objects’ veracity that is most valued, but rather whether it can reflect the charismatic personality of the former owner that he became popular for in twentieth-century scholarship.

EDEN’S OBJECTS: ADOPTIVE NARRATIVES

In contrast to the forgotten narratives that are often a result of “quiet confiscation” cases, some objects have proclaimed a provenance to Robert Eden when there is no evidence to prove this lineage, referred to here as objects with adoptive narratives. These types of objects, when their provenance is proven to be questionable, are often dismissed by historians or art historians as inauthentic. However, I argue that the interpretation of these so-called relics still makes them a significant point of study.

for the Eden story and the larger Loyalist narrative. Even long after Eden’s death, his associational relationships with his objects are so strong, that new objects step in to fill the place of the ones that are missing in order to continue telling the story.

When Chesapeake history enthusiasts are asked about Robert Eden, their first thought is nearly always of the sedan chair at the Maryland Historical Society (fig. 21). Per oral legend, the sedan chair was used by Robert Eden on his final trip from the Eden-Jennings House to the Fowey. It was among the objects left on the dock for the three uncertain days before abandoned by the ship. Supporters of the sedan chair’s provenance argue that it does not appear in the inventories because of its location on the dock, as well as the likelihood that it would have been in the central passage of the house, which was not clearly inventoried in the 1776, 1781, or 1789 inventories. It then may have been picked up by a Loyalist sympathizer and preserved over the years until resurfacing in an unspecified Wilmington, Delaware antiques shop around the beginning of the twentieth century. The seller asserted that it was used by “one of the last Governors of Baltimore,” suggesting either Horatio Sharpe or Robert Eden owned it. Alexia du Pont Ortiz de Bie, a relative of collector Henry Francis du Pont, donated the sedan chair to the Maryland Historical Society in 1951. Not long after, the oral legend of Eden’s fateful ride to the Fowey spread. By the third quarter of the twentieth

256 Sedan Chair Curatorial File. MHS.
century, the sedan chair was displayed next to an Eden-like mannequin figure in an exhibit.\footnote{257}

An in-depth examination of the sedan chair gives the impression of the occupant’s wealth and status. Remnants of the original interior silk upholstery remain, with at least one later upholstery campaign over it. The roof of the chair is topped with carved, gilded plumes on each corner and a crown in the center, suggesting that the owner may have had some professional or personal connection to the British government. Putti completed in cast composition and rococo-style painted scenes appear on the exterior surface. Even for an expensive object like a sedan chair, this is comparably extravagant. The construction techniques and roof of the vehicle suggest that it was English-manufactured rather than the more fashionable French varieties.\footnote{258} Its survival, no matter its provenance, is remarkable and possible American lineage makes it one of only two surviving colonial sedan chairs.\footnote{259} However, it is the object’s possible tie to Robert Eden that attracts the most public attention.

Viewers are captivated by how the grandeur of a sedan chair matches the flamboyant personality reconstructed from Eden’s surviving correspondence. When

\footnote{257}{“10-Year Project: Historical Society’s Costumes Span Two Centuries of Nation’s History,” *Baltimore Sun*, 2 June 1970. MSA.}

\footnote{258}{Sedan Chair Curatorial File. MHS.}

\footnote{259}{Ibid. The other known sedan chair belonged to Governor Winthrop in Massachusetts. While it does not survive, Benjamin Franklin was also known to own a sedan chair.}
Francis Blackwell Mayer incorporated the object into his romanticized painting, *Annapolis in 1750* (fig. 22), he captured the sense of nostalgia that the sedan chair inspires among its viewers. However, amid the extravagant scene, an enslaved man carries the sedan chair, a power differential that artist Fred Wilson would later emphasize in his 1992 groundbreaking exhibit, *Mining the Museum* at the Maryland Historical Society, the last time the vehicle was publicly displayed. For the sedan chair to adopt a narrative long-forgotten by the owners of objects with possibly stronger provenances, a sense of social-historical complexity emerges. It evokes nostalgia for a romanticized past, but also a reminder of the forms of repression required for the movement of these vehicles in many American colonies. Importantly for Eden, the sedan chair is an object of transport. The rider inside the chair does not control its path; it must be moved by others. For a historic figure who is most remembered for his departure, it is unsurprising that the object most strongly associated with Robert Eden is a vehicle, and the one, at least according to legend, that he rode to the dock.

Wilson’s juxtaposition of seemingly unrelated objects in singular arrangements illuminated the untold stories of the Maryland Historical Society’s collection, particularly as it related to African American histories. He played with provenance, questioning whether it should be privileged in museums, a question particularly relevant to the sedan chair. The artistic curation of *Mining the Museum* raised questions of museum interpretation that we continue to discuss several decades later. See: “What We Talk About When We Talk About Race: *Mining the Museum* After 20 Years” (panel session at the annual meeting of the American Alliance of Museums, Baltimore, MD, May 22, 2013).
Since his departure on the *Fowey* in 1776 into the present day, Eden had no control over the interpretation of his Annapolis furnishings. For a person who so intentionally aimed to craft a personal and professional identity through the furnishing of his Annapolis home, the act of confiscation was a catastrophic one. However, the subversive continuation of exerting power over Eden continues with the interpretation of the objects he may have owned. The historic narrative is dominated by the authors of the interpretations, and how we view the objects today is derived from acts of confiscation that occurred two centuries ago.

**CONCLUSION**

Robert Eden’s confiscation case is one case study for understanding dispossession as a tactic of war. For the Loyalist narrative, the research uncovered here calls for a revisiting of the diverse methods employed in confiscation acts and the long-term effect beyond financial and social disempowerment that impacted not only the Loyalist family, but the larger origin story of the American Revolution. Dispossession is a personal story. Object narratives of surviving materials believed to relate to Loyalist confiscation should be examined not only as Patriot exercises of power, but also with consideration towards how their former owner, branded as a Loyalist, may have conceptualized their belongings both prior to and after dispossession.

Studying the act of dispossession in any context highlights the entanglement of people and their objects. When the original owner is removed from their possessions, the materials often persist. While sometimes the objects are completely disassociated
from the owner, new objects fill their place in the narrative. The owner’s intention and personality can be confiscated in the same act, and may live on even when the objects do not. Material culture studies should and have included reminders by scholars that the field cannot be limited to the study of what survives. Whether focused on an object or a narrative, dispossession prompts repossession by a new owner. The re-possessor’s interpretation of the object adds a new layer to the object’s narrative that clouds the original owner’s proposed identity. In turn, the dispossessed feel their own entanglement over their possessions on economic, social, and personal levels. This entanglement stretches beyond the original owner and their immediate family to their descendants, the community in which the act took place, and those who now possess the objects, whether knowingly or not.

Robert Eden was an actor in a global material world experiencing upheaval as a result of the Revolutionary War. Among the medieval streets of his childhood home in Durham, he first entered a Georgian townhouse. In Surrey, he renovated. In Annapolis, he renovated again. The “castle building” that concerned Caroline Eden almost single-handedly bankrupted a mercantile firm and endangered several craftsmen to create a palace fit for not only a governor, but a proprietor.²⁶¹ Had Robert Eden’s life gone the way that he envisioned upon his arrival to Annapolis in 1769, perhaps the objects would have stayed in the Eden-Jennings House. Instead, the act of confiscation irrevocably changed Eden and how he would be remembered. However,

²⁶¹ Lady Caroline Eden to Sir Robert Eden, 20 July 1783. Box 3/1. EFP.
one thing remains how Robert Eden, the debtor, the aspirational tastemaker, and the last proprietary governor, would have wished it. For better or worse, he will always be remembered through his objects.
Annapolis was laid out with streets emerging like spokes from two central circles; the larger of the two is the State House and the smaller is the church. The red rectangular outline indicates Eden’s house and dependencies. Red triangles on the map approximate where extant colonial houses are located, demonstrating Eden’s proximity to members of Annapolis society. Stars represent public buildings: the State House, St. Anne’s Church, and the Assembly Rooms. Blue shaded elements of the map highlights United States Naval Academy property in Annapolis today.

Figure 2  Whitehall First Floor Plan

Figure 3  Eden-Jennings House Devised Floor Plan

Figure 4  3 South Bailey (Haughton House) Staircase

Figure 5  3 South Bailey (Haughton House) Interior Meeting Room

Figure 6  3 South Bailey (Haughton House) Exterior

Figure 7  “Ashtead House, Farm Lane (c.1740),”  D. Yellan (1962)

Figure 8   Side Chairs

Figure 9  “Government House at Annapolis from Rutland Wharf,” Benjamin Ogle (c.1800)

Figure 10  Material Analysis of Lost Objects in Eden-Jennings House Inventories

Figure 11 “Piece of Glass Chandelier Hanging in Ball Room when Washington danced there with Mrs. Macubbin.”

Source: Collection of Maryland State Archives. Special Collections (George Forbes Collection), “Piece of Glass Chandelier Hanging in Ball Room when Washington danced there with Mrs. Macubbin”, MSA SC 182-01-515.
Figure 12  Photograph of Sir Robert Eden, Baronet, Nathaniel Dance (c.1776-1783)

Figure 13  Stereo card of *Sir Robert Eden, Governor of Maryland*, Charles Willson Peale (1775)

Source: *Sir Robert Eden, Governor of Maryland*. Charles Willson Peale (American; 1741-1827), Annapolis, MD; 1775. Stereo card of oil on canvas. Courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library, Record #b1119587.
Figure 14  Grave of Robert Eden

Figure 15   Timeline of Mentions of Robert Eden in Volumes of *Maryland Historical Magazine*

Figure 16  Second United States Naval Academy Chapel and part of old Blake Row (c.1885)

The Eden-Jennings House is the middle building.

Source: “Second United States Naval Academy Chapel and part of old Blake Row,” Annapolis, MD; c.1885. Photograph. Special Collections & Archives Department, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy, #5696.
Figure 17  United States Naval Academy Library Interior (1881)

Source: “United States Naval Academy Library Interior.” Annapolis, MD; 1881. Photograph. Special Collections & Archives Department, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy, #6046.
Figure 18  *Sir Robert Eden*, Florence MacKubin (1914)

Figure 19  Maryland State House, Annapolis (recto and verso), John Trumbull (1822)

Figure 20  *Sir Robert Eden Bart. Bookplate*

Figure 21  Sedan Chair
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Figure 22  *Annapolis in 1750*, Francis Blackwell Mayer (1876)
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Appendix A

“AN INVENTORY OF THE HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE &C OF HIS EXCELLENCY ROBT EDEN ESQR. LEFT ON HIS DEPARTURE IN HIS DWELLING HOUSE AT THE CITY OF ANNAPOLIS TAKEN THE 26TH DAY OF JUNE 1776 VIZT.”

Italicized items indicate that they do not appear in the 1781 inventory.

### 1. Store Room
- 10 long handled scrubbing Brushes @3/6 £11.10.0
- 1 Loaded one 0.5.0
- 4 Clamps 0.6.0
- 2 long handled Hair brooms @5/ 0.10.0
- 2 Painted Hearth Brooms @5/ 0.10.0
- 1 Pier Glass Mahogany frame 6.0.0
- 1 Box of - , 1 Small Bag of Harts 2.0.0
- Horn Shavings 1.0.0
- 2 Case Bottles of Capers 55.5.0
- 9 Loaves of double refined Sugar wt 671 @3/6 11.19.6
- 40 Bushels fine Salt @10/ 20.0.0
- 28 Small pictures framed & Glazed @5/ 7.0.0
- 4 Street Door Lamps @40/ 8.0.0
- 2 Globe Glass Lanthorns with Brass work for hanging @60/ 6.0.0
- 4 long Glass Candle shades @25/ 5.0.0

### 2. Coachman’s Bed Room
- 1 Feather Bed 1 Bolster & 1 Pillow 5.10.0
- 1 Blanket & 1 Rug 2.0.0
- 1 Sacking bottom Bedstead 2.0.0
- 2 New Velvet Jocky Caps 4.0.0
- 1 Hunting Saddle 5.0.0
- 4 ditto with polished steel stirrups 20.0.0
- 1 Womans Hunting Saddle with furniture 4.0.0
- 2 Snaffel plated Bridles 2.10.0
- 11 Fly Netts made of white Twine fringed 5.10.0

### 3. Boys Bed Room
- 1 Feather Bed and 1 Pillow 3.0.0
- 1 Plank Bottom’d Bedstead 0.7.6
- 1 Rug and 1 Blanket 1.0.0
- 2 Old Bedsteads 4.7.6

### 4. Long Garrett
- 1 Large polished steel Stove with an open fret work Fender 10.10.0
- 1 Small ditto with plain Fender 6.0.0
- 1 Common stove 1.10.0
- 2 pair large Dog Irons and 2 pair small ditto 7.0.0
- 4 Sets fire Shovels Tongs and Pokers @25/ 5.0.0

Amot. Carried over 30.0.0
Amount brought over 129.13.0

[f]ilegible] Leather Screw 6.0.0
[f]ilegible] Windsor Chairs 2.0.0
3 old Wilton Carpets 6.0.0
1 Cloaths Horse & 1 Iron Fender 3.10.0
1 Feather Bed & Bolster 4.0.0
1 old Bedstead 0.10.0
Sundry old picture frames 3.0.0
1 Large equal Altitude Instrument and

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Curb Steel Bitted Bridle</td>
<td>0.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Portmantua Saddle with pad &amp; straps</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Rase Saddle</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apparatus</strong></td>
<td><strong>333.0.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Servant mans Bed Room</strong></td>
<td><strong>388.0.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Corded Bedstead, flock mattrass, Bolster, 1 Rug, 1 Windsor Chair</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Servant Woman's Bed Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large Chest containing...</td>
<td>7.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 stuff damask window curtains</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5yds Wilton Carpet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sets of Tent bed furniture of Red and White check</td>
<td>8.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sets of Check Covers for large Sofias</td>
<td>6.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Red and White Check Window Curtains</td>
<td>4.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hammer Cloth for Coach</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Large Chair Check Covers</td>
<td>4.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Small ditto</td>
<td>1.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest [End Chest Contents]</td>
<td>1.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large Easy Chair with Stuff back &amp; Elbows</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany dressing Table</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Swinging dressing Glass</td>
<td>1.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ditto in Walnut frame</td>
<td>0.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany Nights Stool</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ditto</td>
<td>0.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Guitar and Case</td>
<td>5.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair fire Shovel Tongs and fender</td>
<td>1.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sacking Bottom Bedstead</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Closest in said Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 large Blankets @25/</td>
<td>22.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 White Cotton Counterpains @60/</td>
<td>6.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Compleat Sett of Red and White Check Bed furniture for a 4 post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sets Japan'd dressing Boxes</td>
<td>7.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Earthen Chamber pots</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wash hand Basons and Bottles</td>
<td>0.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 flesh Brushes</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pair Venician Blinds</td>
<td>3.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mrs. Eden's Dressing Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feather Bed and Bolster</td>
<td>6.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large flock Mattress</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sacking Bottom'd Bedstead</td>
<td>2.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany dressing Table</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large ditto Chair</td>
<td>1.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amot. carried over</td>
<td>16.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount brought up</td>
<td>601.13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. His Excellency's Bed Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany 4 post Bedstead with white Dimothy furniture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ornamented Cornice with Vases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Passage adjoining his Excellency's Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Oval pier Glasses in White carved frames</td>
<td>14.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany Cloaths press</td>
<td>12.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ditto Cooler and Stand</td>
<td>7.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Small Moco pictures framed and Glazed</td>
<td>8.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bed Room, head Best Stairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany 4 post Bedstead with Green and White furniture</td>
<td>15.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feather Bed, 1 Bolster and pillow and one flock Mattress</td>
<td>9.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large Blanket</td>
<td>1.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large Chintz Counterpain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compleat
1 Large Feather Bed, bolster and pillows 25.0.0
1 ditto dressing Table with Marble Slabs in laid with dove coloured Marble 15.0.0
1 Dressing Glass in swinging frame 3.0.0
1 Damask Window Curtain 3.10.0
2 Sets Venecian Window Blinds 4.10.0
3 Chamber pots & 1 Wash Bottle 0.12.6
59.7.6
Amount carried Over Amount brought over
854.3.0 854.3.0

11. Billard Room
1 Compleat Billard Table with Maces Balls &c. 80.0.0
8 Windsor Chairs 8.0.0
1 long handled hair broom 0.10.0
88.10.0

12. the Bed Room adjoining the Billard Room at the head of the stairs
1 four post Mahogany bedstead with blue & white check furniture 15.0.0
1 feather bed and bolster 8.0.0
2 large mahogany chairs 3.0.0
1 dressing table and glass in a swinging frame 8.0.0
2 flag bottomed chairs 0.15.0
1 wash hand bason and bottle 0.7.6
35.2.6

13. Mr. Smith's Bed Room/Head Back Stairs
1 Four post Mahogany Bedstead 6.0.0
1 Feather Bed, Bolster, pillow and Hair Mattress 10.0.0
1 Pembroke Table 3.0.0
1 Dressing Glass 1.15.0
1 Night Stool 1.0.0
1 Mahogany Chair 1.15.0
2 Reams of Writing Paper 6.0.0
29.10.0

14. Nursery
1 Mahogany Desk 8.0.0
2 large Mahogany Chairs 3.0.0
1 ditto Stool 3.10.0
1 ditto Arm Chair 2.5.0
1 Small Hair Trunk 1.0.0
1 Small looking Glass 1.10.0
2 Check Window Curtains 3.0.0
1 Large Hair Trunk 1.15.0
2 Mahogany Chairs 3.10.0
1 ditto Arm Chair 2.5.0
1 Small Hair Trunk 1.0.0

15. Best Stair Case
1 large square Hall Lanthorn 4.0.0
1 Bell ditto 2.0.0
3 Windsor Chairs 3.0.0
1 Large Hair Trunk 4.0.0
1 Eelligant portrait of Charles 1st Vandike 40.0.0
1 ditto ditto of his Excellency by Peale 40.0.0
1 Painted floor Cloth 5.0.0
98.0.0
Amot. carried up 1144.0.6
Amout brought up 1144.0.6

16. Studdy
2 Handsom Mahogany Book cases 50.0.0
1 ditto Desk and ditto 35.0.0
1 large handsom soffa with check cover 10.0.0
1 mahogany wash hand stand with Glass &c 6.0.0
4 ditto Chairs 8.0.0
2 Small pictures in Gilt frames 10.0.0
119.0.0

17. Gilt Leather Parlour
10 Mahogany chairs with hair bottoms 22.10.0
2 Elbow ditto ditto 6.0.0
2 Mahogany card tables 6.0.0
1 Pembroke ditto 3.0.0
2 Jappand corner Cupboards 2.10.0
2 Crimson Stuff Damask Window Curtains 6.10.0
2 Setts Venecian Window Blinds 4.0.0
1 Pier Glass in a Carved and Gilt frame 16.0.0
1 Dutches 12.0.0
2 China India figures 2.0.0
1 piece of painting representing Dunkirk 15.0.0
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ditto Writing Table</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ditto Chest of Drawers</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Wash hand Stand</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18. Right hand parlour</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>95.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Mahogany Chairs with horsehair bottoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large Mahogany dining table</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mahogany card table</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mahogany fire screen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pier glass in a carve and gilt frame</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 elegant pieces of painting of ruins and water prospects in ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 small ditto of Landscips</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 elegant small Battle pieces in Gilt frames</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ditto representing Shipping..ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Long Room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>160.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Mahogany Chairs with horsehair bottoms</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 large Mahogany Dining Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large Mahogany Cloths Chest</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Small round dining Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Carved claw and pillar Tea Table</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany wine cooler with brass hoops and Stands</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany Candle Stand</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Backgammon Table</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Elegant Iron Dutch Stove</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Handsome Chimney Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Elligent piece of painting of ruins on the breast of the Chimney</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount carried over</td>
<td></td>
<td>135.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>219.06</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1519.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount brought over</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>135.50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1519.06</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 small circular pieces of painting on ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 large handsome pieces of painting waterpieces and Landscapes in</td>
<td>carved and gilt frames</td>
<td>56.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 elegant pieces of painting representing stags</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 ditto representing Rivers landscapes &amp;c in carved gilt frames</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>254.15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>254.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Secretary’s Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Secretary of Mahogany</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sideboard Table with Marbel Slab vased with dove colour'd marble</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Eight day table clock</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 mahogany nest of drawers with folding doors</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 small couch covered with Green and white Check</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Mahogany chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 walnut table</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pine table</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Handsome pictures frames and glazed; representing the death of</td>
<td>General Woolf, and the Marquis of Granby distributing Charity to the Soldier</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 piece of painting Province Arms</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany case with 6 flint Bottles</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large Tin fender</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 large Glass Lanthorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pair small hand Irons</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 fire Shovel and Tongs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hair Trunk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>91.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. Butler’s Pantry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 large french plate Candlesticks</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 small ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 large china bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 small ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 silver table spoons</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 silver punch ladle</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 wash hand glasses, cut</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 doz small dram glasses</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 plain wash hand ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 small glass water bottles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 quart tumbler, cut glass, 1 pint ditto</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 punch glasses with handles, and 3 without handles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 small cut glass chuts</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1/2 dox wine glasses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 quart decanters with ground stops</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount carried up</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1 Doz and 10 Green handles Knives and forks
- 5 large Queen's Ware pitchers: 0.17.6
- 2 Wash hand Basons: 0.5.0
- 2 Mahogany Trays: 2.10.0
- 1 Walnut Desk Bedstead: 7.0.0
- 1 Flock Mattress and pillows: 3.0.0
- 2 Mahogany Plate Baskets with brass handles: 3.0.0
- 1 Flag Bottomed Chair: 0.10.0
- 2 Iron Candlesticks and 1 pair snuffers: 0.7.6
- Amount brought up: 1865.10.6
- Amount brought Over: 62.11.6
- 2 large Carving Knives & 2 forks: 1.5.0
- 11 Green handled Desert Knives & 12 forks: 1.15.0
- 5 Small Silver handled Knives: 1.5.0
- 2 Mahogany Knife Cases lined with Bays: 1.0.0
- 2 Wainscot ditto: 0.7.6
- 3 Tin Spitting Boxes: 0.15.0
- 6 Japand Tin Lamps: 1.2.6
- 4 Leather Decanter stands: 0.17.6
- 1 Japand Bread basket: 0.10.0
- 1 Large Stone Jug: 0.5.0
- 2 Tin Knife Trays: 0.10.0
- 1 Quart pewter pott: 0.4.0
- 1 Silver Wine Strainer: 0.12.0
- Amount carried up: 1865.10.6
- Amount brought Over: 111.8.0
- 2 pair Oznabrig ditto: 2.0.0
- 1 doz damask napkins: 7.10.0
- 10 small ditto: 5.0.0
- 6 Huckaback ditto: 2.5.0
- 3 large new damask table cloths: 10.10.0
- 2 large huckaback ditto: 7.10.0
- 4 damask breakfast cloths: 6.0.0
- 2 old damask napkins: 0.15.0
- 9 small table cloths: 9.0.0
- 4 pillow cases: 1.0.0
- 22 doylers: 3.6.0
- 8 old breakfast cloths: 4.0.0
- 4 large damask table cloths: 12.0.0
- 4 jack towels: 1.10.0
- 6 knife cloths: 0.12.0
- 56 yards oznabrigs @3/: 9.8.0
- 2 large Queen's Ware dishes: 0.15.0
- 11 Middle sized ditto: 2.5.0
- 15 small ditto: 2.5.0
- 24 Soup plates: 1.4.0
- 1 Turine: 0.10.0
- 15 small plates: 0.12.6
- 4 doz plates: 2.0.0
- 7 Butter Boats & stand: 1.1.0
- 1 salad dish and fish strainer: 0.2.0
- 4 scollop shells: 0.4.0
- 4 pie dishes: 1.0.0
- 4 fruit baskets & stands: 2.0.0
- 11 small red & white china: 4.0.0
- 11 silver tea spoons & 2 p. Tea Tongs: 5.0.0
- 1/2 Doz large blue and white china cups and saucers: 1.0.0
- 1/2 doz blue and white coffee ditto: 0.15.0
- 9 blue and white tea cups and saucers: 0.15.0
- 5 china tea pots: 0.15.0
- 1 china bowl and 1 small ditto: 0.8.0
- 1 china pie dish: 0.7.6
- 2 ditto tart pans: 0.7.6
- 13 odd china plates: 2.0.0
- 2 large china dishes: 1.5.0
- 5 small ditto: 1.17.0
- 2 glass sugar dishes: 0.10.0

### 22. Housekeepers Room
- 1 four post Bedstead with blue and white Check furniture: 8.0.0
- 1 Feather Bed and 1 Bolster: 6.0.0
- 2 Blankets and 1 Quilt: 4.5.0
- 1 Mahogany Writing Desk: 5.10.0
- 1 ditto table: 2.10.0
- 1 Iron Stove Shovel and poker: 2.10.0
- 3 Tea Bords: 2.5.0
- 12 pair fine Sheets: 21.12.0
23. Adjoining Housekeepers
Room
1 Mahogany Desk 6.0.0
6 Wood Bottomed Chairs 0.18.0
1 Walnut Table and 2 Coffee Mills 3.0.0
7 Earthen Jars, 1 Stone Jug, 3 Earthen Crocks & 2 Yellow basons 2.3.0
2 Glass Jars, 2 Brass Candlesticks & 1 Iron ditto 0.10.0
Amot. carried up 12.11.0
Amount brought up 2156.15.6

24. In the Kitchen and Scullary
1 Copper fish Kettle and strainer 2.0.0
1 ditto Stue pan and cover 1.0.0
3 Copper Sauce pans two with covers 1.1.0
2 Coffee pots and 1 Chocolate pott 1.10.0
6 Chafing Dishes 2.5.0
4 Tea Kettles 2.0.0
1 copper boiling pot and cover 2.0.0
1 half gallon pot 0.15.0
1 small copper boiler fixed 8.0.0
1 large ditto not fixed 20.0.0
1 skillet and 1 copper coal scuttle 0.18.0
7 pewter water plates 1.15.0
16 pewter plates and 4 dishes 2.7.0
2 large iron pots 1.10.0
2 pair pot hooks 0.10.0
1 iron crane and 6 pot racks 3.0.0
2 grid irons and 2 frying pans 1.10.0
6 trivits and 1 dripping pan and stand 1.10.0
1 smoak jack and 3 iron spits 15.0.0
1 pair large Hand Irons 4.0.0
1 Dutch Oven fixed 8.0.0
4 iron scewers, 1 chopping knife & 1 Bals scewer 0.17.6
4 euckhold scewers 1.0.0
1 large fire shovel tongs and poker 1.5.0
1 pair stilliards 2.5.0
1 cleaver and 1 butchers steel 1.0.0
1 tin dutch overn and 1 tin cullender 0.12.6
1 tasting ladle and dripping pan and 2 egg slicers 0.13.0
1 tin cover, 1 wicker basket tind 1.0.0
3 pint potts and 1 candle box 0.8.0
1 eight day clock 10.0.0
2 large brass soop spoons and a dinner bell 1.0.0
1 large table and 2 forms 4.0.0
1 jappand tea kitchen 1.0.0
1 fire screen lined with tin and 1 plate rack 2.15.0
4 washing tubs, 3 plates, 2 half bushels & 2 shopping blocks 1.9.6
1 New large Markee Compleat 109.16.6
Amount Carried over 2296.12.0
Amount brought forward 2296.12.0

25. In the Room over the Kitchen
1 New large Markee Compleat 30.0.0
Amount Carried over 2296.12.0
Amount brought forward 2296.12.0

26. The Laundry
1 pair Dog irons 1 shovel and tongs 2.7.6
1 large iron skellet 0.7.6
4 sad. irons, 2 box irons and 2 stands 1.12.6
1 large Copper fix'd 15.0.0
1 large Iron Kettle ditto 9.0.0
7 Washing Tubs 1.10.0
3 Cloaths Horses 1.10.0
1 large pine Table and 1 small ditto 3.0.0
3 stools 3 coaths baskets and 1 corner cupboard 1.7.0
35.14.6

27. Servant’s Hall
6 Handsome Chandeliers in packing cases the cost of same in London and charges here 285.0.0
1 New fishing Seine with Ropes 25.0.0
1 old ditto 7.10.0
1 large Dining Table and 2 Forms 2.10.0
1 X Cut Saw 1.2.6
1 Shoulder of Mutton Sail belonging to the flat 5.0.0
2 Hair Brooms, 2 Scrubbing Brushes & 2 Mops 1.0.0
1 pair Steps 0.10.0
1 pair Dog Irons 1.5.0
1 Carved and Gilded Picture frame 1.0.0
329.17.6

28. In the passage leading to the Cellar
4 iron bound hogsheads 2.0.0
4 empty barrels 1.0.0
3.0.0

29. Dairy
9 Earthen Milk pans, 3 Wooden Dishes and 2 Small Churns 1.7.0
1 Paste Board and 2 Milk Piggins 0.12.6
2 Powdering Tubs with Covers 1.10.0
2 Barrels Bisquit and 1 Barrell Corn 2.5.0
4 Stone Jugs and 7 Empty Casks 0.17.6
6.12.0
2671.16.0

30. Beer Cellar
1 Barrel Baltimore Beer 1.5.0
1 ditto Common Vinegar 2.10.0
2 Hogsheads London porter 66.0.0
60 Gallons Wine Vinegar 15.0.0
90 Gallons West India Rum 33.15.0
195l Cheese 11.2.6
1 Barrel Hickory Nutts and 1 Nest wooden ware 1.12.6
1 Empty Hogshead 3 piggins and 1 Tunnell 1.2.6
3 pair of leading Lines, 2 Corn Baskets & Cheese Stand 0.19.6
2 Gallons Honey and Jug 2 Tunnels 1 Keg yellow Oaker 2.15.0
136.12.0
£2808.8.0
Appendix B

“AN INVENTORY OF HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE THE PROPERTY OF SIR ROBERT EDEN, BARONET, LEFT IN THE POSSESSION OF HIS EXCELLENCY THOMAS SIM LEE ESQR.”

Italicized items indicate that they do not appear in the 1776 inventory.

1. Store Room
   2 street door Lamps

2. Coachmans Bed Room
   a walnut Desk Bedstead

3. Boys Bed Room

4. Long Garrett
   a polish steel stove and Fender
   1 Common Stove
   1 Six leaved Gilt leather Screen

5. Servant Man’s Bed Room
   a large chest

6. Woman’s Bed Room
   a Corded Bedstead, Feather Bed & Bolster

7. Mrs. Eden’s Dressing Room
   a Small chest of drawers

8. Sir Robert’s bed Room
   a 4 post Bedstead with white Dimitty Furniture
   1 pair of white Dimitty Window curtains
   1 large Feather bed Bolster and pillow
   1 large hair mattrass
   1 Mahogany Night Tables
   1 large Elbow chair stuffed back &c &c
   1 French commode Table with rose wood and brass ornaments
   1 Book case and Drawers
   a Tin fender

9. Passage near Sr. Robert’s Room
   a mahogany cloaths press compleat

10. Bed Room, head best Stairs
    a mahogany 4 post Bedstead with Green and White furniture
    a Feather bed Bolster and pillow
    a mattrass
    1 Dressing Table with marble slab inlaid
    1 Damask Window Curtain
    2 chairs
    a pair of Dogs
    1 Dressing Glass swinging frame (Crackt)
    a high wire Tender

11. Billiard Room
    8 Window Chairs (Walnut)

12. The passage from Billiard Room
    a Sacking
    bottom Bedstead
    a Feather bed & Bolster
    1 Chair

13. Head Back Stairs
    a Mahogany 4 post Bedstead check Furniture
    1 Feather Bed Bolster and pillows /2 of the Pillows to Mr. Clark’s/
    1 mattrass
    a Dressing Glass
    a pembroke Table
    Night Stool
    2 Chairs (Walnut)

263 Maryland State Papers (Red Books) S 989 MdHR 4557 Book 1, Item 7. See also SM 148, p.57 which copies and dates the inventory to May 17, 1781. MSA.
14. Mr. Court’s Room
A Mahogany Table

15. The Nursery

16. Best Stair Case
a mahogany 4 post Bedstead
Blue & White furniture
a Feather Bed Bolster and Mattress
a pair of Check window Curtains
a Chest of Drawers
a wash hand stand
a looking Glass

17. Studdy
2 Mahogany Bookcases
1 Do. handsome Desk with glass Book case
Chairs

18. Gilt parlour
10 Mahogany Chairs
2 Do. Elbow do.
2 Do. Card Tables
a pembroke table
2 Japan’d corner cupboards
2 Crimson stuff Damask window curtains
2 Lotts of Venetian Window Blinds
a handsome pier Glass gilt frame
a fine piece of painting representing Dunkirk &c. &c.
a Carved pillow & Claw Table
a pair of Fire Dogs, shovel, & Tongs Iron back

In the passage between the parlours
a Ball glass Lanthorn
a large Green Windsor Chair

19. Picture parlour
8 mahogany chairs
a large do. Dining Table
a Mahogany Fire Screen
a handsome pier Glass gilt frame
8 elegant pieces of painting by the celebrated Smith,
gilt frames

20. Long Room
12 mahogany chairs check bottoms
2 large do. with stuff backs
1 Mahogany Cloaths chest
3 Do. dining tables
a do. wine cooler brass hoops & stand
An elegant Iron stove on a marble slab
2 handsome Oval glasses carved frames, white
1 do. long chimney Glass
1 Card table with
a very elegant marble slab therein
an Eight Day Table Clock
a painting of ruins over the Chimney
2 small Do. Landscapes
4 large handsome painting of Landscapes Gilt frames
2 pieces painting of Stages
7 Do. representing Rivers Cities &c. &c.
2 Globe glass Lanthorns with brass hanging
2 bell glasses
a Mahogany Nest of Drawers with folding Doors
a painted floor cloth
a pair of Dogs, Shovel, Tongs & Iron Back
Marble Chimney piece & Slab compleat

21. Secretary’s Office
a compleat secretary’s Desk
a walnut Table
a pine Table
3 Chairs Old

22. Butlers pantry
2 Mahogany Trays
2 Do. plate Baskells brass handles
6 Japan’d Tin Lamps
2 leather Decanter stands
2 tin Knife Trays
2 Small Do. of Landscapes
a piece of Shipping
Portrait of Lord Baltimore
An elegant side Board wt. marble slab varied Colours
a Do. Table
An Iron stove shovel & poker
3 Tea Boards

24. Adjoining the Housekeepers Room
[2?] wood bottomed Chairs
1 Walnut Table
2 Brass Candlesticks
2 Coffee Mills

25. Kitchen & Scullery
a Copper Fish kettle and a Strainer
a do. stove pan and cover
3 copper sauce pans
2 Coffee potts /1/ Mr. Smith gave to Mr. Clark
1 Chocolate pott
6 Chafing dishes /5/ 1. Sold to Mr. Hammond
3 Tea kettles
1 Copper boiling pot & Cover
1 Do. half Gallon pot
1 Do. Boiler fixed
1 Skillet & 1 Copper Coal shuttle
7 pewter water plates
13 pewter dishes
1 Iron pot
1 pair pot Hooks
1 Iron Crane & 6 pot racks
2 Grid irons
1 Frying pan
6 Trivits
a Smoke Jack
3 Spits
1 pair large Dog Irons
1 Dutch Oven fixed
4 Iron scewers, 1 Chopping knife, 2 Ballance skewers
4 Cuckold skewers
a large fire Shovel & Tongs
a Tin Dutch Oven
a pair of Stilliards
1 Cleaver
1 Dripping pan
2 Egg Slicers
1 Tin Cover
2 large brass soup spoons
an Eight Day Clock

23. House Keepers Room
a 4 post bedstead blue & white check furniture
a Feather bed & bolster
a mahogany writing Desk
a large Deal Table & 3 formes
a large fire Screen lined with Tin
a plate Rack
a Brass warming pan

26. The Laundry
1 pair Dog Irons, shovel and Tongs
1 large Iron Skillet
4 flat Irons
1 large Copper fixed
1 large Iron kettle
2 Cloaths Horses
2 pine Tables
Appendix C

"VALUATION OF SIR ROBERT EDEN'S ESTATE IN ANnapolis £2744.15.0"

We Charles Wallace Thomas Hyde and John Randall appointed by the Governor and Council to value the property of the late Sir Robert Eden do value the same as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany Desk &amp; Bookcase with Glass doors</td>
<td>£18.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Do. Library Table cover’d with Green Cloth</td>
<td>6.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Do. Bookcases with Clothes Presses below</td>
<td>12.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Do. Small Desk &amp; Bookcase</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Do. small writing Desk with drawers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Do. Chest of Drawers &amp; 1 Clothes press</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Do. 4 feet Dining Table</td>
<td>15.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Do. Oval Do. &amp; 1 small square ditto</td>
<td>9.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Do. Breakfast Do. &amp; 1 Round Ditto</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Do. Old China Do.</td>
<td>3.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Do. Chairs /in bad order and different sorts a 1/2</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 French Commode Dressing Table</td>
<td>33.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 large looking Glasses Gilt Frames</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Smaller with white Frames &amp; 1 Chimney Glass</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Pictures different sorts &amp; Sizes of Mahogany</td>
<td>17.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Marble Slabs with frames of Mahogany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Crimson Moreen Curtains</td>
<td>7.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?] Piramid Stove &amp; 2 China Images</td>
<td>36.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[?] Andirons &amp; 1pr Tongs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Table Clock &amp; 1 Standing Kitchen Clock</td>
<td>10.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chamber Table &amp; 2 Dressing Glasses</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Small Gilt corner Cupboards</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mahogany Bedsteads &amp; 1 Stained Do./hept posts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Walnut Buroe Bedstead &amp; 1 low post Do.</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Bedsteads 1 pole fire Screen &amp; 1 Gilt leather folding do.</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany Bason Stand &amp; Plate Basket</td>
<td>12.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large square Glass Lanthorn &amp; 5 Round Lamps</td>
<td>1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carried over</td>
<td>3.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount brought over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mahogany pail and Pedestal</td>
<td>234.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pewter water plates &amp; 1pr Kitchen Andirons</td>
<td>234.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Iron Pot 3 Spits 1 Smoak Jack &amp; 1 pr Tongs</td>
<td>1.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Plate rack 2 Coffee Mills &amp; 1 Small Clothes Horse</td>
<td>1.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pr small andirons 2 Trivits &amp; pot hinges</td>
<td>3.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Altitude Instrument /part lost</td>
<td>0.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Iron Oven /sold by the State</td>
<td>0.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dwelling House with the Offices &amp; Lotts in Annapolis</td>
<td>2.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2744.0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

264 Maryland State Papers (Scharf Collection), 1789, MSA S1005-96-14256, MdHR 19,999-88-87. MSA.
Amounting in the whole to two thousand seven hundred and forty four pounds fifteen shillings In
Witness whereof we have here unto set our hands and seals this eighth day of April 1789

Chas Wallace     Thos Hyde     John Randall
Appendix D

1776 INVENTORY VALUE ANALYSIS

Data from June 26, 1776 Inventory
Graphs compiled by Michelle Fitzgerald.

Valuations of objects in Robert’s Eden’s Annapolis home have been examined overall, and then divided between different object category groupings. These graphs reveal that an overwhelming quantity of objects are valued below £1. Of these, ceramics, glass, and metals, all categories with a high disappearance rate between the 1776 and 1781 inventories, have the greatest proportion of objects valued below £1. These charts also serve as a significant reminder that the bulk of Eden’s most significant objects in his confiscation and use within the household are utilitarian items, even though the majority of the financial investment in his furnishings goes towards a small amount of expensive furnishings, textiles, and recreational goods.
1776 Fixtures Values

- Valued Above £1: 17%
- Valued Below £1: 83%

1776 Textiles Values

- Valued Above £20: 1%
- Valued Between £10-20: 4%
- Valued Between £5-10: 4%
- Valued Below £5: 93%
1776 Prints/Paintings Values

- 55% Valued Below £5
- 29% Valued Between £5-10
- 13% Valued Between £10-20
- 3% Valued Above £20

1776 Ceramics Values

- 95% Valued Below £1
- 5% Valued Above £1
1776 Glass Values

- Valued Above £10: 1%
- Valued Between £1-10: 12%
- Valued Below £1: 87%

1776 Metals Values

- Valued Above £20: 1%
- Valued Between £10-20: 22%
- Valued Between £5-10: 1%
- Valued Between £1-5: 1%
- Valued Below £1: 74%
1776 Furniture Values

- Valued Above £20: 2%
- Valued Between £10-20: 8%
- Valued Between £5-10: 10%
- Valued Below £5: 80%
Appendix E

AFFADAVIT

To all to whom these Presents shall come I James Townsend Esquire Lord Mayor of the City of London In pursuance of an Act of Parliament made and passed in the fifth year of the Reign of his late Majesty King George the second Intitled an Act for the more easy recovery of Debts in his Majesty's Plantations and Colonies in America Do Hereby Certify that on the Day of the Date hereof personally came and appeared before me Thomas Hammatt and Francis Davis the Deponents named in the Affidavit hereunto annexed being persons well known and worthy of good credit and by solemn Oath which the said Deponents then took before me upon the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God Did solemnly and sincerely declare testify and depose to be the second matters and things mentioned and contained in the said annexed Affidavit.

In Faith and Testimony whereof the said Lord Mayor have caused the Seal of the Office of the Mayoralty of the said City of London to be hereunto put and affixed and the Account Current marked A and the Deeds Poll marked B and C mentioned and referred to in and by the said Affidavit to be hereunto also annexed Dated in London the twenty third Day of April in the year of our Lord One Thousand seven hundred and seventy three BETWEEN Thomas Hammatt of Tower Street London Gentleman and Francis Davis of Philpot Lane London Gentleman severally make Oath and Say and first this Deponent Thomas Hammett for himself Saith that the Account Current hereunto annexed marked with the letter A is a true copy of the Account Current taken from the Books of Account of William Perkins Thomas Buchanan and William Brown of London Merchants and Partners and that the several Articles and Items therein contained are just and true And this Deponent further Saith that the

265 Eden Papers, Bunch 83. PGL. Note: Only the affidavit and section A of the account book are transcribed here. Section B includes a list of extraneous debts between Eden and others.
Sum of six thousand one hundred and fifty seven pounds one Shilling and three pence appearing at the foot of the said Account to be the Balance due from his Excellency Robert Eden Esquire Governor of Maryland in North America is justly due and Owing from the said Excellency Robert Eden to the said William Perkins Thomas Buchanan and William Brown And this Deponent Francis Davis for himself Saith that he was present and did see William Brown of Tower Street London Merchant for his partner William Perkins and for Thomas Buchanan as his Attorney and for himself Sign, Seal, and duly Execute the Deed poll hereunto also annexed marked with the Letter B And Saith the Names William Brown for Partner William Perkins Thos Buchanan by Willm Brown his Attorney and Willm Brown set and Subscribed thereto is the proper hand Writing of the said William Brown And this Deponent Saith that Richard Cracraft of Philpot Lane London aforesaid Gentleman and this Deponent are Subscribing Witnesses to the Execution thereof And that the Names Richd Cracraft, Richd Cracraft Fras Davis Clke to the sd Mr. Cracraft and Fras Davis Clke to the said Mr. Cracraft are of the respective proper Hands writing of the said Richard Cracraft and of this Deponent And this Deponent Francis Davis for himself Saith that he was present and did see Henry Holland of the Parish of Saint George Hanover Square in the County of Middlesex Building Sign Seal and duly Execute the Deed Poll hereunto also annexed marked with the Letter C and Saith that he Name H. Holland set and subscribed thereto is the proper handwriting of the said Henry Holland and this Deponent Saith this Deponent and Richard Cracraft of Philpot Land London Gentleman Subscribing Witnesses to the due Execution thereof and that the Name Cracraft and Fras Davis Clke to Mr. Cracraft thereto Set and Subscribe Witnesses are of the proper handwriting of this Dept and the said Richard Cracraft respectively Thos Hammond/Hammatt Fras Davis Sworn at the Session House 23rd Day of April 1773 [at the Old Bailey] Before me James Townsend Mayor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1769 March 10</td>
<td>To Cash….</td>
<td>2500.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 29</td>
<td>To ditto…..</td>
<td>500.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 31</td>
<td>To ditto paid his Order of this Dates to John Elsely ….</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>To [illegible] On £1000 at 2/6 &amp; Policy /6 Insurd Furniture p. Mitchell</td>
<td>20.5.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>To Goods p the Lord Baltimore Jas. Mitchell…</td>
<td>29.11.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; April -</td>
<td>To Cash paid sundries this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jas. Russell Acct Expenses of Shipping 2 Mares p. Lynch</td>
<td>20.15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Freight of Goods p. Richardson</td>
<td>0.7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>his Order 31 March to Wm Turner Esq.</td>
<td>21.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Simon Lessage for 1/4 years Rent of his House in Percy Street due at Midsummer</td>
<td>13.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>his Bill 3 Instant to Erasmer Carvey NB whole amount £190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cosway p Recet 21.0.0…</td>
<td>195.--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; May -</td>
<td>To Cash paid sundries this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mrs. Eden's order to Mary Hanshaw</td>
<td>1.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>His Order 30 March to O Edwards for £84 &amp; Interest 10/</td>
<td>84.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Entries Shipping Charges Searchers for &amp;c. of Goods Furniture &amp; Carriages Shipd on board the Lord Baltimore James Mitchell of Maryland</td>
<td>9.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Joseph &amp; Thos. Balmer for Lemons &amp; Oranges in full</td>
<td>4.17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ann Whiffing p his Order Quarterly 4.4.0…</td>
<td>103.13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 23</td>
<td>To Wharfage Porteage Waterage Warehouse Rent &amp;c of Goods Shipd p Mitchell…</td>
<td>12.12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; July &quot;</td>
<td>To Cash paid Sundries this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>his bill 24 April to Scott Pringle &amp; Co.</td>
<td>120.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ann Whiffing due 27th Inst. 4.4.0…</td>
<td>124.4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Augt 1st</td>
<td>To Goods p the Frederick Samuel Nicholson…</td>
<td>26.4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carried forward</td>
<td>3532.5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24th</td>
<td>BY Cash of Martin &amp; Co. p 1/4 yrs Interest due him …</td>
<td>62.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 28</td>
<td>By do p Robert Mundall bill on Jno. Glassford …</td>
<td>42.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct -</td>
<td>By ditto of Sundries this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>of Willm Eden Esq</td>
<td>62.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ditto of St. Thos Jenifer's bill on Hanbury</td>
<td>13.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Galloway &amp; Stewart ditto £100 on James Russell 1/2 to this Acct &amp; 1/2 to Wm Eden Esq 50.0.0…</td>
<td>125.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770 Jul 6</td>
<td>By Cash of Wm Eden Esq…</td>
<td>63.15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 23</td>
<td>By ditto of Martin &amp; Co p 1 yrs Interest on £5000…</td>
<td>250.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 7</td>
<td>By ditto of ditto p 1/4 yrs ditto due 19 Augt…</td>
<td>62.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 14</td>
<td>By ditto of William Eden Esq…</td>
<td>58.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771 Feb 26</td>
<td>By ditto of his Bill on ditto…</td>
<td>200.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 13</td>
<td>By ditto of William Eden Esq…</td>
<td>58.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2</td>
<td>By Nett Proceed 10 hpds Tobo. P Kelty…</td>
<td>79.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 4</td>
<td>By Cash of Martin &amp; Co p 3/4 Yrs Interest on £5000 due 19 May …</td>
<td>187.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 15</td>
<td>By JM Jordan Bill on JM Jordan Compy …</td>
<td>500.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772 Jany -</td>
<td>By Cash p Sundries Vizt of Wm Eden Esq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>p Billingams Rent</td>
<td>44.7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cash 80.0.0…</td>
<td>124.7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 20</td>
<td>By Nett Proceed 2 hhds Tob. P Kelty…</td>
<td>13.12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 10</td>
<td>By ditto 4 ditto p Nicholson</td>
<td>21.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 18</td>
<td>By ditto 1 ditto p Jarrold</td>
<td>5.16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augt 14</td>
<td>By cash of Martin &amp; Co. p 1 yrs Interest day of May last</td>
<td>250.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 16</td>
<td>By ditto of ditto p 1/4 yrs ditto day 19 August</td>
<td>62.10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Carried forward</strong></td>
<td>£2166.5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Brot Over</strong></td>
<td>3532.5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augt</td>
<td>To Cash paid 2 Bills Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>his bill 29th Apr Mr. Carrick</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ditto 22 do to Lamar &amp; Co.</td>
<td>80.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To Goods p the Lord Camden Johnstown</td>
<td>272.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 26</td>
<td>To ditto p the Good Intent Carrington</td>
<td>25.14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>To Cash paid and Sundries this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>his bill 31 March to W Atkinson</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his ditto due to G Patterosn</td>
<td>25.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto ditto due to Ralph Dobbinson</td>
<td>51.18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto 30th ditto due to Bernard Charlton</td>
<td>29.18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>his order 31 ditto to Thos Wells</td>
<td>29.19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ditto 29 ditto to Peter Provost</td>
<td>27.10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Robert Baldwin &amp; Mazines</td>
<td>0.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Thos Philpot p Rect 4.0.0.0</td>
<td>188.11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30</td>
<td>To Interest from 10 March to this Day</td>
<td>127.9.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decr</td>
<td>To Cash paid 3 Bills Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>his Bill 30 March to In Deards? &amp; Plate</td>
<td>81.7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ditto 23 ditto to John Devonport</td>
<td>290.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ditto 26 ditto to Saml Swinton Esq.</td>
<td>568.8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770 Jany</td>
<td>To Cash paid 5 Bills this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>his bill 29 March to Levick &amp; Co.</td>
<td>100.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ditto 17 June to Samuel Mitchell</td>
<td>26.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ditto 31 March to John Trotters</td>
<td>45.18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ditto ditto due to Ralph dobinson</td>
<td>176.7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto ditto due to Willm Wilkes 11.14.3…</td>
<td>360.4.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20</td>
<td>To Goods p the Polly John Kilty…</td>
<td>97.1.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>To ditto p ditto (a Box of Plate)…</td>
<td>10.12.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>To Cash paid Sundrie Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Scott &amp; Co. bill of Madera to Scott &amp; Co.</td>
<td>56.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Saml Potts Esq of the Post Office &amp; Newspapers 1.2.6…</td>
<td>57.2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>To Cash paid Sundries Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mrs. Eden Order 24 May to Margt Walker</td>
<td>5.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Benja. Kenton on Account 50.4.6…</td>
<td>55.4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augt 16</td>
<td>To Cash paid Samuel Potts Esq…</td>
<td>2.2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 31</td>
<td>To Gibson &amp; Webank p Pram of Insurance on his Life from March 1769 to this time…</td>
<td>362.8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novr. 15</td>
<td>To Cash paid Lamar &amp; Co. 28 Jul p Wine…</td>
<td>66.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decr 14</td>
<td>To ditto p his Bill 25th Sept to Isaac Sandall…</td>
<td>3.10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Carried forward</strong></td>
<td>6048.17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Brot Over</strong></td>
<td>6048.17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771 Jany</td>
<td>To Cash paid Sundrie Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Saml Potts Esq of half Years News Papers</td>
<td>2.2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Andrew Ninaw[?] P Stays for Mrs. Eden</td>
<td>5.8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Willm Scarborough Perfumes</td>
<td>2.16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>his Bill 25 Sept p Thos Hulls</td>
<td>20.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto 27 ditto to James Mitchell 50.0.0…</td>
<td>80.6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 16th</td>
<td>To Cash paid Willms Polly Sadler full</td>
<td>29.6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 4</td>
<td>To Goods p the Lord Baltimore James Mitchell…</td>
<td>156.15-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Cash and Sundrys this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>his Bill 22nd Novr to Jas. Dickinson Esq.</td>
<td>144.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>James Mitchell bill to John Ashington for a Boat Sails &amp;c 26.18.10…</td>
<td>170.18.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 6</td>
<td>To Goods p the Polly John Kilty…</td>
<td>256.4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May -</td>
<td>To Cash paid Sundrys Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Benj Kenton bill 6 April at 6 Weeks</td>
<td>50.0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Scott &amp; Compy ditto 22 March to Scott &amp; Co. 122.0.0…</td>
<td>172.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>To Cash paid Samuel Potts Esq. p Rect. …</td>
<td>2.2.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct -</td>
<td>To Cash paid 2 Bills Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>his bill 9 June to Dr. John Shuttleworth</td>
<td>50.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Scott &amp; Co. ditto 2 Augt to Scott &amp; Co. 60.0.0…</td>
<td>110.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Cash paid John Gresham for Shoes …</td>
<td>13.19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novr 13</td>
<td>To ditto paid his Bill 28 July to Ditto of St. Thos Jennifer …</td>
<td>60.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 3</td>
<td>To Goods p The Trinity Page…</td>
<td>62.6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>to Cash paid 2 Bills Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his bill 6 July to B Kennedy</td>
<td>138.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ditto 5 Augt to James Mitchell 181.9.2…</td>
<td>219.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772 Jany</td>
<td>To Cash paid Sundrys this Month Vizt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>bill 12 August to Rachel Moore</td>
<td>46.4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Potts Esq p half years news papers 2.2.….</td>
<td>48.6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feby 15</td>
<td>to Ditto paid James Locke Houlter full…</td>
<td>16.1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>to Goods p the Eden from Nicholson …</td>
<td>78.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14</td>
<td>To Cash paid Gresham for Mrs. Edens Shoes ….</td>
<td>9.15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>To Goods p the Sea Nymph Richardson…</td>
<td>13.10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 11</td>
<td>To Cash paid Samuel Potts Esq. ….</td>
<td>2.2.0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 30</td>
<td>TO Sundry Persons? On his Life from 24 April 1771 to 24 April 1772…</td>
<td>250.16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To Interest from 31 Oct 1770 to this Day…</td>
<td>522.2.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Errors Excepted
London 16 Oct 1772 PBB
8323.7.1

1772 Brot Over £2166.5.10
Oct 16 By Balance due to Perkins Buchanan & Brown …6157.1.3
£8323.7.1
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IMAGE PERMISSIONS

Rights and Access
The maps in the Map Collections materials were either published prior to 1922, produced by the United States government, or both (see catalogue records that accompany each map for information regarding date of publication and source). The Library of Congress is providing access to these materials for educational and research purposes and is not aware of any U.S. copyright protection (see Title 17 of the United States Code) or any other restrictions in the Map Collection materials.

Note that the written permission of the copyright owners and/or other rights holders (such as publicity and/or privacy rights) is required for distribution, reproduction, or other use of protected items beyond that allowed by fair use or other statutory exemptions. Responsibility for making an independent legal assessment of an item and securing any necessary permissions ultimately rests with persons desiring to use the item.

CONTENTS AND USE
Office of Coast Survey’s Historical Map & Chart Collection covers the land and waters of the United States of America, including territories and possessions (past and present). The images are free to download, and may be used for commercial or educational purposes. Although not required, we encourage users to cite "NOAA’s Historical Map & Chart Collection" when using the image(s).
March 6, 2017

Michelle Fitzgerald
7300 Johnson Farm Lane, Apt. 202
Chadds Ford, PA 19317

Permission is granted to include the images listed below in "The Turn of the Peoples Mind": Loyalists, Dispossession, and Maryland's First State Governor's Mansion, by Michelle Fitzgerald, an M.A. thesis submitted to the University of Delaware, Winterthur Program in American Material Culture, spring 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession or Call Number</th>
<th>Book or Object</th>
<th>Reproduction to be made from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. 20S. 92x093-2a</td>
<td>Papers of the Whitehall Estate • Whitehall first floor plan</td>
<td>Digital scan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The credit line to be used with each picture is:

"Courtesy, The Winterthur Library: Joseph Downs Collection of Manuscripts and Printed Ephemera"

Please provide a complimentary copy of the publication. This permission is for one-time editorial use; if subsequent reproduction is desired, another permission form must be secured and fees paid, where applicable. Please note use restrictions on reverse.

Emily Guthrie
Rights and Reproductions
Winterthur Library
Photographic Use Contract
for Winterthur Library Collections

1. This permission is for the use of the photographic materials listed on the front of this page. Only photographic materials supplied by the Winterthur Library of library collections are permitted to be reproduced.

2. Failure to pay the required fees for reproduction means that permission has not been granted.

3. The reproduction must not be cropped, bled off the page, printed on color stock, nor have anything be superimposed on the image. Each image must be reproduced unaltered and in its entirety unless approved in advance in writing by Library Photo Services. When a detail is used, the word DETAIL must appear in the credit line.

4. The full credit line exactly as supplied on the front of this page must appear in immediate proximity to the image or in the section devoted to photographic credits. No abbreviations are permitted. In the case of films, television, or filmstrips, the credit line must be included in the credits.

5. All negatives, internegatives and color transparencies remain the property of the Winterthur Library. An overdue fee is charged for every month beyond the initial three-month period that these materials are in the possession of the borrower. A charge equal to the replacement cost will be levied for each damaged transparency.

6. This permission is valid only for the individual, company, or institution to which it is specifically issued and may not be transferred, assigned, sold, or otherwise disposed of without written permission.

7. When used for promotional purposes, references to the Winterthur Library, outside of the copyright notice, if any, are not permitted unless particularly applied for and granted in writing.

8. Photographic materials shall not be used to show or imply that the Winterthur Library endorses any commercial product or enterprise, concurs with the opinions expressed in, or confirms the accuracy of any text used with the said materials.

9. Black-and-white photographs for reproduction are sold outright and are not returnable.

10. The permission hereby granted terminates immediately upon publication.

11. Any breach of these terms and conditions may result, at the sole discretion of the Winterthur Library, in the revocation of permission to reproduce with the right to seek other remedies, including damages.
Eden House Floor Plans

troster-and-pearre@juno.com  <troster-and-pearre@juno.com>

To: mfitzer@udel.edu

Fri, Feb 17, 2017 at 4:13 PM

Michelle Fitzgerald

Dear Michelle:

My late business partner drew the plans, so he should get the credit: Michael F. Trostel, FAIA.

Please, do not hesitate to remove any/all of the names of rooms and/or titles.

I would love to have a bound copy for my library, but must reimburse you for it.

Sincerely,

Peter
REQUEST FORM 6
REQUEST TO PUBLISH MATERIAL

To: The Heritage Manager, Surrey History Centre, 130 Goldsworth Road, Woking, Surrey,
GU21 6ND T: 01483-518737 E: shd@surreycc.gov.uk

Date: 3/3/17

Name (please print): MICHÈLLE FITZGERALD

Address: 7330, Johnson Road, Fort Lee, VA, 22317, U.S.A.

In accordance with the requirements of Surrey History Centre I request one-time, non-exclusive, world-wide rights to publish the following material held by Surrey History Centre in a single edition and single format.

Please describe the material, giving the full reference number:

PHOTOGRAPH OF ASHTED House
HISTORIC BUILDINGS & ANTIQUITIES OF SURREY
CC110113/2014

Please provide bibliographical information relating to the planned publication, including title, publisher, print-run and date:

Title: "THE TWO OF THE VIRGES MAD, LOYALISTS, PERSECUTED"

Applicant's signature: MICHÈLLE FITZGERALD

The Surrey History Centre hereby authorises you to publish the material identified above. In granting this authorisation Surrey History Centre does not surrender its own right or the right of owners of deposited material to publish it or to grant permission to others to do so. Nor does this authorisation by Surrey History Centre remove the author's, producer's or publisher's responsibility to guard against the infringement of rights that may be held by others.

The following credit line must appear in its entirety in the above named publication:

Reproduced by permission of Surrey History Centre

The following caption must appear beneath each reproduced item:

Copyright of Surrey History Centre

Approved by: [Signature]

Date: 3/3/17

Please ask for a photocopy of the completed form

form6.doc 24 March 2015
April 12, 2017

Michelle Fitzgerald
7300 Johnson Farm Lane, Apt. 202
Chadds Ford, PA 19317

Subject to the conditions of the Photographic Use Contract for Winterthur Collection printed on the reverse side, permission is hereby granted to reproduce the photographs below only in Thesis:

Title: "The Turn of the Peoples Mind": Loyalists, Dispossession, and Maryland's First State Governor's Mansion

By Michelle Fitzgerald
Publisher: UDEL/UMI
Expected date of release: Spring 2017

This permission will be null and void unless the application fees are paid per invoice number: GRATIS
and one complete gratis copy of the publication in which the images are reproduced is provided to Winterthur Photographic Services

1969.0765.001, 002 Side Chairs digital image (by author)
Credit line: Courtesy, Winterthur Museum, Side Chairs, 1750-1780, United States, American beech, Hard pine, Bequest of Henry Francis du Pont, 1965.765.1, 2

[Signature]
Photographic Services Coordinator
Marketing & Communications Division
Photographic Use Contract for Winterthur Collections

1. This permission is for the use of the photographic materials listed on the obverse of this page. Only photographic materials supplied by Winterthur of Winterthur collections are permitted to be reproduced.

2. Failure to pay the required fees for reproduction means that permission has not been granted.

3. Permission is only granted for one-time use. For re-use of photography, a new permission for must be obtained and appropriate fees paid.

4. The reproduction must not be cropped, bled off the page, printed on color stock or with colored ink, nor have anything be superimposed on the image. Each image must be reproduced unaltered and in its entirety unless approved in advance in writing by the Registrar. When a detail is used, the word DETAIL must appear in the credit line.

5. The full credit line exactly as supplied on the obverse of this form must appear in immediate proximity to the image or in the section devoted to photographic credits. No abbreviations are permitted. In the case of films, television or filmstrips, the credit line must be included in the credits.

6. All negatives, internegatives and color transparencies remain the property of Winterthur. An overdue fee is charged for every month beyond the initial three-month period that these materials are in the possession of the borrower. A charge equal to the replacement cost will be levied for each damaged transparency.

7. This permission is valid only for the individual, company or institution to whom it is specifically issued and may not be transferred, assigned, sold, or otherwise disposed of without Photograph Services written permission.

8. When used for promotional purposes, references to Winterthur, outside of the copyright notice, if any, are not permitted unless particularly applied for and granted in writing.

9. Photographic materials shall not be used to show or imply that Winterthur endorses any commercial product or enterprise, concurs with the opinions expressed in, or confirms the accuracy of any text used with the said materials.

10. Black-and-white photographs for reproduction are sold outright and are not returnable.

11. The permission hereby granted terminates immediately upon publication.

12. Any breach of these terms and conditions may result, at the sole discretion of Winterthur, in the revocation of permission to reproduce with the right to seek other remedies, including damages.
Hi Maria,

Thank you! The working title of the thesis is "The Turn of the People’s Mind: Loyalists, Dispossession, and Maryland’s First State Governor’s Mansion." I will be sure to include the preferred citations to the photographs – and please let me know if you need anything else.

I heard that the Search Room will have light at last! I will definitely have to stop by and see it the next time I’m in town.

All my best,

Michelle

On Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 4:54 PM, Maria A Day - MSA <maria.day@maryland.gov> wrote:

Hi Michelle,

Glad that you are at the end game of your program. Well done!

To complete the formal permissions, could you please help me by giving me the title? (Or working title of your thesis -- basically whatever it's going to say on your title page). That's important for our records.

I am going to waive the fees for reproduction rights as I typically do for theses and dissertations. It appears that you already have photographs.

Our citation guidelines are online here: Special Collections examples are provided.

If you could please add the credit: "Collection of Maryland State Archives" to the photograph captions, that would be great.

By the way, the next time you are in Annapolis come and check out the re-vamped Search Room. It should be re-opening after a half-year renovation in mid-March. We have all of the lights in the Referers above the Search Room now lit and the carpeting is brand new.

Best regards,

Maria A. Day
Director, Special Collections and Conservation
Maryland State Archives
Annapolis, Maryland
410-260-6410
maria.day@maryland.gov

On Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 4:00 PM, Michelle Fitzgerald <mfitzer@udel.edu> wrote:

Hi Maria,

I hope you've been well since I've last seen you! I've greatly enjoyed your posts on all the travels you have been on this past year. Japan looks amazing!

My thesis is wrapping up at Winterthur on Robert Edson and, as part of it, I would like to request reproduction rights for two images in MSA's special collections, SC 182-01-615 and SC 770-6, both digitized copies I have attached here. The thesis will have limited distribution.

Please let me know if you have a preferred citation or anything else to proceed in order to gain image permissions from MSA special collections. I appreciate your help!

All the best,

Michelle

---

Michelle Fitzgerald
Lois F. McNeil Fellow, Class of 2017
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture
University of Delaware

---

Michelle Fitzgerald
Lois F. McNeil Fellow, Class of 2017
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture
University of Delaware
Winterthur Thesis - Request for Reproduction of Images

Reference <reference@frick.org>
To: Michelle Fitzgerald <mfitzger@udel.edu>

Ms. Fitzgerald,

We have received your email of February 27, 2017. The Frick Art Reference Library is happy to release the images that are mentioned in your message free of charge, but we do not give formal publishing consent. If necessary, identifying copyright owners and obtaining permission is the responsibility of the author and the publisher. If publishing the images, we ask that they be accompanied by the phrase “Courtesy of the Frick Art Reference Library.” We can refer you to the United States Copyright Office for more information.

United States Copyright Office
http://www.copyright.gov

Upon request, we can forward high-resolution .tiff files to you of the images in question under separate cover.

Sincerely,

Suz Mosson
Chief of Public Services
Frick Art Reference Library
The Frick Collection
10 East 71st Street
New York, NY 10021
reference@frick.org

---

Winterthur Thesis - Request for Reproduction of Images

Michelle Fitzgerald <mfitzger@udel.edu>
To: library@frick.org

Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 4:26 PM

Hello,

I am a second year MA candidate in the Winterthur Program for American Material Culture at the University of Delaware. My thesis relating to Robert Eden includes analysis of two portraits available in the Frick Photarchive, records b1328680 and b1328590 (images attached in email).

I was unable to determine from the Frick and NYARC Discovery's website whether these images are free use or require permission for reproduction rights. If they do require permission, I would like to do so for a thesis with limited distribution.

Please let me know how you wish for me to proceed. I would appreciate any information you are able to offer.

Thank you,

Michelle

---

Michelle Fitzgerald
Lois P. McNeil Fellow, Class of 2017
Winterthur Program in American Material Culture
University of Delaware

2 attachments

- RobertEdenBart_NathanielDance.png
  379K

- RobertEdenGov_CWP.png
  323K
Hi, Michelle:

Sorry for the delayed response. There’s no problem with your using any of the photos in your thesis. We just ask that you use the following credit line with them:

Special Collections & Archives Department, Nimitz Library, U.S. Naval Academy

Very respectfully,

Adam Minakowski
Reference & Special Collections Librarian
Nimitz Library
U.S. Naval Academy
589 McNair Rd.
Annapolis, MD 21402-5029
410-293-6891
minakows@usna.edu

For Official Use Only - Privacy Sensitive; Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in civil and criminal penalties.

On Mon, Feb 27, 2017 at 4:44 PM, Michelle Fitzgerald <mfitzger@udel.edu> wrote:

Dear Adam,

Thank you for your help this past summer regarding photographs of the former Governor’s Mansion. I was able to gain the necessary information from the digital archive and it has been very helpful in the final chapter of my M.A. thesis at Winterthur.

There are two images that I would like to include in my thesis, 8046 and 5690, for which I would like to request reproduction rights. The thesis will have limited distribution. I read Nimitz Library’s reproduction policy, but wanted to check with Special Collections for written permission prior to incorporating it.

Thank you. I appreciate any information you may be able to offer me on how to proceed.

All the best,

Michelle
A Favor!

Chris J Kintzel - MSA <chris.kintzel@maryland.gov>
To: Michelle Fitzgerald <mfitzger@udel.edu>

Mon, Jan 30, 2017 at 12:21 PM

Michelle,

You can simply say:

Collection of the Maryland State Archives
Sir Robert Eden (1741-1784)
Phebea MacKulm (1657-1694), after Charles Willson Peale (1741-1827)
Oil on canvas, 1914

You can use the same model for the other portraits if that is easier for you.

Collection of the Maryland State Archives
Title
Artist
Medium, date

Chris

Christopher J. Kintzel
Associate Curator and Collections Manager
Maryland Commission on Artistic Property
Maryland State Archives
350 Rowe Boulevard
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-269-6475
410-974-3686 (fax)

On Mon, Jan 30, 2017 at 11:31 AM, Michelle Fitzgerald <mfitzger@udel.edu> wrote:
Thank you, Chris! Do you have a preferred citation/credit for the Eden portrait?

On Mon, Jan 30, 2017 at 8:05 AM, Chris J Kintzel - MSA <chris.kintzel@maryland.gov> wrote:
Michelle,

Attached is a copy of David Olin’s after treatment image of Robert Eden. I am also including an image of Annapolis in 1750 (I will see if I can find a better one).

Chris

Christopher J. Kintzel
Associate Curator and Collections Manager
Maryland Commission on Artistic Property
Maryland State Archives
350 Rowe Boulevard
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-269-6475
410-974-3686 (fax)
General Principle:
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Arlene Wilson
Mar 06, 2017, 10:58am via System

Dear Michelle,

I spoke with another Special Collections librarian and, upon further research, we found that the last Robert Eden Barron died in the 1840s, so this bookplate should be well within the date range for public domain. The University of Delaware Library webpage, under Special Collections, Tools for Primary Research, provides links to sites that have information about obtaining copyrights, which you may find helpful. Here is the link: https://library.udel.edu/spec/research/access/tools/

Several of the links provide basic copyright information, including the date ranges that would render a work under copyright restrictions and those that reside outside these time limits. You can use this information to cross-reference any specific dates you have relating to the “Robert Eden, Bart” bookplate.

I hope this information answers your inquiry and provides you with the references you need. Please let me know if there is anything else I can assist you with.

Sincerely,

Arlene Wilson
Special Collections
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