VI
CHAPTER

Town Plans and Everyday Material Culture
An Archaeology of Social Relations in Colonial Maryland's Capital Cities

PAUL A. SHACKEL

DURING THE seventeenth century, Chesapeake society was transformed from "crude egalitarianism" (McCusker and Menard 1986) into a society that emphasized the modern values of class structure and individuality. Many of the changes in the landscape and material culture of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Chesapeake are a product of these broad sociocultural changes. For instance, James Deetz (1988) hypothesizes that colonoware made by African Americans can be linked to the changing relationship between white masters and black slaves. Mark Leone (1987) also suggests that the instability of the social order in Annapolis during the 1760s led the aristocracy to create formal gardens.

In this analysis I use the town plans of the two Maryland capitals, their architecture, and everyday material goods to demonstrate the relationships between changes in social, political, and economic conditions and the introduction of a new material culture. These new material forms helped to separate the community into various social groups, created strong group boundaries, and promoted individuality.

There is more than a coincidental relationship between the rise of the naturalizing ideology of racism and the development during the 1660s and 1670s of explicit uses of monumental architecture in Maryland's first capital, St. Mary's City. The redesign of the town incorporated baroque elements and emphasized the dominant powers of the church and state. The redesign of St. Mary's city in the 1660s and the 1670s occurred in conjunction with the increasing concern of the wealthy about a growing lower class and the legalization of racism against African Americans. Racism created a new underclass and reduced the threat from an uneasy land-poor group.

During a subsequent era of sociocultural instability in the Chesapeake and in Maryland's second capital city, Annapolis, tensions apparently developed between wealth groups. The elite responded by introducing a new set of material goods and a new set of rules for formal dining. This new etiquette emphasized individuality. Also during the 1720s, changes in architecture from impermanent to permanent structures reveal the breakdown of community maintenance relationships.

Changes in material culture can be more than an index of wealth or a product of diffusion. They can also be a reaction to sociocultural change and an expression of relationships in society. The meanings and uses of material goods change with the increased ambiguity of social hierarchy and can be used to symbolically reinforce the hierarchy. An analysis of the meanings and uses of goods

therefore provides a fruitful analysis of cultural change in the Chesapeake.

MEANINGS AND USES OF GOODS

The meanings of goods can be controlled by groups defined by such factors as wealth, class, occupation, or gender to support a dominant ideology. This control can be exercised in two ways: (1) by making artificial phenomena and their meanings appear to be "natural" or part of the natural order, or (2) by placing the meaning in the past, making it appear that there is a historical precedent and, therefore, that the meaning is inevitable. The group in control will establish the meanings that are to be used to dominate others (Hodder 1986:150). Ideologically based asymmetrical relationships in society occur as power relationships in many everyday interactions.

Historical archaeologists of colonial America should find interesting Daniel Miller's (1987:135–137) and Neil McKendrick's (1982) interpretation of the changing material culture in England during the Enlightenment. This period marked a change in the symbolic use of goods by interest groups to reinforce their position in the social hierarchy.

> In a society in which the social distance between classes is *too great to bridge*, as, say, between a landed aristocracy and a landless peasantry, or in which the distance is *unbridgeable*, as in a caste society, then new patterns of increased expenditure on consumer goods are extremely difficult if not impossible to induce. (McKendrick 1982:20)

In a period of unquestioned social stratification, material goods often indicate the established hierarchy and are sometimes reinforced by sumptuary laws. In such circumstances, restrictions tend to be imposed on mercantile practices, and the meanings of goods and their place in the hierarchy are relatively uncomplex and firmly controlled.

With the disintegration of power of the old regime in Renaissance Europe, the amount and type of goods used in society were radically transformed. Goods that had relatively static symbolic meanings during times of unquestioned hierarchy, were now more active in creating new meanings and reinforcing social asymmetry, since the old order was increasingly being questioned and threatened. With the increased production of goods, those lower in the order began emulating the higher groups. The demand for goods increased as the social hierarchy became more ambiguous (Miller 1987:136). Feeling threatened by emulation, the upper levels of the hierarchy attempted to reestablish differences. The elite found it necessary to produce new goods, new behaviors, and new social actions to keep their social distance (Shackel 1987, 1993).

RACISM IN THE CHESAPEAKE

Racism and the material culture and behavior that reinforced it were not codified in the Chesapeake in the first half of the seventeenth century. The demands and rewards of the tobacco economy before 1660 unleashed a fierce individualism that worked against the social cohesion necessary to forge highly structured hierarchies. As the number of freed white and black indentured servants increased, they competed with the wealthy for land. This competition threatened the emerging social order. Consequently, the gentry championed the legislation and introduced new material culture patterns that would establish a hierarchy and marginalize peripheral groups such as African Americans through codification. An example of this can be seen in the development of racism in parts of the colonial Chesapeake.

A study of Northampton County, Virginia, shows that before the Reformation took place in England all blacks who came to Virginia's eastern shore entered as slaves. African Americans had to develop strategies to escape their bondage: sometimes they were freed by their masters; the other option was self-purchase, but in this case they had to rely on the cooperation of the master. Planters usually used self-purchase as a way to motivate slaves to attain higher productivity. Freedom served as a powerful goal and often increased the planter's profits with greater output. Obviously some planters lived up to their promise, as 29 percent of the African Americans in Northampton County were free in 1668 (Breene and Innes 1980:10–17; see also Deal 1988:275–305). Interaction between nongentry whites, such as small planters and indentured servants, and African Americans occurred on a daily basis. In fact, up until Bacon's Rebellion "the two races exchanged land, traded livestock, worked for each other, sued one another, and socialized together" (Breene and Innes 1980:104). Some white servants lived with and worked for African American planters (Breene and Innes 1980:105).

Timothy Breene and Stephen Innes trace the accounts of Anthony and Mary Johnson, free African Americans who lived in Northampton County, Virginia. By 1651 Johnson owned a modest estate of 250 acres, bred cattle and hogs, and grew tobacco. A 1653 court record indicates that Johnson owned a black slave. Johnson's oldest son accumulated an estate of 450 acres. The Johnsons moved to Somerset County, Maryland, where Anthony died. In the 1670s his children were able to increase their estates. A third generation of free landowning Johnsons existed until 1706, when the last survivor died without an heir. In the communities that the Johnsons inhabited, racial boundaries appeared nonrestrictive in court cases and land deed transactions (Breene and Innes 1980:10–17).

Some historians believe that planters preferred white skilled servants to the unskilled, unwesternized, alien blacks (Kulikoff 1986). Breene and Innes (1980:49) claim "the planters were, in one important respect, quite without prejudice: they were willing to employ any kind of labor, and under any institutional arrangements, as long as the labor force was politically defenseless enough for the work to be done cheaply and under discipline." It was under these circumstances that indentured servants and free whites and blacks operated in their Chesapeake communities.

To encourage the immigration of white servants, the Chesapeake gentry created legislation that improved the conditions of the servants. Specifically, at the end of their servitude they were to become freemen and landowners (Maryland Archives 1640:1:52, 97). Legislators set limits to the terms of servants without indentures (Handlin and Handlin 1950:241). The aim of shortening the term of indenture was to encourage laborers to emigrate in the hope of becoming freemen and establishing their own plantation. Early legislation applied stiff penalties to blacks and whites equally for running away, drunkenness, and carrying arms. Until the 1660s the statutes applied to blacks were similar to those for white servants. These regulations grew less stringent for white servants but little changed for the African Americans (Handlin and Handlin 1950:244; Morgan 1975). Within a decade the plantation system introduced a growing number of freedmen into a society in which much of the agricultural land was occupied by large plantation owners. Limited opportunities for advancement existed.

The gentry felt that the freedmen were a threat to their livelihood. Their fears increased as the proportion of African Americans in the labor force increased. In Virginia the African American population totaled less than 2,500 in 1660s, but by the 1700s slave traders were importing several thousand black slaves per year. The increased alien black population threatened a hierarchy dominated by white planters (Breene and Innes 1980:108). The gentry's answer was legalized racism. The substitution of slaves for servants in the 1660s gradually eased the threat of insurrection and functioned as a way of keeping labor docile (Kulikoff 1978). As Edmund Morgan (1975:328) notes, "If freemen with disappointed hopes should make common cause with slaves of desperate hopes, the results might be worse than anything Bacon had done."

Differential treatment between blacks and whites created a division of interest through racial contempt. For instance, white servants who ran away with slaves had their sentences doubled—for their time lost and that of the slave (Handlin and Handlin 1950:244). The division between whites and blacks in the consciousness of the freedmen appeared to be working by the 1660s. As Winthrop Jordan (1978:278) points out, "White men were loudly protesting against being made 'slaves' in terms which strongly suggest that they considered slavery not as wrong but as inappropriate to themselves." Even African American servants were unable to protect themselves against this racist legislation. "White men were more clearly free because Negroes had become so clearly slave" (Jordan 1978:278). Freedmen's social unrest over the lack of economic mobility had threatened the upper class. In response to this unrest, the colonial upper class created a new, lower class and promoted racial prejudice where it had previously not existed, thus dividing the power of the poor and creating a new labor base.

Reasserting the Dominant Culture: The Redesign of Maryland's First Capital

In the early seventeenth-century Chesapeake settlement, all social groups owned the same type of goods, although the wealthy owned more. All social groups lived in the same type of home. The region included a mix of recently freed indentured servants, a small proportion of which comprised African Americans, as well as young Anglo men and women in search of economic opportunity (McCusker and Menard 1986:141). White plantation owners worked alongside white and black indentured servants.

St. Mary's City, Maryland's first capital, was settled in

1634. Historians are united in claiming that the development of the town was slow, especially in its first several decades of existence (Carr 1974; Menard 1975). The town conformed to John McCusker and Russell Menard's (1986) model of "crude egalitarianism." Probate inventory analyses of St. Mary's county indicate that members of all wealth groups accumulated few luxury items (Carr and Walsh 1977:34). The town center consisted of little more than the home and plantation of Leonard Calvert, governor of the colony.

However, Henry Miller (1986:123–125, 1988: 62ff.) has demonstrated through archaeology that by the late 1660s and early 1670s the design of the center of the town had changed considerably. Miller (1986:125) notes that the Maryland assembly's concern for redeveloping the town plan may have occurred as early as 1662. At the same time, the ruling class created and legislatively codified a difference between whites and blacks. Five years later Lord Baltimore granted a charter to create the City of St. Mary's. The new design of the town—which is the earliest documented baroque plan in the New World—probably took shape during the 1660s. As Morris (1979:124–25) points out, immense centralized autocratic powers initiate baroque urban design. This new design emphasized stratification and class structure, particularly in religious and governmental institutions. During the 1680s and 1690s St. Mary's town plan was "fleshed out" by the building of monumental architecture (Miller 1986, 1988).

As the town developed, so too did racist legislation. In 1662 Virginia declared that "'if any Christian shall commit Fornication with a Negro man or woman, he or she soe offending' should pay double the usual fine" (Jordan 1978:277). The following year the Maryland legislature declared "Negroes were to serve 'Durante Vita'", that is, their entire lives (Jordan 1978:279; Handlin and Handlin 1950:241). By 1669 the beating of slaves was formalized by legislation (Morgan 1975:312). Within several years of the 1676 Bacon's Rebellion—an insurrection of small planters, indentured servants, and black slaves—Virginia passed "An Act preventing Negroe Insurrection" and stated that negroes and slaves could not own guns (Breene and Innes 1980:27). In 1681 a Maryland act described mixed marriages as a "disgrace not only of the English butt also of many other Christian Nations" (Jordan 1978:277). After 1691 marriages between slaves and freemen were made illegal. Consequently, by the end of the seventeenth century, legislation was couched in the terms of race, that is, black and white. The fact that by the first decade of the 1700s "white servants were as much the exception in the tobacco fields as slaves had been earlier" (Morgan 1975:308) reflects the effectiveness of this codification.

Three points in particular should be made about the creation of St. Mary's new baroque town plan. First, three important buildings—Smith's Ordinary, the Lawyer's Lodging, and Cordea's Hope—were all built in close proximity to the Country's House (Miller 1986, 1988; see also chapter 5). The County's House functioned both as inn and as the state house, and these buildings surrounded a "commons" area. Second, avenues replaced disordered paths. Third, these avenues connected prominent institutions: the state house and the Chapel, with the center of town. The Jesuits built the Chapel in the late 1660s, while the state house was completed in 1676. Each was constructed of brick, stood about 1/2 mile from each other and 1,400 feet from the town center, and each was surrounded by a substantial amount of open space. "A line drawn from the Chapel through [the town center] to the state house forms an angle of 140 degrees" (Miller 1986:126).

Miller suggests that because of the economic situation in the Chesapeake, where it was more economically advantageous to establish tobacco plantations than towns, these cities served primarily as administrative centers, that is, as centers of power, rather than centers of commerce. "The Baroque cities of the seventeenth-century Chesapeake can be seen as a skillful response to the need for expression of ideology and authority in an agrarian society lacking a centralized economy" (Miller 1988:70). It is also clear that the need for authority had increased, not only because the region lacked a centralized economy or because baroque town planning had been introduced in England at this time, but also because social, political, and economic conditions were rapidly changing in the Chesapeake.

The development and completion of the plan (that is, the placement of monumental architecture) was implemented during the legalization of explicitly racial inequalities. The plan may have been conceived by the aristocracy as an expression of their power in the local society in the face of their increasing concern over a growing lower group that had little economic mobility. A new lower class was formed to divide and disarm a portion of the subordinates, and the entrenched aristocracy propped its position through explicit uses of material goods, such as

town planning and architecture that emphasized governmental and religious institutions.

Culture and Material Change in Maryland's Second Capital City

In 1689 William and Mary ascended the throne of England. Protestants in Maryland took this opportunity to gain control of the colonial government, and in 1694 the capital was moved from the Catholic stronghold of St. Mary's to a Protestant concentration known as Anne Arundel Town, renamed Annapolis in 1695 (Riley 1887:54–58). In 1698 the town consisted of 40 dwellings and about 250 inhabitants (Papenfuse 1975:9). Described in 1708 as a place "where scarce a house will keep out rain" (Cook 1900:29–30), Annapolis did not initially grow as an economic center because it lacked a dependent hinterland (Walsh 1983a:1).

Francis Nicholson is credited with the design of the Annapolis baroque town plan in 1695, which was imposed on an earlier, gridlike plan. The Anglican church and the state house were placed on the highest points of the town, encompassed by circles that had streets radiating from them (Reps 1972; Ramirez 1975). The two monumental structures could be seen from any location in the city, and many of the streets framed a vista that led the eye to these two institutions of power. This visual attention reinforced the church's and state's authority (Leone et al. 1989; see also Miller 1988).

The 1710s and 1720s witnessed another dramatic surge in racist legislation in Maryland. Sometimes this prohibiting legislation was masked as a naturalizing ideology. For instance, interracial marriage or copulation was prohibited because it was "unnatural or inordinate." In 1728 an act was passed "for the punishment of negro women, having bastard children by white men; and for as much as such copulation are as unnatural and inordinate as between white women and negroe men" (Kilty 1799:IV B No. 5:203). Quotas were also placed on segments of the white population. Numerous laws were enacted to "prevent the importing [of] too great a number of Irish papists into the province" (Kilty 1799:XXXVI, LL No.4:197).

The 1710s and 1720s had more racist legislation passed than any other decade before or after. This legislation was a product of an increasing number of family dynasties elected to the Maryland assemblies in the early eighteenth century who developed political monopolies to protect their place in the hierarchy. By the 1720s, 60 percent of those elected had Maryland-born fathers. After this date the number increased to 84 percent (Kulikoff 1986). Racist legislation was one tool that created a clear position in the hierarchy for an increasing number of slaves and indentured servants so that they would not threaten the power of established hierarchy.

This legislation must be viewed in the light of the social and economic crises that befell Annapolis and Chesapeake residents around the 1720s. For instance, Edward Papenfuse (1975:14–15) and Lorena Walsh (1983b:6) estimate that between 1720 and 1730 the city's population increased between 65 and 70 percent. This was twice the rate of any other ten-year period during the colonial era. During the 1710s and 1720s there was also a drastic redistribution of wealth. Original research by Jean Russo (1983:3), expanded upon by Paul Shackel (1987, 1993) and by Leone and Shackel (1987, 1990), indicates a restructuring of wealth holdings in Annapolis from 1710 to 1732 (table 6.1). (All wealth has been deflated to the 1700 pound in order to make these comparisons.) The poorest wealth group (those whose estates were valued at £0 to £49) in seventeenth-century Annapolis made up 75 percent of the population while possessing only 28 percent of the city's total wealth held at death. By the 1720s their wealth had decreased disproportionately faster than the decrease in membership in this segment of the population. Between 1723 and 1732, 30 percent of the population making up the lower wealth group owned about 2 percent of the total wealth in that city. Therefore, the average wealth per estate in this group decreased with time.

However, the scenario is just the opposite for the wealthy. In the first decade of the eighteenth century the wealthiest group in Annapolis (those with estates valued at £1,000 or more) accounted for 8 percent of the population and had accrued 21 percent of the wealth held at death. By the 1710s this share in wealth had increased to 56 percent, and increases in wealth held by the elite did not slow down until after the 1730s. By 1725 four Annapolitans owned more than half of the town's land, and the landless were subjugated to a leasehold system (Baker 1986). Between 1722 and 1735 the Chesapeake became engulfed in the most devastating and persistent tobacco depression in the colonial era (Hemphill 1985:54). The cost of imported labor and manufactured goods began to rise during the 1720s and thus indicated the possibility of inflation (Carr and Walsh 1977:15). As tobacco values

TABLE 6.1. *Percentage of Wealth Held by Wealth Groups in Annapolis, Maryland*

Year	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Total Wealth and Population from Those Inventoried	
	%W	%P	%W	%P	%W	%P	%W	%P	Wealth (£s)	Population
1689–99	28	75	0	0	72	25	0	0	321	4
1700–09	8	46	14	23	51	23	21	8	2,175	13
1710–22	5	38	18	42	21	13	56	8	8,444	40
1723–32	2	30	7	30	13	21	78	18	41,769	33
1733–44	3	37	8	27	12	16	77	20	19,804	51
1745–54	3	48	4	13	7	13	86	26	15,292	31
1755–67	2	26	7	34	7	15	84	25	32.673	53
1768–77	2	30	8	43	5	13	85	20	17,697	30

NOTE: Group I = estates valued at £0–50; Group II = estates valued at £51–225; Group III = estates valued at £226–1,000; Group IV = estates valued at more than £1,000; %W = percentage of wealth; and %P = percentage of population.

SOURCE: Russo (1983); Leone and Shackel (1987, 1990).

declined, the Virginia legislation imposed a tobacco inspection act, which required that tobacco be brought to public warehouses for inspection. Middling planters, fearing that their tobacco would be overlooked in favor of the crops of wealthier planters, began rioting and burning tobacco warehouses from Northern Virginia to Southern Maryland (Kulikoff 1986:107–11).

During times of economic stress, within a competitive system or when the existing social order is being threatened by a new and growing population, the meanings goods establish can create overt distinctions between groups and standardize behavior in order to reinforce or reestablish the hierarchy (Hodder 1979, 1982; Douglas and Isherwood 1979; Miller 1987). Not only did a colonial Chesapeake naturalizing ideology enforce itself through legal means and confirm the established order, but the material culture and the behavior associated with it actively created these boundaries.

As remarked earlier, material culture refers to items that do more than merely reflect human behavior; they are also products having symbolic meaning that actively shapes and creates society through the actions that individuals or groups take in response to those symbols. Indeed, material objects may be the most fundamental and unnoticed aspect of socialization. They not only play an important role in social reproduction, but they can also act as a bridge between the mental and physical world and between the conscious and unconscious (Bourdieu 1977; Miller 1987).

PROBATE ANALYSIS OF FORMAL DINING

As the crises mentioned above affected the Chesapeake region, rules and meanings may have been uncertain and an attempt made to reinforce the traditional order. These new social relations were based on a modern discipline (see Foucault 1979), a behavior that was regular, predictable, and replicable and that manifested itself in a new code of manners and material culture. The wealthy could reaffirm their place in the hierarchy by dismembering the communal values of medieval society and using a new form of social discipline and material culture to create social differences between them and the lower classes. The new modern discipline can be demonstrated in part by the new etiquette and material culture used in the process of eating, such as sets of plates, knives, and forks—which are formal and segmenting items. The assumption is that these sets of items reflect a new formal behavior departing from the medieval communal tradition. Items in groups were intended to relate to each other functionally and to serve socially as the material expression of formalized social structures. No longer were people sharing the same dishes; one plate was used by one person. Relatively few of

these formal and segmenting items existed in the earliest estate inventories in Annapolis, but by the 1720s there was a sharp increase in the consumption of these goods by the elite, which reflects the use of a new modern behavior (table 6.2). The fact that etiquette books existed in the probate inventories among the wealthiest Annapolitans in the 1720s indicates that not only did they use these new items of etiquette, but they also paid particular attention to the new rules of social behavior. This new behavior was effectively used to segment the wealthy from the lower poorer groups. Interestingly, this new behavior was prominent among the English elite in the seventeenth century and was nonexistent in colonial Annapolis—one of only a few urban centers in the Chesapeake—up until the 1710s. The new behavior did not emerge gradually, but was instead rapidly introduced into Chesapeake society (Shackel 1991, 1993).

Some Chesapeake historians have argued that the decrease in explicitly segmenting goods in the 1730s and 1740s was a result of the influx of a new rural population into the city. These people did not know the rules of the new etiquette. Since the new immigrants did not know the rules of high society, they would not have the goods to continue the material stratification of the community (Carr, personal communication 1987). I would like to propose an alternative interpretation. I have argued elsewhere (Little and Shackel 1989) that once social hierarchy is reestablished there may be little point in maintaining chattels that explicitly segment groups. If the reestablished order were considered to be unbridgeable, there would be little need to reinforce the hierarchy with material goods, thus the material culture that reinforced the new etiquette would decrease.

Archaeological Analysis of the Transition from Impermanent to Permanent Architecture

During the social, political, and economic fluctuations in the Chesapeake and Annapolis during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, there was a change not only in the types of chattels owned by people, but also in the kind of architecture used, which moved to more permanent structures after 100 years of earthfast construction. These structures used wood posts as foundations,

TABLE 6.2. *Some Formal Dining Items Found in Annapolis, Maryland, Probate Inventories*

Wealth in Pounds	1688–1790			1710–1732			1733–1754			1755–1777		
	C	N	%	C	N	%	C	N	%	C	N	%
Set of Plates												
000–49	9	1	11	24	3	13	33	2	06	33	1	03
50–225	3	0	00	27	3	11	18	2	11	30	5	17
226–490	4	1	25	12	2	17	11	1	09	9	2	22
491+	1	0	00	9	2	22	15	3	20	17	7	41
Sets of Forks												
000–49	9	0	00	24	0	00	33	1	03	33	3	09
50–225	3	0	00	27	5	19	18	6	33	30	3	10
226–490	4	0	00	12	3	25	11	6	55	9	7	78
491+	1	0	00	9	4	44	15	2	13	17	12	71
Sets of Knives												
000–49	9	0	00	24	0	00	33	0	00	33	3	11
50–225	3	1	33	27	5	19	18	5	28	30	4	30
226–490	4	0	00	12	3	25	11	6	55	9	7	78
491+	1	0	00	9	5	56	15	4	27	17	13	76

NOTE: C = total number of cases; N = presence of item; and % = percentage of cases.

and the buildings only lasted an average of 10 years but did not require high expenditures for maintenance (Carson et al. 1981). I use the ideas of Henry Glassie (1987) and Robert Blair St. George (1983) to argue that the decision to prolong the use of earthfast structures was based on the need to maintain social relations between different wealth groups. When earlier relationships disintegrated, a new order of behavior and material culture were created to reestablish a hierarchy in society. From archaeological investigations in Annapolis, Maryland, it appears that the dissolution of social relations in the 1720s was accompanied by a shift to a more permanent architecture, and that this move severed some historically maintained relationships. The change toward permanent architecture in Virginia and Maryland began in the 1660s (see chapter 4; Miller 1986, 1988).

Maintenance relationships are established when action is taken to keep objects or buildings in working order by supplying the necessary funds or needed provisions to replace decayed or damaged parts. Social relations are also created and maintained. Maintenance-related tasks "insured a fundamental continuity in economic, as well as social, relations in communities. . . . [This allowed owners to] seek periodic contractual obligations with a local worker capable of mending the product" (St. George 1983:2). From this perspective, it might be argued that members of all wealth groups built earthfast buildings for more than a century as a way of structuring social relations by maintenance relationships. The change to a more permanent, maintenance-free architecture is better understood when considered as an ideologically influenced decision to clearly distinguish between wealth groups. Intentions of mobility or permanency based on economic success and type of crop, as suggested by Carson et al. (1981) are also recognized as factors in the development of permanent architecture, but these factors alone do not fully explain why these maintenance relations were abandoned.

The limited documentation of social interaction in rural seventeenth-century Chesapeake suggests that these maintenance relationships had a complex character in both the urban and rural context. Although most settlers chose not to live close to each other, informal neighborhoods did appear. "Some cooperation—whether warmly supported or grudgingly extended—was essential to survival" (Walsh 1988:206). Rural social exchange was limited because the intensive care tobacco required left little time for interaction. Also, tobacco goods were exchanged mainly between the planter and a foreign merchant. Walsh (1988:206) argues that as long as most of the Chesapeake residents were immigrants, neighborhood relationships remained weak. But by 1700 nearly half of the region's residents were native-born (Kulikoff 1986:273–274), and the amount of social interaction, especially in new and growing urban areas, increased.

Maintenance relationships may develop in three distinct forms. First, explicit formal relationships are created where a laborer is hired to perform a task, whether in an urban or industrial setting. Second, maintenance relationships may take the form of a balanced or general reciprocity wherein neighbors or relatives are called upon to assist in a task. These are implicit and expected relations and are typical of rural, agrarian communities. Third, work might be performed in-house, either by the owner or servants and slaves. The latter two cases may have predominated during the early Chesapeake settlement. But as the native population increased and urban areas began to develop at the turn of the eighteenth century, settlers began to differentiate between social and economic exchange. The first type of maintenance relationship became increasingly important, as was the case in early eighteenth-century Annapolis, discussed below.

St. George (1983:2) argues that the "maintenance of material forms implies, perhaps is identical with, the maintenance of social forms." An economy based on maintenance-related tasks would ensure a continuation of economic and social relations as well as impose contractual obligations on local workers (St. George 1983:2). Maintenance relationships create a form of reciprocity and may symbolically create a form of communality. Note, too, that vernacular technologies involve local materials and local labor (Glassie 1987:121). The actors are diverse and interlock their talents. When people start opting for more permanent architecture, they are withdrawing from the "local economic system/exchange relations." With the withdrawal from the local system, there occurs a radical change that may disrupt the existing social order (Glassie 1987:237). The change in house forms and material culture forms are associated with a reorganization of social relations in the community. No longer do people rely on the community to organize their social relations. Instead, they take these responsibilities upon themselves. This withdrawal from the local economic system is one manifestation of the new Renaissance ideal of individuality.

The Sands House in Annapolis is a case in point. During the spring of 1988, the Historic Annapolis Founda-

tion was notified that this house was to be remodeled and that the ground might be disturbed. Since this structure dates to the turn of the eighteenth century, archaeologists considered it important to determine when and how it was made "more permanent" through renovations that created a maintenance-free foundation. The Sands House (18AP47) was originally an impermanent structure built on blocks and was underpinned with fieldstone during some of the earlier eighteenth-century renovations, with at least one post mold filled with stone. Excavations have found diagnostic artifacts under the fieldstone as well as in the post-mold fill with a terminus post quem of 1700 and a mean date of manufacture of 1738. Therefore, the underpinning of the structure may have occurred some time around the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the same time that many of the interior renovations took place.

The concept of maintenance relationships helps explain why people used earthfast structures during the seventeenth century. Repairs to the earthfast posts had to be performed on an occasional basis (usually at 10-year intervals) in order to increase the longevity of the structure. It is probably true that the residents of the Sands House were also involved in a maintenance relationship up until the 1720s. Archaeology has demonstrated that about the 1720s the Sands House was made more permanent for it was underpinned by a stone foundation.

This change from an impermanent to a more permanent architecture was an indication of increased individuality and a shift in community relationships. The change from an earthfast construction technique that lasted on the average of about 10 years without upkeep to a more permanent and more maintenance-free architecture was in part an ideological decision. During this era of dramatically changing social relations, the elite in the city not only acquired different types of chattels, but they also began expressing their new social position through architecture. During the 1720s the most affluent citizens of Annapolis began to build with stone foundations, brick exterior walls, and brick chimneys (Yentsch and McKee 1987:46). It appears that interclass cooperation diminished among the upper class as the meaning of their goods, services, and wealth changed. The earliest brick dwelling known to have been built in Annapolis was erected by 1721 by Charles Carroll. Soon after, other wealthy merchants followed Carroll's lead. Unlike the use of formal and segmenting dining items, which decreased in the 1730s and 1740s, the use of more permanent architecture increased from the 1720s and may have temporarily replaced other forms of material culture that distinguished the wealth groups.

Discussion

The interdisciplinary approach to material culture studies brings both an historical and archaeological perspective to bear on important questions and thus offers a powerful tool for interpreting the past. In this study, historical data indicated a change in the material culture goods found in probate inventories. The archaeological analysis contributed data on town planning and changing vernacular architecture. When these data are combined and placed in a social context, the dynamic meaning of the goods becomes clearer, as does the change in their meanings during times of social, political, or economic instability. Changing town plans, increased permanent architecture, and an increase in formal dining—all demonstrate the meanings of changing material goods in the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Chesapeake.

Material culture is more than an expression of wealth. It is also a mechanism that may create, structure, and reshape social relations. Changes in sociocultural systems and in power relations are often reinforced by new symbols in the form of everyday material goods. With a strong and unquestionable hierarchy, symbolic change seldom occurs and material goods maintain a character that reflects that hierarchical relationship in the community. When the social hierarchy is threatened, new goods are introduced in an attempt to reestablish social asymmetry.

When the Chesapeake hierarchy was threatened by an increasing number of white and black freedmen, the elite divided the lower socioeconomic group by introducing racist legislation. Legalized racism in the 1660s gradually eased the threat of insurrection and was a way of keeping labor under control. The aristocracy essentially created a new, lower class and promoted racial prejudice where it had previously not existed. Racism divided the power of the poor and created a new labor base. Harsh penalties made it undesirable for whites to associate with blacks. New expressions of material culture were introduced to explicitly segment groups. It is more than a coincidence that New World baroque town planning developed during the 1660s, during the radical shift between white and black relationships. Undoubtedly this is not the

only variable related to the town planning, as Miller (1988) explains, but it played a vital role.

This new baroque plan in St Mary's City emphasized the power of the two leading institutions in the community, church and state. When the capital was moved to Annapolis in 1694, the royal governor reestablished a major presence of authority and retained the symbolic citing of these central buildings. Both the state house and the church were placed on the highest points in town, surrounded by circles with streets radiating from them.

The 1720s was marked by social, political, and economic fluctuations. The population increased sharply, inflation and a depression took hold, and wealth restructuring prevailed in the city of Annapolis. Racist legislation became embedded in a naturalizing ideology and community relations began to disintegrate. Legislation stated that it was unnatural for whites and blacks to marry, socialize, and have sexual intercourse. Discriminatory legislation against Irish papists grew and legitimized the subordination of additional groups. Racist, ethnic, and religious legislation defined new roles in society during this period of sociocultural instability.

Early Chesapeake settlers probably did not differentiate between social and economic exchange until at least the turn of the eighteenth century. When these exchange systems became distinct, the relationships maintaining the social structure transformed dramatically. The perception of the new social structure that promoted a visible hierarchy was supported by a new material culture. These changes brought shifts in consumption patterns and the styles of architecture used by the elite. The upper wealth group began to dismember the medieval tradition. No longer were they satisfied with sitting on benches, eating communal meals with knives, and sharing goblets. Rather, they began to adhere to a new set of rules, or etiquette, and to sit on individual chairs, eat off their own plates, and use their own utensils. This movement toward individuality among the elite began in Maryland around the 1720s.

The shift away from community relations during the 1720s can also be documented archaeologically. Medieval-style architecture, which reflected traditional maintenance relationships, dissolved. Earthfast structures gave way to more permanent and ostentatious facades. In the case of the Sands House in Annapolis, the residents removed themselves from the community work network by replacing the impermanent wood posts with a stone foundation. Periodic maintenance was no longer needed and neither was the regular assistance of craftsmen in the community.

The development of distinct class boundaries and the concept of the modern individual was not historically inevitable but rather was a product of the changing social values and the reaction of the elite to an increasingly powerful lower group. The wealthy in the Chesapeake reacted toward sociocultural instability by using material symbols that reinforced the established order. The new material goods associated with the new behavior emphasized individuality and defined class boundaries and thereby changed the landscape and material culture of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Chesapeake.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to Mark Leone for inviting me to participate in the Archaeology in Annapolis project. Some of the data presented here were collected while I was employed by the Historic Annapolis Foundation. I am especially grateful to Mrs. Margaret Dowsett, proprietor of the Sands House, for allowing archaeologists from the foundation to excavate in the house while it was under renovation. Henry Miller insightfully suggested that I explicitly distinguish between various types of maintenance relationships. His analysis on the St. Mary's City town plan has facilitated this comparison between Maryland's capital cities. I appreciate Barbara Little's suggestions during the formulation of the ideas of this essay and her comments on various drafts. Paul Mullins also made valuable suggestions on an earlier draft.

REFERENCES CITED

Baker, Nancy

1986 Annapolis, Maryland 1695–1730. *Maryland Historical Magazine* 81(3):191–209.

Breene, T. H., and Stephen Innes

1980 *"Myne Owne Ground": Race and Freedom on Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1640–1676.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Bourdieu, Pierre

1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Carr, Lois Green

1974 The Metropolis of Maryland: A Comment on Town Development along the Tobacco Coast. *Maryland Historical Magazine* 69(2):124–145.

Carr, Lois Green, and Lorena Walsh

1977 Inventories and the Analysis of Wealth and Consumption Patterns in St. Mary's County, Maryland,

1658–1777. The Newberry Papers in Family and Community History, paper 77-46. Newberry Library, Chicago.

Carson, Cary, Norman F. Barka, William Kelso, Gary Wheeler Stone, and Dell Upton

1981 Impermanent Architecture in Southern American Colonies. *Winterthur Portfolio* 16(2/3):135–196.

Cook, Ebinezer

1900 [1708] The Sot-Weed Factor, or A Voyage to Maryland. In *Early Maryland Poetry*, edited by Bernard C. Steiner, pp. 29–30. Fund Publication No. 36, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

Deal, Douglas

1988 A Constricted World: Free Blacks on Virginia's Eastern Shore, 1680–1750. In *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, edited by Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo, pp. 275–305. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Deetz, James

1988 American Historical Archaeology: Method and Results. *Science* (239): 362–367.

Douglas, Mary, and Baron Isherwood

1979 *The World of Goods*. Basic Books, New York.

Foucault, Michel

1979 *Discipline and Punish*. Vintage Books, New York.

Glassie, Henry

1987 Vernacular Architecture and Society. In *Mirror and Metaphor: Material and Social Construction of Reality*, edited by Daniel Ingersol and Gordon Bronitsky, pp. 229–246. University Press of America, Lanham, Md.

Handlin, Oscar, and Mary Handlin

1950 Origins of the Southern Labor System. *William and Mary Quarterly* 7:199–222.

Hemphill, John M. II

1985 *Virginia and the English Commercial System 1689–1733*. Garland, New York.

Hodder, Ian

1979 Economic and Social Stress and Material Culture Patterning. *American Antiquity*. 44(3):446–454.

1982 *Symbols in Action: Ethnoarchaeological Studies of Material Culture*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

1986 *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Jordan, Winthrop

1978 Unthinking Decision: Enslavement of Negroes in America to 1700. In *Interpreting Colonial America*, edited by Kirby Martin, pp. 140–161. Harper and Row, New York.

Kilty, William

1799 *The Laws of Maryland*. Vol 1. Frederick Green, Printer, Annapolis, Md.

Kulikoff, Allan

1978 The Origins of Afro-American Society in Tidewater Maryland and Virginia, 1700–1790. *William and Mary Quarterly* 35:226–259.

1986 *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Culture in the Chesapeake, 1680–1800*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Leone, Mark P.

1987 Rule by Ostentation: The Relationship between Space and Sight in 18th-Century Landscape Architecture in the Chesapeake Region of Maryland. In *Method and Theory for Activity Area Research*, edited by Susan Kent, pp. 604–633. Columbia University Press, New York.

1988 The Georgian Order as the Order of Merchant Capitalism in Annapolis, Maryland. In *The Recovery of Meaning: Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, edited by Mark P. Leone and Parker B. Potter, Jr., pp 235–262. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Leone, Mark P., and Paul A. Shackel

1987 Forks, Clocks and Power. In *Mirror and Metaphor: Material and Social Constructions of Reality*, edited by Daniel W. Ingersoll, Jr., and Gordon Bronitsky, pp. 45–62. University Press of America, Lanham, Md.

1990 The Georgian Order in Annapolis, Maryland. In New Perspectives on Maryland Archaeology, edited by Richard J. Dent and Barbara J. Little. *Maryland Archaeologist* 26(1&2):69–84.

Leone, Mark P., Julie Ernstein, Elizabeth Kryder-Reid, and Paul A. Shackel

1989 Power Gardens in Annapolis. *Archaeology*. 42(2): 34–39, 74–75.

Little, Barbara J., and Paul A. Shackel

1989 Scales of Historical Anthropology: An Archaeology of Colonial Anglo-America. *Antiquity* (62)240:495–509.

McCusker, John J., and Russell R. Menard

1986 *The Economy of British America: 1607–1789*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

McKendrick, Neil

1982 Commercialization and the Economy. In *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England*, edited by Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, pp. 9–194. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Menard, Russell Robert

1975 *Economy and Society in Early Colonial Maryland*. Ph.D. dissertation on file at the Department of History, University of Iowa.

Miller, Daniel

1987 *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*. Basil Blackwell, New York.

Miller, Henry

1986 *Discovering Maryland's First City: A Summary Report on the 1981–1984 Archaeological Excavations in St. Mary's City, Maryland*. St. Mary's City Archaeology Series No. 2. Alexander H. Morrison Fund Publication, St. Mary's City.

1988 Baroque Cities in the Wilderness: Archaeology and Urban Development in the Colonial Chesapeake. *Historical Archaeology* 22(2):57–73.

Morgan, Edmund S.
1975 *American Slavery American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia*. W. W. Norton, New York.

Morris, A. E. J.
1979 *History of Urban Form: Before the Industrial Revolution*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Papenfuse, Edward C.
1975 *In Pursuit of Profit: The Annapolis Merchant in the Era of the American Revolution, 1763–1805*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Md.

Ramirez, Constance Werner
1975 *Urban History for Preservation Planning: The Annapolis Experience*. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Reps, John W.
1972 *Tidewater Towns: City Planning in Colonial Virginia and Maryland*. Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, Williamsburg, Va.

Riley, Elihu
1887 *The Ancient City: A History of Annapolis, in Maryland 1649–1887*. Record Printing Office, Annapolis, Md.

Russo, Jean
1983 Economy of Anne Arundel County. In Annapolis and Anne Arundel County, Maryland, A Study of Urban Development in a Tobacco Economy, 1649–1776, edited by Lorena S. Walsh. N.E.H. Grant No. RS 20199-81-1955. On File at Historic Annapolis, Inc., Annapolis, Md.

St. George, Blair
1983 Maintenance Relationships and the Erotics of Property in Historical Thought. Paper presented at the American Historical Association Meetings, Philadelphia.

Shackel, Paul A.
1987 *A Historical Archaeology of Personal Discipline*. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor.
1991 Consumerism and the Structuring of Social Relations: An Historical Archaeological Perspective. In *Digging into Popular Culture: Theories and Methodologies in Archeology, Anthropology and Other Fields*, edited by Ray Browne and Pat Browne, pp. 31–41. Bowling Green State University Popular Press, Bowling Green, Ohio.
1993 *Personal Discipline and Material Culture: An Archaeology of Annapolis, Maryland, 1695–1870*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, Tenn.

Walsh, Lorena S.
1983a Annapolis as a Center of Production. In Annapolis and Anne Arundel County, Maryland, A Study of Urban Development in a Tobacco Economy, 1649–1776, edited by Lorena S. Walsh. N.E.H. Grant No. RS 20199-81-1955. On File at Historic Annapolis, Inc., Annapolis, Md.
1983b Anne Arundel County Population. In Annapolis and Anne Arundel County, Maryland, A Study of Urban Development in a Tobacco Economy, 1649–1776, edited by Lorena S. Walsh. N.E.H. Grant No. RS 20199-81-1955. On File at Historic Annapolis, Inc., Annapolis, Md.
1988 Community Networks in Early Chesapeake. In *Colonial Chesapeake Society*, edited by Lois Green Carr, Philip D. Morgan, and Jean B. Russo, pp. 200–41. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Yentsch, Anne, and Larry McKee
1987 Footprints of Buildings in Eighteenth-Century Annapolis. *American Archaeology* 6(1):40–51.