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ABSTRACT

New Yarmouth, Eastern Neck, Maryland: Resistance to Town Building from the Colonial Period to the Present

by

Brynn Torelli

Dr. Liam Frink, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Anthropology
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The work presented in this thesis is an attempt to shed light on the early colonial development of Maryland’s Eastern Shore and its possible relationship with current settlement patterns in the region, with particular interest in Kent County. Traditional interpretations of the lack of urban development on the Eastern Shore, both in the Colonial era and the present, have tended to focus on environmental and geographical factors. This research seeks to examine this trend toward rural living in newer and broader ways by incorporating human agency and investigating the possibility that the lack of town development during the Colonial era could reflect intentional resistance to urban living on the part of colonial plantation owners and small-scale farmers. This work addresses a series of significant questions concerning possible influences on individual and group motives as well as the political and religious factors involved in the early development of Kent County. In an effort to address these questions, several issues will be examined. The first involves how groups living in the region during the Colonial period interacted with each other and the Proprietors of Maryland. The second concerns how contact with European culture and social norms may have influenced town development. The third deals with the impact of early economic and agricultural
endeavors, and finally, how the region’s relative isolation may have worked to convince early residents that town development was not feasible and/or undesirable.

Historic documents (deeds, wills, early maps, paintings, census records) and archaeological investigations of the several colonial sites along Eastern Neck as well as the site thought to represent the town of New Yarmouth, Eastern Neck, Maryland were all examined. The results of this work will help to explain how communities developed on the Eastern Shore and Kent County in particular, during the colonial period, as well as to shed light on how the historic propensity to resist urbanization may influence the present trend toward rural living versus urban development in the region.
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PREFACE

This research is presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts Degree from the Department of Anthropology and Ethnic Studies, at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

All archival and historical document research, archaeological investigations, and the production of this final report were carried out during the 2006-2009 academic years under the supervision of Dr. Liam Frink and the Examination Committee consisting of the following members: Dr. Jiemin Bao, Dr. Karen Harry, and Dr. Joseph Fry. Many of the archival materials, predominantly those pertaining to the location of the town of New Yarmouth, were originally compiled by Elizabeth Seidel, Director of the Washington College Public Archaeology Laboratory, Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland. Seidel and her husband Dr. John Seidel, Associate Professor of Anthropology at Washington College, also identified the potential site of New Yarmouth on Eastern Neck, Maryland. This identification was originally established based on the metes and bounds found in the Ringgold/Tovey deeds. This site information was utilized during archaeological investigations conducted during this study.

Deeds associated with properties surrounding New Yarmouth were used to further identify the site and to more accurately delineate the boundaries of the town. All further conclusions drawn from these previously collected materials and all additional research undertaken with the use of these materials as well as newly researched documents is original.

All other aspects of this work are original.
This project was supported by a fellowship grant from the Maryland Historical Trust. One of the stipulations associated with the release of grant monies by the Trust involved interaction with undergraduate Anthropology students at Washington College. As a result, the archaeological investigations associated with this project were conducted with the aid of a number of Washington College undergraduate students, all of whom participated in some segment of the field investigations and the archival research. Field investigations were conducted during the 2007 Summer Field School in Archaeology under the direct supervision of the author, who functioned as both Field School Instructor and Principal Investigator for all work associated with the Eastern Neck, Maryland region.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The research presented in this thesis concerns the history of settlement in the Maryland region, with specific attention paid to the Eastern Shore and its first county, Kent County. The Eastern Shore is comprised of nine counties separated from the Western Shore by the Chesapeake Bay. These counties developed on a different track than those of the Western Shore, exhibiting predominantly dispersed rural communities with only a small number of towns. The Western Shore on the other hand grew into a far more urbanized region with large cities and several important ports. The current study seeks to better understand these two such different trends in settlement patterns by asking whether or not Eastern Shore colonists were involved in intentional resistance to town building. The now lost colonial town of New Yarmouth, the first county seat of Kent County, is here posited to have fallen victim to resistance to urbanization on Eastern Neck, a small peninsula forming the extreme southern portion of Kent County.

Figure 1. Map of Maryland indicating counties and county seats on both the Western and Eastern Shores (Maryland Judiciary at mdcourts.gov, Circuit Court for Kent County, 2006, http://www.courts.state.med.us/clerks/kent/map.html)
A Brief History of the Maryland Colony and the Eastern Shore

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, England expended great effort in colonizing and developing the New World. Joint stock companies and entrepreneurs financed initial efforts, funding voyages to fledgling colonies and often providing passage to individuals, known as indentured servants, in exchange for several years’ worth of labor upon arrival. Some of the colonies were established by individual proprietors, as was the case with the Maryland colony. In 1632, Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore and a Catholic living under Protestant rule, was granted a charter to establish the Maryland colony (Brugger 1988:5). This charter gave Calvert, and his successors, proprietary control of the region that would later become the state of Maryland, a region geographically separated by the expanse of the Chesapeake Bay.

At the time of the Calvert charter, the Maryland colony was to be bounded on the north by the fortieth parallel and on the south by the southern bank of the Potomac River. The western boundary was marked by the meridian running through the source of the Potomac. The colony extended eastward, across the Chesapeake Bay to the Atlantic Ocean and included parts of the present state of West Virginia, all of Delaware, and an island already considered part of the Virginia Colony (Maryland State Archives 2005). This small island, Kent Island, would become a major point of contention in Maryland’s early history.

Cecil Calvert envisioned a colony in which Catholics could find freedom from the persecution they faced at home in England. He also intended his colony to be ruled by manorial law, a system of governance that gave the Proprietor of the colony princely power over his holdings. Under such a system, Calvert would depend on a base of
wealthy, mainly Catholic landholding colonists to bring enough settlers to help establish the Maryland colony. In exchange for supplying settlers, these elite individuals would be granted tracts of land. If an elite colonist supplied enough settlers to receive a large land grant (upwards of 3,000 acres), he would also be granted the right to establish a manor on the land and rule both the lands and the people working and living thereon. While Calvert as Proprietor was dependent on these elite colonists, these potential manor lords were also dependent on him for both land and titles. The manorial system envisioned by Cecil Calvert was one of co-dependence and would prove troublesome to the fledgling colony (Menard and Carr 1982:177-178).

The troubles of the manorial system would be compounded by the establishment in Maryland of the headright system of land acquisition. The headright system stipulated that individuals who transported settlers to the new colony would be granted tracts of land. The more settlers transported, the larger the tract of land. This in itself was not problematic as the manorial system called for such land grants. However, the headright system also allowed for land grants to recently freed indentured servants and individuals who funded their own transport to the New World without additional settlers. Such individuals were granted fewer and smaller tracts of land. The largest problem associated with the headright system came when newly freed indentured servants and individuals of lesser means transporting only them or one additional settler found it more and more difficult to claim their land grants. Elite colonists, or manor lords, were already in possession of large tracts of land, leaving fewer and fewer acres available for the remainder of new settlers.
The religious beliefs of the elite versus the poorer settlers also proved troublesome for the Maryland colony. As previously noted, Calvert envisioned his manor lords as wealthy Catholics. However, the settlers these individuals transported to the new colony, the individuals who built the communities and worked as indentured servants, were predominantly Protestant (Brugger 1988:6). While Calvert created a charter stipulating that there would be religious tolerance in his new colony, the two groups were separated not only by ideology but also by economic standing. This situation would cause further tension in the fledgling colony.

In 1633 Calvert dispatched two ships, the *Ark* and the *Dove*, carrying colonists to the New World. Among these colonists were members of the Catholic gentry and a more substantial number of Protestant workers, some of whom brought their wives, though there is no record of any colonists travelling with small children (Brugger 1988:5-6; Menard and Carr 1982:168). These colonists, after suffering through the long sea journey, including severe storms that nearly caused the loss of both the *Ark* and the *Dove*, settled on the lower Potomac on an island they called St. Clement’s (Brugger 1988:7-8; Menard and Carr 1982:169-170).

In the winter of the following year, the new colony’s Governor, Leonard Calvert, Cecil Calvert’s younger brother, set about exploring the Potomac region in an effort to locate a more permanent settlement site. The site he found was located on the St. Mary’s River (at that time Calvert named the waterway St. George’s River) and was inhabited by a tribal group of Yaocomicos. This group of Native American already had plans for abandoning the site of their village due to fears of invading Susquehannocks and agreed to surrender their lands to Governor Calvert over the period of one year. In March of
1634, the first portion of the village site was surrendered and the Maryland colony’s new settlement was named St. Mary’s (Menard and Carr 1982:171-172).

Figure 2. Detail of 1740 map showing St. Clement’s Island to the left and St. Mary’s near center (“A new map of Virginia, Mary-Land, and the improved parts of Pennsylvania and New Jersey,” 1740 [Library of Congress American Memory online map collection])

The new St. Mary’s settlement faced numerous difficulties, including troubles associated with religious beliefs, economic disparities between settlers, and the headright system of land acquisition. However, St. Mary’s like many towns established on the Western Shore managed to survive these difficulties. The establishment of settlements on the Eastern Shore was made yet more difficult by the presence of Englishman already living in the region. Kent Island, the largest piece of land in the Chesapeake Bay and located east of present day Annapolis, was the location of a trading post and settlement established by William Claiborne in 1631.
In 1631 William Claiborne, a Virginian, had received a charter to establish a trading post on Kent Island, a piece of land considered by Claiborne and his followers as part of the Virginia colony (Menard and Carr 1982:190). By the time of the arrival of the Maryland colonists, Claiborne was aware that the island on which he resided had been granted to Cecil Calvert for the Maryland colony and that Calvert expected the residents of the island to adhere to the Proprietor’s rule. Claiborne believed that the charter excluded previously settled lands and resisted Calvert’s claim by first inciting Native American unrest by suggesting that the Maryland colonists were actually hostile Spanish and later launching a naval battle against Calvert’s men. After nearly four years of conflict, Claiborne was forced to submit to Calvert and Kent Island became part of Maryland as well as becoming the first Eastern Shore county, Kent County (see Figure 3) (Brugger 1988:12-13; Jennings 1982:218-219).
Many of the new inhabitants of Maryland’s Eastern Shore, like Claiborne, were Virginians. These individuals moved northward from Kent Island to the Eastern Neck region. Eastern Neck is a peninsula which forms the southern portion of present day Kent County. The peninsula is located at the juncture of the Chesapeake Bay and the Chester River and its southernmost edge is cut by Church Creek with Grey’s Inn Creek forming its eastern boundary.

Figure 4. Detail of 1860 map showing Eastern Neck and Eastern Neck Island (Martenet’s map of Kent County, Maryland; shore lines and soundings from U.S. Coast Survey, roads and inland from actual surveys by C.H. Baker, county surveyor, under the direction, and drawn, and published by Simon J. Martenet, c.1860 [Library of Congress American Memories online map collection])
As previously noted, many of the original Eastern Shore inhabitants were actually Virginians. Some of the most influential Eastern Shore families, even into the present, came from Virginia to Eastern Neck in the early seventeenth century with the Ringgold family proving one of the most significant. Thomas Ringgold, a Protestant from Virginia, moved to Eastern Neck in the early 1600s (Maryland Historical Trust 1967:28). Ringgold possessed a large tract of land on the peninsula which he called Huntingfield and upon his death this property was divided between his three sons. James Ringgold was the oldest of the heirs and he acquired addition portions of the family estate when one of his brothers died (Usilton 1994). James Ringgold, like his father before him, was involved in local politics and was a member of one of the wealthiest Eastern Shore families. James Ringgold held such considerable sway in local government that by 1678 he and an English associate recently emigrated to Eastern Neck, Samuel Tovey, had convinced the rest of the Kent County Commissioners to grant permission for the two to establish the town of New Yarmouth. This town was located on a portion of Ringgold’s inherited land which he had sold to Tovey five years prior in 1673 (Kent County Land records Liber A Folio 373-377). The two wished to establish the town and erect a courthouse to become the first county seat of Kent County.

Although Ringgold and Tovey were successful in establishing the town of New Yarmouth and securing both a courthouse and jail for the site, the town was relatively short lived (Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 146-149; Reps 1972:114). The new county seat of Kent County was also named by the Proprietor of Maryland, now Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore, as an official port for trade (Reps 1972:114). All trade in the area was required to move through the town with fines imposed on those
who failed to submit to this rule. With its location on an easily navigable waterway, two purported shipyards, a courthouse and jail, and official port status, New Yarmouth should have been ripe for success. Like St. Mary’s on the Western Shore, the town could have been successful due to its political and economic importance (Shomette 2000), yet by 1696 New Yarmouth had apparently disappeared (Rock Hall Historical Collections 1957:20).

The success of St. Mary’s on the Western Shore spurred further development and eventually the capitol of the Maryland colony was moved from the town further north to Annapolis. However, the failure of New Yarmouth on the Eastern Shore also seems to have sparked a trend in settlement, this one focused on dispersed communities with few successful towns. Both trends have persisted into the present and the lack of urbanization on the Eastern Shore is the focus of this work.

Themes and Significance

The history of the earliest colonization of the Maryland region has been the subject of numerous research papers and publications, often as part of broader works on the Chesapeake as a whole (Shomette 2000; Brugger 1988; Kulikoff 1986; Middleton 1984; Quinn 1982; Tate and Ammerman 1979). However, these works have frequently focused on the Western Shore with its town and urban centers such as St. Mary’s City, Annapolis, and Baltimore. The Eastern Shore has generally been relegated to a side note in these works. The Eastern Shore’s earliest settlement has been understood almost entirely in terms of its geographic isolation from the main body of the Maryland colony and its reliance on tobacco as a cash crop. According to conventional research, these factors led to the development of the Eastern Shore as a region of dispersed rural
communities. The present work seeks to redefine the history of Maryland’s Eastern
Shore, with particular emphasis on Kent County, by focusing less on environmental
factors and more on the individuals who built the communities in question. By taking
into account individual and group agency it may be possible to better understand the non-
environmental factors involved in the trend toward rural living from the Colonial era to
the present.

The research presented in this work is intended as a preliminary study of the past
and present trends toward rural living in Kent County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.
Two main themes are dominant throughout the work, the first being that colonists on the
Eastern Shore may have actively resisted urbanization. The second theme, intimately
linked with the first, is that the lost town of New Yarmouth, the first planned town on the
Eastern Shore, suffered from a lack of interest in or intentional resistance to its founding
by local residents. These themes are investigated through historical document research,
archaeological survey, and studies of present trends in settlement patterns in Kent
County.

The study of colonial resistance to town building on Maryland’s Eastern Shore is
significant on a number of levels. In most previous historical investigations, conducted
primarily by historians rather than archaeologists, the question of why the Eastern Shore
developed as a rural region lacking in formal towns and has continued on this track into
the present has been side-stepped. Much of the research has been conducted under the
theoretical framework of cultural determinism which posits that environmental factors
determine culture, including settlement patterns. Thus, the geographic isolation of the
Eastern Shore directly led to a lack of urban development in the region. In addition, the
fact that the soils of the Eastern Shore were especially good for the growing of tobacco led to the use of tobacco as a cash crop and further stunted the growth of potential urban settlements. The problem with this viewpoint is that it does not account for individual or group agency, de-emphasizing the personal choices of the people who lived in the region.

While the Eastern Shore region is isolated due to its separation from the Western Shore by the expanse of the Chesapeake Bay as well as numerous rivers and coves and tobacco production was an extremely important early economic system, these factors were not entirely responsible for the rural nature of the area. The Eastern Shore had plenty of land on which to grow the “sot weed.” A certain type of tobacco, Orinoco, while less high in quality, grew very well in the area and could be produced at a lower price for higher returns than the better quality strains (Brugger 1988:17 and Kulikoff 1986). However, low prices in the tobacco market during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries encouraged planters to begin growing grains for export (Kulikoff 1986:100). Furthermore, the difficulties associated with travel on the Eastern Shore lessened over time with the construction of bridges and advancements in shipbuilding technology. Therefore, while these factors are important, they may not be the only reasons for this widespread and persistent lack of towns on the Eastern Shore. The present study has sought to bring the history of the Eastern Shore, specifically Kent County, out of the shadows and into the current stream of anthropological research. It attempts to incorporate the choices and attitudes of people involved in the development of the Eastern Shore’s communities.

So infrequently has the Eastern Shore been the focus of intense academic study that any minor research will contribute to the body of knowledge on this unique and
interesting region. In addition, little to no research has been done concerning the possibility of movements of resistance to town building or living on the part of the original colonists of the Eastern Shore. While a great deal has been written on the conflict between William Claiborne, the Virginian who held a trading post on Kent Island when the Calvert family first received the Maryland land grant, and Charles Calvert, the third Lord Baltimore, other inhabitants have been largely ignored. Thus far, little research has been conducted into the possibility that the various peoples living on the Eastern Shore, and Kent County in particular, may have felt that town living was an encroachment on their freedoms or impractical in light of the dual manorial/headright system employed by the Proprietors. Nor has significant research been conducted into the forms possible resistance may have taken.

Locally, the Eastern Shore exhibits settlement patterns which are often dispersed and predominantly rural in nature, even into the present. While towns and cities do exist, they are centered on major waterways and the coastline where tourism plays a key role in economic life, as is the case in Worcester County where the Ocean City beaches and resorts represent a huge tourist destination. Inland the communities remain mostly agricultural and towns are generally small with low population densities, just as they were during the early life of the region. This pattern is so pervasive that for census purposes, several dispersed small communities and farms (considered areas of “dense” population) are often grouped by the government as census designated places (CDPs). Studying the possibility of the resistance of early colonial residents to town building could lead to insights into current trends in possible resistance to urbanization on the Shore.
Additionally, the town of New Yarmouth represents the first county seat of one of the earliest counties in the Maryland colony, Kent County. Locating and studying the archaeological remains of this site is significant for county history as well as the Eastern Shore as a whole since New Yarmouth was one of the first planned towns established in the region. Artifactual evidence from the potential New Yarmouth site and surrounding properties has the ability to increase our knowledge of early seventeenth century life in the Chesapeake (especially concerning wealthy landowners and small scale farmers) as well as of early shipyard life in a region so heavily reliant on shipping and trade.

Material culture from which interpretations can be drawn about early colonial life includes a wide range of artifacts and features. In particular, this work has sought to compare the material cultural remains identified at a variety of locations along Eastern Neck, the small peninsula on which New Yarmouth was once a port. The purpose of this comparison is to determine social patterning in the region. Was Eastern Neck primarily occupied by elite families and large plantation owners or smaller scale farming families? Sites chosen for field investigation included known plantation sites as well as properties which may have represented smaller-scale farms. Comparison of these two types of sites was intended to aid in the understanding of how individuals from one or both classes may have lived in close proximity in the Colonial era and how this may have influenced ideas concerning settlement patterns, including possible resistance to urbanization.

On a broader scale, trends in colonial resistance to town building can be seen throughout the Chesapeake region and the southern colonies but have been little studied. It is important to attempt to gain knowledge about early colonial life since trends such as patterns of resistance to urbanization at the earliest stages of colonization would have had
significant effects on the future social, political, and economic structures of the colonies as a whole.

In an effort to understand the previous research conducted on the history of the Eastern Shore, a literature review was conducted. This literature is explored in relation to the theoretical frameworks in play at the time of their production. The predominant theory utilized within the current project is also explained. The results of this review are presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 provides a list of significant questions designed to guide the research and interpretation of the findings.

Chapter 4 presents the methodology employed throughout the course of this research including archival investigations, cartographic sources, and archaeological investigations. The results of these investigations are presented in Chapters 5 and 6. Chapter 7 presents further results of historic research concerned with more recent trends toward rural living in Kent County. This chapter focuses on the histories and current status of the five towns recognized as municipalities by Kent County.

Chapter 8 provides a brief examination of how each of the research questions was answered or partially addressed and presents the main conclusions drawn from all of the evidence at hand. Chapter 9 summarizes the future research necessary to more fully explore the themes of this paper.
CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL CONTEXT OF PREVIOUS HISTORICAL STUDIES

The study of possible resistance to town living or urbanization on Maryland’s Eastern Shore cannot be conducted without first establishing a theoretical framework. Much of the early work concerning the history and development of the Eastern Shore was written by historians and lay persons during the nineteenth century. Authors from this period include Doyle (1889), Emory (1886), Griffith (1821), Hanson (1876), and McSherry (1849). Each author documented the history of counties, major cities and towns located within the Eastern Shore region, writing from different perspectives, often incorporating a personal perspective to their material. For instance, James McSherry (1849) was a devout Catholic who practiced law in Maryland. He wrote several articles for the *United States Catholic Magazine*, and later published a book concerning the history of the state of Maryland which had a definite religious flavor. For example, whether they were serious historians or merely interested in the history of the region, these authors were influenced by their strong religious beliefs and by their exposure to anthropological theory which was a new and developing school of thought.

By the late seventeen hundreds the philosophical and biological basis for anthropology had been established (McGee and Warms 2004:7). However, anthropology was not yet a discipline and theoretical paradigms were just beginning to emerge. Many of the authors concerned with writing the history of Maryland during the latter portion of the nineteenth century were no doubt influenced by evolutionary theory and social Darwinism and, later, functionalism. Mark Leone and Parker Potter note that
functionalism is often allied with evolutionary theory and that both are frequently equated with religion or other aspects of ideology (Leone and Potter 1988:3).

Functionalism, as South and Thomas write in articles published in a compilation edited by Leone and Potter in 1988, is based on the assumption that the parts of a society can be combined to attain a picture “of how that society works or worked” and that “societies achieve some functional end” such as colonization through missionization, warfare, or another form of power play (South and Thomas 1988:3). Within this context, it makes sense that McSherry and others would feel comfortable incorporating a religious slant in their writings.

Evolutionary theory and functionalism relied heavily on empirical data and description. Authors writing during this period of overlapping and shifting theory were likely to describe and categorize both objects and people. This type of work was often used to uphold ideas of racial superiority and to justify the suppression of “inferior” groups.

For example, in Queen Anne’s County, Maryland: Its Early History and Development (Emory 1886), Emory describes the major Native American tribes that were present in the Eastern Shore’s third officially designated county, Queen Anne, during the colonial period. Emory writes that in 1669 some of the Indians in the region (presumably of the Choptank tribe) were employed in deer hunting and some youths were being educated in English schools, “facts which go to show that the friendliest relations existed between the colonists and the neighboring Indians” (Emory 1886:14). Emory’s 1669 account also describes some of the living conditions of the Indians in the Queen Anne’s
County area, but though he describes these conditions he makes no attempt to interpret the information, a fundamental problem with many older studies.

Later work in anthropological and archaeological theory began to shift away from strict empiricism and categorization and moved toward explanation. To this end, another major theory, Cultural Ecology, developed in an attempt to explain culture and culture change rather than merely to describe (Erickson and Murphy 1998).

Cultural ecology is the traditional framework that has been used to study the lack of town living or urbanization in the Chesapeake. Paynter and McGuire (1991) state in their explanations of culture change that theories associated with cultural ecology - sometimes called cultural determinism in their more extreme forms – minimize or neglect the examination of social power. In this theoretical model, culture change is explained in terms of the relationship between any given society and its environment, or “in the technology for obtaining and/or consuming energy,” a result of outside influences on cultural groups (Paynter and McGuire 1991:3). This theoretical framework places the environment in a key role in terms of culture change but denies individual and group choice unrelated to environmental factors.

Charles Barker (1940), in his discussion of the state of Maryland before the American Revolution, briefly touches on the rural nature of the colony, stating that “economic decentralization” accounts “for certain deficiencies in cultural growth.” Barker asserts that the reason Maryland lacked the urban development represented in the north in places such as Boston, Philadelphia, and New York was that the inhabitants of the region were too isolated by the expanse of tobacco farms and the rivers and inlets of the Chesapeake Bay (Barker 1940:2).
In this explanation, it is the environment as well as the economy that restricted urban growth. However, since Barker seems to view rural life as inferior to urban life, this interpretation would also suggest that people were forced to avoid urbanization rather than electing to resist town living. While such a theory certainly explains the phenomenon of persistent rural living in Maryland as a whole, it fails to account for human agency, both individual and group choice which may have influenced the development of the Eastern Shore.

More recently, the field of anthropology has undergone further changes in theoretical thinking. While explaining cultural changes is still an issue for many, more researchers are now attempting to address cultural issues by interpreting data collected through meticulous research instead of relying totally on the physical and environmental forces that may affect choice.

As the theoretical focus in anthropology turned toward a more processual or post-processual viewpoint, researchers such as Delle, Mrozowski, and Paynter are focusing more on human agency and the role(s) of race, class, and gender in culture and less on outside or environmental influences. Processual archaeologists are concerned with practicing anthropology, and archaeology, as a scientific discipline with a focus on explanation rather than description. Methodology should follow the models established by the hard sciences and data should be utilized to create cross-cultural generalizations about cultures and culture change. In terms of archaeological study, processualists are interested in the formation processes involved in the creation of the archaeological record. Since the 1970s, however, reactions to processual archaeology have been calling for revisions of the theory. The answer for many has been a turn toward post-processual
theory (Shanks and Hodder 2007:144-147). While processual theory seeks to objectively study past cultures post-processual theory asserts that no individual is completely objective and that personal biases will inevitably affect the questions researchers ask. The subjective nature of human beings needs to be taken into account in order to achieve a satisfactory understanding of reality (Preucel 1991).

In light of these new trends in anthropological theory, Delle et al. are finding new ways to connect material culture and archaeological remains with the broader social patterns of cultures (Delle, Mrozowski, and Paynter 2000). Associated with this is a push to re-examine old issues in new ways, such as the traditional views on the cause for the lack of towns on the Eastern Shore during the colonial period. Historic archaeology is at the forefront of this movement.

Other areas of current theoretical interest include the use of space and architecture. Studies involving the use of space do not focus on just environmental landscape. Instead, they incorporate cultural landscapes, defined by Deborah Rotman and Michael Nassaney (1997) as the “articulation” between the natural environment and the “built environment” (Rotman and Nassaney 1997:42). This built environment includes the arrangement and distribution of structures within a landscape as well as the organization of space inside and outside of these structures or areas of activity.

In Maryland, the examination of how space and architecture are utilized within an environment has been incorporated into anthropological studies of three major cities on the Western Shore: St. Mary’s City, Annapolis, and Baltimore (Leone and Hurry 1998; Epperson 2000). By studying the way in which these cities were designed (St. Mary’s City and Annapolis follow a Baroque plan while Baltimore is thought to be a panopticon)
Mark Leone and Silas Hurry, among others, have suggested that these landscapes were intended to draw the eye to those structures which represented the main political and religious beliefs espoused by the leaders of each city (Leone and Hurry 1998).

Terrence W. Epperson (2000) suggests that architecture can also represent forms of power. Epperson studied the homes of Thomas Jefferson and George Mason in an effort to understand the use of the central rotunda at both Monticello and Gunston Hall. Epperson found that the rotunda in both structures provided a more or less uninhibited view of the lands of each estate which may have been an intentional move on the part of the architects as a means of keeping an eye on the grounds and those working them (Epperson 2000). Other studies involving the use of space focus on understanding gender and class relations as well as other concerns (Rotman and Nassaney 1997).

Along with a shift in research designs to focus more on agency, race, class, gender, architecture, and use of space, researchers are now also considering context. De Cunzo (1996) has edited a compilation of articles which all deal to some degree with the communicative qualities of material culture, its active role in constructing identity and mediating interactions, and its lack of meaning outside of a specific context (De Cunzo 1996). Leone and Potter also discuss the issues of ideology and consciousness as being of utmost importance in the study of human cultures. Consciousness, they say, is the “awareness of ideological constructions” which suggests a greater freedom to recognize and employ alternatives after other issues “like political or neurotic ones are visible.” (Leone and Potter 1988:19)

Eric Wolf (1997) and Bill Frazer (1999) as well as others argue that historical archaeology has the ability to incorporate this broader contextual knowledge in
interpreting the past because it is possible to draw information from historical documents as well as oral testimony in addition to the physical archaeological remains recovered. Due to this ability to incorporate a wider variety of data, historical archaeology can begin to look at such phenomenon as patterns of resistance, gender and race relations, and many others, in new ways. Anthropologist Eric Wolf, for instance, believes that it may be possible to begin to look at the processes involved in forming patterns of dominance and resistance by examining “the relations of power that mediate between the mobilization of social labor in society and the mental schemata that define who does what in the division of that labor.” This can be done by looking at the broader systems and studying the ways in which knowledge is acquired, communicated or restricted in vocal and non-vocal shows (Wolf 1997:xiv). In all of this, researchers must be historically informed and include in their work both political economic history and the relationship(s) it has to the formation of genders, classes, ethnicities, and other categories of human identity.

Similarly, Bill Frazer (1999) asserts that historical archaeology has a specific role in the study of power relationships and how they are instigated, revitalized and modified via material culture. With specific reference to interest in forms of resistance, Frazer believes that historical archaeologists must explore both change and continuity by examining the intricate connections between groups in all echelons of social organization (Frazer 1999:4-5).

This paper will employ these most recent theoretical framework designed to broaden our understanding of culture and culture change over time through. By attempting to bring new interpretations to the old question of why colonial Maryland, specifically Kent County on the Eastern Shore, remained a predominantly rural area, this
research is an effort to better understand the context in which town planning took place. It also examines the roles of individuals, class, religion and gender to interpret the social structure of the period.

To meet the goals of this research, a more recent theoretical framework has been chosen on which to hang the interpretations of both historical documents and material culture presented here. Rather than adhere strictly to processual or post-processual theory, this work has been conducted under what Michelle Hegmon has termed a “Processual Plus” theoretical framework.

Hegmon (2003) suggests that while there are several clear theoretical perspectives, including the previously discussed cultural ecology, a large quantity of American archaeology can be classed under the broad category Hegmon has named processual plus archaeology. These theories and methodologies can be grouped together, Hegmon believes, because they share several themes, including an interest in human agency, material culture, gender, and others. In addition, these themes can be studied scientifically, but still be subject to interpretation (Hegmon 2003). Hegmon’s processual-plus framework has of course been criticized. Moss (2005) noted that the concept of processual-plus archaeology blunted the impact of many critiques of processual archaeology and that many of the themes Hegmon is willing to combine under a single heading, including femist and Marxist archaeology, should not be lumped together because those who practice these forms of archaeology often aspire to move beyond scientific archaeological study in an attempt to affect actual social change (Moss 2005). Despite this critique, the concept of processual-plus archaeology is here utilized because
it allows for the convergence of scientific method with interpretation without losing sight of non-environmental factors such as individual and group agency, religion, and gender.

The results of this work are intended as a starting point for more in-depth research into the colonial development of the Eastern Shore as well as the region’s continued rural status. In no way does this work purport to be the final judgment on early trends toward rural living in the region as a whole or in Kent County in particular, nor does it fully answer all of the questions posed. Instead, it is meant to be combined with future research efforts into the political and religious trends of the Colonial era through the present in order to create a more complete picture of the Shore, its various inhabitants, and the factors involved in possible resistance to more structured urbanized communities.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As stated previously, the dominant theme in this work is the possibility that the environment is not the only, nor the leading, factor in the early rural nature of the Eastern Shore in general and Kent County in particular. Specifically, it is posited that intentional resistance to town building or urbanization on the part of one or more groups of Eastern Shore inhabitants could have played a key role in the way in which Kent County developed in the Colonial era and has continued to develop into the present. An additional and intimately linked purpose for the current research is the study of the now lost town of New Yarmouth, the original county seat of Kent County, Maryland. As the earliest planned town on the Eastern Shore, the study of New Yarmouth’s inception and relatively quick failure could shed considerable light on the processes involved in the development of early European settlement in the region.

Before specific questions can be asked concerning early colonial town development and current trends in Kent County settlement patterns, the term “town” must be defined. To that end, this work utilizes the Oxford English Dictionary’s definition of the term “town” for all discussions of Colonial settlement patterns. The Oxford English Dictionary Online (OEDO) states that by 1628 the term “town” was being used in common English to indicate “an inhabited place larger and more regularly built than a village, and having more complete and independent local government.” In addition, the OEDO quotes COKE On Litt. §171. 115b as stating that a town “cannot bee a Towne in Law, vnless it hath, or in time past hath had a Church and celebration of Diuine Seruice” (Oxford English Dictionary Online 2006). This aspect of the colonial use of the term
“town” will become important in later chapters. The same use of the term “town” will be applied to all work related to archaeological evidence of the colonial town of New Yarmouth and when discussing the possibility of colonial resistance to town living.

With a firm definition in place, it is possible to begin exploring the primary objective of this work, whether or not resistance to town living or urbanization played a role in both the early and continued development in Kent County on Maryland’s Eastern Shore. Much of the research related to this objective has been conducted with the use of census records and for the sake of consistency, all work related to recent trends in Eastern Shore settlement rely on the Bureau of the Census for definitions of “rural” and “urban” places. As defined by the Bureau of the Census for the 2000 census, rural is defined as “all territory, population, or housing units located outside of UA’s or UC’s.” A UA, or urban area, is any densely settled territory with a population of 50,000 or more. Additionally, a UC (urban cluster), previously known as an urban place in the 1990 census, is any densely settled territory with at least 2,500 inhabitants but fewer than 50,000 inhabitants. Rural areas, then, consist of places with fewer than 2,500 inhabitants. Towns fall under the general category of “places” and are specifically named as “incorporated places” (Census 2000 Urban and Rural Classification, Appendix A 2006:A-17 to A-22).

Conventional research holds that the Chesapeake region as a whole has few towns due to environmental or geographical constraints and, to a lesser extent, the region’s reliance on tobacco as a cash crop during its early history. In an attempt to move beyond these traditional explanations, several specific research questions have been posed and are discussed in greater detail in later chapters:
• What influences did government (bureaucratic policies, legislation, sanctions), both before and after the overthrow of the Proprietorship, have on colonial actions concerning urbanization?

• How did markets (competing labor forces and market prices) affect local economies? Could the effects of outside markets have influenced one group more so than another, for instance elites as opposed to poorer classes or vice versa, to prefer rural living?

• Did the Crown’s establishment of town acts impose in any way on the freedoms of plantation owners?

• What forms could or did resistance to town building/living have taken? Could the possibility that the church at New Yarmouth was outside of the town proper indicate some form of resistance?

A great deal has been written on the proprietary nature of the original Maryland land grant as well as the Calvert family. This system of government helped to shape the initial settlement of the area but also led to political and religious unrest and the eventual overthrow of the Calvert family as proprietors of the Maryland colony (Brugger 1988; Rainbolt 1979; Warman 1949:23). Despite the troubles associated with the Proprietorship, the government of Maryland, prior to and after the overthrow of the Calvert family, attempted to centralize the tobacco trade by mandating the establishment of towns and ports throughout the region (Kulikoff 1986:104). The body of work concerning this push to urbanize Maryland in order to increase profits in the tobacco trade has been an invaluable resource in the study of the effects of political attitudes on settlement patterns and it has been relatively unproblematic to begin to understand these dynamics. Additionally, the study of the tobacco trade in the Chesapeake region has produced a substantial body of work from which to draw inferences about markets and local economics (Barker 1940; Clemens 1980; Kulikoff 1979 and 1986; Mitchell 1983; Rainbolt 1979; Riley 1950; Shomette 2000; Warman 1949; Wyckoff 1938).
The final two questions are related to one another and have been the most difficult to answer. It may be possible that the large plantation owners of the Eastern Shore were having their rights and freedoms (whether actual or perceived) infringed upon by the government with the enactment of the numerous town acts of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. As Clemens (1980) points out, the European settlers of the Eastern Shore “came to obtain land, establish families, and raise crops and livestock.” (Clemens 1980:80) The obtainment of land had the potential to provide settlers with a means of income and livelihood as well as a certain level of freedom, assuming, of course, that individuals were capable of cultivating that land and that the acquired property was sufficient for cultivation or other economic pursuits. Those who had established themselves as large, wealthy plantation owners would have come under financial obligations associated with the establishment of towns (increased costs for the transportation of crops to towns and taxes on tobacco at ports as well as the possible fines associated with inspection regulations) which may have represented threats to their wealth and power base. This may have led to the intentional resistance to town living at least on the part of the wealthy. On the other hand, the presence of a town could have supplied wealthy landowners with a means of further displaying their wealth by allowing them to maintain two homes, one within the town limits and one on their plantation.

Intimately linked with the above argument is the form(s) resistance to town living and urbanization may have taken, and may continue to take today, on the Eastern Shore. The fact that many plantation owners built wharves on numerous navigable waterways may be viewed as both a means of securing more profit but also as a form of resistance to
the establishment of acts which dictated where planters were required to transport their products for shipping and trade (Kulikoff 1980:107).

Further objectives of this research included the exploration of the current lack of urbanization and town living throughout the Eastern Shore today. This objective has led to questions related to current Eastern Shore settlement patterns as they remain predominantly rural in nature, although this increasingly began to change after the much objected to construction of the Bay Bridge and today with the onset of urban sprawl (Brugger 1988:564-565; Eastern Shore Land Conservancy 2004). Although it is recognized that cultural values and factors have changed significantly from the eighteenth century to the present (trends which may be tracked through historic documents), the Eastern Shore persists in exhibiting a lack of urbanization which may, in part, be the result of resident resistance to town living or representative of the legacy of the earliest settlers of the Eastern Shore. Specific questions which have arisen in relation to this objective include what possible influence, if any, does the current agricultural market and recent interest in protecting historical sites and sites of natural beauty or significance have on town building and increased urbanization? To what extend has a tradition of rural living influence current residents in terms of their views on urbanization?

This work has sought to shed light on the possibility that early colonial residents of the Eastern Shore actively resisted town building or living which influenced settlement patterns, potentially even into the present. In an effort to gain archaeological support for this theory, the potential site of New Yarmouth, the first county seat of Kent County, Maryland and one of the first planned towns established on the Eastern Shore as a whole has been chosen as a case study. Based on the present historical information, it is
believed that New Yarmouth is representative of the type of towns being established throughout the Eastern Shore region during the Colonial period, including its simple grid plan and location on an important waterway. Archival research has led to the identification of what the author believes to be the location of this now lost town. Archaeological evidence lends support to this position.

Additional questions initially posed at the outset of this project deal with how archaeological evidence may support or refute the notion of intentional resistance to urbanization. Could structural remains indicate a form of active resistance? For instance, if archaeological evidence suggested that houses within the New Yarmouth town boundary were not constructed according to the plan established by Ringgold and Tovey, could it indicate resistance to strict guidelines or rather represent the financial situation of the inhabitants? Other archaeological evidence includes the remains of an official or governmental presence. Can such a presence be seen in structural remains, luxury goods such as fine porcelains and tobacco pipes, or other material remains marked with official insignias (for instance, wine bottles bearing an official seal or ceramic remains decorated with a royal crest)?

Additionally, it is known that New Yarmouth was designated as an official port for tobacco trade. Archaeological evidence of the two shipyards purported to have been present at the site may reveal information concerning how heavily the site was utilized for this purpose and what types of materials other than tobacco were entering and exiting the town. Survey of this site was also planned in order to better understand the physical layout of early planned towns as well as to glean information on population dynamics. Were the residents of this town primarily involved in agricultural or shipyard pursuits?
How did elites and poorer classes interact and live in relation to one another? Other specific questions posed in relation to the planning and establishment of the New Yarmouth site include:

- Who were the “new citizens” of New Yarmouth?
- Did the two shipyards exist at the site and, if so, who comprised the labor force?
- Was the church located outside of the town? Would this be comparable with other similar sites or would such a location reflect a rare or isolated incidence? If the church were outside of the town, could this indicate a form of resistance to the church or to the town itself?
- What were the political agendas of James Ringgold and Samuel Tovey?
- Did local plantation owners relocate to the town or remain removed? Perhaps they remained on their plantations but also owned property in the town?
- How did outside markets influence the economic prosperity and eventual failure of New Yarmouth and towns like it?
- Did the benefits of town living outweigh the negatives or the other way around?

The above questions have been posed in an attempt to examine an old problem in a new way. The trend in the Chesapeake region toward rural living, both in the colonial era and the present, has been noted by many scholars. However, these scholars have mainly been content to focus on Maryland’s Western Shore and to credit environment and a cash crop economy for this Eastern Shore phenomenon rather than delving deeper into individual and group behavior in the region. Some of these questions overlap and all are intended to be connected in some way.

Not all of these questions could be addressed within the confines of this project but a concerted effort was made to at least partially address the majority of them through archival and historical research. Those questions related to archaeological research were
more constrained, as they required work within the Kent County region. Every effort was made to travel to Maryland’s Eastern Shore in order to conduct this essential research.
CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This project has sought to better understand the potential for resistance to town living and urbanization on Maryland’s Eastern Shore through the employment of a multivariate research design. Although the majority of the work consists of archival research and previous literature studies, cartographic sources and archaeological investigations have also been invaluable in reaching the research goal. Each portion of the project has been designed in an effort to extract the maximum of information possible within the parameters of the study.

Archival Research

The primary line of evidence for this project has been documentary sources. The questions and themes presented in this work deal primarily with early European inhabitants of the Eastern Shore. For this reason, colonial documents have been an invaluable source of information for both general Kent County history and specific details pertaining to the development of the town of New Yarmouth.

Many of the archival materials utilized during this project were previously collected from the Maryland Historical Archives in Annapolis by Washington College’s Public Archaeology Laboratory Director, Elizabeth Seidel. These materials included original deeds to the James Ringgold land holdings and documents detailing the sale of portions of these holdings to Samuel Tovey. Additional materials include two accounts of life at the New Yarmouth site which were acquired through the Maryland Historical Society in Chestertown, Maryland. Although Seidel previously reviewed these materials,
they were revisited and examined for details which may shed further light on the possible location of the now lost town of New Yarmouth.

Despite the body of documentary evidence already compiled, the author visited the Maryland State Historical Archives on several occasions in the summer of 2007 to ensure that all significant sources had been identified and studied. Additional materials acquire during these visits include land grants and patents for the properties surrounding New Yarmouth, wills, and court proceedings from the time during which court was held in New Yarmouth. These materials were viewed on microfilm at the Archives and copies of the text in their original format were made for future transcription by the author. Additional materials, including paintings and other images and census records were viewed on the Archives’ website. Copies of these materials were also made for future study.

While each of these lines of evidence was able to provide important clues about early colonial settlement and society, there were a number of caveats to consider when relying on them. Historical documents can only truly be understood and utilized when fair consideration is given to the social context in which they were written and the individual motivation of the author in producing the work. On a more practical note, archival documents are subject to deterioration and loss which can create gaps in the historical record. This particular concern has been of significance to this work as a key document, one of two versions of the original Ringgold/Tovey deed likely created within a short time of one another, is missing the portion which indicates the date of the document. Both versions of this deed are located on microfilm at the Archives and it was necessary to make the decision to rely on the dated version. The problem here is, of
course, that the dated document may not be the final deed and, therefore, the most reliable source for study. However, it is the most complete document available and in deciding to utilize it the author is aware that valuable information may have been lost or misinterpreted. Finally, many historical documents are transcribed during the research process and all researchers must keep in mind the potential for faulty transcriptions on the part of both previous and current researchers. Letters and symbols in written English during the Colonial era are often easily misinterpreted which can alter the meaning of the original text. The author has been exceedingly careful when transcribing documents to avoid such pitfalls but recognizes that the potential for error is always present.

All deeds and other historical documents were carefully read in order to ascertain when and how James Ringgold and Samuel Tovey conducted their business and established a plan for the founding of New Yarmouth. Special attention was paid to the metes and bounds of each parcel of land Tovey purchased from Ringgold as well as the descriptions of these parcels listed in the deeds. Later accounts by local historians, predominantly based on oral testimony and a few ambiguous archaeological finds, were also studied in an attempt to gain further details about the region in which New Yarmouth once existed. The metes and bounds of the original 100 acre parcel which was to become a town were then matched against the verbal descriptions of the area. These same verbal descriptions were compared with current maps of the Eastern Neck region with special attention paid to the western bank of Gray’s Inn Creek. Additionally, the locations designated as the New Yarmouth site by earlier local historians were compared with both the deed information and current maps. This work was originally conducted by Dr. John Seidel and Elizabeth Seidel and was later revisited for this project. This information
made it possible to establish a new and more likely potential location for the site. The site is now thought to lie on the land between Joiners Cove to the north and Goose Cove to the south with a small portion of timberland set aside north of the town site between Browns Cove and Lucy Cove (Figure 5).
Cartographic Sources

Maps have played a key role in the understanding of the development of a rural landscape on Maryland’s Eastern Shore. Historic as well as modern maps were consulted in an effort to compare past and current town distributions and privately held lands versus town lands. Comparing this data over an extended period of time has the potential to inform on the typical life span of towns in the research region. If it is noted that town names and indicators only appear for brief periods before disappearing from maps, it may support the concept of a trend toward resistance to town living. As is the case with other forms of historical documentation, cartographic sources were created within specific social contexts and with individual motivations behind them.

Historical map research has focused primarily on locating the town of New Yarmouth on Eastern Neck. Historical maps from the early and mid nineteenth century were examined for land owner and place names and symbols which may be associated with similar land owner and place names and symbols discussed in other forms of historical documentation such as deeds, land grants and patents, wills, and census records. Direct correlations between the visual evidence in historic maps and the written evidence of other forms of historic documentation could help to either support or refute the premise that the Town of New Yarmouth was established along Gray’s Inn Creek, between Brown’s Cove and Lucy Cove, on Eastern Neck Maryland. In addition, comparisons between different historical maps have the potential to show population change and movement over time.

The use of historic maps has been especially significant in better understanding that period during which the Eastern Shore saw an upsurge in the number of towns
incorporated in the region. Regional maps plotting the locations of railroads were utilized to identify both likely and actual locations for the development of towns in Kent County during the nineteenth century. The use of cartographic sources is discussed in further detail in later chapters.

**Archaeological Investigations**

This project has been reliant on archaeological investigations in two main ways: in the identification of the currently lost site of New Yarmouth and as a means of comparing social status among colonial residents of Eastern Neck. Archaeological investigations were conducted in conjunction with the 2007 Washington College Summer Field School in Archaeology.

The primary goal of archaeological investigations was the location of the site of the now lost town of New Yarmouth. To this end, historical documents such as land grants and deeds were consulted in an effort to identify the current owner of Napley Green, the property here posited as the potential location of the New Yarmouth site. During the course of this work it was discovered that the man who owned the property died in 2006; he was over 100 years old. Following his death, ownership of the property fell to an out of state relative who proved difficult to contact. Once contact was made with this individual she agreed to allow access to the property for pedestrian survey. However, the lessee of the land would not agree to the research program and the property owner supported the decision. Despite the inability of the author to gain access to the potential town site itself, archaeological investigations of surrounding properties proved useful in supporting the interpretation of where New Yarmouth was located.
As is the case with many properties on the Eastern Shore, the potential location of the New Yarmouth site and much of Eastern Neck is under agricultural production. For this reason, a strategy of basic pedestrian survey of all targeted properties was employed during archaeological investigations. A pedestrian survey, or surface collection survey, is a non-invasive survey technique generally employed on recently plowed fields but possible in other settings provided surface visibility is at least 50 percent (Shaffer and Cole 1994:11-12; The Council of South Carolina Professional Archaeologists 2005:14-18; Virginia Department of Historic Resources rev. 2001:84). Some experimental work has shown that the act of plowing brings buried artifacts to the surface without moving them too far from their original depositional locations (Ammerman 1985 and Odell and Cowan 1987).

During a pedestrian survey, a research team (in this case students from Washington College as well as laboratory staff members) arranged themselves at even intervals along a baseline at the edge of a field. When an area was suspected to contain more plentiful archaeological deposits, crew members lined up at twenty foot intervals whereas areas which were deemed less likely to provide significant amounts of artifactual evidence called for longer intervals of fifty feet apart or more. During the current study it was found that most survey areas were located in agricultural fields employing the no-till method of farming. This method involved leaving the chaff from previous crops in the field which was later disced rather than plowed. While this method decreased visibility, it was still possible to identify surface artifacts with a 20 foot survey interval. Crew members walked forward along their designated transects at a steady pace and carried pin flags with which to mark isolated artifacts or concentrations of cultural material visible
on the ground surface. These flags were later used as a guide for mapping artifact concentrations thought to represent sites. Diagnostic materials were collected for further analysis in a laboratory setting. Pedestrian survey had the potential to not only identify sites based on areas of highest artifact concentration, but also to aid in defining the boundaries of sites without expending a great amount of time and money (Shaffer and Cole 1994:11-12).

Pedestrian survey of several properties located on Eastern Neck, both in the vicinity of and moving further away from the potential New Yarmouth site, was conducted in late May and early June of 2007 in cooperation with the Washington College Summer Field School in Archaeology. Conducting pedestrian survey during the summer months allows for optimum visibility. At this time, fields have been recently tilled and planted but crops are often not yet mature enough to restrict visibility to below seventy or eighty percent.

Both artifactual and structural remains related to shipyard and domestic activities were all identified during the archaeological survey of Eastern Neck properties. In particular, the preponderance of large stones, likely ballast, located throughout the property owned by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation between Browns Cove and Lucy Cove, was significant in supporting the interpretation that Napley Green is the location of the New Yarmouth site. These finds also helped to shed light on early seventeenth century domestic activities and social status along the peninsula.

Artifact Processing and Long-Term Storage

All artifacts recovered during archaeological investigations are housed at the Washington College Public Archaeology Laboratory in the historic Custom House,
Chestertown, Maryland. At this location they were cleaned, identified, catalogued and analyzed by the author with support from field school students.

All artifact processing was undertaken with archival quality materials including acid free paper and archival quality pigment pens. The collection was used to aid students in the identification of archaeological materials such as ceramics, glass, nails, etc. and will ultimately be returned to the landowner. If a landowner chose to donate these materials, they are housed in the Washington College Public Archaeology Laboratory at Washington College as part of its public education collection and may be put on display.
CHAPTER 5

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MARYLAND COLONY

The study of Maryland’s Eastern Shore cannot be removed from the history of the establishment of the Maryland colony as a whole. The political, religious, economic, and social ideals which were incorporated into the plan for the establishment of the Maryland colony surely played a role in the way in which the Eastern Shore would later be settled. For this reason, it is considered important to briefly discuss the history of the founding of Maryland in the early seventeenth century. In the following chapter, the colonial history of Maryland is outlined from the initial settlement of the Western Shore through the little researched development of Kent County on the Eastern Shore and the planning of Kent County’s first “town.”

Colonizing the Western Shore

The Maryland colony envisioned by the three Lords Baltimore most influential in the colony’s establishment (George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, his son Cecilius, the second Lord Baltimore, and Charles, the third Lord Baltimore) was one designed around the manorial system and freedom of religion for Catholics (Menard and Carr 1982:172-190).

A charter for a colony in the Chesapeake was eagerly sought by George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore. George Calvert was a Catholic Englishman living in Britain during the reign of Charles I, a Protestant monarch with a Catholic wife. Calvert, like many within the relatively small British Catholic community, was from the landowning class and lived during a period in which anti-Catholic statutes were common. Although Catholics were often considered traitorous, as they were perceived to have sided with the
Spanish during the previous century, King Charles I’s court contained a number of courtiers who were both secretly and openly sympathetic toward Catholics (Bossy 1982:149-151). This situation would lead to political strife and eventual overthrow of the British Crown, but during the lifetime of George Calvert, it meant that Catholics had some options when it came to practicing their faith.

George Calvert himself had enjoyed a successful career as an official for the British Crown during the early seventeenth century. However, Calvert supported pro-Spanish policies and renewed his Catholic faith in the 1620’s, moves which ended his office-holding years. Despite this, Calvert had gained a wealth of experience during his tenure as an official, including investing in colonizing ventures such as the Virginia Company as early as 1609. In 1621, Calvert sent a small contingent of men and women to Newfoundland to establish his Avalon colony. In 1623 he asked for and was granted a charter which gave him “complete jurisdiction over his colony.” This charter was the direct forebear of the charter Calvert would obtain for his next big venture, Maryland (Menard and Carr 1982:173-174).

Although it was George Calvert who first sought the Maryland charter, it would be his son, Cecilius who saw the fruition of his father’s grand scheme. By the time of his death in April of 1632, George Calvert had not yet received the charter for a colony in the New World that he had sought from the Crown. This was, in part, the result of opposition to the concession. George passed on his estate and his vision for a colony in the New World to his son Cecilius who was, in June of the same year, the beneficiary of his father’s work and received a charter for an area north of Virginia to be known as Maryland. This charter “granted regal powers” to the second Lord Baltimore which
enabled him to “declare war, raise a militia, pass laws with the assent of an assembly of freemen, establish courts of justice, punish and pardon, and appoint all government officials” (Menard and Carr 1982:175). Essentially, Cecilius Calvert was “virtually king in Maryland. With the aid of the assembly he could pass any law which did not come into conflict with the laws of England” (Fiske 1976:30) (Figure 6).

Figure 6. Charles Calvert receiving the Charter of Maryland from King Charles I, by [Edwin] Tunis, King Charles I and Cecil Calvert, charcoal drawing, Tunis Collection, Maryland State Archives. MSA SC1480-1-2.

Cecilius wanted to establish a colony based on the manorial system, a vision he shared with his father before him who had borrowed the idea from colonizing ventures undertaken in Ireland (Menard and Carr 1982:173). The manorial system would have established in the Maryland colony an elite class of wealthy individuals with high social standing. These elite citizens would become the gentry, providing a foundation of leadership based on wealth and land which Calvert believed would aid in the establishment of an orderly settlement in the New World. These elite colonists would
bring with them enough settlers in the form, mainly, of indentured servants to establish
the Maryland colony. In return for their investments, these individuals would receive
land grants, anywhere from 100 to upwards of 3,000 acres. Anyone who was able to
arrange for the transport of enough men to receive a grant of land of 1,000 to 3,000 acres
“could have the tract erected into a manor, with the right to hold courts and with all other
privileges usually attached to a manor in England.” The long term plan for these new
lords of manors was the formation of a loyal group of political leaders answering to Lord
Baltimore. Calvert hoped that the very fact that these individuals were dependent on him
for their land and titles would ensure their loyalty to the Proprietor (Menard and Carr

Lord Baltimore intended to establish the town of Saint Mary’s on the Western
Shore as his center of government. From this seat, the Proprietor would rule the colony
through his loyal manor lords and effectively create a well ordered and thriving society in
the Maryland wilderness. As Menard and Carr (1982) point out, though, transporting the
manorial system wholesale from England to the New World turned out to be a
problematic business. Calvert was convinced that establishing a town was key to the
growth and prosperity of his new colony. However, the system he established was
dependent on indentured servants who owed their passage to the New World to wealthier
individuals in the form of several years’ worth of labor. These indentured servants would
have worked off their debt in due time and expected the small plots of land they had been
promised as a propaganda measure to entice them to the New World. The land available
in St. Mary’s for newly freed indentured servants, though was growing increasingly small
within the boundaries of the “town” Calvert envisioned. This problem stemmed from the
headright system Lord Baltimore established side-by-side with his intention to distribute town lots of 5 to 10 acres to settlers and recently freed indentured servants. Although small lots were available for some less wealthy individuals, the headright system allowed the more prosperous investors, Calvert’s “gentry,” to claim much larger plots of land and effectively shut out the many lower status colonists from the proposed St. Mary’s town area. While the “gentry” in the new colony were mainly Catholics seeking both religious freedom and increased wealth in the New World, the indentured servants, representing the majority of colonists, were predominantly Protestants. This meant that both groups had to interact and tolerate one another. For this reason, and despite the fact that the charter for the Maryland colony stated that the Church of England would be established in Maryland, Calvert supported and instituted a policy of religious toleration (Fiske 1976:30). In addition, centralized populations in the form of towns like St. Mary’s were unnecessary for economic prosperity since economic markets were “in the hands of English merchants and ships’ captains” (Menard and Carr 1982:194 and 197). For these reasons, the town of St. Mary’s was slow to grow and early on it appeared that Calvert’s vision would fail entirely.

Despite the set-backs associated with the Calvert vision of a manorial Maryland colony and the realities of the system as they functioned in the New World, the second Lord Baltimore was eventually able to establish a town on the Western Shore which he called St. Mary’s Town. The eventual growth of this city likely depended heavily on the fact that it was the seat of Maryland’s colonial government. By the 1660’s, some three decades after the initial establishment of the Maryland colony, the population of the town of St. Mary’s was sufficiently large to require the construction of public buildings
(Menard and Carr 1982:197). In light of its slow early start, the baroque plan of the town supports Leone and Hurry’s belief that it was designed to draw the eye to those structures representative of the main political and religious beliefs of the city’s leaders (Leone and Hurry 1998) makes sense. It is reasonable to suggest that Cecilius Calvert would want to ensure that his new settlement was aware of higher establishment in terms of governance since his own manorial system had created tension between his proprietorship and the power of his manorial lords. It seems possible that the early settlement of the Western Shore of Maryland was just as resistant to urbanization as the Eastern Shore would become, although the Western Shore would later see a turn toward town growth unparalleled on the Shore.

Given the extent of the troubles plaguing the fledgling town of St. Mary’s, it is easy to imagine how an area even more remote, such as the Eastern Shore, could fail to produce urban centers of wealth and commerce. It is also easy to see why so many researchers have chosen to set aside the Eastern Shore as rural due to geographic isolation. However, the Western Shore was able to begin expanding its urban centers relatively quickly after the abandonment of St. Mary’s as the colony’s capital and its removal to Annapolis further up the Bay. Why then, was the Eastern Shore unable, or unwilling, to expand to the same extent?

Colonizing the Eastern Shore

While much has been written concerning the founding of the Maryland colony, most of it has focused on the Western Shore and St. Mary’s City. Colonization of the Eastern Shore is little studied and, therefore, little known. The following is a very brief sketch of the circumstances of early Eastern Shore settlement as they are usually found in
Maryland’s Eastern Shore had been the location of settlement prior to the Calvert land grant. In 1631, a Virginian by the name of William Claiborne received a charter from Virginia to establish a small trading post on Kent Island. Claiborne and a number of followers had been living on Kent Island since approximately 1627 (The Maryland Historical Trust 1967:7), he had received this charter prior to the Crown’s grant of the Maryland land to Lord Baltimore, and was already running a successful trading business with the local Native peoples and had built a stockade, church, and store by the time the first of Calvert’s colonists arrived on the Western Shore in 1634 (Brugger: 1988:12 and The Maryland Historical Trust 1967:1) (Figure 7).

William Claiborne vehemently protested the land grant conveyed by the Crown to Lord Baltimore because it included Kent Island and the Eastern Shore. Claiborne argued that the grant did not include land already settled, for he had persuaded a number of Virginians to settle on Kent Island with him and begin planting crops. This small group considered themselves and their island, the largest in the Chesapeake Bay, to be part of
Virginia (Brugger 1988:12, Menard and Carr 1982:190, The Maryland Historical Trust 1967:1-7). Claiborne and his followers set the tone for Eastern Shore settlement by steadfastly holding to their belief that Kent Island was separate from the Maryland land grant (Figure 8). Claiborne went so far as to convince the local Native American tribes in 1634 that the newly arrived Maryland settlers were actually hostile Spanish invaders. In 1635 he would lead violent skirmishes against Calvert’s ships. However, Claiborne’s resistance to the Calvert land grant caused his fur trading to suffer and eventually all claims to the land in question were deemed to be under the control of Lord Baltimore. Despite this set-back, Claiborne and his followers took advantage of changing political tides in England and upon the execution of King Charles I in 1649 and the subsequent establishment of the Commonwealth, the new Cromwellian government instructed him to subjugate the province from which he had been banished. During this period, Claiborne and others were successful in bringing Kent Island and the Eastern Shore back into Virginia. In the end, however, Cecilius Calvert regained his proprietorship and reinstate his claim over the region (The Maryland Historical Trust 1967:6-7). Claiborne and his followers had to come to terms with the Lord Proprietor, though Claiborne himself left Kent Island and returned to Virginia to continue plotting against Maryland (Brugger 1988:13).
Given the earliest settlement of the Eastern Shore and its resultant conflict, it seems little wonder that the Shore should develop in a different manner than the Western Shore. The Eastern Shore was a place apart from the beginning, both in terms of its geography and its earliest colonists. From the beginning, the Eastern Shore was not settled as part of Maryland, but rather as part of the Virginia colony. As with the Kent Island settlement, many colonists to the Eastern Shore, including some of the most prominent names in Kent County history, were emigrants from Virginia. In addition, settlement on the Shore came about later than that on the Western Shore and during a time of turmoil. Not only was conflict clear between Claiborne, his followers, and the Lord Proprietor, but the political climate abroad influenced government in the new Maryland colony and settlement of the Shore saw both proprietary rule and governance under the Commonwealth. It seems possible, if not likely, that the original colonists of the Eastern Shore, in the form of the Kent Island settlers, saw themselves as different from Western Shore Maryland inhabitants and sought to remain separate, as indicated by
their allegiance to Claiborne prior to the reinstitution of Lord Baltimore and the Lord Proprietor. Also, these original settlers did not immigrate to the Shore under the manorial system imposed by the Claverts, but rather were used to the governing methods present in the Virginia colony from which they mainly came.

Establishing Kent County, Maryland

Kent Island was the first portion of what is today considered the Eastern Shore of Maryland to be settled by Europeans during the Colonial Period. Kent Island would later lend its name to the first officially established county on the Shore, Kent County. By 1647, Kent County was established on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, only the second county ever officially established in the colony, and included Kent Island. Although it is likely that Kent County was established earlier, perhaps as early as 1642, the first written record of it does not appear until 1647. The settlers of Kent County seem to have come both from Virginia and Britain, though the earliest were immigrants from the Virginia Colony. These individuals included wealthy adventurers, members of the landowning classes, and indentured servants, the same demographic which appeared on the Western Shore in 1643. Those making the journey from England were often, as was the case with Western Shore settlers, Catholics seeking religious freedom. Many indentured servants were Protestants eager to serve their indenture and later gain access to land of their own, a commodity in short supply in their native country. A few Jesuits were also present among the first group of settlers sailing to the Maryland colony. Much of this demographic information is gleaned from works related to the Western Shore alone. Unfortunately, little work exists on the first settlers of the Eastern Shore and no census records for the Shore exist prior to 1797.
The Ringgold family, highly significant in the history of Kent County, originally emigrated from Virginia to the Eastern Shore. Thomas Ringgold was the family patriarch, having come from England to the New World sometime prior to the 1670’s (likely much earlier than this) and was also a key figure in much of early Eastern Shore politics and governance. Ringgold has been described as “an agitating Puritan who was unwelcome in Virginia, so settled in Maryland where he was granted religious freedom.” (Newman 1985:279) Thomas Ringgold was established in Maryland during Kent County’s earliest days, and in 1652 when complaints were brought against Captain Robert Vaughan, “the chief in place and command upon” Kent Island, by the inhabitants of the island, Ringgold, along with several other men, was named a Commissioner for Kent Island by Parliament (The Maryland Historical Trust 1967:28). At this time, Kent Island was the location of court hearings, though no formal courthouse was present at that location. Ringgold thus held significant political clout on the Eastern Shore during the early Colonial Period. Thomas Ringgold’s eldest son, James Ringgold would later marry a Vaughan, of the Kent Island Vaughan’s his father had been named to regulate. It was James Ringgold who worked together with Samuel Tovey, recently arrived from England in the 1670’s, to establish one of the first planned towns on Maryland’s Eastern Shore.

**Eastern Neck and the “Town” of New Yarmouth**

Little is known about Samuel Tovey, James Ringgold’s associate in the New Yarmouth venture. Although Gust Skordas lists Tovey as arriving in Maryland from England in 1675 and transporting his wife and two children to the New World in 1679, this date of arrival is likely inaccurate (Skordas 1968). The original document indicating the property transferred from Ringgold to Tovey, that which would later become New
Yarmouth, is dated 1673 (Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 373-377) and though this could indicate that Ringgold corresponded with Tovey prior to his emigration to the New World, there are no other documents which suggest it. In any event, Tovey was present on the Eastern Shore in the early 1670’s and was active in local politics. Tovey’s name appears in court documents as a witness as well as the minutes of the meetings of colonial commissioners as a Kent County commissioner in St. Mary’s City (Maryland State Archives 2009). James Ringgold and Samuel Tovey represented important and apparently wealthy figures in colonial Maryland. Together, they planned to establish a town on the western shore of Gray’s Inn Creek on Eastern Neck, Kent County, Maryland. Such a town, bolstered by the conveyance of a courthouse and jail, was hoped to gain the pair further social and political status.

As has been noted previously, St. Mary’s City on the Western Shore remained an urban area due to its status as the seat of government in the new Maryland colony. Both Ringgold and Tovey would surely have understood the significance of possessing the county courthouse within their own town. Since Kent County was still relatively new in the 1670’s and its borders rather ambiguous (until 1662 Kent was the only county on the Eastern Shore), the region would likely have need of a centralized body of justice easily accessible by all members of early Eastern Shore society (Maryland State Archives 2006). Court had previously been held on Kent Island, but the population of the Eastern Shore was now spreading out from this original point of settlement. Lord Baltimore declared that “the County Court be held in some part of East Neck rather than on Kent Island as formerly.” (McCall 1993:4) It seems probable that the choice of East Neck (Eastern Neck) reflected the movement of Eastern Shore settlement up from Kent Island.
to the nearby and easily navigable Chester River, though there are no surviving census records from this era from which to glean population statistics. Gray’s Inn Creek feeds from roughly the mouth of the Chester River, which opens onto the Chesapeake Bay, northward into the point of land known today as Eastern Neck. Since it was declared that the court be moved to Eastern Neck, Ringgold probably saw this as a golden opportunity to increase his wealth and standing since he had inherited a large portion of the neck, a property known as Huntigfield, upon the death of his father Thomas. By joining forces with Samuel Tovey, and selling portions of the Huntingfield property to him, Ringgold was able to outline a plan for a town which could house the county court as mandated by the Proprietor.

In addition to the fact that James Ringgold held a large proportion of the land on Eastern Neck, the area is reported to have possessed a church as early as 1652 (McCall 1993:2). McCall, in his *A Tricentennial History of St. Paul’s Church, Kent*, merely states that “some accounts” relate that the Anglican St. Peter’s church was present on Eastern Neck. However, McCall fails to provide any form of citation for this information which could be traced in an effort to verify the claim. If the claim concerning St. Peter’s was accurate, the church’s presence would have been significant for the formation of a town. The Oxford English Dictionary Online (OEDO) states that by 1628 the term “town” was being used in common English to indicate “an inhabited place larger and more regularly built than a village, and having more complete and independent local government.” Although a town was larger than a village it was not necessarily larger in population as some areas were considered towns by the presence of a periodic market or “by being historically ‘towns.'” The OEDO quotes COKE *On Litt.* §171.115b as stating that a
town “cannot bee a Towne in Law, vnless it hath, or in time past hath had a Church and celebration of Diuine Seruice.” (Oxford English Dictionary Online 2006) As this was the common usage of the term “town” during the period in which Ringgold was living, his choice of that term in the document outlining his sale of property to Tovey with the intention of building a town seems significant. Ringgold, a large land holder on Eastern Neck, would have been aware of both the earlier St Peter’s church and its location and could, therefore, call his town a legal town in all senses of the word at that time.

By 1678 Ringgold apparently held enough sway in political circles and enough land on Eastern Neck to succeed in establishing the town he and Tovey planned in prior years. The pair planned their town in an area of low population density at a time when both the proprietary government and the Crown were pushing for urbanization to increase their profits from shipping and trade. Despite these desires, few towns had developed in the Maryland colony and by 1678 New Yarmouth would have been the first such “urban” area on the Eastern Shore. In 1681, four years after Ringgold and Tovey first endeavored to build a town, “the Inhabitants of Kent County” consented to place the county courthouse in the town of New Yarmouth and this structure with accompanying jail was conveyed to Ringgold by Charles Calvert, third Lord Baltimore, and then Proprietor of the Maryland colony. It is interesting to note that although New Yarmouth had been planned four years prior to the conveyance and at least one street, East Street, had been named, no mention is made of the residents of the town (Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 146-149). New Yarmouth was founded by two men who were able to take advantage of the unique situation present in the Maryland colony and on the Eastern
Shore at that time. These men were well-to-do, held political office, and recognized an opportunity to better their positions.

The establishment of the town of New Yarmouth is significant in Eastern Shore history and has the potential to shed light on the lack of urbanization in the region during the Colonial Era. The history of this important site, as it has been interpreted from the historical documentation available, is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5 (Figure 9).

The Eastern Shore in Context

The Eastern Shore of Maryland was colonized during a period of local turmoil and foreign upheaval. The strip of land known today commonly as The Shore, saw little advancement in population growth during its early history. It may be possible that this lack of population growth was in part the result of the Calvert focus on the Western Shore and the urban centers which the Lord Propriector hoped to found there. Ships sailing from England and transporting settlers to the Maryland colony landed on the Western Shore, while the individuals who first settled the Eastern Shore were predominantly emigrants from northern Virginia who saw themselves as separate from the new arrivals. In addition, these frontiersmen, as they can be considered, literally fought for their right to remain a part of the Virginia colony, rather than being incorporated into the new
Maryland colony. Those who remained once it had become clear that Lord Baltimore possessed control of the region, and those who followed shortly thereafter, may have been seeking, as it seems was the case with Thomas Ringgold, religious freedom. Those hardy enough to brave the as of yet unexplored Eastern Shore were also likely seeking land and a chance at personal wealth.
CHAPTER 6
THE SEARCH FOR NEW YARMOUTH

The planned town of New Yarmouth, the first county seat of Kent County, Maryland, the first county on the Eastern Shore, has been lost to history. The town existed, it would seem, from approximately 1678 to 1696 when the courthouse and jail were removed from the town and moved further up the Chester River to Chestertown, still the county seat of Kent County today. Without the benefit of possessing the county’s main political structure, the town was apparently no longer necessary and the name New Yarmouth ceases to appear in written documents. The location of the town has been debated for many years and several individuals have sought to relocate the locally significant site.

As part of the current research, an attempt has been made to once again locate the site of New Yarmouth on the western bank of Gray’s Inn Creek on Eastern Neck. New Yarmouth is considered significant to this research at hand because it reflects the short-term nature of urban areas on the Eastern Shore, despite careful planning, a favorable location on a navigable waterway, and legal status as an official port for the tobacco trade. It is suggested here that New Yarmouth, though purportedly a thriving “town” in the modern sense of the word, was in actuality a “paper town” in the words of Don Shomette (Shomette 2000), with few apparent residents within its bounds. Several questions directly related to the town of New Yarmouth have been posed previously in Chapter 3. Unfortunately, this work has been unable to answer many of these questions. Although in depth research with historic documents has proved a fruitful source of information on the “town,” little evidence has been found to indicate how dense the
population within the town was or that those who did keep houses in the town kept them as their primary residences. It would seem that only archaeological investigation can truly answer the questions concerning the “new inhabitants” of New Yarmouth and the existence there of structures outside of the courthouse, jail, and buildings already present as part of Samuel Tovey’s homestead. Archaeological investigations, however, had to first focus on locating the site of the town before they could begin to be applied to the plan, organization, and residents of the town. For this reason, all archaeological work and much of the historical documentation research conducted as part of this thesis has by necessity sought to relocate this significant colonial site.

This latest attempt to relocate New Yarmouth has taken into account a wider breadth of historical documentation and has employed modern scientific archaeological survey methods. Together, these modes of discovery have helped to paint a very different picture of the setting of New Yarmouth than previous work has suggested.

Archival Investigations

The town of New Yarmouth was established by two individuals, both public figures on the Eastern Shore, wishing to increase their wealth by securing the courthouse for Kent County, Maryland. The town was planned during a period in which the government was also pushing for the founding of towns in an effort to increase its own income from the colonies (Riley 1950). This site, currently thought to be located on a farm known as Napley Green, was the original county seat of Kent County, the Eastern Shore’s first officially established county (c. 1642).

The town of New Yarmouth has seen little in the way of research over the years. Archival investigations yield documents concerning the initial planning of the site as well
as the establishment of the first courthouse and jail at the site, but documentation from those years during which the town prospered (approximately 1678-1696) are nearly non-existent as are those from the years following the removal of the courthouse from New Yarmouth and the eventual fall of the town and its shipyard(s). A few individuals have attempted to pinpoint the location of the now lost town, including Dr. Peregrine Wroth of Chestertown, and Robert L. Swain, Jr.

Dr. Peregrine Wroth (1786-1879) practiced medicine in Chestertown, MD. The majority of Dr. Wroth’s work concerning the site of New Yarmouth appears to have come from oral histories he collected from neighbors and friends such as the thirteen Kent County physicians he notes in his memoirs. Dr. Wroth’s autobiography included his recollections of the region in which New Yarmouth once existed as well as his gathered history of the town itself. In his work, however, Dr. Wroth and his informants establish the location of New Yarmouth in the northern section of Eastern Neck, near or on a cove (probably Brown’s Cove) near Browns Point. This location was pinpointed primarily based on the memories of individuals local to the area as well as the discovery of the “unmistakable remains of a wharf” (Rock Hall Historical Collections 1957:21).

Robert L. Swain Jr. was also a local historian who had an interest in locating the New Yarmouth site. Swain also notes the discovery of a wharf and recounts the efforts of “a few interested members of the Washington College Department of History and an official of the Kent County Historical Society” who traveled to Browns Point (slightly to the North of that area which is currently proposed for the town site) in 1937. Although the group failed repeatedly to find the location of New Yarmouth, they were later pleased with their discoveries of a few fragments of old brick, glass, and porcelain recovered
from a farmers’ field. This sparse evidence was apparently enough to convince the group that they had discovered the New Yarmouth site (Rock Hall Historical Collections 1957:20).

The efforts of Dr. Wroth, the small group from Washington College, and Robert Swain relied almost entirely on oral testimony. Little in the way of archaeological evidence could support their claims as to the location of the New Yarmouth site. The wharf was not satisfactorily dated, nor were the few artifacts recovered as both glass and brick are difficult to date based strictly on physical appearance alone and no professional archaeologists appear to have been involved. These few artifacts were apparently displayed at Washington College shortly after their recovery, but have since been removed to an unknown location. Recent research into the whereabouts of these materials has failed to recover them for analysis. Had those involved in these discovery projects consulted the original deeds concerning the location and transfer of property for the New Yarmouth site, they may not have placed it so far to the north on Gray’s Inn Creek. However, it is recognized that this information would have been difficult to access at that time since the Hall of Records, the predecessor to the Maryland State Archives where such documents are now housed, was not created until 1934. Though the group from Washington College was working after the establishment of the Hall of Records, the Hall was still in the early stages of collecting such materials (Maryland State Archives 2003).

The town of New Yarmouth was the result of the efforts of two men, Kent County Commissioner James Ringgold and his associate, an English emigrant and possible merchant named Samuel Tovey. Upon his death, Thomas Ringgold left his eldest son,
James Ringgold, a large parcel of land on Eastern Neck. This property was only a portion of Thomas Ringgold’s holdings, the other portions going to his two other sons (Dr. John L. Seidel and Dr. Doug Hanks personal correspondence 1998; Usilton 1994). In 1673 James Ringgold sold Samuel Tovey three sections of this Eastern Neck property. Land deeds state that the first parcel Tovey purchased included 50 acres on the Chesapeake Bay side of Eastern Neck (parallel to Gray’s Inn Creek). The second parcel included a lot of unspecified acreage out of a larger parcel called Huntingfield which is the property originally left to James Ringgold by his father. Tovey purchased this lot, described as eight perches by eighty perches (one perch equals 16.5 feet), which is approximately four acres, for five shillings (Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 373-377).

It is the third lot purchased by Tovey from Ringgold which holds the key to locating New Yarmouth. This third lot consisted of 100 acres (including the four acre lot Tovey had already purchased for personal use). The deed for this lot states that this 100 acre lot was sold “with the intent to make a town and draw together inhabitants.” The 100 acres were to be divided into 100 foot squares on which each inhabitant was required to build a forty foot house with a brick chimney. Extra acreage was to be set aside for plantations. The deed stipulates that both Ringgold and Tovey must agree when assigning lots to new citizens. Ringgold was able to take lots for public use as well, including streets and common areas. A large area was to be set aside for a period of eleven years for communal timbering (Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 382-389).
Based on the metes and bounds outlined in the deeds, including those for the four acre lot Tovey purchased for personal use, the basic shape of the New Yarmouth site can be established. This property was likely slightly further south than Dr. Wroth, Swain, and others placed the town. It has never been in question that New Yarmouth was established on Gray’s Inn Creek (alternately known as Grave’s End Creek and Grave’s Inn Creek). However, the extent of the property as described in the deeds places the site slightly south of Brown’s Point with its northern boundary at Brown’s Cove and its southern boundary likely somewhere below Lucy Cove, both branching off to the West from Gray’s Inn Creek (this will be discussed in greater detail below) (Figure 10).

Figure 10. Detail from USGS 7.5 min topographic map of Maryland showing Browns Cove and Lucy Cove

The layout detailed by Ringgold and Tovey for the planned town of New Yarmouth was likely highly influenced by the colonial town acts which the British Crown established for its colonies in the New World. These acts generally called for towns to be established along major waterways with lots, streets, and public lands of
specific sizes. The size and style of the structures to be erected in such towns was also established by the Crown with time constraints for the construction of specified structures. If this time limit were not met, those who purchased lots forfeited their original payment for the plot (Riley 1950:311). Whether or not such regulations were actually put into effect in the Maryland colony remains conjectural. However, James Ringgold and Samuel Tovey did established their town on a major waterway, Gray’s Inn Creek, and created regulations for the size of lots and the size and type of structures which could be built thereon. By 1678 Ringgold was successful in convincing his fellow commissioners to support the town.

The support of the commissioners was to come in the form of a courthouse which would be located at the New Yarmouth site. Charles Calvert, third Lord Baltimore, conveyed a courthouse and associated jail to James Ringgold in 1680. These two structures were established on a lot called East Street which indicates that at least one street had already been laid out in the town during those three years prior to the conveyance (Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 146-149). Secondary sources indicate that in 1693 an ordinary was being run in the town, though this business may have actually existed some years prior to these reports. The town also included a church and by 1697 it is reported that not one but two shipyards were present. Despite the apparent prosperity and growth of New Yarmouth, the population of the region was changing and by the 1690’s began moving further up the Chester River. In 1696 the county commissioners agreed to remove the courthouse from the town of New Yarmouth and relocate it to Quaker Neck. Between 1702 and 1706 the courthouse was moved once
more to its current location in Chestertown (Brugger 1998; Rock Hall Historical Collections 1957:20).

Court was last held in New Yarmouth was 1696. The town is not mentioned in any court proceedings after this date (Rock Hall Historical Collections 1957:20). Although the town likely remained for a few years after the removal of the courthouse, as indicated by sources placing two shipyards at the site a year after the courthouse was moved, the town did not last much longer. Eventually the property was sold and converted into agricultural land. The site here identified as potentially that of New Yarmouth is a working farm called Napley Green.

**Historical Documentation**

A number of historical documents have been used in an attempt to shed light on both the early lack of urbanization on Maryland’s Eastern Shore and the town of New Yarmouth. Among these documents, including deeds, land grants, indentures, early maps, and census records, deeds and indentures have been the greatest aid in better understanding the location of the New Yarmouth town site.

In an effort to locate the site of the colonial “town” of New Yarmouth it was considered prudent to review the work already done. As has been indicated previously, interested local historians have been searching for the site since the 1800’s and each of them left written documentation about what they believed they had found as evidence in support of their identification of the town site. Dr. Peregrine Wroth and Robert L. Swain Jr. both believed that New Yarmouth had once been located somewhere along Brown’s Cove, a small creek branching from the west bank of Gray’s Inn Creek into Eastern Neck, near the north end of the neck. Later, Robert J. Johnson reanalyzed the printed
information left behind by Wroth and Swain but went a step further. Johnson utilized the Maryland State Archives to find the original document indicating the metes and bounds of the land transferred from James Ringgold to Samuel Tovey in 1678, the land which was to become New Yarmouth. By converting the perches into modern feet, Johnson established a basic shape for the property Tovey purchased from Ringgold (Johnson 1975:25). However, close examination of this document and a full transcription indicate that Johnson has inaccurately quoted the primary source. According to the original document, the plot of land which would form New Yarmouth is described as follows:

and the said one hundred acres of Land for Town Land is Situated and being on the Eastern shore Of Chester River in Kent County afd [aforesaid] and is part of a tract of Land formerly granted to Thoms Ringgold Gentleman Deceased father of the said James Called by the Name of Huntingfield as by the said patent doeth appear the Land hereby granted known by the Name of greate Neck lying and being in Grays Inn Creek in Chester River and boundeth as followeth Beginning at Marked white Oak standing in a point of Land upon the North side of Grays Inn Creek and bounded on the South side by Edward Rogers by a Line Drawn from the said marked white Oak South West

West one hundred twenty four perches back in the Woods to a marked Hickory bounded on the West by a Line drawn North North West from the said Hickory two hundred and eighty perches to a marked white oak on the North side by a Line Drawn East from the said white oak twenty seven perches To a marked white oak by the side of a Creek bounded on the East by a Creek called greate Neck Creek and thence by Grays End Creek on the East side up to the Marked white Oak in the point of Land afd [aforesaid]

(Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 382-389)
The passage as provided by Johnson, however, has been reworded to reflect current spellings and place names. In addition, Johnson has inaccurately quoted the first measurement. The description of the New Yarmouth property as quoted by Johnson is as follows:

“…One hundred acres of land for a town. Land is situated and being lands in the Eastern Shore on the Chester River in Kent County and is a part of a piece of land formerly granted Thomas Ringold called by name of “Huntingfield” Known by the name of Great Neck and being in Grey’s Inn Creek and in the Chester River and boundeth as follows: Beginning at a markd white oak standing in a point of land on the north side of Grey’s Inn Creek and bounded on the south by Edward Rogers by a line drawn from said white oak west one hundred and twenty four perches back in the woods to a marked hickory bounded on the west by a line drawn north north west from said hickory two hundred eighty perches to a markd white oak twenty seven perches to a markd white oak by the side of the creek bounded on the east by a creek called Neck Creek and thence by Grey’s Inn Creek on the east side up to the markd white oak to a point of twenty seven perches afd….” (Johnson 1975:25)

The differences in these two passages, while rather subtle, are telling. There are two documents which indicate the metes and bounds established between Ringgold and Tovey for the plot of land under discussion. The first is that quoted here by Johnson and transcribed later by BST. This document was made between Ringgold and Tovey and was written by Benjamin Randall, clerk. While this document provides details concerning the planned town of New Yarmouth, it is not known when it was written. It is possible that Ringgold and Tovey were not satisfied with this document. In 1678, a version of the document was written, this time with Charles Banckes acting as clerk, and included the consent and signature of Ringgold’s wife, Mary. This second document provides identical metes and bounds, differing only in the phrasing, a result of a different clerk at a different time. It is unclear which of these documents was written first as the front page of the second document, that on which the date was written, is missing from
the records. Therefore, it was necessary to utilize the most complete document available and both this study as well as Johnson’s work utilized the same document. Despite this, Johnson indicates that the first line drawn from the starting locus point was drawn west one hundred and twenty four perches. The document, though, indicates that this measurement was actually south west one hundred and twenty four perches. This mistake has caused an error in Johnson’s entire scheme. However, Johnson was able to place New Yarmouth within the property currently thought to have represented the town. Johnson’s schematic indicated that the likeliest spot for New Yarmouth was Little Gum Point, at the south east tip of the current Napley Green property while recent research indicates that it probably existed further North within the property.

Despite the troubles with Johnson’s interpretation of the historical record, no other researcher has yet attempted to locate the site of New Yarmouth. All subsequent works which include information on the town rely solely on Johnson’s work. Rather than rely on a secondary source such as Johnson represents, this research examined a broader range of documentation. Not only were those documents directly relating to the metes and bounds of the New Yarmouth property studied in detail, properties known to surround the area were also researched. For instance, the original deed as quoted previously indicates that the parcel of land in question was bounded on the south by the property of Edward Rogers. Starting with this name, land patents, deeds, wills, indentures, etc. were all scoured for the name Edward Rogers. In this way it was possible to find documentation indicating the metes and bounds of the property belonging to Edward Rogers during the period in which Ringgold and Tovey were planning New
Yarmouth. Similar work was done with other nearby property owners, some of whom were uncovered only after the Rogers patent was found and transcribed.

The metes and bounds of each of the properties known to have surrounded the Ringgold/Tovey plot were entered into a computer mapping program. This program calculated almost the exact size and shape of each property in relation to one another. In this way, it was possible to gain a much more accurate and detailed understanding of the way in which the New Yarmouth property was situated on Eastern Neck.

Although the focus of much archival research was on the location of the town of New Yarmouth, a good portion of it was also centered on understanding the composition of the town’s inhabitants. Unfortunately, census records do not exist for Kent County prior to 1797 and very few documents indicate where individuals resided aside from mentioning the county in which they lived. There were, however, a few documents, court proceedings mainly, which indicated that someone other than Samuel Tovey resided within the town. For instance, the minutes from a session of the provincial court held at New Yarmouth in 1693 state that the “most principall Free holders & Justices aforesaid att y‡. house of M‡. Thomas Joces at y‡. Towne of New Yarmouth doth by a Free Election Elect 6 Vestriemen.” (Kent County Court Proceedings, 1676-1698) This document dates to the end of New Yarmouth’s life as a town but does provide evidence of someone living within town boundaries.

The fact that historical documentation mentions only an individual who is associated with the courthouse and justice system in New Yarmouth does not mean that only politically important figures or wealthy individuals resided in the town. Nor does it indicate that those individuals owned primary residences in the town. Less elite residents
are likely not mentioned because they did not play a significant role in court proceedings except when participating as either plaintiff or defendant in a case. This seems especially likely since the place of residence for individuals mentioned in court documents is not listed except in the case of those such as Joce whose home was a venue for political activities. When other individuals are mentioned by name, records rarely indicate where they lived unless it is to state which county they resided in. However, the fact remains that no documentation prior to the above-mentioned 1693 court minutes provides any evidence to support that New Yarmouth had significant population before or after the conveyance of the courthouse and jail in 1681. In addition, there is no documentary evidence of anyone purchasing lots within the town site or that those who may have purchased lots and constructed houses utilized those homes as their primary residences. Therefore, historical documentation has been exhausted as a line of evidence for better understanding the “new residents” of New Yarmouth.

**Cartographic Evidence**

As part of the effort to identify the site of the colonial town of New Yarmouth, several maps, both historical and modern, have been utilized. Most early maps of the Maryland region do not provide significant detail of the Eastern Shore and even less detail of the Eastern Neck region. For this reason, it was necessary to use maps dating mainly from the nineteenth century. In conjunction with and as a compliment to maps, aerial photographs of the Eastern Neck region have been incorporated into this study.

Historical maps, while not always geographically accurate, do provide other types of information useful in the search for New Yarmouth. For instance, historical maps often list the names of property owners or indicate with the use of a symbol where
structures or towns existed. These maps can be compared with modern maps of the region to see both change in landscape and land use and property ownership. Aerial photographs are excellent resources to use in conjunction with both historic and modern maps as they have the ability to show actual geographic features as well as evidence of structures or other features which previously existed in a specific location.

No historical maps of Eastern Neck were able to provide any direct evidence of the location of the town of New Yarmouth. In part this is because all maps depicting Eastern Neck with any degree of detail were prepared well after the town had disappeared. In addition, property in the region has changed hands many times between the colonial era and the mid nineteenth century. The map most often referenced throughout the research for this thesis comes from the Lake, Griffing and Stevens Atlas of Kent and Queen Anne’s Counties, 1877 (Figure 11). While several property owner names are listed on the map, no names directly related to New Yarmouth are present. Despite this, this map has been significant to the work because it is the earliest detailed depiction of the Eastern Neck environment including the Grays Inn Creek shoreline that could be found.
Initially, the 1877 map was compared with the metes and bounds outlining the property that would become New Yarmouth from the 1674 deed discussed in detail earlier in this chapter. Although no direct correlation between these early land measurements and the map could be found, it was useful to see the western bank of Gray’s Inn Creek as it may have looked during the colonial era. This kind of comparison allowed for a general idea of the likeliest location for the New Yarmouth town site to be...
formed. Later, this same map was compared with the computer calculated property boundaries derived from the original metes and bounds from five historical documents concerning the properties surrounding the New Yarmouth property. This comparison narrowed the possibilities for the town site even further. Both the 1877 map and the computer calculated boundary map were compared with the hand-drawn map produced by Robert Johnson in 1975. This comparison was of particular interest as until this most recent effort, no researcher had questioned Johnson’s placement of the town, nor his model for how the town looked (image not available as the model is no longer on display at the Rock Hall Historical Society). Finally, the 1877 map was compared with recent aerial photographs accessed through GoogleEarth (GoogleEarth 2009).

The comparison of the 1877 map with a recent aerial photograph was significant because it allowed for the greatest comparison of environmental features over time. As can be seen on the 1877 map, the area currently thought to represent the property on which New Yarmouth existed has changed little since the nineteenth century. Agricultural fields and forested portions of the land are nearly exact on both images. The roads present on the images are in actuality the same and have not changed course since their earliest depiction (the only difference is that currently large portions of these roads are paved, though some remain dirt or gravel dries only).

One final map has been utilized in the search for the New Yarmouth site. The map produced by Simon J. Martenet in Martenet’s Atlas of Maryland, 1865 is the only one which provides hard evidence for the presence of someone directly related to the New Yarmouth town site (Figures 12 and 14). Martenet’s map is used in conjunction with a modern aerial image of the region for the purpose of comparison (Figure 13).
Figure 12. “Kent County” from *Martenet’s Atlas of Maryland, 1865* by Simon J. Martenet
Figure 13. Aerial image of the Napley Green property (at right between Spring Point and Little Gum Point) (GoogleEarth 2009).

Figure 13. Detail of Thos. Ringold’s property from Martenet’s map of “Kent County” from Martenet’s Atlas of Maryland, 1865 by Simon J. Martenet.
As can be seen in Figure 13, this map shows a Thos. Ringgold in the region of the current Napley Green property. It is known that upon the death of Samuel Tovey, his widow accused James Ringgold, Tovey’s associate and fellow town planner, of entering her home and rifling through her husband’s documents. The result of this documented case was that Ringgold took over ownership of the property once more, allowing the Tovey widow to remain in a small house on the land (Maryland State Archives 2006). The Martenet map shows that the Ringgold family retained the property well after colonial era in which New Yarmouth was founded. In addition, by placing the Martenet map beside a recent aerial photograph, it is plain to see that the current location of the main house and associated structures on the Napley Green property are in nearly the same location as the Ringgold property. Similarly, the 1877 map depicting Eastern Neck indicates that an A. Harris resided in nearly the same location at that time (Figure 11). Since the Harris property of 1877 and the Ringgold property of 1865 were once the Tovey property of the late sixteen seventies to nineties, it can be assumed that the main area of construction on the property is in roughly the same place today as it was during the colonial era. Further, the aerial photograph presents several ground disturbances in the field directly north of the current house site which may indicate the locations of older structures on the property, perhaps those associated with New Yarmouth (Figure 14). It is interesting to note that few such disturbances are visible in the field near Little Gum Point where Robert Johnson placed the town.
The comparison of historical and modern maps in conjunction with aerial photographs constitutes only a small portion of this research project. This situation derives from a lack of detail in most early maps of the Eastern Shore and Eastern Neck in particular. However, the few appropriate maps available were significant in narrowing the possible locations of the New Yarmouth town site as well as providing additional evidence in support of currently held beliefs concerning this location. In addition, a more subtle line of evidence is presented in these maps. Each map as well as the aerial photograph provides visual proof of the rural nature of the Eastern Neck area. While property owner names are present, these are not closely spaced; rather they are spaced in such a way as to indicate that those who resided in the region did so on relatively large
tracts of privately owned land. Modern tax maps also demonstrate this pattern in the modern era.

Several smaller maps, each depicting the plan of an Eastern Shore town in or near Kent County, were also studied. These maps were significant in the interpretation of how the town of New Yarmouth may have been organized. It is known from historical documents that the town was to be laid out according to a simple grid plan, a common town plan for the time. However, Robert J. Johnson, along with his work in locating New Yarmouth, created a model of how he believed the town was likely organized. This model was, until recently, on display in the Rock Hall History Museum, Rock Hall, Maryland. There is no documentation citing references for Johnson’s model and it has been assumed that it is merely his interpretation of a colonial town. Though there is no evidence to support Johnson’s model, it has become locally recognized as the colonial town. This being the case, it was considered important to compare the plans of towns established on the Shore during the colonial period (these towns are all later in date than New Yarmouth) (Figures 14 and 15).

Figure 14. Town plan for Chesterville, Maryland. “Chesterville,” from Lake, Griffing & Stevenson’s atlas of Kent and Queen Anne’s Counties, 1877 (The Historical Society of Kent County’s online map collection).
Archaeological Investigations

Archaeological investigations of properties located in the Eastern Neck region of Kent County, Maryland were restricted to terrestrial surveys in agricultural fields. It was the intent of such work to identify archaeological sites, through systematic terrestrial survey and surface collection, related to the colonial settlement of Eastern Neck as well as the establishment of the site of the now “lost” town of New Yarmouth. New Yarmouth was the original county seat of Kent County, Maryland, and its location has been the subject of debate since the early nineteenth century. Identification of colonial sites throughout Eastern Neck, both locations of known plantations and locations with unknown histories, was intended to produce comparative material. By comparing the types of cultural material and features identified during survey, it was the intention of this
work to provide information on class and population distribution on the peninsula in relation to the New Yarmouth site. This data could then be utilized to draw conclusions about social interactions in the region as well as to identify groups potentially involved in resistance to urbanization.

Field Methodology

All archaeological surveys were conducted by field school students under the direct supervision of the author and assistants. In addition, all laboratory work, including artifact processing and site form completion was conducted under the supervision of the author as lead investigator with support from Laboratory Director Elizabeth Seidel.

Prior to field work, permission was sought from several property owners in the Eastern Neck region to conduct pedestrian surveys and surface collections on private lands. At no time were students or field school staff allowed to survey any property without prior verbal or written permission from the property owner and occasionally from lessee’s whose crops may have been impacted as a result of such surveys.

Once permission was granted, the author, as lead investigator, led a small group of field school students to the Eastern Neck region to conduct pedestrian surveys and record any archaeological sites encountered. During these surveys, diagnostic artifacts from the surface were collected for future analysis and sites were located remotely with the use of a hand-held global positioning system (GPS) unit.

Terrestrial Survey

All areas surveyed during the 2007 field season were cultivated fields. However, the majority of these fields were being farmed using a technique known as no-till. The use of no-till farming means “the soil is left undisturbed from planting to harvest.”
Fields are not plowed between the time a crop has been harvested and the time the next crop has been planted, although discing does occur. Instead, the remains of the recently harvested crop are left in the field and the new crop is planted among them. This allows the remains of the first crop to decompose in place to help supply the soil with nutrients even while the second crop is growing. While this technique has been found to be more environmentally friendly, it is difficult to conduct pedestrian surveys in fields which have not been plowed and in which the husks of previous corn crops or the shaff of previous wheat crops are obscuring the ground between currently planted furrows. Despite this condition, it was possible to survey most fields while recently planted crops were still immature enough to allow a clear view of 85-90% of the ground surface. In addition, most of the fields included in the project had previously been planted in corn which made walking easier and left more of the ground surface visible than the remains of wheat would have.

Since most fields included in the project were no-till, it was necessary for individuals involved in the pedestrian surveys of these lands to walk along relatively close transects in an effort to ensure that as little ground as possible was missed in the survey. Transect intervals of 15-20 feet were utilized even when artifact density was anticipated to be relatively low. In most instances, transects ran parallel to furrows to avoid unnecessary crop damage.

During pedestrian survey, all diagnostic surface finds were collected including ceramic sherds and coins. When concentrations of cultural material such as brick fragments or oyster shells were encountered, a small representative sample of these artifacts was collected.
Survey Areas

Before pedestrian survey could begin, it was necessary to identify which properties in the Eastern Neck region of Maryland’s Eastern Shore were going to be included in the study. It was the intention of the survey plan in part to locate the heretofore “lost” town of New Yarmouth (c. 1678-1696) as well as to attempt to identify possible differences in social status among residents of the Eastern Neck region. This additional goal was intended to provide a comparative collection of cultural materials with which to identify social standing and lifeways on plantations and farms on Eastern Neck versus those of the town of New Yarmouth. For these reasons, properties on Eastern Neck and in nearby areas were selected for inclusion in the project based on their geographic location and, in some cases, the known historic nature of the property. Properties lying on both the Chesapeake Bay side of Eastern Neck as well as the Gray’s Inn Creek side were considered for the project along with properties close to Eastern Neck Island on Church Creek and one to the north of the Eastern Neck area near Swann Creek. Actual survey was dependent on weather, and crop growth and land owner or lessee permission. Some of the properties slated for inclusion could not be surveyed due to poor weather conditions and, more often, a failure to acquire access to the property through either the land owner or lessee.

A total of six properties were originally considered for survey. These properties included the historically significant plantation known as Trumpington located on the Bay side of Eastern Neck; a property called The Farm, also lying on the Bay side of the Neck; Alton, another historically known property, lying on the west bank of Church Creek; the extensive property of Napley Green along Gray’s Inn Creek; those lands belonging to the
Chesapeake Bay Foundation which lay on the Gray’s Inn Creek side of Eastern Neck; and Gliding Gander, a large agricultural area located near the head of Swann Creek and lying adjacent to the Chesapeake Bay (Figure 16). Recent tax maps were consulted in an effort to identify and contact the appropriate parties for permission to access these lands.

The owners of both the Alton and Trumpington properties granted permission to the author to conduct terrestrial surveys on those lands and provided information on the extent of their lands so as to avoid survey on properties not under their ownership and for which permission to access was not granted (Personal correspondence with Mrs. Mildred Strong and Mrs. Julia Ridgely, May 2007). Only in the case of The Farm property was permission not gained via direct contact with the land owner. Instead, through speaking
with those individuals who rented the house located on the property, it was found that the landowner resided in Baltimore. That being the case, the property owner was contacted via telephone and permission to access the land was granted.

While the author contacted most land owners personally, Dr. John Seidel was instrumental in negotiating with the Chesapeake Bay Foundation for permission to access their lands as well as in the location of the current property owner for Napley Green. While permission was granted to access Chesapeake Bay Foundation lands, the owner of Knapley Green agreed only on the condition that the lessee farming the land also gave permission. The lessee, unfortunately refused to allow pedestrian survey to be conducted on the property. The properties which were included in the final archaeological survey are shown on the maps below. Boundaries for each of the sites identified within each property are also illustrated (Figures 17 and 18).

![Figure 17. Location of the Gliding Gander survey area with Sites 6 and 7 depicted (aerial image from GoogleEarth 2009)](image-url)
Laboratory Methodology

All artifacts collected during the terrestrial surveys conducted in the Eastern Neck region were brought to the Washington College Public Archaeology Laboratory for processing, analysis, and storage for future research. All work conducted by field school students within the Lab was under the direct supervision of the author.
Many of the artifacts collected during the terrestrial surveys on Eastern Neck were outside of the scope of the current research. These items included diagnostic prehistoric materials such as projectile points and pottery sherds as well as twentieth century debris from agricultural and domestic activities. These materials were collected as part of an effort to document all archaeological sites identified within a survey area regardless of the relationship of said sites to the Colonial era or the New Yarmouth town site. Diagnostic Colonial materials, such as pipe stem fragments and ceramic sherds as well as non-diagnostic artifacts such as brick fragments, were collected for their ability to shed further light on life on Eastern Neck during the Colonial period. These artifacts were additionally collected as a comparative collection from which to glean information about the social and economic status of the various inhabitants of the Eastern Neck region. This information was to be further used to draw conclusions about the groups of inhabitants most likely to have been involved in possible resistance to town building.

Once artifacts from each site were processed, the author analyzed the historic collections with a focus on the Colonial era materials. Pipe stem fragments were one of the major artifact types identified during survey. In the lab, pipe stem fragment bore diameters were measured for later use in pipe stem dating. Brick fragments and non-diagnostic rocks seen in the CRFP survey area were also significant in drawing conclusions about colonial era sites regarding the town of New Yarmouth.

In particular, pipe stem fragments were subject to bore measurements in an attempt to date the sites from which they were recovered. In the 1950s historical archaeologist J.C. Harrington conducted research on the extensive pipe stem collection from the Jamestown site in Virginia. Harrington’s study showed that pipe stem bore
diameters seemed to decrease over time. Harrington created a table indicating the date ranges for various stem bore diameters (Deetz 1996:27-28):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bore Diameter</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/64</td>
<td>1590-1620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/64</td>
<td>1620-1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/64</td>
<td>1650-1680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/64</td>
<td>1680-1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/64</td>
<td>1720-1750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/64</td>
<td>1750-1800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pipe stem bore diameters were measured with a standard set of drill bits which correspond to the diameter measurements in Harrington’s table. When pipe stem fragment sample sizes were sufficient, bore diameters were compared to Harrington’s chart and a relative date was chosen based on the bore size most frequently recorded at each site.

**Site Identification**

At the start of the 2007 summer field season, six agricultural properties in the Eastern Neck region were chosen for inclusion in a pedestrian survey program designed to identify the New Yarmouth town site as well as to gain comparative data concerning cultural material use and social standing between plantation and farm residents and town residents. However, due to planter’s concerns and crop growth it was not possible to survey all of the properties within the parameters of this project. Instead, only four properties were subject to pedestrian survey and surface collection. These properties included Alton on Church Creek, The Farm on the Chesapeake Bay side of Eastern Neck, those lands belonging to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation located on the west bank of Gray’s Inn Creek, and Gliding Gander at the head of Swann Creek.
Alton

The property known as Alton is located in the southern portion of Eastern Neck, approximately 0.66 miles from the bridge which joins Eastern Neck with Eastern Neck Island (Eastern Neck National Wildlife Refuge). This property lies on the west bank of Church Creek and today consists of several large agricultural fields with a main house centrally located on the land. A retention pond is located in front of the main house and a few smaller structures (a barn complex with fenced enclosure) related to emu farming are present just to the east of the house (see Figure 18). The full extent of the cultivated portion of the property was subject to pedestrian survey. At the time of survey, all of the fields surrounding the main house and smaller structures were planted in corn. Farming was done using the no-till method but the crops were immature enough at that time that much of the ground (approximately 65-70%) was still visible and a substantial number of both historic and prehistoric artifacts were recovered.

Although all four fields located on the Ridgely Property were surveyed in full, sites were identified only in those two fields bordering on Church Creek. The two fields in front of the main house, those which bordered on Eastern Neck Road, contained few archaeological materials, predominantly prehistoric in nature.

Site 1

The Alton property consisted of three large fields, two along the west bank of Church Creek and one in front of the house bordering on Eastern Neck Road, and one small roughly triangular shaped field also along Eastern Neck Road. The first, and largest, field subject to survey was located directly behind the main house on Church Creek (see Figure 18).
The extreme northern portion of this field contained few artifacts with the exception of a very small concentration of brick fragments and a nearby scatter of cement fragments. These materials are considered to be recent in nature and were neither sampled nor plotted with the GPS although their rough location was recorded in field notes. The southwest corner of the field, however, proved to be far more archaeologically significant and artifacts of a historic nature were recovered from a relatively large area beginning in the extreme southwest corner of the field and extending for some distance along the fence line of the emu enclosure. A dirt driveway marks the southern boundary of the field and this dense artifact scatter also follows the driveway east a short distance. Some of the materials collected from this area(108,150),(875,836) among other materials. These materials did not seem representative of structural remains (no nails, fasteners, plaster, brick, mortar, or window glass were recovered), instead having the appearance of a large trash deposit, likely associated with the main house or an earlier structure which may have existed where the main house stands today. This site was most likely nineteenth century in nature.

Site 2

Site 2 identified on the Alton property is also located in the largest of the four fields, that which is bounded on the west by the main house and barn complex, on the south by the long dirt driveway leading to a dock, and on the east by Church Creek on which the dock is situated. During the course of the survey which identified Site 1, it was noted that oyster shell fragments were becoming increasingly prevalent toward the center of the south half of the field and seemingly stretching east toward Church Creek. Some
of the shells and shell fragments present in the scatter area exhibited hinges up to 1.5 inches thick (see Figure 18).

Initially, this oyster shell scatter was identified as Feature 1, however, further survey revealed that the scatter was rather dense and extended down the slope toward Church Creek and well past the stone marker bearing the words “Isabel 9-19-03” to mark the point to which the creek had flooded during Hurricane Isabel in 2004. Many of the artifacts identified in Site 2 were colonial in date. Cultural material included pipe stem fragments with large bores, pipe bowl fragments, North Devon Gravel Tempered ceramic, possible gun flint fragments, and a single hand wrought nail.

**Site 3**

Site 3 on the Alton property is located within the second large field which is bounded on the north by the long dirt drive leading to a dock and on the east by Church Creek. Survey began at the north edge of the field, that which was bounded by the dirt driveway, and almost at once small fragments of oyster shell were seen to be liberally scattered across the surface in this area. As survey progressed southward, a much more dense concentration of slightly larger oyster shell fragments was found (see Figure 18).

Unlike the oyster shell scatter which comprises Site 2, the shell feature identified as Site 3 contained few historic artifacts, although some did occur mainly along the driveway. Instead, debitage such as flakes and cores were recovered as well as a projectile point made of a poor quality raw material, possibly rhyolite. Prehistoric materials of this type became more plentiful the further east the oyster shell scatter extended toward Church Creek. The dominance of prehistoric artifacts within this oyster shell scatter along with information provided by the landowner suggests that a large
prehistoric shell midden which had been utilized by Native Americans in the past existed on the property (personal communication with Julia Ridgely May, 2007).

**Summary**

A total of three sites were identified on the Alton property. All of these sites were located in those fields which were bounded on the east by Church Creek. Two of the sites were historic in nature and included a probable nineteenth century trash midden related to domestic activities and an oyster shell midden which appears to have been predominantly utilized in a colonial context. The third site is considered prehistoric in nature, despite the presence of some historic artifacts along the modern driveway, and as such does not fall within the parameters of this study.

Although the Alton property has likely been at least partially devoted to agriculture since the colonial era, the no-till method of farming has been a fairly recent program. Despite the fact that the land has been plowed for many years, it may be possible that intact cultural features exist beneath the plowzone. Further and more invasive archaeological investigations hold the potential to reveal features such as middens, privies, post holes and post molds, among others within the historic sites.

**Chesapeake Bay Foundation Property**

The Chesapeake Bay Foundation manages a large portion of land located in the north of Eastern Neck and lying on the west bank of Gray’s Inn Creek. While much of this property is in use for agricultural purposes, only two fields were chosen for inclusion in this terrestrial survey program. These two fields are located on Gray’s Inn Creek between Brown’s Cove to the north and Joiner’s Cove to the south (see Figure 18). These particular fields were chosen because, while most of the land here has been turned
over to no-till farming, these fields had been recently plowed followed by a light rain and 100% of the ground surface was visible at the time of survey.

The two fields on which terrestrial survey were conducted were separated from each other only by a dirt driveway utilized by both the farmer cultivating the land and the property manager in charge of maintaining and protecting the property. The northernmost of the two fields was bounded on the north by a wooded area, on the west by a wooded area which separated it from a nearby fallow field, on the east by Gray’s Inn Creek and on the south by the before mentioned driveway. Approximately half way across the field, protruding into the field from the northern wooded boundary, is a modern retention pond. Both fields were anomalous on Eastern Neck in that they contained large cobbles and tabular stones. These stones were liberally strewn throughout both fields while no other property on Eastern Neck appears to contain stones of either this size or density.

One historic archaeological site was identified during pedestrian survey of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation lands. The multitude of cultural materials collected from each field ranged from the Colonial Era to the late nineteenth century and was spread over a wide area, suggesting use of the site over a relatively long period of time. However, due to the construction of the retention pond, these materials may have been displaced and are potentially no longer within their original context. The southern field yielded a penny dating to 1890 as well as a few projectile points. However, artifact frequencies were low in this area and decreased significantly as surveys moved east toward Gray’s Inn Creek. The single site identified on Chesapeake Bay Foundation lands was located along the southwest edge of the pond in the northernmost field.
Site 4

Site 4 was first identified as an area of artifact concentration during a preliminary walk over of the property by the author and an additional field school instructor. During this preliminary study of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation lands, it was noted that a high frequency of colonial pipe stem and pipe bowl fragments were present near the southwest edge of the pond located in the northernmost field chosen for study. These materials were not collected at that time and no maker’s marks or other decorative elements were apparent on pipe stem or bowl fragments based on visual inspection of these materials in situ. Once systematic pedestrian survey began, it was found that this northernmost field contained numerous colonial artifacts including manganese tinted glass, ceramic sherds of various types (whiteware, stoneware, porcelain), olive green wine bottle glass, and brick fragments, as well as several prehistoric artifacts such as debitage and points.

Brick fragments were scattered over a large area beginning half way down the west edge of the field and extending south only a short distance but extending east approximately three quarters of the way across the entire field. The bricks in this scatter ranged in size and contained both plain and glazed brick fragments. The pond previously discussed along the north edge of the field fell within this brick scatter area and along the southwest edge of the pond Site 4 was identified.

Site 4 consists of a small area along the southwest edge of the modern retention pond which yielded a high frequency of colonial pipe stem and bowl fragments (see Figure 18). The pipe fragments were all made of white ball clay and the stem fragments had large bores indicating a relatively early period of production. During formal survey it was noted that one pipe bowl fragment was stamped with the initials “W.E.”. Once
these letters were identified, a call was placed to Washington College Archaeology
Laboratory Director Elizabeth Seidel who researched the initials. This research provided
significant insight into both the artifact itself as well as the potential age of Site 4. The
initials “W.E.” stood for Will Evans, a British pipe producer, and the particular mark
found on the pipe bowl fragment was in use from c. 1660-1697 (Walker 1971:1432).
This means that the pipe bowl fragment is from a pipe that was produced in England
sometime during the late 17th century and subsequently imported to Maryland.

Although it is not possible to definitively date Site 4 based solely on the Will
Evans pipe bowl fragment recovered, the information is intriguing for several reasons.
First, it is known that the original county seat of Kent County, New Yarmouth, was
located on Eastern Neck, somewhere along the west bank of Gray’s Inn Creek. Previous
investigations have tended to place the now lost site somewhat further south on the creek,
below Lucy Cove and sometimes closer to the mouth of Gray’s Inn Creek. However,
recent research concerning historical documentation of land grants, indentures, and deeds
has suggested that New Yarmouth was once located a relatively short distance from
current Chesapeake Bay Foundation land holdings. In addition, historical research has
indicated that the town had at least one associated shipyard or port. It may be possible
that the anomalous stones found throughout the two fields in our study area represent
ballast which could indicate the location of this shipyard. Also, the date of the pipe bowl
fragment recovered beside the modern retention pond is within range of the period during
which New Yarmouth (c. 1676-1696), was serving as a town with both courthouse and
jail.
Further investigations may prove that the brick scatter in which Site 4 was identified may be part of or associated with the site. The brick itself may represent a structure which once stood on the property, but no other architectural materials such as nails, mortar, or window glass were present within the scatter. Additionally, Chesapeake Bay Foundation Land Manager Dick Stevens related that the modern pond was dug during the 1940’s (personal communication, June 2007). The spoil associated with its construction was spread across both fields. This being the case, it may be possible that the brick scatter represents material displaced when the pond was dug. At present, Site 4 consists only of the pipe stem and bowl fragment concentration found along the edge of the pond for two main reasons. The first reason is that this concentration of objects of the same type and general time period is anomalous within both the brick scatter and the field as a whole. The second reason is that this concentration of material is located at the edge of the pond. This location was not disturbed during the digging of the pond itself and it is more likely that an area in such close proximity to the pond received less of the spoil than the remainder of the fields which could account for the visibility of the concentration upon plowing.

**Summary**

The property along the west bank of Gray’s Inn Creek which belongs to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation yielded an interesting array of artifacts, including both prehistoric lithic materials and historic cultural remains such as ceramics, colonial wine bottle fragments, pipe stem and bowl fragments, and two coins dating to the 18th century. Unfortunately, it is not possible without further invasive archaeological investigations to know for certain whether or not the brick scatter and Site 4 are truly associated. The
construction of the retention pond in the 1940’s may have spread archaeological material from one location across the extent of both fields chosen for study.

Site 4 is an intriguing archaeological location both within its geographic area and for its potential association with a historically significant town site. Future archaeological work at Site 4 could provide significant information concerning the lost town of New Yarmouth. Geological research could also provide insight into the origin of the many stones spread throughout both of the fields chosen for study. These stones are unique to these two fields and do not seem to occur in any other locations on Eastern Neck.

The Farm

The land known as The Farm is located on the Chesapeake Bay side of Eastern Neck. The property is located north of the Alton property and across Eastern Neck Rd. from a wooded area which is bounded on the east by Church Creek. The landowner of The Farm lives on Maryland’s Western Shore, rents out the main house, and leases the surrounding agricultural land to a farmer.

The Farm property is comprised of three large agricultural fields with a section of shoreline along the Chesapeake Bay. Originally, all three fields were chosen for inclusion in the pedestrian survey program. However, the presence of wheat in the large field which is bounded on the west by the Bay and the field just north of the main house diminished ground visibility to well below 50% and made it impossible to survey these portions of the property. The shoreline was incorporated into the survey project only in the case of the The Farm property but few archaeological materials were found. The field
to the south of the house which is bounded on the east by Eastern Neck Rd. was subject to terrestrial survey and a single colonial era site was recorded.

Site 5

Darrin Lowery led students in conducting the pedestrian survey of the The Farm grounds. As stated previously, it was not possible to conduct survey on much of the land originally slated for inclusion in the project. However, survey of the field to the south of the main house and bounded on the east by Eastern Neck Rd. recovered a small number of artifacts. The site itself is represented by a small brick fragment concentration which may be the remains of an outbuilding of indeterminate date.

Gliding Gander

The Gliding Gander property is located near the head of Swann Creek, north of the Eastern Neck area and the closest town of Rock Hall. The property is composed of approximately 120 acres of agricultural land bounded on the west by the Chesapeake Bay. A steep cliff drops to the shoreline along the Bay while the north is bounded by a tree-line separating the Gliding Gander property from another parcel of land further north, the east is bounded by a line of trees also separating the Gliding Gander property from another land owner’s holdings, and the south is bounded by a long dirt driveway (see Figure 17).

The location of the Gliding Gander land on the Chesapeake Bay and near to the headwaters of Swann Creek meant that this property had a high level of potential for the presence of archaeological sites. All fields were planted in corn during the time of survey. This crop was unfortunately nearly mature and ground surface visibility was lower than the ideal at approximately 45-55%. Despite the relatively low visibility, all
fields on the Gliding Gander tract were subject to terrestrial survey and several interesting and significant artifacts were recovered. The property owner was very helpful in terms of providing information concerning likely areas for the location of archaeological sites. According to the land owner, a large prehistoric oyster shell scatter was located in the large field in the northwest corner of the property. The land owner, family members, and employees had recovered numerous prehistoric artifacts including a variety of point types as well as lithic tools such as axes from this area. Unfortunately, the landowner also informed the crew that the property had been looted of many of these prehistoric finds in previous years (personal communication, June 2007). Nevertheless, one prehistoric site (Site 6) was located within this large field. However, the prehistoric nature of this site means that it is outside of the parameters of this project.

A second site (Site 7) was historic in nature and was located within a large field bounded on the north and east by a line of trees, on the west by a dirt driveway bisecting the entire property (and separating this field from that in which Site 6 was located), and on the south by the main dirt driveway.

Although numerous diagnostic artifacts of both prehistoric and historic origin were recovered during survey of the entire Gliding Gander property, only the two abovementioned archaeological sites were located. Much of the property is marred by large shallow drainages which criss-cross the fields along with grassy lanes for the passage of farm equipment and other vehicles. These earthworks have disturbed large portions of the property and as it is not known if the spoil of their construction was spread across the fields or transported/used in some other location, it is impossible to
know without further intrusive testing if the majority of the artifacts were in or near their original depositional locations.

Site 7

Site 7 is located in a more highly disturbed portion of the Gliding Gander property than is Site 6 (not discussed due to its prehistoric nature). The large field to the east of that in which Site 7 is located is cut several times by drainage ditches, a linear mounded area, and grassy lanes/roads (see Figure 17). Despite the disturbance in this area, a small concentration of colonial materials was located and was unique to the area in which they were found. Survey began at the north edge of the field and moved south over a period of two days. Many artifacts were recovered during this surface collection program, including prehistoric lithic artifacts as well as historic ceramics such as whiteware, stoneware sherds, and colonial bottle glass. However, it was not until survey had nearly been completed in the field that anything more than disarticulated surface scatter was identified.

Site 7 is comprised of a small concentration of white ball clay pipe stem and bowl fragments in association with several ceramic sherds and other historic artifacts. Materials such as these were found throughout the fields of the Gliding Gander property, but this concentration of materials was the only cohesive group of objects of similar type and date noted. Additionally, these materials were not directly beside any of the earthwork disturbances present throughout the field. For these reasons, the concentration was designated Site 7.
Summary

The Gliding Gander property was expected to have a high potential for archaeological sites. Unfortunately, conditions for terrestrial survey were not ideal and it was found that the property had been disturbed by several modern drainage ditches, mounded areas, and grassy lanes/roads. Despite the low visibility and the modern disturbances to the land, a high frequency of artifacts was recovered during surface collection including both historic and prehistoric materials. Two sites were located during the survey of this property.

Both Site 6 and Site 7 appear to be the only possibly in-tact concentrations of cultural materials on the Gliding Gander property. Further archaeological testing below the plowzone in both areas may uncover features such as garbage pits, hearths, or post holes and post molds. Artifact analysis has not yet been done on the materials recovered from either site, but future research should help to relatively date both sites.

Discussion

The purpose of the archaeological surveys outlined above was two-fold. First, terrestrial survey sought to identify the site of the now “lost” town of New Yarmouth and second, cultural material recovered during survey was intended to be used to compare the types of sites throughout the Eastern Neck region as well as the social status of the areas various inhabitants. This information was to be used to draw conclusions about which groups of inhabitants may have been most likely to participate in intentional resistance to towns. Unfortunately, the first purpose of the surveys was nullified when the author failed to gain access to the Napley Green property, thought to represent the location of New Yarmouth. However, terrestrial survey on Eastern Neck did identify a number of
relevant sites which offered an opportunity to examine potential social patterning in the region.

While the exact location of the town of New Yarmouth remains a mystery, archaeological survey to the north of the proposed town site was successful in identifying a likely related site. Terrestrial survey of the CRFP property was possibly the most significant portion of the current archaeological investigations. As noted previously, numerous un-worked stones were present throughout the two fields chosen for study. These stones do not occur in any other known locations on Eastern Neck. Given the presence of so many stones in an area along a navigable waterway where historical documents indicate one to two shipyards once stood, these seemingly non-cultural rocks may be interpreted as ballast. If this interpretation could be verified, Site 4 on the CRFP property may represent the location of the two shipyards purported to have been associated with the New Yarmouth town site. The pipe bowl fragment dating the site to approximately 1660-1697 is supported by pipe stem fragment bore diameter measurements. The majority of the fragments had diameters ranging in date from approximately 1650-1720 with a few outliers likely representing normal variation. In conjunction with the diagnostic pipe bowl fragment and the glazed brick fragments found nearby, the CRFP property has significant potential to yield information regarding the Eastern Shores first major shipyards.

Brick fragments from the CRFP property are likely related to Site 4, the pipe stem and bowl fragment concentration, although the connection is not definitive. James Deetz notes that “Building in brick was practiced in the Chesapeake, but only rarely” in the seventeenth century (Deetz 1996:149). However, Hume (1996 and 1994) indicates that
in Virginia, at least, brick making was a common occupation and structures were often built with the material. Considering the number of emigrants from Virginia to Maryland’s Eastern Shore, it is possible that homes and other structures were built with bricks on Eastern Neck more frequently than might be expected. But considering the early date of the New Yarmouth site, it is equally possible that most homes were constructed of locally available natural materials such as hardwoods. In Volume 1 of the Maryland Geological Survey (1897), it is indicated that brick making began in Maryland in the colonial era with scattered references to the industry in the earliest records. However, there is no reference as to where in Maryland this industry was based and it is known that the predominant occupations on the Eastern Shore were the growing of tobacco and other crops. Also, as discussed earlier in the present chapter, James Ringgold and Samuel Tovey stipulated that the houses constructed in New Yarmouth had to have a brick chimney (Kent County Land Records Liber A Folio 382-389). However, they did not indicate that the entire structure should be brick. It might be reasonable to assume then that in this early period of settlement, brick was utilized for structures but was not necessarily the predominant building material. At the time New Yarmouth was established, brick was likely not a building material commonly available to all members of society.

While brick may have been produced locally in the Maryland colony, it is not known to what extent, if at all, brick was produced on the Eastern Shore. Some brick was likely imported from England and for many in the lower classes would have been considered a luxury item. Glazed brick was likely more costly as it required the use of salt in the glaze, a durable and decorative finish (Sovinski 1999). Glazed brick would
likely not have been used for a simple house or ordinary structure. However, important buildings, or the homes of elite individuals, may have incorporated glazed brick into their facades. The Custom House located in Chestertown, Maryland (c. 1745) has a façade of alternating plain brick stretchers and glazed brick headers forming a pattern known as Flemish bond (The Historical Society of Kent County Maryland 2006). The Custom House still stands in Chestertown and was an extremely important structure in its day. All goods being traded in or out of the town passed through the Custom House. Since historical documents verify that New Yarmouth was named an official port of entry for trade, it is possible that the town, or more likely the associated shipyard(s) also contained a custom house. The glazed brick fragments at the CRFP property were identified in association with numerous colonial olive green wine bottle fragments as well as ceramic sherds, and were in close proximity to the pipe stem and bowl concentration. Pipes, ceramics, and wine were all items that would have been shipped into the area and passed through a custom house at an official port of trade. While it is certainly intriguing to think that the CRFP property is the location of the colonial shipyards at New Yarmouth and possibly contained a structure of significance to trade and the economy, these ideas are merely conjecture. Only additional sub-surface testing and archival research could verify these possibilities.

Glazed brick fragments were identified only on CRFP property; however, brick fragments were recovered from at least one additional site on Eastern Neck, Site 5 at The Farm survey area. The brick scatter is thought to represent the remains of a small outbuilding. As stated previously, brick may have been luxury item for some residents of Maryland’s Eastern Shore in the Colonial era. Constructing outbuildings of brick could
have symbolized a property owner’s wealth that they could afford to construct even mundane structures out of expensive materials. The presence of brick on the CRFP property and at Site 5 may indicate that wealthy individuals were living in the region and that at least one structure of significance to the economy may have been present.

Only one additional colonial site was identified during survey on Eastern Neck. Site 2 on the Alton property represents an oyster shell midden and contained a scatter of Colonial era materials. This is the only site from the era that seems to imply lesser social standing of its former inhabitants. The artifacts recovered at Site 2 were items common in most Colonial households, including undecorated tobacco pipe fragments, a single hand wrought nail, and North Devon Gravel Tempered ceramic sherds. North Devon ceramics tend to be relatively crudely constructed with large gravel granules included in the temper. According to Ann Brown (1982), North Devon Gravel Tempered ceramic is a redware dating from c. 1680-1720. Ivor Noel Hume (1978) states that North Devon ceramics have “a pink paste with a gray core, heavily gravel tempered” and are “Glazed in light brown or apple green.” North Devon types include utility items such as cream pans, jugs, and storage jars (Hume 1978). These items would not have been considered luxury goods and were instead part of the everyday vessels used by many poorer families at the time.

The small number of sites identified during terrestrial survey makes comparisons between them difficult. However, the work was successful in identifying both wealthier and poorer groups inhabiting the Eastern Neck region. It is possible that these groups represented wealthy plantation owners as well as smaller scale farming families but
additional archaeological investigations and archival studies are necessary to truly identify these early settlers.
CHAPTER 7
THE TOWNS OF KENT COUNTY

Although this work has sought to examine the rural nature of the Eastern Shore as a whole, it is intended to focus more intimately on Kent County. Kent County has historically had the lowest population of any of the Eastern Shore counties and this trend continues into the present. This low population is in association with a very low number of towns present in the county. While several areas of population are locally referred to as towns and often appear on maps as such, Kent County only recognizes five incorporated towns as municipalities: Betterton, Chestertown, Galena, Millington and Rock Hall (Figure 19). Each of these towns can trace its roots back to the early eighteenth century; yet they have remained relatively low in population and have not seen considerable growth over time. Although these towns were all established after the period in which New Yarmouth was founded, they are related to that town in several ways and a comparison of both the geography and economy of each may shed further light onto the failure of New Yarmouth compared to the relative success of these locations. The histories of each of these towns and their roles in the broader Kent County Diaspora are discussed below. The information presented here has relied heavily on census records.
Figure 19. 7.5’ USGS quadrangle map (Eastern Neck quad) indicating the locations of the five incorporated towns of Kent County in relation to Eastern Neck.

Chestertown

As has been noted previously in Chapters 5 and 6, Chestertown became the county seat for Kent County, Maryland, following the collapse of New Yarmouth as a viable location for judicial activities within the county and the courthouse’s removal first
to Quaker Neck. Founded in 1706, Chestertown is located on the easily navigable Chester River northeast of Grays Inn Creek. Although the town’s roots were likely present prior to 1706, this date marks the official status of the town as a port of trade as established in the 1706 Act for the Advancement of Trade and Erecting Ports and Towns in the Province of Maryland, an act similar to those which established New Yarmouth as an official port in the late eighteenth century (Allen 2003) (see Figure 19).

While Chestertown followed in the path of New Yarmouth in terms of being named an official port, its primary export was not tobacco. Chestertown came into existence shortly after the introduction of wheat cultivation in the early eighteenth century. This introduction of wheat meant that the Eastern Shore was one of the first regions in Maryland to move away from tobacco as a cash crop and expand its agricultural productivity. This expansion also meant that locations such as Chestertown were not bound by the seasonality of tobacco production but instead retained significance year round. The cultivation of crops such as wheat called for additional workers to aid in both the cultivation and transportation of produce. As Brugger (1988) states, general farming required wagons which necessitated the work of teamsters and “craftsman who created a demand for goods and services” (Brugger 1988:65). The area surrounding Chestertown was more expansive than Eastern Neck, on which New Yarmouth lay, and more land was readily available for small scale farmers who were interested in cultivating a wider variety of crops. In combination, these factors likely allowed Chestertown to expand into a true town unlike so many other locations of population throughout the Eastern Shore (Brugger 1988; Allen 2003).
While no census records exist for Kent County prior to 1790 (that census only recording population by county and not by city or town within each county), it is possible to glean some information about the inhabitants of Chestertown. For instance, it is known that at least one member of the Ringgold family, Thomas Ringgold IV (1715-1772), owned property within the town including a dry-goods business and shipyard. Thomas Ringgold was both economically and politically active in the town as he both shipped goods to foreign lands and practiced law (Allen 2003). Although it is not known which son of the original Tomas Ringgold (the purveyor of the Huntingfield property to James Ringgold) Thomas IV must be, his status and ventures are in keeping with the tradition the Ringgold family viewed throughout Kent County as prosperous and influential citizens.

Today, Chestertown boasts a population of approximately 4,746 individuals as per the 2000 federal census with a population of 4,899 in 2007 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). The presence of Washington College within the town allows for a greater number of job options than might otherwise be available without the yearly influx of new students to the small liberal arts college. While Chestertown has managed to retain its position as an important town within Kent County as well as expand its population, it is by no means a booming urban area. As Shomette (2000) notes, it was common during the early eighteenth century to experiment with town building by establishing sister cities. Chestertown is located on the north side of the Chester River. Just across the river, Kingstown was established in 1732 (Shomette 2000:28). Despite its equally ideal location on the Chester River and its close proximity to the center of Kent County including the courthouse and the base of exportation, Kingstown failed to achieve the
same town status as its neighbor and remains merely a Census Designated Place (CDP) with a population of 1,644 individuals in 2000, a decrease in population from 1990’s 1,660 (U.S. Census Bureau 2000).

**Comparing Chestertown with New Yarmouth**

The towns of New Yarmouth and Chestertown have much in common, including their location on waterways ideal for shipping, their status as official ports for importation and exportation, and their function as the seat of Kent County. However, these two locations developed in very different ways and a comparison of the two could help to shed further light on the failure of New Yarmouth and the success of Chestertown.

In the few historical documents mentioning New Yarmouth, including court records, the main crop exported from the town appears to have been tobacco, the cash crop relied upon at that time by the majority of colonial economies. Tobacco requires large expanses of land to cultivate and, as we have seen, Eastern Neck was predominantly under the ownership of private plantations and large scale farmers. This meant that little land was available to small scale farmers for cultivation of any crops. In addition, towns exporting tobacco were generally significant seasonally rather than year round. Tobacco marketing called for inspectors only during the spring and summer months while the remaining months of the year were devoted to cultivation and drying. While inspectors were present, locations devoted to the tobacco trade were important, but often they failed to grow into towns of any substance (Brugger 1988:65). New Yarmouth was most certainly one such location; however, it had the additional significance of the courthouse and jail which should have bolstered its year round significance and potentially drawn
inhabitants. Despite this, it seems that with the introduction of wheat cultivation, the population of Kent County was moving north where more lands were available to a wider array of planters.

As has been stated, Chestertown was founded during this period and was surrounded by ample land for cultivation and livestock. Whereas the removal of the courthouse from New Yarmouth left the town bereft of its year round significance, Chestertown had a sustainable economy even without the courthouse and jail. While we have seen that the reliance on tobacco as a cash crop did play a role in the failure of the town of New Yarmouth, the author would argue that the rural nature of the region in which New Yarmouth was founded was more largely due to the lack of available land for small scale farmers. This is, again, in part a reflection of the cash crop economy, but more importantly a reflection of the simple geography of the Eastern Neck peninsula. In order for individuals to attain land for cultivation, they had to move beyond Eastern Neck and into previously unexplored territory to find available property.

Betterton

No official date of founding is available for the town of Betterton; however, it is known that its history reaches back to the mid eighteenth century when it was first founded as a fishing village overlooking the confluence of the Sassafras, Elk, and Susquehanna Rivers (Maryland Municipal League 2009) (see Figure 19).

Betterton was ideally located to take advantage of the new steamboat technology available nearly a century after the town was initially established. In conjunction with the digging of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, the steamboat aided the town in becoming a hub of shipping. From Betterton the produce of Kent County could be
shipped to markets in larger urban areas such as the cities of Baltimore on the Western 
Shore, Wilmington in Delaware, and Philadelphia in Pennsylvania. By the time of 
Betterton’s incorporation in 1906, its involvement in shipping and its fame as a summer 
resort had helped the town reach economic prosperity. 

Unfortunately, Betterton’s tourism economy failed once travel by steamship had 
become obsolete and the construction of the Bay Bridge across the Chesapeake allowed 
for easy access between the Eastern and Western Shores by automobile (Maryland 
Municipal League 2009). As of the 2000 Census, Betterton had a population of only 376 
residents. While this was a population increase from the previous census period (1990’s 
360 individuals), the town has since seen a decrease in population. The Census Bureau 
estimated that in 2007 Betterton’s population was approximately 354 (U.S. Census 
Bureau 2000). 

Comparing Betterton with New Yarmouth 

Betterton’s initial economic prosperity and population growth was due to its 
involvement in shipping. New Yarmouth, too is said to have had at least one, possibly 
two shipyards, and was ideally located for involvement in the shipping of goods from the 
Eastern Shore to the Western Shore and beyond. However, little data is available for 
extent of shipping at New Yarmouth and it may be possible that shipping was not as far 
reaching as was the case with Betterton. However, shipping is nearly the only way in 
which these two towns were similar. 

Betterton did not rely entirely on shipping for economic success, instead 
becoming involved in tourism. This was, of course, partly the result of increased 
maritime technology in the form of steamboats not available during New Yarmouth’s
heyday. Despite its economic prosperity, Betterton’s population never reached the higher levels exhibited in Chestertown. This may be due to the fact that a reliance on tourism meant that much of the population was seasonal and temporary. In the end, though, the same advance of technology that originally jump-started Betterton’s economy spelled its downturn. The advent of the automobile and the construction of the Bay Bridge caused the town to lose its beach resort status. It is interesting to note that in this case, a decrease in the isolation of the Eastern Shore aided in the decline of a town rather than supporting it. Had it not been incorporated in 1906, Betterton may not have continued to enjoy official municipal status in Kent County.

Galena

Originally identified as Downs’ Cross Roads after a local tavern owner and later Georgetown Crossroads, Galena was founded in 1763. In 1813, silver was discovered near the town and a small mining operation was put into effect. The mine owner feared theft by British soldiers during the War of 1812 and while the mine was closed shortly after its opening, the town’s name was changed to Galena after a type of silver found in the vicinity. Galena was incorporated in 1858 (Maryland Municipal League 2009).

Galena is situated south of the Sassafras River and a short distance west of the Delaware border. While Galena is sandwiched between two unnamed tributaries of the Sassafras, the town is not located directly on any waterway (see Figure 19).

Although Galena was incorporated during a period in which railroads were being constructed across the Eastern Shore, the town does not appear to have had any significant relationship with railroad lines. No rail lines are pictured in the 1877 plan of the town produced for Griffing and Stevenson’s *Atlas of Kent and Queen Anne’s*
Counties, 1877 (Figure 20). With little in the way of written historical accounts of the town, it is difficult to identify the reasons behind Galena’s relative stability as a town in Kent County.

Figure 20. Plan of the town of Galena c. 1877 (“Galena, Kent Co” from Lake, Griffing & Stevenson’s Atlas of Kent and Queen Anne’s Counties, 1877 [The Historical Society of Kent County Maryland’s online map collection]).

As of the 2000 census, Galena had a population of 428 individuals, an increase from 1990’s 324. The Census Bureau estimates that in 2007 Galena’s population again increased to approximately 502 individuals (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). While this is definitely steady increase, Galena’s population is still well below that of Kent County’s largest urban center, Chestertown.
Comparing Galena with New Yarmouth

It is difficult to compare two such different towns when so little is known about the early history of either. However, it is recognized that Galena and New Yarmouth were situated in entirely different environments. Galena is the only town in Kent County not directly situated on a waterway, instead lying between two small tributaries of the Sassafras River. For this reason, it is unlikely that Galena played a significant role in shipping as New Yarmouth did. Yet the town of Galena continues to exist, likely in part due to its status as a municipality.

Millington

Although Millington is recognized as an official town and municipality in Kent County, very little is known about its history. The few facts known include that Millington was initially founded in 1754 and that the town was later incorporated in 1890 (Maryland Municipal League 2009) (see Figure 19).

Millington is located near the end of the Chester River, where the river narrows before crossing into Delaware. While this portion of the Chester River is navigable by small vessels, it is not suited for the large scale shipping activities in which towns such as Chestertown, Betterton, and Rock Hall were involved. Millington may have evolved into a town due to its location at a cross roads. Incorporated in 1890, the town had a railroad line running nearly through its center with a depot present. This line was in place at least as early as 1877 when the town was mapped in Griffing and Stevenson’s *Atlas of Kent and Queen Anne’s Counties, 1877* (Figure 21). Although no definite proof has been found, the author contends that the incorporation of the town in 1890 was at least in part the result of its significance in the railroad industry.
Millington is unique in that the town straddles the border between Kent County and Queen Anne’s County to its south. This unusual positioning means that only a portion of Millington’s population resides in Kent County. In total Millington’s population was recorded as 416 individuals during the 2000 Census, an increase of only seven individuals over 1990’s total of 409. The Census Bureau, however, estimated that Millington’s population fell in 2007 to approximately 396 individuals (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). Over a period of 17 years Millington’s population has neither grown nor decreased to any significant degree.

Comparing Millington with New Yarmouth

On the surface it may seem that the towns of Millington and New Yarmouth have little in common. Millington was founded several decades after New Yarmouth had disappeared as a “town” and while situated on a navigable waterway, likely was not
ideally located for major shipping activities. New Yarmouth on the other hand is known to have participated in large scale shipping and was an official port for the imporation and exportation of goods to and from the Eastern Shore. However, these two towns do have a commonality.

It has been suggested that Millington was incorporated as a town in part because of its significance in railroad activities. In this way, the town was involved in shipping, though not perhaps to the same extent as New Yarmouth. However, when the railroad’s significance began to wane in the wake of new advancements in technology and transportation, Millington began to stagnate. Despite its position within two counties, the town has seen no appreciable population growth, at least since the 1990’s although further census research should be undertaken to track population trends over a wider period of time. The situation in Millington is not that dissimilar to the fate of New Yarmouth. Once the population began to move up the Chester River, New Yarmouth was no longer considered a viable location for the county seat. With the removal of the town’s judicial significance, New Yarmouth petered out. Further research may show that had Millington not been incorporated as a municipality, the town would have floundered and perhaps likewise disappeared once its significance as a railroad depot was lost.

Rock Hall

Rock Hall was established in 1707; just one year after Chestertown’s founding, and was originally referred to as Rock Hall Crossroads. Although 1707 is the official date of establishment, as with the other towns in Kent County the area was likely inhabited prior to this date. Rock Hall Crossroads was a fishing town from the start, much as Betterton had been at the outset, and became a lively port for tobacco ships.
Later, the town became a center for fishing and crabbing on the Chesapeake Bay (Maryland Municipal League 2009).

Rock Hall is located north of the New Yarmouth town location at the head of the Eastern Neck peninsula (see Figure 19). The town was laid out according to a simple grid plan although it is situated at an angled crossroads (Figures 22 and 23). Little else is known of the history of Rock Hall as a town and community.

Figure 22. Plan of Rock Hall, no date.
Figure 23. Plan of Rock Hall c. 1877.

The 2000 Census reported that Rock Hall had a population of 1,396 individuals, a marked decrease from 1990’s 1,584 inhabitants. However, the Census Bureau estimated that in 2007 Rock Hall had a population of 1,422 which shows a slight rise in numbers. Once again, this number fails to reach the population heights of Chestertown.

Comparing Rock Hall with New Yarmouth

Little is written about the early history of Rock Hall, a trait the town shares with New Yarmouth which would have been located a short distance south of this current municipality. While the two towns were both involved in shipping, neither seems to have prospered in this regard for an extended period of time. It is interesting to note that Rock Hall is located at a rather short distance from the proposed site of New Yarmouth. The
author contends that while Rock Hall was likely inhabited prior to its official founding in 1707, the town came into being as part of the same population movement that allowed Chestertown to become a more viable location for the county seat. Rock Hall too had a larger quantity of surrounding land available for cultivation for small scale farmers but was still close to several navigable waterways, including both Grays Inn Creek and the Chester River. It is possible that some of the early inhabitants of New Yarmouth moved to Rock Hall and Chestertown as these locations grew into more “urban” settings.

Discussion

Brief histories of the five recognized towns in Kent County, Maryland have here been discussed in an attempt to shed further light on the current rural nature of the county and the Eastern Shore in general. In addition, comparisons of these towns with New Yarmouth were intended to highlight the inconsistencies in the failure of one town and the success of several others.

While each of these five towns was initially established in the eighteenth century, all later in date than New Yarmouth, it appears that none of them were intentionally founded as towns at their start. New Yarmouth’s conception can be traced back to two individuals who set out to found a town in an effort to gain further wealth and status by participating in both shipping and countywide politics. The founders of New Yarmouth campaigned among their fellow commissioners to win the courthouse and jail and become the seat of Kent County. In addition, they laid out the town according to a known grid plan. Each of the five towns currently recognized in Kent County had humbler origins. Chestertown, still the most prosperous town in the county and the current seat, was laid out anew in 1730 according to a grid plan (Shomette 2000:28).
However, the town was in existence prior to this with residents involved in fishing and agricultural activities, including both cultivation and livestock. Betterton and Rock Hall were both founded as small fishing towns, while little is known about the initial establishment of either Galena or Millington. While little is known about these two towns, it does not appear that either was in any way intentionally designed as an official town. It seems that each of these towns developed more naturally in taking advantage of both open spaces for cultivation of a wider variety of crops and being located near waterways for both shipping and fishing exploits.

Although each of these towns continues to exist and function as a municipality within the county, only Chestertown has gained any significant population level. As we have seen, Betterton, Galena, and Millington have seen no real significant population change since the 1990 census. Rock Hall, while higher in population than the others, also does not reach the population density of Chestertown. These five towns represent the population centers of Kent County, which serves to highlight just how rural Kent is even into the present.

Overall, Kent County has the lowest population of any county on the Eastern Shore. The 2000 Census recorded a total countywide population of 19,197 individuals residing in Kent County, 5,550 individuals less than the next population low county, Somerset whose year round inhabitants and economy are tied to tourism (U.S. Census Bureau 2000). There are, of course, several other named places throughout Kent County which can be considered populated areas. Places like Kennedyville, for instance have appeared as town locations on maps at least as early as 1895 in publications such as Simon Martenet’s 1895 *Atlas of Maryland* (Martenet 1895). Today, however,
Kennedyville and other such places do not enjoy town status and in some cases, as with Morgnec, Maryland, consist only of a few privately owned houses and small farms loosely related to one another.

In order to make a more informed interpretation concerning this current trend toward rural living in Kent County and the historical tendency toward a lack of towns in the county, more research will need to be conducted. Census records especially can shed light on population increases and decreases over time, from the late eighteenth century to the present as well as population movements throughout the county as a whole. Despite the need for further investigation, the current research has indicated that Kent County residents are still choosing to live outside of town limits just as it appears they were during the Colonial Era.
CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The work presented in this thesis has been in part an effort to increase the limited body of research concerning the rural yet culturally rich and much-overlooked Eastern Shore of Maryland. It has also been an effort to examine an old question in a new way, utilizing as many lines of evidence as possible to better understand the trend toward rural living on the Shore during the early colonial era and throughout the region’s history. Finally, this work has attempted to locate and study the lost town of New Yarmouth, the first county seat of Kent County, the Eastern Shore’s first officially established county. While it is recognized that not all of the goals of this work have been met and that not all of the questions posed for the research have been answered, this final text is considered a large advancement toward meeting those goals and answering those questions.

Summary

Maryland’s Eastern Shore and especially its first officially organized county, Kent, had seen little urban development until the nineteenth century. Even during this era of railroad construction and town incorporation, the Shore did not develop a landscape of large densely populated towns and cities. This trend toward rural living, an outgrowth of the circumstances surrounding the initial colonization of the Eastern Shore continues into the present, although recent trends in population dispersion and urban sprawl from the Western Shore are continually acting on the region to change its rural flavor.

As we have seen, the Eastern Shore of Maryland was colonized in a time of both political and religious unrest in both the New World and the Old World. The Calvert plan for the Maryland colony hinged on creating towns on the Western Shore to serve as
hubs of social, political, and economic growth in the fledgling manorial colony. Little thought seems to have been given to the Eastern Shore as a viable place for similar growth. However, the Lord Proprietor was adamant about his rights to the already inhabited region. The earliest European colonists of the Eastern Shore were not a part of the Calvert expedition, but rather came from the established Virginia colony and considered themselves a part of that colony despite the recent Calvert claim to the land. William Claiborne, the first to hold a land grant on the Eastern Shore, even led armed naval conflicts against Calvert followers. Despite these conflicts, the Eastern Shore was deemed to be under the same proprietary rule as the Western Shore. Even after this decision, the Eastern Shore saw little in the way of colonization. Those who did choose to move to the region still came predominantly from Virginia while those who came from England often were seeking religious freedom. These earliest settlers were geographically separated from the rest of the Maryland colony but also separated by their regions of origin and their diverse religious make-up. Many of the individuals who settled on the Eastern Shore were Methodists and Quakers rather than Catholics.

Despite the efforts of both the Calvert family and the Crown in England to establish towns as centers of commerce and trade on the Eastern Shore, of which the town of New Yarmouth was one, the region continued to be comprised largely of privately owned tracts of land dedicated to the production of tobacco. Those towns that were established solely for the purpose of creating a port for the tobacco trade rarely grew into anything larger than a small port. It would not be until the nineteenth century with the advent of the railroad on the Shore, that towns were incorporated in record numbers. Many more towns, though, would die out as soon as the railroad was no longer
a significant factor on the landscape as they had grown up only because the railroad was there. Those towns which did stand the test of time rarely developed significantly higher populations over time. Sudlersville in Queen Anne’s County is one such town. Sudlersville was present prior to the advent of the railroad, but was considered a “bustling town” of 311 residents in the late nineteenth century (Emory 1981). Current census records show that while the demographic of the population may have changed, the town has grown little since the eighteen hundreds. As of the year 2000, Sudlersville only had a population of 412 individuals (U.S. Census Bureau 2000).

**Discussion**

It is clear that the Eastern Shore of Maryland grew up under circumstances which led the region to retain a rural flavor throughout its long and interesting history. This phenomenon has often been attributed to the region’s geographic isolation from the more heavily populated Western Shore and surrounding colonies as well as its dependence on tobacco as a cash crop. These two factors are extremely significant in understanding the lack of urbanization on the Shore; however, they are not the sole reasons for the continued trend toward rural living. Instead, it appears that the Eastern Shore, and Kent County in particular, has retained its rural flavor for many reasons. These reasons include the aforementioned fact that the Shore was initially colonized by a diverse group of individuals with a sense of separateness from the rest of the Maryland colony. The families who were most influential in the earliest colonization of the Shore by Europeans seem to have carried with them that feeling of independence. While many of these families were content to reside on private plantations, others were interesting in increasing their wealth and political power through the development of towns. It is
interesting that it is often the elite members of early colonial Eastern Shore society who both wished to increase their wealth through urbanization and desired to retain their own private tracts of land. They both wanted and resisted urbanization.

Less elite individuals are more difficult to identify in both the historical documentary record and the archaeological record. Because these individuals are less obvious in the research, it is difficult to understand what role they played in town construction and urban living. It seems that often these individuals and families remained on small plots of privately owned land rather than purchasing lots within towns. However, they may have begun moving toward town living once the population moved further up the Chester River where land for cultivation was more readily available. While some individuals may have done this, it appears, based on maps and census records, that many more settled on small farms both removed from and in the vicinity of towns.

Research Questions

As discussed in Chapter 3, several research questions have been posed which are directly related to the possibility of resistance to urbanization on the Eastern Shore as well as the life of the now lost town of New Yarmouth. Many of these questions could not be fully addressed; however several have been touched on in this work.

Question 1

- What influence did government (bureaucratic policies, legislation, sanctions), both before and after the overthrow of the Proprietorship, have on colonial actions concerning urbanization?

This question is likely the question best addressed by this work. As discussed in detail in Chapter 2, the three Lords Baltimore intended the Maryland colony to be a
manorial colony with urban centers of social, political, and economic life under the supervision of manorial lords who answered directly to the Proprietor. The Proprietor had nearly king-like status in terms of his control over the governing of the colony. However, the old manor system did not translate into immediate success for the Calverts. In fact, it seems that the conflicting ideas of a headright system and an urban center caused the opposite effect in the fledgling colony. The manor lords received large tracts of lands which left little property for the recently freed indentured servants and new colonists arriving in Maryland. Without available plots within the town itself, individuals and families continued to reside instead on the manors of the lords who were meant to help govern under the Proprietor. Over time, Saint Mary’s City grew into a bustling town, but it quickly fell out of favor and the population moved north to Annapolis.

On the Eastern Shore, settlers predominantly resided on Kent Island as this area had already been colonized by the Virginian William Claiborne and his followers. Over time, though, new land was sought for the production of tobacco as well as private ownership and people began to move northward into the Eastern Neck region. Once on Eastern Neck, individuals and families purchased large tracts of land for tobacco plantations. This did not leave a significant portion of land left over for town development. Despite this, James Ringgold and Samuel Tovey understood the significance of involving themselves in a program of urbanization. They were aware of the Proprietor’s and the Crown’s desire for towns and ports which they believed would garner them more income from the new colony. With this in mind, the two associates set about establishing the town of New Yarmouth. The actions of Ringgold and Tovey were in part based on the prevailing beliefs within political circles of the time that town
building was necessary for a thriving colony. It seems that at least a few others agreed with Ringgold and Tovey as there are documents indicating that at least one individual left the remainder of his estate to Ringgold and Tovey to furnish the new courthouse at New Yarmouth. Records concerning individuals and families not directly associated with politics and the justice system are scarce and there is no indication that the majority of the Eastern Neck population supported the town building effort.

As we have seen, government and political policy had several influences on colonial actions concerning urbanization. From the start of the Maryland colony on the Western Shore at St. Mary’s City, settlers often could not purchase town lots due to a lack of land while others chose to remain on manors because they received a number of benefits from the manor lords not necessarily available through town life. On the Eastern Shore, colonists from the start were against the Maryland Proprietary government as it removed their own claim to Kent Island and other portions of the Eastern Shore. On Kent Island itself and further up the Shore on Eastern Neck, open land was available for the cultivation of tobacco and those seeking wealth and religious freedom moved into the region, settling on large tracts in an effort to gain social and economic status. Those who favored a town, namely Ringgold and Tovey, were seeking greater political power for themselves. However, once New Yarmouth was established and the Crown named it an official port for the tobacco trade, little evidence exists to indicate that it saw substantial growth. It would seem that individuals did not relocate to the town. Instead, it may be possible to suggest that those who resided in the town were directly related to court proceedings. These same individuals may have also held other properties which were used as primary residences when court was not in session.
In order to more fully answer the question of government policy effecting the actions of colonists in terms of urbanization, more archival and archaeological research are necessary.

Question Two

- How did markets (competing labor forces and market prices) affect local economies? Could the effects of outside markets have influenced one group more so than another, for instance elites as opposed to poorer classes or vice versa, to prefer rural living?

Unfortunately, the above question has only barely been touched on in this work. Archival research has as of yet not provided enough evidence about the labor force to make inferences about their choices in living conditions. It is known, though, that tobacco as a cash crop was a major part of the impetus for Kent Island colonists to move northward. North of Kent Island was enough untapped land to accommodate both tobacco plantations and small farms. However, there is not yet enough evidence to suggest which groups may have been more affected by local and outside markets. Far more research is necessary to really understand the nature of markets and their affects on local populations on the Eastern Shore during the early colonial era.

On the other hand, it has been recognized that markets in both the mid to late eighteenth century and the nineteenth century did have some effect on town development. For instance, Chestertown was able to grow in part because it participated in shipping to larger markets across the Western Shore and beyond. These shipping activities were tied to an expanded repertoire of cultigens including wheat and corn, rather than tobacco alone.
Question Three

- Did the Crown’s establishment of town acts impose in any way on the freedoms of plantation owners?

This question requires further historic document research in order to be more fully addressed. However, it is known that the Crown in England was establishing town acts after which Lord Baltimore modeled his own town act legislation. Through previous research it is also known that though these town acts were set in place and some towns were built, many of these failed to draw inhabitants or failed shortly after the town acts were repealed (Shomette 2000). In this sense, the Crown’s establishment of town acts did touch on the colonial inhabitants of the Eastern Shore since they were a direct model for Lord Baltimore’s own plans. Further research is necessary to more fully address the issue.

Question Four

- What forms could or did resistance to town building/living have taken? Could the possibility that the church at New Yarmouth was outside of the town proper indicate some form of resistance?

The question of forms of resistance has been exceedingly difficult to address within the parameters of this project. Many ideas for what forms of resistance could have been employed have been considered, including an increase in privately owned docks constructed by plantation owners to trade their products from their own lands rather than transferring their tobacco to an officially recognized port such as New Yarmouth. Most ideas cannot be fully explored without the aid of more intensive archaeological survey, most notably subsurface testing.

Despite the difficulty in finding evidence for possible forms of resistance without significant archaeological data, the second half of the question was answered during
archival research. It seems that the church at New Yarmouth, St. Paul’s, was already in existence prior to the establishment of the town. Ringgold and Tovey were aware of the common usage of the term “town” during their time and likely recognized that having a church was a vital part of being a town. With a church already located on Eastern Neck, just a short distance from the lands Ringgold and Tovey possessed, it was safe to place New Yarmouth on Gray’s Inn Creek and still refer to it as a town because St. Paul’s church was only a short distance away.

The fact that St. Paul’s church predates New Yarmouth indicates that the placement of the church in relation to the town does not suggest any form of intentional or passive resistance to the town.

Aside from the research questions presented above, several other questions, some overlapping with those already presented, were posed in relation to the archaeological survey of the New Yarmouth site. Obviously, it was not possible to answer all of these questions as archaeological survey had to first focus on accurately identifying the site of the town. Despite this, several key issues have been touched on in this work.

Question 5

- Who were the “new citizens” of New Yarmouth?

Uncovering the citizens of the town of New Yarmouth has not been an easy task. Archaeological survey was not possible on the property thought to represent the New Yarmouth town site. This lack of even the most basic terrestrial survey means that no physical cultural remains from the people who inhabited the town are available for study. A lack of artifacts prevents distribution studies based on artifact type which in turn
prevents any model of site organization or social/economic differentiation across the site from being formed.

Moreover, historical documents have yielded little information concerning the “new citizens” of New Yarmouth. Most documents do not list the town in which individuals live, stating only their county of residence. Census records have not been a viable source of information because they do not extend back beyond 1797 for Kent County, well after New Yarmouth had passed into history.

The only documents providing direct evidence to the identities of possible town residents are deeds, indentures, and court records. From the deeds and indentures, we know that Samuel Tovey had a house on the property that would become New Yarmouth. Aside from this house, several other structures were already present on the site. Tovey and his wife and children lived in the house he had constructed but no records indicate whether or not this house was located within the town proper once New Yarmouth was planned and established. Aside from the Tovey family, it is documented that a Mr. Thomas Joces had a house “at y⁵. Towne of New Yarmouth” (Kent County Court Proceedings, 1676-1698) in 1693. It is not known when Joces moved to the town, nor how long he remained once the courthouse was removed to Chestertown, further up the Chester River. It is probably safe to assume that shortly after the removal of the courthouse, most of those who did live in the town dispersed or followed the flow of the population up river to Chestertown. No matter how long he resided there, Mr. Joces did keep a residence in the town of New Yarmouth and so far, he is the only resident to whom a name can be given.
As it has only been possible to establish two definite residents of the town of New Yarmouth, it is not possible to give an accurate account of the social climate within the town nor can any real economic differentiation among residents be proposed. It is no surprise that the two individuals named as living within the town are from a higher social class. These two men were intimately linked to the court proceedings at New Yarmouth and were, therefore, influential in local politics. This may seem to suggest that those who lived within the town were associated with the justice system and were predominantly upper class citizens of the Eastern Shore. However, such a suggestion would be a stretch given the evidence thus far uncovered. A lack of evidence concerning poorer or less socially elite individuals and families does not mean that such people did not reside within the town. Instead, the evidence as it is so far known only indicates that New Yarmouth did have at least a few elite citizens. More research is needed to uncover more about the “new citizens” of New Yarmouth.

Question 6

- Did the two shipyards exist at the site and, if so, who made up the labor force?

Several historical texts state that New Yarmouth possessed at least one, if not two shipyards. The fact that the British Crown named New Yarmouth as an official point of entry for the tobacco trade also suggests that at least one shipyard must have existed for that purpose.

As of yet, no archival materials have been found which mention the shipyard(s) at New Yarmouth, though further research will likely bring to light more supporting material. This research then has had to rely entirely on archaeological investigations to glean information concerning the potential for shipyards at the New Yarmouth town site.
As was discussed in Chapter 5, the property belonging to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation on the west bank of Gray’s Inn Creek, a relatively short distance north of Knapley Green and the suspected New Yarmouth town site, was found to exhibit evidence of shipping. This evidence came in the form of the unexpected discovery of a dense spread of large cobbles and tabular stones throughout the study area. These stones are not native to Eastern Neck; indeed, few large rocks are naturally present throughout Kent County. The rocks resemble ballast and the fact that they are contained within a small portion of land seems to indicate that ships were unloading in that location.

The possible ballast stones found on Chesapeake Bay Foundation property, though, are not the only evidence for a shipyard present in that location. Terrestrial survey also recovered a concentration of colonial brick, including glazed brick fragments, and colonial olive green bottleglass fragments. The density of these materials may mark the location of a structure associated with a shipyard, such as a customs house. Although this concentration has not yet been called a site, see Chapter 5 for further details and discussion, a smaller concentration of colonial pipe stem and pipe bowl fragments only a short distance away also provided another important clue to identifying the site as the possible location of a New Yarmouth shipyard.

Among the ball clay pipe stem and bowl fragments recovered from the Chesapeake Bay Foundation lands was a single marked piece. A pipe bowl fragment bearing the letters “W.E.” These initials stand for Will Evans, a British pipe producer who made pipes for export bearing the mark found on Chesapeake Bay Foundation lands from c.1660-1697, a time period supported by additional relative dating of pipe stem fragments and coinciding with the life of New Yarmouth as an official port of trade.
Together, the historical documentation, and more importantly the archaeological evidence recovered during terrestrial survey suggest that New Yarmouth did possess at least one shipyard and that said shipyard was located a short distance north of the town, between Brown’s Cove and Joiner’s Cove. The presence of colonial artifacts here has not gone unnoticed by local residents and materials from this area may have been part of the remains discovered by Dr. Peregrine Wroth when he stated that he had found the town of New Yarmouth, based predominantly on the identification of an old wharf.

Despite the exciting discovery of the likely location of a New Yarmouth era shipyard, no evidence has yet been recovered to suggest who the labor force may have been. This part of the above question is not possible to answer without further archival research and archaeological testing, including subsurface test excavations.

Question 7

- Was the church located outside of the town? Would this be comparable with other similar sites or would such a location reflect a rare or isolated incidence? If the church were outside of the town, could this indicate a form of resistance to the church or to the town itself?

This question has been answered previously, but bears further discussion.

Through archival research it was possible to show that the church associated with New Yarmouth had actually been present on Eastern Neck prior to the establishment of the town. As this was the case, it is not likely that the location of the church indicates any form of resistance to the construction of the town. However, in an effort to verify that this was the case, several town plan maps from Kent County and the surrounding areas were studied in an effort to better understand church placement within towns. Unfortunately, since no colonial town maps exist for the region, nineteenth century plans were necessarily utilized instead.
As seen in Chapter 8, the numerous small towns present on the Eastern Shore during the nineteenth century were relatively simple in plan. The significant factor in terms of the abovementioned question, though, is the location of various churches within those towns. All towns for which plans were found had at least one church, some larger towns exhibiting two or more. The vast majority of these churches were Methodist with a few Quaker churches present as well. The key point is that each church was located either in the town proper or on the edge of the town but still within a planned block of structures. At no time is the church located at a distance from the town. Had it been found that the church at New Yarmouth was constructed after the formation of the town, and intentionally placed at some distance from the town, it could have been a good indication that some form of resistance was occurring. It is now known, though, that this is not the case.

Question 8

- What were the political agendas of James Ringgold and Samuel Tovey?

This question has also been touched on in previous chapters. It seems highly likely that both Ringgold and Tovey were seeking to increase their social and political standing, as well as their personal wealth by establishing a town on their property and urging the government to place the courthouse for the entire county there. By gaining the county courthouse, Ringgold and Tovey would ensure that their town was the center of politics and commerce in Kent County and ensure themselves a large share of profits produced through both shipping and political activities.

Question 9

- Did local plantation owners relocate to the town or remain removed? Perhaps they remained on their plantations but also owned property in the town?
It was not possible to fully explore this question within the parameters of this research and the time constraints associated with it. As has been stated previously, little evidence of the residents of New Yarmouth has been found. However, it is known that several individuals owned large tracts of land around the property that would become the town site. It does not seem that these individuals abandoned their homes on these properties to move to the town. Only further research will tell whether or not at least some of them purchased town lots and kept multiple residences, one within the town and one on their plantation.

Question 10

- How did outside markets influence the economic prosperity and eventual failure of New Yarmouth and towns like it?

This question too has been addressed previously within this chapter. However, it also bears further clarification. It is highly likely that main individuals already residing on the Eastern Shore, specifically on Kent Island, began moving northward up the Chester River in search of land on which to grow tobacco. Several of these early settlers moved to Eastern Neck, with is numerous navigable waterways and open land. Although this was a major impetus for the movement of people up the Chester River, it is not the entire story. Kent Island was becoming crowded and any new arrivals seeking to gain property of their own on which to establish small farms or plantations were not likely to find any on Kent Island.

The lack of available land within the bounds of the already settled portion of the Eastern Shore as well as the need for land for the production of tobacco indicates that both outside tobacco markets and local land markets influenced the movement of people toward Eastern Neck. The town of New Yarmouth was established in part to take
advantage of the lucrative tobacco trade and was named an official port of entry for the tobacco trade by the British Crown. Although the economic stimulus of the tobacco trade played a huge role in the life of New Yarmouth, it does not seem to have spelled the end for the town.

During the late seventeenth century, the population of Kent County was increasingly moving further up the Chester River. The reason for this has not been much studied within this project; however, it seems possible that economic change played a part in the relocation. Other likely factors include the need to accommodate a greater number of new settlers arriving in the Maryland colony and the need for larger shipyards to accommodate the increasingly diversified production of crops. These factors led to the eventual removal of the courthouse from New Yarmouth to Chestertown, closer to the center of the changing population. However, New Yarmouth retained its excellent location on a highly navigable waterway and local residents and plantation owners would still have utilized shipyards along Gray’s Inn Creek. An example of this is presented in the painting of a shipyard along the Creek dating from the eighteenth century (Figure 9).

Question 11

- Did the benefits of town living outweigh the negatives or vice versa?

It was not possible to address this question to any significant degree. Without further archival and archaeological investigations in seems likely that the benefits or negatives associated with town living on the Eastern Shore will remain unknown.

Conclusion

The research presented in this thesis was intended as a starting point for the broader study of the rural nature of Maryland’s Eastern Shore region in both the colonial
era and the present. The results of the research presented here have provided a wealth of information concerning the earliest settlement of Kent County on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. Through the use of historical documents, maps, and archaeological investigations, it has been possible to further the body of knowledge on Eastern Shore colonial settlement and the establishment of the first “town” in the region. Though by no means a complete answer to the question of why the Eastern Shore has been a predominantly rural area with few urban centers from the colonial period into the present, advancements have been made in better understanding the complex of factors involved in the phenomenon.

The main thesis of this work stated that the research intended to move beyond traditional views of the rural nature of the Eastern Shore. Rather than relegating the region to a historically insignificant rural locale due only to its geographic isolation and its dependence on tobacco as a cash crop, this work has investigated a wider range of social, religious, and political factors. In addition, it was suggested that an intentional resistance to urbanization may have played a significant role in the rural nature of the Shore. The planned town of New Yarmouth has been presented as a case study to support the notion that resistance to town living may have been occurring in Kent County.

Although this work has not been able to completely answer the question of resistance to urbanization as a viable factor in the rural nature of the Eastern Shore, the possibility has not been ruled out. The body of evidence collected thus far has been inconclusive in terms of resistance. It is highly likely that only further research in conjunction with more in depth archaeological investigations will resolve the question.
key part in understanding the potential role of resistance to urbanization on Eastern Neck will be the archaeological survey of the Napley Green property on the west bank of Gray’s Inn Creek. This property is thought to represent the location of New Yarmouth and archaeological investigations there could yield artifactual and structural evidence of the size and organization of the town as well as the population density. As it stands, little evidence has been found to contradict the theory that New Yarmouth was little more than a courthouse and jail. The shipyard, while present, was not located within the town proper and very little suggests that individuals and families nearby relocated to the town.
CHAPTER 9

FUTURE RESEARCH

The work presented in this thesis is intended as a preparatory body of information for a larger project in which the rural nature of the Eastern Shore is studied in greater depth. This type of initial study has never been conducted before for the Eastern Shore region and Kent County in particular and it is hoped that it will serve as a guide for future researchers. Future archival and archaeological investigations will allow for a much clearer picture of early settlement on the Shore as well as population density, distribution, and social standing. The question of resistance to urbanization as a viable factor in the rural nature of the Colonial Eastern Shore and into the present continues to be a main focus to the research.

Future research is expected to include a more in depth examination of archival materials including deeds, indentures, wills, probate records, and census records. It is hoped that through the study of these significant primary sources, more data on the residents of colonial Eastern Neck and their association with the town of New Yarmouth might come to light. In addition, further archival investigations are key to answering the several research questions only briefly touched on in this work, including the role of outside markets, economics, and politics in the development of the Eastern Shore as well as the relationships between coexisting groups of individuals from different economic, social, and religious backgrounds. Understanding the relationships among the colonists on the Eastern Shore is considered highly significant in analyzing the possibility of intentional resistance, either passive or overt, to urbanization.
More in depth study of census records from the earliest existing census documents dating from 1790 to the present is necessary to more fully understand the both population dynamics within Kent County and the towns therein as well as population movements throughout the county and the Eastern Shore.

Significant archaeological research still needs to be conducted to better understand the location, plan, and population of the town of New Yarmouth. By conducting pedestrian survey of the Napley Green property, it is hoped that the actual town site might be identifiable within the larger property or at the very least, that the potential area of study can be narrowed down. This kind of survey could support or negate the archival research which suggests the town was once located directly north of the current house site. Further and more invasive archaeological investigations of the possible shipyard located on Chesapeake Bay Foundation property and the surrounding areas may also provide significant information concerning populations surrounding the town as well as the level of trade that really occurred on Gray’s Inn Creek during the early colonial era.
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