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From the Editor:

MARTINA KADO, Ph.D.

Dear readers,

I t is a distinct pleasure to present this issue of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*: it has been an honor to take over as editor, and this the first issue I curated from beginning to end. The articles featured here have several things in common. They offer insight into the lives of people whom we have come to know as important historical figures in parallel with the often-invisible work of others who enabled them to achieve this status. Secondly, much of the research that informs the articles and images accompanying them came from the rich collections of the museum and H. Furlong Baldwin Library at the Maryland Historical Society. Finally, all three article authors reside outside Maryland, testifying to the relevance and reach of Maryland history on a national, as well as transatlantic level.

Most of our long-term readers will be familiar with the work of Tracy Matthew Melton. He is the author of *Hanging Henry Gambrill*, published by the Maryland Historical Society in 2005, and has been a contributor to the *Maryland Historical Magazine* since 2004. His “One Letter or a Million” offers an in-depth account of the life and work of Margaret and Rosalind Redding, Baltimore-born sisters who worked as stenographers and typists for H. L. Mencken for over thirty years. Examining what it means to be a female entrepreneur with creative aspirations in a male-dominated publishing world, Mr. Melton’s article also unpacks Mencken’s literary stature as dependent upon the meticulous work of the Redding sisters on his letters and manuscripts. As a precursor, readers might want to consult Mr. Melton’s “Michael J. Redding and Irish-American Patriotism,” which discusses the Redding family background and activism of the sisters’ father, published in the *Maryland Historical Magazine’s* vol. 107, no. 3 (Fall 2012). To complement their reading, our audience can visit the newly reopened Mencken House and Museum at 1524 Hollins Street in Baltimore, where the Maryland Historical Society has just returned over one hundred Mencken-related objects that were in its care for years. These include the writer’s desk, chair, and two typewriters, a Masonic Sword belonging to his brother August Mencken, a set of mounted elephant tusks, paintings, and many personal photographs.

Back in 1957, the *Maryland Historical Magazine* published the text of ten letters written by the Marquis de Lafayette to Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely of Hampton (vol. 52, no. 3). Featured in this issue, Basil Considine’s “Letters to a Marquis” revisits this remarkable decade-long transatlantic friendship by presenting the text of three newly
identified letters written by the third mistress of Hampton to the Revolutionary War hero. A groundbreaking companion piece to the 1957 collection of Lafayette’s letters, this article reconstructs a chronology of the correspondence between 1824 and 1834, addresses the difficulties of researching women’s history due to their frequent absence from historical record, and most importantly, allows Eliza Ridgely’s voice to be heard for the first time in this context. To illustrate this period in both correspondents’ lives, Mr. Considine’s article is accompanied by some rarely published images: an anonymous portrait of Lafayette done after Ary Scheffer’s famous 1819 painting, and renditions of both the Hampton and La Grange residences during the 1820s and ’30s. Most readers will be familiar with Ridgely’s depiction as The Lady with the Harp by Thomas Sully (1818), but will not have seen her portraits by Anna Claypoole Peale (1823) and George Saunders (c.1840), painted at an age closer to the years of her correspondence with the Marquis. In addition, readers might be interested in two articles from former issues of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*: B. Paterson Shipe’s “Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely, the ‘Lady with a Harp’” (vol. 77, no. 3, Fall 1982) and R. Wilson Torchia’s “Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely and the Ideal of American Womanhood, 1787–1820” (vol. 90, no. 4, Winter 1995).

If you ever wondered how George Washington occupied his time after the Revolutionary War, Benjamin Hudson’s article “Harry Dorsey Gough and Agricultural Improvement in Maryland, 1774–1808” will fill you in: in addition to being president of the United States, he was engaged in agricultural experimentation. Washington is a recurring character in this account of Gough’s pioneering improvements to the raising of horses, cattle, and sheep, and the cultivation of fruit at Perry Hall. Gough’s agricultural successes and failures, and the operations of his large estate, would not have been possible without the indentured servants and enslaved individuals who provided the labor that enabled such advancement. This is evidenced, among other things, in two closely analyzed paintings of Perry Hall from 1795 and 1805.

Our readers are invited to visit the Maryland Historical Society’s museum and H. Furlong Baldwin Library to further explore and experience the topics covered in this issue of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*. For example, both the Ridgely and Gough families are well represented in the Maryland Historical Society’s collections. In addition to the Ridgely and Gough Papers available to researchers in our H. Furlong Baldwin Library, the *Perry Hall, Slave Quarters with Field Hands at Work* and *Perry Hall, View from the Northwest* paintings by Francis Guy are both currently on display in our galleries. Our *Spectrum of Fashion* exhibition, open until October 2020, features several pieces of clothing worn by members of the Ridgely family (including two garments belonging to Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely herself) as well as by the formerly enslaved individuals who lived and worked at Hampton. Together, these garments make up a poignant social history highlighted in the *Spectrum of Fashion* catalogue, available for purchase at our Museum Store or at shop.mdhs.org. Readers interested in learning more about the history of Perry Hall and Hampton are welcome to consult E. Rossiter

Since 1975, the *Maryland Historical Magazine* has published the Maryland History Bibliography for the previous year—an indispensable resource for professionals and enthusiasts alike. Compiled and generously provided to us by Anne S. K. Turkos and Elizabeth Caringola, this list is also available online at lib.umd.edu/dct/collections/mdhc. Together with our informative Book Reviews section, our readers will be able to peruse plenty of new and exciting content on Maryland history.

With every issue, the *Maryland Historical Magazine* reaches over three thousand members and subscribers in the United States and beyond, including the United Kingdom and Australia. Furthermore, it is a collaborative project between researchers, contributing Maryland Historical Society staff, and our readers—with substantial overlap between all these groups. We extend our sincerest thanks to this community for your enthusiasm, hard work, and being an invaluable part of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*.
Henry Louis Mencken, photograph by Robert Kniesche taken on Mencken's sixtieth birthday, September 12, 1940. Maryland Historical Society, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Robert F. Kniesche Collection, PP79-1261
“One Letter or a Million”: The Redding Sisters and H. L. Mencken

TRACY MATTHEW MELTON

In March 1938, a Minneapolis Tribune notice informed readers that Margaret Redding Lappin had begun teaching her series of lectures on the “Twenty-six Typewriter Keys to Success” at the local College of Commerce. “By symbolically identifying each lecture with a typewriter key,” the reporter added, “Mrs. Lappin seeks to impress upon the minds of young women about to enter upon a career the importance of the typewriter as an open sesame to more important work in business.” The additional comment, clearly coming from Lappin herself, softly imbued the otherwise mundane three-sentence notice with a hint of possibility, both personal and profound. It suggested not only that any specific young woman might aspire “to more important work in business,” but also that all young women might aspire to such work in business, and perhaps in other professional fields.¹

The comment also provided the slightest of hints about Lappin’s own career. The typewriter had indeed been “an open sesame” for herself and her sister Rosalind, furnishing them with a working front-row seat to the making of American literature. First Margaret, and then Rosalind, served as secretaries to H. L. Mencken, the iconoclastic journalist, literary critic, magazine editor, and popular author who lived and worked in their hometown of Baltimore. Margaret had begun with Mencken just as he was fully emerging as one of the nation’s best-known and most influential literary figures. Shortly before Mencken first engaged her on a few small projects, F. Scott Fitzgerald had written in his semiautobiographical first novel, This Side of Paradise, that protagonist Amory Blaine had been “rather surprised by his discovery through a critic named Mencken of several excellent American novels.” Mencken had personal relationships with Fitzgerald, Theodore Dreiser, Sinclair Lewis, and numerous other literary figures. He coedited the influential literary magazine The Smart Set and later The American Mercury with George Jean Nathan and was an important adviser to his publisher Alfred A. Knopf.²

Tracy Matthew Melton is the author of Hanging Henry Gambrill: The Violent Career of Baltimore’s Plug Uglies, 1854–1860, and numerous articles published in the Maryland Historical Magazine. His obituary for William and Mary (W&M) Professor Carl R. Dolmetsch, Jr., author of The Smart Set: A History and Anthology, appeared in the most recent Menckeniana. He is a member of the W&M Libraries Board and writes for W&M Libraries Blog.
For a quarter century, Margaret and then Rosalind sat regularly at Mencken’s desk taking dictation and later, at their office or residence, typing the letters that he would send to literary correspondents across the world. They typed and retyped his manuscripts, becoming intimately familiar with his words and ideas before they reached the public. Margaret took charge of the newspaper clippings about Mencken that his service forwarded to him and spent decades pasting them into the large books that he provided. “I think I read every clip; I did not want to miss anything,” she later wrote. Eventually, Rosalind would become an indispensable collaborator, a trusted caregiver, and the most essential person responsible for cataloguing and organizing his papers, ensuring that his controversial career would be well documented and accessible. Outside Mencken’s family, no one was closer to the Baltimore bard during his last decades. The work could be brutally demanding but also enthralling for the literary-minded sisters.

Still, Margaret and Rosalind struggled against feelings of inadequacy, frustrated ambitions, and limitations imposed by prevailing attitudes and norms regarding women, work, and marriage. Margaret strove to establish herself as a businesswoman and writer as she moved from city to city with her husband, an insurance company executive. Rosalind rooted for her success. “It would be grand if one of us really amounted to something,” she wrote Margaret, using Mencken’s vocabulary, “My own life, as I look back, has seemed very much in vain. I’ve made but little impression here, but then I’ve plenty of company, and must be content with being merely one of the boobiens.” Contentment outwardly prevailed, though a stifled scream emanates from the carefully catalogued papers the sisters left behind.

Despite disappointment and disillusionment, Margaret and Rosalind managed to achieve a remarkable record of entrepreneurship and professional diligence and perseverance during long careers that coincided with evolving attitudes and the opening of opportunities for women in business offices, and eventually “to more important work in business.” While Mencken and his literary friends and associates brashly advanced new ideas and sensibilities in fresh and compelling and often confrontational voices and narratives, Margaret and Rosalind more quietly helped to craft new ways of living and working.

The Redding Family

Margaret and Rosalind—Marge and Woe—were daughters of a large Baltimore Irish-American family. Their father Michael John “Mike” Redding had emigrated from Ireland as an eleven-year-old boy and lived with his family in Baltimore in modest circumstances. Mike attended school and apprenticed as a carpenter. He married Ellen (Ella or Ellie) Flaherty, herself the daughter of Irish immigrants. Mike and Ellen had five children, four of them still living when she died in March 1888. Several months later, Mike married Ellen’s sister Catherine Theresa “Kate” Flaherty who had come into the Redding household to help with the children. Mike and Kate together had another
eight children, seven surviving childhood—Lillian (Lillie), Agnes, Margaret, Rosalind, Michael Emmet, Clare, and Patrick Brendan. Margaret was born in February 1892 and Rosalind in June 1894. The two sisters were close in age and maintained a strong attachment throughout their lives.5

Books filled the Redding sisters’ childhood world. Their saloonkeeper father was an avid reader and amateur scholar. He accumulated a large library and had a reputation for reading when business was slow. He had Mencken’s *In Defense of Women* (1918) in his library and often read Mencken’s “Free Lance” newspaper column to his family. He privately published his own books on Irish culture and history. He embraced a romantic Irish nationalism and believed that “the ultimate power of the artist lies in the spirit of local patriotism and pride in the race from which he sprang.” Their mother Kate also loved to read. “In my own youth,” Margaret once observed of her life before Mencken, “I had had access to hundreds of books, and I had stumbled through many a man’s philosophy as I went along.” Margaret learned early to engage with ideas propagated by men.6

Mike Redding displayed a commonplace, paternalistic attitude toward women. His own words—the consistent use of masculine pronouns in his writing—reveal a fundamental assumption of a male-dominated world. Outside his home, his daily life was largely a male world of saloons and liquor stores, Irish associations, Catholic knighthoods, and political party meetings and rallies. Women sometimes worked in auxiliary positions, especially in Irish nationalist and Catholic associations, and Mike Redding admired Maud Gonne, Sabina Davitt, and the women loyal to the Irish nationalists sacrificing their freedom and lives for the cause. They were to be cherished for their love and devotion, but he clearly did not view women as equals in his homeland’s struggles, or in life.
Redding argued that Irish “civilization” offered “its women” respect and honor and asserted that the Irish—men and women—looked at marriage as a sacrament, “and its desecration is not tolerated.” Publicly he was loving, loyal, and dutiful to his wife and daughters. He threw his wife Kate a party for her forty-fifth birthday and wrote her a poem—“My wife, my star, my heavenly rose / Whom God has given as a mate / To light the way to Heaven’s gate.” At home, he seems to have been an affectionate but demanding husband and father. His daughters had access to his library and privileged education in public and private schools. He funded Margaret’s first business venture. Only in later years, after Margaret had developed a thriving business, did Mike and Kate’s marriage unravel and his relationships with his children become significantly strained.7

Newspaper notices of the Redding family capture some of the flavor of life in a prosperous Catholic Irish-American household in Baltimore in these decades. Mike Redding purchased his wife Ellen, and then Kate, expensive watches and jewelry. He took his daughter Nora on a two-week vacation to the Grand Atlantic Hotel in Atlantic City. Margaret and Rosalind, as young women, traveled together by steamship to Boston. The Redding children occasionally appeared in newspaper lists of guests at private parties and social events. Rosalind acted in Cinderella in Flowerland at the St. Ignatius Church Sunday School. Margaret won an academic scholarship to St. Mary’s Female Seminary in St. Mary’s City in Southern Maryland (now St. Mary’s College). Clare also attended St. Mary’s. The family’s rapid advancement over just a few decades seemed perfectly representative of the prevailing progressive view of the American experience, of the rags-to-riches American Dream.8

Soon after the Great War, Margaret Redding, a talented, ambitious daughter of this prosperous, prominent Irish Catholic family, was working for H. L. Mencken, himself in many ways a product of the same Old Baltimore as Mike Redding, but in more significant ways the nation’s most vigorous challenger to the traditional worldview embraced by Mike Redding and the preponderance of his contemporaries. In Main Street (1920), Sinclair Lewis listed Mencken with Dreiser, Sherwood Anderson, and other writers as “subversive philosophers and artists with whom women were consulting everywhere.” In Lewis’s Babbitt (1922), George Babbitt described Mencken’s writing as consisting of “highly improper essays, making fun of the church and all the decencies.” During these years, Margaret connected with Mencken, she and Rosalind becoming the women who worked most often and most closely with the gargantuan literary figure. Their lives would be thoroughly shaped by specific male influences—most notably Mike Redding and H. L. Mencken—and broader patterns of gender relationships, as well as their own individual strivings within these personal and collective contexts.9

“One Letter or a Million”

Margaret launched her career as a business services entrepreneur in February 1920. Little information is available regarding Margaret’s movements for several years after she left St. Mary’s. In August 1912, she sailed to Boston with Rosalind, and the fol-
lowing February her mother hosted a twenty-first birthday reception for her. The vast majority of St. Mary’s students in this period went into teaching, but Margaret found her way into secretarial work. Her siblings were marrying, but she did not envision herself staying home as a traditional housewife. Describing Rosalind, Margaret wrote, “I knew she did not care about staying at home or about housework any more than I did.” Margaret’s subsequent career and autobiographical writing revealed her a hard-nosed, ambitious businesswoman wholly dedicated to her work and, later, her writing. She sought professional work, not domesticity.10

In January 1920, a census taker listed Margaret as working as a secretary and living with her sister Agnes and brother-in-law Roger W. Bacon, a businessman, in San Francisco, California. Agnes and Roger had been in the Bay Area for more than a year, and Margaret had gone out with them, or joined them later. The following month, though, she was back in Baltimore where her father gave her $1,100 to start a business. She advertised for stenographers, typists, and bookkeepers for an employment agency that she was opening out of the family home. Soon, “Miss Redding” was offering to provide Baltimore businessmen with first-class secretaries, stenographers, and typists. She also offered typing and other secretarial services herself. Her company’s motto was “One Letter or a Million.”11

Margaret Redding’s letter to J. P. Adams, on her company’s letterhead, “One Letter or a Million,” dated March 1925. Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale Collection of American Literature, H. L. Mencken Collection, YCAL MSS 794
Subsequent Baltimore city directories listed Margaret and her sister Clare as stenographers, and Margaret as a notary public as well. For Margaret, the job title was misleading. She was a hard-working and efficient entrepreneur, and demand for her services was strong. She accepted assignments to place stenographers with specific skills: one with knowledge of bookkeeping, one with knowledge of billing. Mike Redding claimed that he soon had six or seven typists working in his house. In February 1923, a reporter interviewed Margaret about secretarial work in Baltimore. She said she had fielded fifty-six calls for stenographers over the three previous weeks but had only thirteen applicants for positions. Weekly pay for secretarial work had recently increased by 20 percent on average. She expressed frustration with the women who sought employment through her agency. Many lacked basic skills and had little ambition. “Girls of today appear to have no thought for their future in the business world. Although they may need work badly, they will turn down opportunity after opportunity for minor reasons.”

Margaret’s success allegedly contributed to turmoil within her family. Kate sued for divorce claiming that Mike treated her badly and had driven the children from the house. He responded that Margaret’s business operations had overwhelmed his household, and he had told Margaret to find new workspace. That same February, Margaret moved to an office in the flatiron Morris Building at North Charles and Saratoga Streets.

While she was still working out of her family home, H. L. Mencken became a client. Mencken said he had seen her sign while passing in a streetcar. “It was a neat small black sign with gold lettering,” she later wrote, “and Mencken had keen eyes. But I wonder as I write these notes, if Mencken did not prudently decide to ‘case the joint,’ having read my small ads in the Baltimore Sun?” Mencken may have also been drawn to the Redding name. Margaret described Mencken and her father as “distant acquaintances,” and the newspaperman certainly knew of Mike Redding, the colorful saloonkeeper whose name frequently appeared in the Sunpapers, often on the editorial page.

According to Margaret, Mencken was “in my office the very earliest days of my venture,” and her records show the earliest receipt to him dated January 17, 1922, with his note, “Beautifully done!” She forever felt his initial visit a momentous event. “Mr. Mencken had a cane and a debonair air. He talked in a quick, manly voice. He did not smile, but he was friendly.” “You meet but one Mencken in a lifetime. Meeting him, knowing him, is an experience never to be forgotten. Whatever happens to him after you have met him becomes important to you.”

Margaret thought fondly of this period. “In those early days of my knowledge of Mencken, I was a happy person. I had my own little world; the depression was not even around the corner for me.” Rosalind worked with her. “Rosalind and I left the Park Avenue house in those early days and walked pleasantly downtown for lunch on Charles Street at the Woman’s Exchange.” The Woman’s Exchange was at 333 North Charles Street, just a few blocks up from the Morris Building where Margaret would soon relocate her business. Women sold goods at the Exchange and it offered lunch to downtown workers, especially female office personnel. One told a reporter, “The
Woman’s Exchange offers foods prepared according to high standards of cooking and greater variety than I find elsewhere.” The location also likely provided Margaret opportunity to network and gather business intelligence.\(^{16}\)

Initially Mencken brought cards for the *The American Language* for Margaret to type up and drafts to turn into a finished product. In 1923, she began to take dictation for the writer at his family’s row house at 1524 Hollins Street. She was there several times a week. She considered the work an intellectual thrill. “Never once in all the time I worked for Mencken did I fail to catch my breath and feel my heart beat faster as I stood on his front steps at 1524 Hollins Street in Old Baltimore, waiting for the door to open to me.” They worked together in his small studio office. “In the room there was scarcely space to take a step between one object and another. If Mencken pushed

Margaret Redding’s earliest receipt to H. L. Mencken, dated January 17, 1922, with his note, “Beautifully done!” Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale Collection of American Literature, H. L. Mencken Collection, YCAL MSS 794.
back in his chair he would touch the chest; if I pushed back I would touch the sofa.” “Mencken dictated very few routine letters. There was suspense and a wonder-what’s-coming-next feeling about sitting opposite him with the pencil poised.”

She was a most diligent amanuensis. Mencken had a corner basin where he “occasionally refreshed himself by bathing his face and hands.” “One day he was at the basin and I heard the water running. I never turned to follow his movements, but sat in the pose proper for a secretary, eyes on pad, pencil poised.”

Margaret also took over Mencken’s clippings books. He had long subscribed to a clippings service, which sent him newspaper articles about himself. He faithfully pasted them into large books. She took them over at the beginning of 1927—the first clipping dated November 26, 1926—and continued working on them for decades. “From the very first I did them at home, in the evenings.” She described working on them at various times. “I have mental pictures of myself doing Mencken’s clippings, amazing me from this distance.” She recalled settling down at her tile kitchen table at night, the clippings spread out before her. On another occasion, she worked on them at a nice hotel. “In this cozy retreat I worked until midnight and finished my book. I delivered it to HLM courtesy of Rosalind a few days later when I was sure it was dry.”

Mencken provided direction but was always pleased with her work. He was apologetic when clippings came in large numbers and often added a quip or commented on them. “There is still a considerable pile of clippings,” he informed her, “but I hope to plow through it within the next ten days. By the end of the week I’ll be sending you a copy of my new book—swell stuff but somewhat unorthodox. I begin to fear that I may have to go to hell for it.” On sending her two new blank clippings books, he wrote, “At the same time I shall send you a packet of clippings relating to the recent lynching on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The county papers have been roaring against me, and some of the stuff is very interesting.”

Mencken became Margaret’s pet client. He valued hard work and diligence, and his appreciation and praise amplified her natural inclinations. “I may have neglected my other business to give Mencken the service he demanded and I am sure I did. Anything but perfection—or at least as near perfection as I could get, was unthinkable.” “To say that I loved working for Mencken would be putting it mildly. There were many typing jobs we could have gone after in the office around town. There were office potentials I should have been developing. But I gave Mencken the preference when I was allotting my time.” “I was a little foolish about his work; once when I had sprained my ankle badly, I travelled back and forth from my office to his home in a taxi. I never mentioned to Mr. Mencken that I was disabled. During the eight years I missed, I believe, but one day for illness.” She often submitted him bills below the true cost of the work. “Rosalind was amused at my charges to Mencken, and after she took his work over she did much better by giving herself the raises she deserved.” “Rosalind’s common sense matched her good looks and she was astonished that my admiration for HLM took such an impractical way of showing itself.”

The work developed a distinct schedule. She would usually take dictation in the morning on days when “sessions” were scheduled, return to the office in the Morris Building to type the letters, and then return them to Mencken who always mailed
them. Typing and other clerical work was done at the office, and the clipping books at home, most often in the evening. Some of the most rewarding work was typing up Mencken’s drafts for publication. “As I remember,” Margaret wrote, “on book manuscripts, Mencken gave me a chapter or two at a time. They were written on the typewriter on coarse, cheap 8½x13 paper, with almost no corrections. Perhaps a word or two inter-written here and there in Mencken’s hand.” He inscribed a gift copy of *Prejudices: Fifth Series*, “For Miss Redding, who did as much work on it as H. L. Mencken,” and one of *Prejudices: Sixth Series*, “For Miss Redding, who has already typed it twice and some of it six times.”

The sisters prepared and closely proofread Mencken’s *The Charlatanry of the Learned*, a translation of a work written by one of Mencken’s ancestors’ relatives. “Rosalind and I were sorry when our part in ‘The Charlatanry of the Learned’ was over. We felt we knew Johann Burkhard Mencken [Mencke] as well as we knew our own Henry, and we shared HLM’s filial allegiance to his counterpart.”

Mencken effectively replaced Mike Redding as the most prominent male influence in Margaret’s life. Family relations were obviously strained with her parents separated and her own name mentioned in the newspapers as a cause. On one occasion, Mencken’s work directly generated some bitterness in her toward her father. In December 1923, she became a founding subscriber (#1343) to Mencken’s new venture, *The American Mercury* magazine. Mencken personally thanked her for the subscription—“I hope you like the magazine. At all events we’ll put a lot of hard work into it—and give no quarter to the Ku Kluxers!” Her father borrowed her copy of the first issue (January 1924) but did not return it. She mentioned the fact to Mencken who soon after gave her a signed copy of the issue. The unreturned magazine had come up after Mencken had inquired about Mike. “He’s all right,” Margaret had told him, but, “He turned into pretty much of a tyrant in his old age.” Mencken’s response—“All old men are tyrants”—disappointed her. There was not much hope in it.

Margaret inwardly grappled with Mencken’s ideas, her efforts hampered not by her intellect but by a sense of insecurity, deeply interwoven into herself as the daughter of an opinionated father, as a woman who had grown up reading “many a man’s philosophy,” and as the secretary to one of the nation’s brashest intellectuals. One conversation between Mencken and Margaret illustrates the dynamic involved. They were discussing the Teapot Dome oil reserves scandal involving Secretary of the Interior Albert Bacon Fall as she departed 1524 Hollins, and Mencken remarked that everyone involved had died shortly after. She replied, “Maybe the wages of sin is death.” She long remembered the moment. “Mencken is above me; how did he manage to look so powerful? In the sense, I mean, of being uncontradictable.” “Mencken received my remark as if it gave him a delectable pleasure. He answered with a long-drawn-out ‘Ah-h-h!’ His face lit up, really, not a figure of speech.” “Of course we two know it isn’t so? But wouldn’t it be a dreadful idea if it were true?” Margaret interpreted his real meaning—“I am the only one of us two who knows the wages of sin is not death and never will be. As for you,
why you half believe it, more's the pity." "How did I get away?" Margaret concluded, “Alas, I don’t remember. Shock, no doubt.”

But she did quietly scrutinize Mencken’s thinking—“What was Mencken’s philosophy? The absurdity of the idea that all men are born equal? Full acceptance of ‘the enlightened vs. the masses’ as reasonable? The belief that mankind is inherently pitiable, ridiculous? The dictum that only a few men can attain Olympus? The surety that all religion is a fraud from which man is painfully and gradually freeing himself? The belief that only Science can discover if there be a crumb of hope for man against darkness? “On this slender thread (‘No one knows Who’) I base my conception of Mencken and his philosophy on religion. He would like to know the answers, but he doesn’t; moreover he doubts he ever will, for lack of evidence. If other men know, then they know something which, he writes, is just not so. This being the case, Mencken shakes the pillars, calls for battle and blood against the Fundamentalists.”
Margaret always maintained a bit of hero worship for Mencken, but especially so in the beginning. “At the time I met him, I was an American through and through. I was neither a scoffer nor a devotee in religion. For this reason I could accept Mencken's philosophy as being very reasonable for him.” “I was not equipped mentally to take him apart, to know what he really was saying, or whether he meant what he said always. But I knew he had a masterful style; his words had the ring of sincerity; he was a man of great charm and honesty, so I accepted him, prejudices and all.” Over time, though, she began to decide that some strands of his thought were not convincing: “Mencken always wanted proof. That there is no test tube proof of God's existence is true. But there is positive proof of the existence of those millions who believe in Him. They do exist; they do sing His praises. Seeming miracles, counter to nature, have occurred on earth in sight of crowds, and on lonely fields.” Here was her Catholicism and her father’s belief in the naturalness of the supernatural.27

What troubled Margaret most was the seeming hopelessness she thought ingrained in Mencken’s thinking. “I would like to think that Mencken was searching for some modicum of hope in the mystery of man.” A Mencken comment, disturbing even to Margaret, made her doubt this search. She stood in his doorway with him. “It was another bright day. There had been a disastrous flood in Missouri and he had mentioned it in several of his letters. He accompanied me down the stairway and opened the door for me. Just before I was about to leave, he said suddenly: ‘If all the people in Missouri were drowned, it would not affect the progress of the world at all.’” “I must have taken in a picture of him very vividly, for it remains with me until now. He seems to be in motion, thinking, although he is standing perfectly still. He vibrates.” Her frightened response was to laugh. “Don't laugh,’ he said, without annoyance or emphasis. ‘I mean it.’” “I could read his books and even type them in manuscript without faltering,” Margaret wrote, “But that day, hearing his powerful voice, seeing his eyes light up, proof of his sincerity, listening to such a volcanic indictment of ‘the unenlightened,’ I had to laugh or believe.”28

Margaret Redding Lappin

The Roaring Twenties were heady years for Mencken and Margaret. Mencken’s brash iconoclasm made him a cultural icon. He was supremely influential in New York literary circles. His name appeared often in newspapers and magazines. He inspired Anita Loos’s bestselling novel Gentlemen Prefer Blondes, and his name made a cameo appearance in the book. Mencken’s vicious descriptions of William Jennings Bryan and the Fundamentalists at the John Scopes trial for the teaching of human evolution contributed greatly to its immediate and long-term significance in American culture (and three decades later inspired the character E. K. Hornbeck in the play Inherit the Wind by Jerome Lawrence and Robert E. Lee). After Rev. J. Franklin Chase and like-minded Bostonians attempted to prevent the local sale of the April 1926 issue of The
American Mercury because it included Herbert Asbury’s “Hatrack,” the fictionalized story of a Missouri prostitute and the local hypocrites who patronized her, Mencken arranged his own sensational arrest for selling a copy to Chase at Boston Common. He wanted to protect his magazine and take the fight for freedom of speech directly to the book banners.

Margaret was at Mencken’s side in Baltimore during the Hatrack fight, taking dictation on the numerous letters and press releases that Mencken sent out. He met her at 1524 Hollins a couple of days after his arrest and subsequent dismissal of the charges for an exceptional evening dictation session. “He let me in himself. He was wearing a Tuxedo, was freshly shaved and pomaded. He looked almost handsome, absolutely debonair.” The letters were repetitious and business-like. “I only remember,” she later wrote, “his glowing, vibrant presence, the sound of his voice, and the meaning, if not the wording of what he was thinking and saying in the letters: ‘Hallelujah! Hallelujah! I beat him. I beat him.’” According to Margaret, “Whomsoever shared his life shared a battle ground.” That night, “He looked like a victorious warrior, and it was no trick at all to see the Tuxedo as a suit of armor.” As they separated, Mencken gave Margaret a copy of the controversial issue, and she turned to “Hatrack” on her way home. “In her bleak life,” Margaret wrote of Hatrack, “no one had ever dreamed of seeing the girl Hatrack in the apparel of Victory while a gallant gentleman rescued her from the likes of J. Frank Chase. I wanted to know what she had felt inside herself? How old was she? Where did she get her food? Who loved her?”

Two years later, in the late winter of 1928, thirty-six-year-old Margaret surprised Mencken with news that she was marrying and moving to New York and could no longer be his secretary. On March 9, she wrote, “I am at last convinced that I am one of the unlucky mortals who cannot live alone.” “The man I am marrying—Charles F. Lappin—is with the New York Life Insurance Company—but he uses his hours of relaxation for studying and writing. So far he has done nothing worth much, but he has had encouragement from some of the magazine editors.” “Working for you has been such a privilege that I give it up with real regret.” She offered to help him with projects, such as organizing his “Free Lance” clippings or indexing his books, and let him know that she would regularly be in Baltimore.

“It is evil news, indeed, that you are thinking of going to New York. I’ll be lost here without you,” Mencken responded. To Blanche Knopf, his publisher’s wife and business associate, he wrote, “Horrible news: my stenographer is to be married. I had never suspected her of wayward thoughts. When she goes I’ll be crippled badly.”

When Mencken next saw Margaret, he enjoyed a moment with her. He called his sister Gertrude. “Miss Redding is going to be married. Come here! Come here!” “Along with myself and everyone else,” Margaret recalled, “she [Gertrude] had had her hair bobbed in the then new fashion, originating with Irene Castle.” Margaret and the Menckens gathered together. The impish Mencken expressed mock incredulity, “A girl who drives her own car around Baltimore—going to New York to live!” “Couldn’t you
resist him, Miss Redding?” Margaret and Charles married in April. Later she wrote about her last week working for Mencken, when she broached the question of continuing to work on his clippings, “Mr. Mencken, I would like to go on doing the clippings

March 9, 1928.

Dear Mr. Mencken,

Once again, I intrude on you with personal business. That is, if you can call getting married “business.” I am at last convinced that I am one of the unlucky mortals who cannot live alone. This would not interest you if it were not for the simple fact that I must reside in New York with my husband-to-be, and so of course give up the immense privilege of taking care of your personal dictation in Baltimore.

In order that you may not be inconvenienced, I am coaching my sister, Mrs. Lohnsick, to take your mail. She is a good stenographer and an intelligent woman. I hope I have not been presumptuous in assuming that you would find her satisfactory. She is eager to take care of your mail, and I hope you find the arrangement satisfactory. I am to be married on April 7. I’ll take care of you myself up to that date. Afterwards, you can call on her, as you have me. She will also manage the office—your manuscript, clippings, or other requirements in the stenographic line will be looked after here as usual.

The man I am marrying—Charles F. Lappin—is with the New York Life Insurance Company—but he uses his hours of relaxation for studying and writing. So far he has done nothing worth much, but he has had encouragement from some of the magazine editors.

Working for you has been such a privilege that I give it up with real regret. I hope you’ll let me do something for you at some other time. I’d like very much to get your Free Lance clippings into shape for you. It could be an any task for my old moments. Or if you contemplate any indexing on your new book, or other detail work, I’ll do it gladly if it can be handled in New York. I’ll be in close touch with Baltimore, and expect to spend at least a week out of each month here.

Please forgive me for the intrusion on your time. I’d have notified you on my intention sooner, but I did not want to bother you while you were ill. I am afraid that today is none too soothing to your throat.

Sincerely,

Margaret Redding’s letter to H. L. Mencken, dated March 9, 1928, informing him on her impending marriage to Charles F. Lappin. Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale Collection of American Literature, H. L. Mencken Collection, YCAL MSS 794
for you, even after I get to New York.’ I could blush as I think of it.” He agreed and continued with the dictation. For a wedding present, he gave her a “magnificent” silver card tray engraved with her maiden initials, “M R”.

Margaret arranged for Rosalind to take the position. “I asked Rosalind to take over Mencken’s work for she had no children, was bored with housework, shopping and like pursuits.” Her younger sister was initially reluctant. “She was shy of meeting Mencken and did not trust her shorthand.” Margaret assured her, though, that it was only a part-time position and she could resign at any time. She reminded Rosalind “that she no longer would be coming into our little business office, that if she did not do something she would have no excuse to be downtown for lunch, and so on, and so on.” Rosalind came around to the idea and sought approval from her husband, John W. Lohrfinck—“After that I had to persuade my husband that it was a good idea. If he objected then I knew I would miss Marge and her office where we had been together for several years. But he agreed.”

Margaret considered Rosalind “a secretary of superior qualifications,” but the sisters understood that she would have to hone and expand her skills to work for a client with such a demanding working style. According to Margaret, “She let me dictate to her in the evenings at her house or mine. She practiced hard on word-signs. Her memory turned out to be excellent; she was a quick study.” Rosalind then went to 1524 for her first dictation with Mencken. “I warned him I was not as competent as my sister and that he must dictate slowly, which he agreed. But in less than five minutes, he had forgotten my existence and was rattling out the words at a rate which almost took my breath.” “Within a year,” Rosalind proudly recorded, “I could take his dictation with no effort whatsoever; I transcribed it, however, with a dictionary at hand.” Margaret also attempted to persuade her sister to take over the office in the Morris Building, but she declined because it would have been “too arduous.” Rosalind wrote its obituary, “She let two young ladies have it, who ran it straight into the ground in six months.” Rosalind would continue as Mencken’s secretary for two decades, and beyond.

Mencken helped Margaret find work in New York. He had nothing for her at The American Mercury offices but recommended her to Blanche Knopf. Margaret later wrote that she never contacted her because she was “too shy.” She did do some work for Ernest Boyd, a literary critic and friend to Mencken, and his biographer. Shortly before her marriage, Margaret had met Ernest’s wife Madeleine, herself a book translator and well-connected member of New York literary circles, at Mencken’s house and done some work for her. Madeleine, a French woman with a robust personality, just at this time was acting as literary agent for Thomas Wolfe, successfully helping him arrange publication of his major novel Look Homeward, Angel. In New York, Margaret worked part-time for the Boyds. “I took manuscript dictation from Ernest Boyd. As Mencken had taken pains to bring the Boyds and myself together, I assumed an obligation to help them.” “I found no solace in the Boyds’ literary endeavors for their flat was at times the scene of quarrels between them. Boyd seemed to me, after Mencken, coldly antagonistic.”
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Margaret, in general, struggled in New York. Her other literary clients also disappointed her. She found them odd and idiosyncratic. One would not touch anything in her apartment without gloves. Another allowed the family cat to walk on the plates and nose her lamb chop. When Margaret declined to eat the meal, her client responded angrily, “Why didn’t you tell me that you hated cats? She’s one of the family.” “The big city overpowered me with its noise and movement.” The subway made her feel ill. She and Charles moved first to Brooklyn but then to Manhattan, where they were closer to the Boyds and other clients, and to Sinclair Lewis. Mencken noted that she was living “within a cat’s jump” of his friend Lewis’s “bastile” [sic]. “If you hear a series of loud yells in the middle of the night it will be a sign that he has come back from the country and is studying the week’s International Sunday-school Lesson.”

New York, though, gave her a prime opportunity to advance her own writing career, something that she had begun to discuss with Mencken. He seems to have kicked off the conversation—“When he guessed that I would like to write he told me to write a million words before trying to sell.” Shortly after her marriage, he wrote her, “Why don’t you send your novel to Knopf? Let it go to his literary adviser, Harry C. Block. I’ll ask him to give it immediate attention.” He followed up two days later—“I’ll stir up Block about your novel as soon as I get to New York. He will read it at once.”

Margaret had three poems—“For Clare,” “Lilac,” and “Ungesungene Lied” [sic]—published under the name “Marghj Redding” in the Brooklyn Daily Eagle. The spelling may have been homage to her client H. L. She claimed it inspired him to write a col-
umn “on girls and women who spelled their names in outlandish ways.” According to Margaret, “It was a fad of the moment.” In “Ungesungene Lied,” she asked, “What if my songs remain unsung;/ Lie in my heart, unborn, unseen?” It was a plaintive question that would take four decades to answer. 38

Margaret pitched stories to *Vanity Fair* and worked with Madeleine Boyd and other agents. In July 1929, Madeleine wrote her regarding one of her short stories, “I have sent your story to Mr. T. Wells, at Harper’s Magazine. I thought it quite good, and I would have liked to talk to you at length about it. I am going to have an office when I come back in October and I’ll be freer to see people and do things.” At Mencken’s request, Margaret sent him a story for *The American Mercury*, which he had to decline as “too mild for us.” Margaret optimistically wrote Charles in early November 1930, “Mr. Hardy the agent sent for me. He said some flattering things and wants all my ‘stuff’ hereafter.” 39

At the time, Charles was in Buffalo making arrangements for the couple to relocate there. New York Life had transferred him to the inspection office at the firm’s Buffalo offices. Charles reported to her in Babbitt-like language that he had arrived at his new workplace and met the man who headed the office. “He is a fine fellow. He introduced me to the various officials. We had lunch with the Agency Director, two Agency Organizers, and another chap who is what they call a bonded clerk.” Margaret initially had a difficult time adjusting to New York City but now did not want to leave it for Buffalo. Surviving letters reveal that the couple had some painful phone conversations as she prepared to join him. He tried to assure her that she would like it there, “I have been advised that there is plenty of room in Buffalo for competent stenographers. It isn’t the same here as in New York. There is no glut of talent and the sheep are not herded with the goats.” And it would be good for her writing—“I am sure that you can write better in Buffalo than in New York. You will get the detached feeling that is so essential and some of the thoughts that will come to you about New York will be surprising. I am making a prophecy.” 40

In Buffalo, Margaret did pursue her writing. She earned an “A” in a short story writing course at the University of Buffalo. She sought agents and publishers. She continued to correspond with Mencken regarding his clippings and her own writing. Mencken, who was exasperated by the leftward turn in politics and literature during the Depression years, wrote her regarding an apparently new project with words probably more discouraging than encouraging, “I see no reason why you should not find a publisher for this novel. It is charming stuff, and a welcome relief from the ‘advanced’ writing this is now pouring into every publishing house from the East Side.” He cautioned that whatever her manuscript’s merits, publishing houses were in difficult straits because of the business depression. They were not taking on new authors. In May 1936, she was finally able to celebrate with him the publication of short story in a magazine. “My most sincere congratulations,” he responded, “Now that you have it behind you, selling other stuff will be easier. Editors are all sheep!” 41
That same year, New York Life relocated Margaret and Charles to Minneapolis. As they arranged for her continued work on Mencken’s clippings, her famous former client complimented her new residence in his inimitable style, “I have never been there myself, but I hear that it is a really lovely and charming town. Certainly the malt liquor ought to be good.” He disappointed her, though, when he was in Minneapolis the following year with his Sunpapers associate Paul Patterson but failed to visit her and Charles, later apologizing that he did not have the time. She was further disappointed when local reporters attributed negative comments about the city to him. Mencken had not seen her Minneapolis. “We were living on the loveliest spot imaginable, directly on West Lake Harriet in the town of Minneapolis, with a forest of giant trees straight ahead.” Mencken wrote her seeking to make amends, “so far as I can recall every word we said was in praise.” “I begin to suspect,” he kidded, “that journalism is still very from an exact science.”

In Minneapolis, Margaret’s writing shifted from fiction to instruction and advice aimed at secretaries and career women. She was teaching her “Twenty-six Typewriter Keys to Success” at the College of Commerce in 1938. The same year, she copyrighted “What make [sic] it click; or, The drama of Julia Bullock and her job.” During World War II, she shopped a book that Mencken described as “essentially what the trade calls a textbook.” He recommended Prentice Hall or Macmillan, which he noted had had success with The Secretary’s Handbook. He assured her, “It is excellent stuff, and it will find a publisher soon or late.” “Thanks again for your interest and courtesy,” she responded, “and also for that note of consolation the other day; if I ever think of giving up I’ll remember what it did to Shakespeare, when he stopped writing.” In 1951, Margaret began publishing Careerfuls, a regional quarterly magazine for career women. “It earned no money for me, but a lot of fan mail.” She continued the venture for four years when New York Life again relocated the couple, this time back to New York, where they lived in Thornwood in Westchester County. By that time, Rosalind’s time with Mencken was concluding.

Rosalind Redding Lohrfinck

In Baltimore, Rosalind became an indispensable part of Mencken’s work, and his life. She took dictation on his letters and manuscripts, typed Mencken’s letters, and prepared his manuscripts for publication, most of the work completed in the apartment she shared with her husband John W. Lohrfinck. Mencken’s writing was voluminous, and the typing and other clerical tasks required colossal effort and persistence. But it was rewarding. One of her first big projects was Treatise on the Gods. Rosalind described working on the book, “I had the task of making the fair copy of the manuscript. This was indeed a stimulating experience and I’d have done all the work gratis.”

Rosalind’s work with Mencken gave the sisters opportunity to bond over the shared experience and discuss him and his work. Rosalind (Woe) wrote to Margaret (Marge)
on Mencken’s wedding day in August 1930. He was a famously defiant bachelor, and the news that he was to marry Sara Haardt, a writer, was a supreme surprise to the public, even to Margaret, who learned of it from a Baltimore friend on Fifth Avenue in New York. “Later Rosalind told me that Mencken had sworn her to secrecy about his plans for he wanted the news to be a bomb. And it was.” The day of the wedding, Rosalind wrote, “I went over there today—his wedding day! He thanked me profusely for helping him out this week—every day—and told me if I didn’t finish in time today to sign the letters myself, as my work was always very accurate. That’s the first half baked compliment he has ever given me about the notes.” With Mencken on his honeymoon, she would have some time off—“I’ll be a lady of leisure now for three weeks. He said he’d write to me when to come, so I suppose I am not fired.” “I’ll miss the old boy. I only wish I had a regular job.”

John Lohrfinck died suddenly of a heart attack less than four months later. Rosalind and John had married in 1915. He had worked as a buyer for Hochschild, Kohn & Co., a prominent downtown Baltimore department store. “Rosalind was shaken; her recovery was slow. She felt sure she could not continue any routine. She lost weight and looked wretched. Even her features seemed to change from calm serenity to tortured caricature; her skin was affected. Her hair turned from a delicate brown to whiteness that resembled platinum.” “She visited me in Buffalo,” Margaret remembered, “and was not herself at all.” Now a grieving Rosalind had the time to devote her days to Mencken, and also the financial incentive, her husband’s death coming as the national economy settled firmly into prolonged depression. She evolved into Mencken’s full-time secretary with a regular monthly salary.

Typing Mencken’s letters gave the sisters an intimate knowledge of his literary relationships. In October 1931, Rosalind wrote Margaret to share some interesting developments. George Jean Nathan, long a stylish and prominent figure in New York literary and theater circles, had been Mencken’s partner at *The Smart Set* and *The American Mercury*, and his close friend, until a falling out while they worked together on the latter magazine. Now Nathan had written a book (*The Intimate Notebooks of George Jean Nathan*, 1932) with his impressions of literary figures, including Mencken, Dreiser, and Ernest Boyd, and had sent Mencken the proofs to read. Rosalind copied some of the Nathan manuscript and Mencken’s comments. She was sending them to Margaret. “Of course, don’t show it to a soul, as my life wouldn’t be worth a penny if it got out.” “Please tear all this stuff up. It is only for you to see, as I know you’ll get a big kick out of it, as I did.”

The sisters debated Nathan’s comments about Mencken’s willingness to kneel at the altar of the church when he married, an act that many found almost unimaginable given the content and tone of decades of his writing on women, marriage, and clergymen. Rosalind thought Mencken’s kneeling was insignificant relative to the larger matter of his willingness to submit to a church wedding. Margaret defended him—“Mencken could not be legally married in Maryland, save in a church. And he wanted to be married in
Maryland. The man who married him is a broadminded minister and finds himself a minister as you and I find ourselves stenographers—because we were born into that. No. Mencken has a right to his personal liberty.” “Believe me,” Margaret added, “you’ll never know the thrill I got out of reading this; it was like old times; leave him and the vacuum will be unfillable.”

Rosalind stuck to her position. “It is incongruous with his beliefs, and it simply should not have taken place. The fact that Md. does not permit a legal service has nothing to do with it. It is a big country, and I stand by my guns on that one point. He has roasted the clergy too often to permit such a service, and I can’t understand it.” Like others, including Ernest Boyd, she saw an inconsistency in what he asserted in his writing and how he lived in private. “Underneath, of course, I realize he is almost puritanical. He reminds me in this respect a great deal of John [Lohrfinck]. A liberal in many ways, and yet much of the puritan in him.” “I suppose it will take a long while before any man living can shake off the effects of our church-going ancestors. To believe in such things is as stupid as to believe in Santa Claus, but it is almost an impossibility not to have a shade of it somewhere in our character.” Mencken, though, just seemed to her too “superhuman” to have succumbed.

Rosalind had assisted Margaret with proofreading and now the sisters reversed roles, Margaret proofreading with Rosalind when she was in Baltimore. Margaret described them working together on *The Charlatanry of the Learned*. “We would stop at eleven, for we needed time to clear the couch where I would sleep. We indulged ourselves in hair-care, nail polishing and other before sleep amenities. Then I would make a small Scotch for Rosalind and sherry for myself while Rosalind sat and wondered had she forgotten any instructions.” Thinking about their own family’s history, they joked together about turning it into a book. “That was the way it was with Rosalind and me. When the going got really rough, our Irish cottage humor sprang up as from a flowing fountain of simplicity and saved us.”

Mencken left *The American Mercury* at the end of 1933, and he spent less working time in New York and more in Baltimore. His writing, still prodigious, became more focused on himself. Besides *The Charlatanry of the Learned*, a personal project undertaken primarily because of the family connection, he completed three popular autobiographical accounts—*Happy Days*, *Newspaper Days*, and *Heathen Days*—and dictated enormous manuscripts on his career intended not for publication but for future research into himself and his working world (published posthumously). Mencken also produced *A New Dictionary of Quotations on Historical Principles from Ancient and Modern Sources* and a fourth edition and two substantial supplements to his landmark *The American Language*.

Most of Mencken’s writing—including his extensive correspondence—was Rosalind’s typing. His description of *A New Dictionary of Quotations* offers a concise picture of the staggering work involved. “In the book, by my count, there are about 42,260 quotations, and it runs to between 850,000 and 900,000 words. The proofs have oc-
cupied me since July, and before that I put in three months reading the fair copy made by Mrs. Lohrfinck from the original cards. At one time or another I must have put at least 60,000 cards into the file. In the final revision I destroyed many thousands.” In the book’s preface, Mencken wrote some more words, “My debt to my secretary, Mrs. Rosalind C. Lohrfinck, is endless.” He gave a copy to her mother Kate for Christmas and inscribed it, “For Mrs. Catherine Redding, by command of Mrs. Lohrfinck (the real author).” “Mother was delighted by the courtesy,” Margaret wrote.52

On September 23, 1943, an accident to Mencken’s African American housekeeper Emma Ball—a slip on the waxed hardwood floor—got him thinking about his dependence on her and his African American cook Hester Denby—and on Rosalind. His wife Sara, who had been seriously ill for years, since before their wedding, had died in 1935, and Mencken was living with his brother August at 1524 Hollins. Referring to Emma and Hester, he wrote, “If they quit tomorrow August and I would be in a really desperate state, and it would probably be impossible for us to go on keeping house, for servants of their fidelity and capacity are now virtually unprocureable.”

I am even more dependent upon Rosalind Lohrfinck, my secretary. She knows my business inside and out, and saves me an enormous amount of work. In fact, it would be impossible, without her aid, for me to undertake anything as complicated and onerous as the supplement to “The American Language,” now in progress. She is an extremely rapid stenographer, and knows all my regular correspondents. In copying typescripts she is so accurate as to be almost miraculous: in fact, she sometimes goes a whole week without making a single mistake. If she left me I’d be almost helpless, and if the two colored women left also my life would be changed almost as much as if I lost an arm.53

Mencken’s concern about losing Rosalind threatened to become a reality when she became gravely ill in July 1944. She had taken dictation during the day. “But on her return home to transcribe my dictation she began to feel rocky, and soon after noon she called me up to say that she had a temperature of 102 degrees.” She went to Union Memorial Hospital, and Mencken visited her there. “In all probability she will be ill for weeks.” “Doing my own mail, I begin to realize what a heavy burden it is, and how much she helps me in handling it.” Several weeks later, he recorded, “Mrs. Lohrfinck is ill indeed. There is evidence that a secondary infection has followed the virus infection, and that endocarditis has set up.” A few days later, “It seems to be plain that Mrs. Lohrfinck has endocarditis, and her outlook is not good.” “Her mind seems to be perfectly clear, but her speech is affected. She has difficulty finding words, and it is hard to understand her.”54

In August, another Redding sister, Clare (Crump), began to fill in for Rosalind. She assisted Mencken with his mail and “the accumulated typescript of the American Language Supplement.” “She will be the third Redding sister to work for me. She is
married and has a daughter twelve years old, but insists that she can spare enough time from her household to do my work.” Clare was not as familiar with his work, but he appreciated her “quiet competence.” Still, he missed Rosalind who was finally improving but not yet well enough to return to work. “I shudder to think of my difficulties if she is still ill when the time comes to do the List of Words and Phrases for the American Language Supplement.”

Two months later, Rosalind was still ill. Mencken finished the supplement on October 10, “and all that remains is for Mrs. Crump to copy a dozen or so pages and folio them to the end. The Index and the List of Words and Phrases, of course, are yet to be done, and with Mrs. Lohrfinck still disabled the whole burden of the job may fall on me.” Finally, on October 30, Rosalind returned to 1524 Hollins. “She looked pitifully thin and pale, and I suggested that she had better wait a few weeks before resuming, but she protested that she was tired of idleness and eager for occupation.” Her speech was still impaired, as was her eyesight. She made uncharacteristic mistakes with Mencken’s letters. He knew that her limitations were frustrating to her, “The intelligent suffer much more when they are ill than the stupid.”

Not until the following January did Mencken feel she had largely regained her old secretarial skills. On January 22, he reported that she had for the first time turned in a batch of letters “in which there were no gross errors.” “She was so good before her illness that she spoiled me. I could dictate to her at high speed for an hour or more, giving her 50 or 60 letters and a lot of notes and other stuff, and she would bring it in without an error.” He added, “She has finished copying the long List of Words and Phrases for [the] American Language Supplement, and is half way through the Index.” Rosalind slowly resumed her heavy workload. Referring to A Mencken Chrestomathy, he noted in October 1947, “Mrs. Lohrfinck has already copied 300,000 or 400,000 words, and I’ll probably have 1,000,000 before I settle down to make my selections.”

These working patterns, which really traced all the way back to Margaret’s tenure with Mencken, came to a sudden and staggering halt when Mencken suffered a life-threatening stroke in Rosalind’s apartment on the evening of November 23, 1948. He was picking up some typing, and they were sharing a drink and a chat together. The incomparable wordsmith, with whom she had spent two decades helping to turn his thoughts into words on paper, suddenly began to slip into incoherence as they spoke. She called a doctor who arrived promptly and drove him to Johns Hopkins Hospital. The stroke effectively ended his writing career.

In significant ways, Mencken now needed Rosalind’s assistance even more. He had been struck down while he still had several projects underway and numerous professional and personal friends with whom he corresponded. Rosalind knew his business better than anyone. She was really the only person, especially in the beginning, who could cut through his mental and verbal confusion and carry out his professional affairs with a minimum of disruption. His condition caused Rosalind and Margaret intense emotional pain. A dominant presence in their lives, a person with a towering intellect
and personality, was now severely disabled and struggled to convey the simplest of thoughts. He could not read or write.

**Old Days**

Rosalind continued as Mencken’s secretary and became a caregiver as well. “Her temperament was sympathetic and unselfish. This was plain to anyone who knew her,” Margaret explained, “In our family each one of us wanted to be her ‘particular’ friend.” Rosalind could empathize with him, having felt similar frustrations during her own illness—“I can well imagine how much he suffers under such conditions, as I went through the experience after my own illness in 1944, which of course was much less severe than Menck’s.” The situation was difficult, though. In April 1949, she wrote, “It is now five months, and while he has shown some improvement, his condition is still lamentable and I remain in despair.” And that June, “To think of his great mind paralyzed for seven long months is enough to drive any one crazy.” “I’d give my life to cure him—but the gods have never been kind to me.”

The work consisted primarily of answering his letters, organizing his papers, and working on a few publishing matters. Mencken’s brain gradually healed itself to some extent, but especially in the first months after the stroke he had difficulty organizing his thoughts and finding words to express them. “During his illness she answered Mencken’s mail with only a few confusing hints from him to guide her,” Margaret wrote about Rosalind and her work on his correspondence. *A Mencken Chrestomathy* had almost been ready for publication at the time of his stroke and appeared in bookstores in the spring of 1949. Rosalind patiently assisted him in getting out signed copies to his friends. One night, when they were out to the movies, Mencken told Rosalind, “You are the artist of the book; you’ve done the main work. It is a monument to you, not to me.”

Rosalind had a small role in a literary controversy involving Mencken. In February 1950, the American Academy of Arts and Letters named him as the recipient of its Gold Medal for Essays and Criticism. Mencken had long disdained such associations and awards, and it surprised some when he apparently agreed to accept it. Privately, Mencken did not want it and was incensed about the acceptance. According to Margaret, “Augie [August] accepted for Menck + Menck was so angry Augie was afraid to tell him . . . Woe volunteered to take the blame. He let her.” That May, writer and critic Mark Van Doren accepted the medal on Mencken’s behalf.

Rosalind most famously found the manuscript that became *Minority Report: H. L. Mencken’s Notebooks* while working on his papers. The project had been lost amid the wreckage of his stroke. Now Mencken’s thoughts and opinions, taken down as he worked, would be available to the public, the bestselling book opening with a grand, male-dominant Menckenism, “We must respect the other fellow’s religion, but only in the sense and to the extent that we respect his theory that his wife is beautiful and his children smart.”
During these stroke-ravaged years, Mencken’s secretary performed one truly Herculean task. Mencken had directed Margaret and Rosalind not to make carbon copies of the letters they transcribed. Now he was reconsidering; it would be helpful if they went over to the Enoch Pratt Free Library with the rest of his papers when he died. He wondered if she had her old notebooks, and she did. She was excited to take on the work and asked Margaret if she had her old notebooks. “But I did not have them,” Margaret wrote, “I had dropped much cargo in my travels around the U.S.A., with my husband.” Rosalind calculated the number of old letters in her notebooks at about 80,000, which she diligently retyped.63

Rosalind regularly went to dinner and the movies with Mencken, with August often accompanying them. Mencken rarely enjoyed the movies, and the evenings could be frustrating. “I took him to the movies last night. It was ‘The Sleeping-Car to Trieste,’ a very much involved movie, and he could get no sense out of it whatsoever.” “I returned from the movies last night very much dejected, and spent most of the night crying over him.” But time with him could also be fun, with Mencken teasing her in his old style. Once he was talking about dying and asked if the priests gave her a difficult time for not going to church. She said it had been so long that they did not. He replied she would have “a bad time when you get to Hell.” “They’ll say to you: ‘Ha, ha. You are one of those girls that didn’t come in.’ It will be bad for you.”64

Mencken and Rosalind had sometimes dined together before the stroke, her calling them “pleasant affairs,” and she lamented that August was now frequently with them. Rosalind did not like August, which Mencken sensed, and he hinted on at least one occasion, after a disappointing dinner, that they would return to the restaurant, Maria’s, soon, without August. She and Mencken went to the movies one night, and August later joined them for beers at Schellhase’s, where Mencken had often gone with his friends in the Saturday Night Club. Maria’s, Schellhase’s, and the Hippodrome Theatre, where they went to the shows and movies, recalled fond days in a bygone Old Baltimore.65

Mencken died in bed after retiring on the night of January 28, 1956. His death was obviously a landmark event for the Redding sisters. Mencken remembered Rosalind in his will, leaving her $10,000. Of course, much work was left. Mencken, with Rosalind’s assistance, had carefully prepared his papers and letters for deposit at the Enoch Pratt and the New York Public Library. But the arduous work of getting them to the libraries and then cataloguing the vast collection remained. Rosalind knew the material better than anyone—she had generated most of it—and worked on it at the Pratt. One job she undertook was to list “the contents of the many bound volumes of Mencken’s manuscripts, newspaper work, and magazine articles—and the almost incredible record of his thousands of book reviews.” Margaret thought the work felt anticlimactic to Rosalind. She quoted her, “The atmosphere seemed cold. The trained librarians cannot break away from their rigidity. With Mencken, the farther away from rules you were, the more you were likely to be able to assist him. Working with women stifled me. I am sure they thought I was a complete ignoramus.” Rosalind had confidence in her
ability to handle the work but thought that the working environment restrained her.66

Both Rosalind and Margaret, despite all their accomplishments, often displayed a similar mixture of self-assurance and feelings of frustrated ambition, inadequacy, and insecurity. Margaret told an anecdote about a minor incident at the Maryland State Board of Education where Rosalind worked as a senior stenographer after her work at the Enoch Pratt wrapped up. One of “the head men” was discussing her work with Mencken. He said he had been afraid to dictate to her after she had told him she worked for Mencken. “You needn’t have been,” she replied, “Mr. Mencken was the smart one.” When discussing the day Mencken so boisterously congratulated her on her engagement, Margaret herself wondered what would have happened if Mencken had not dominated the scene “with strings of words, like noisy steam coming from an arrested locomotive, anxious to be off again.” “If he had kept quiet, who knows I may have come up with some clever lines?”67

Rosalind did get a few seconds to describe Mencken to a national radio audience. In July 1956, Biographies in Sound, an NBC radio program hosted by Chet Huntley, featured Mencken. Huntley interviewed Mencken’s Baltimore friends Louis Cheslock and Hamilton and John Owens; his publisher Alfred Knopf; and writers William Manchester, James Cain, Herbert Asbury, and Charles Angoff, as well as several other well-known literary figures. They discussed Mencken’s philosophy, his career, and his life. The last person making an appearance was the only woman, Rosalind Lohrfinck. She recalled finding the Minority Report manuscript as they prepared his stacks of papers for the Pratt and described Mencken’s delight that it was complete and ready for publication. His greatest satisfaction was that he would be denounced again.68

Rosalind died in August 1964. Shortly after, Mencken biographer Dr. Carl Bode of the University of Maryland wrote Margaret a letter of condolence. “May I tell you that I share in the sense of loss you feel? I thought Mrs. Lohrfinck was a real lady, of the kind we do not see often enough nowadays. I know that her assistance meant a great deal to H. L. Mencken.” Margaret responded, “She and I were dear friends as well as sisters and I trained her into Mencken’s work when I gave it up myself to be married. We could not have been closer had we been twins and I feel her loss very keenly.”69

A few years before, Margaret and Charles had moved to suburban Maryland, outside Washington, D.C., where he worked in the New York Life office. Charles died in March 1966, shortly before he was to retire. During his career, he had managed to find writing success as a columnist for the Catholic newspaper The Wanderer. Margaret spent the following years organizing and recording her knowledge of Mencken and his career. Rosalind had made a tentative start on a memoir of her work with Mencken but had not gotten far. Margaret collected her papers and her own correspondence and material relating to Mencken. She wrote a manuscript on her and Rosalind’s relationship with him.70

As Margaret worked on her manuscript, she submitted several articles to newspapers, magazines, and journals. The Baltimore Sun published her story of working on The
Charlatantry of the Learned in September 1970 and a nostalgic account of receiving gifts from Mencken, “Imagine, Yule Gifts from HLM” that December. Her “Merry Christmas from Mr. Mencken” appeared in Menckeniana, a quarterly journal, in the winter 1971 issue. The Washington Evening Star ran her “Memories of Mencken” in March 1972.71

The Star story coincided with the world premiere of the play An Unpleasant Evening with H. L. Mencken, adapted from Mencken’s writings by Paul Shyre, at Ford’s Theatre in Washington, D.C. Margaret attended a preview performance. The quiet and dignified eighty-year-old woman was certainly the audience member most intimately acquainted with the working Mencken portrayed on the stage. Like several theater critics, she found the portrayal unsatisfying. She wrote several draft letters offering some personal knowledge that would make the play more accurate and truer to Mencken’s behavior. What probably most troubled her, though, was the focus on his “unpleasantness”—“It is so difficult for an audience to sit in rapt attention and bear all the burden of listening to constant and unrelieved criticism.” The play should make Mencken “more believable and more human, which he was.”72

Margaret attempted but failed to get her criticism of the play into the Star that same month. This failure was the continuation of many years of frustration and disappointment in having her work published. Besides a few poems, a short story, and the few articles on Mencken, she had met with consistent rejection from editors and publishers for more than four decades. In 1970 and 1971, she unsuccessfully pitched “If We Can Keep the Tree,” her account of the Mencken-Dreiser relationship, to the Washington Post, National Review, Modern Age, and Reader’s Digest.73

In a letter to Harold A. Williams at the Sunpapers in September 1971, following his rejection of the article that later appeared in the Star, she thanked him for his courteous rejection—“I have been conditioned to expect more ‘no’s’ than ‘Yes’, sorry to say.” Her manuscript, “As I Saw Mencken,” remained unpublished but found a home in a box at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University. Her songs were not unborn, but did remain largely unseen.74

Margaret died on May 25, 1972, just over two months after attending An Unpleasant Evening with H. L. Mencken. She and Rosalind had faced a world publicly and personally dominated by males. Their father Mike Redding was a towering figure in their family, who provided his daughters opportunity but eventually became a domestic “tyrant” in Margaret’s mind. Margaret’s successful personnel bureau found “girls” to work for Baltimore businessmen. When she married, she abandoned her own business career to move to New York with her new husband. Rosalind sought approval from her own husband to replace Margaret as Mencken’s part-time secretary. For both women, but especially Rosalind, Mencken became a titanic force altering and shaping their lives. The sisters worked for him and devoted their days to his legacy. They felt this domination—Rosalind consistently expressing her powerlessness, and claiming that she was one of the boobiens and not the “smart” one, Margaret feeling like Mencken’s words plowed her under, preventing her from being clever.75
Yet the Redding sisters displayed real skill and resilience in bucking against their circumstances. They did not tear down but built professional lives word by word, stacking them up by the millions. They were two more women taking advantage of the typewriter and opportunities developing in a transforming economic landscape. As a business owner, business school instructor, and magazine publisher, Margaret directly trained and coached women how to type, how to behave professionally, and how to be successful in business. These were quiet contributions to the remaking of the workplace, and the broader role of women in their world.
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Letters to a Marquis: New Documentary Findings in the Correspondence of Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely of Hampton and the Marquis de Lafayette

BASIL CONSIDINE

ELIZA EICHELBERGER (RIDGELY) RIDGELY (1803–1867) was during her lifetime one of the most famous residents of Hampton, the Ridgely family estate in Baltimore County. The daughter of an influential and very wealthy Baltimore merchant, Eliza grew into a talented musician, a pioneering businesswoman and horticulturist, and a renowned socialite and trend-setter. At the age of twenty-one, she met Marie-Joseph Paul Yves Roche Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette (1757–1834) during his 1824–1825 tour of the United States. Before the Marquis had even left the country, the two began a decade-long correspondence that lasted the rest of Lafayette’s life. A detailed understanding of their relationship and correspondence, however, has proved elusive due to gaps in the documentary record.1

Although ten letters written by the Marquis to Eliza were published by the Maryland Historical Magazine in 1957, none of her replies were then known to be extant — nor, indeed, any contemporaneous letters written by Eliza. This situation persisted for the past six decades, unchanged by the landmark cataloguing and indexing of Lafayette: A Guide to the Letters, Documents, and Manuscripts in the United States (1975) and its counterpart Lafayette: Documents conservés en France (1976). However, these circumstances have recently changed with the discovery of three surviving letters written by Eliza to the Marquis de Lafayette. The earliest of these letters is housed at Château de la Grange-Bléneau, the family estate of the Marquis de Lafayette near Paris, France (EER-02), and a second at Cornell University in Ithaca, New York (EER-03); the third is known only from a microfilm copy (EER-04), with the whereabouts of the original currently unknown. Individually, they show several of the different paths that primary sources can take: EER-02 arrived at its destination and has never left the possession
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of the Lafayette family and its heirs. EER-03 has been lost or destroyed, but survives in copy form. While not individually catalogued in either the records of the Archives nationales de France or Cornell University, it survives in a microfilm series made after the French government disputed the sale of a rare book merchant’s collection of Lafayette documents to an entity outside of France. The original may yet re-emerge from the archives. Finally, EER-04 appears to have been sold or gifted by the family’s descendants, ending up in the above-mentioned collection of Lafayette documents. This collection was eventually purchased by Cornell University, forming the nucleus of the Arthur H. and Mary Marden Dean Lafayette Collection now held at that institution. Further details on the discovery of these letters are found below.² The thirteen extant letters exchanged between Eliza and the Marquis de Lafayette were, like most of his correspondence with Americans, primarily in English; only one of their surviving letters (MdL-09; discussed below) was written in French. Their collected correspondence is summarized below, followed by the full text of Eliza’s letters, along with notes on several missing letters.
Eliza’s letters are important on several levels. They show for the first time a back-and-forth correspondence between Eliza and the Marquis, contain information to reconstruct a larger communications timeline (including several still-missing letters), and serve as a key for decoding names, messages, and references in Lafayette’s own letters. When combined with several ancillary writings by third parties, the correspondence also illustrates the dynamics of transatlantic social intercourse during the post-Napoleonic period, including the limitations faced even by affluent, upper-class women engaged in long-distance travel.3

Gaps in the Record

Although the paucity of scholarship on Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely and her relationship to the Marquis de Lafayette can be attributed in part to the prior lack of documentation, it is also symptomatic of a larger, persistent gap concerning women in Lafayette studies. As the historian Lloyd S. Kramer observed in 1996, “The tendency of biographers to overlook Lafayette’s friendships with women writers extends from nineteenth-century studies to the most recent accounts of his life”—a statement that remains broadly true more than two decades after its writing.4
Maryland Historical Magazine

A barrier to balancing this historical tendency is the limited availability of information in period sources. For example, newspaper accounts of Lafayette’s 1824–1825 tour of the United States frequently included lists of names for male politicians and civic figures, military officers, and other distinguished men, while referring to women only as nameless groups. Although rich information, including women’s names, can sometimes be found in first-hand accounts in contemporary letters and diaries, these have not tended to be indexed systematically because they are generally not written to or by famous men.5

This tendency is also problematic because it does not reflect Lafayette’s own interests and activities, as measured and documented through his written output. For example, the recipients index of Lafayette: A Guide to the Letters, Documents, and Manuscripts in

Detail of George Washington and His Generals at Yorktown, Charles Willson Peale, c.1784. The Marquis de Lafayette is the first figure on the left, portrayed in his American general’s uniform and standing next to George Washington. Between Lafayette and Washington is General Benjamin Lincoln, followed by the Comte de Rochambeau to Washington’s left, then General de Castellux (Rochambeau’s chief of staff), and Tench Tilghman at the far right. Maryland Historical Society, Gift of Robert Gilmor, Jr., 1845.3.1
the United States lists letters to eighty-six unique, named women within its geographically constricted sample, only a handful of whom were related to Lafayette. (Some nineteen letters to unnamed women are also indexed in this volume.) A simple comparison of numbers shows that Lafayette counted Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely as a dear, treasured, and close friend. His interest, as with most of his other female correspondents, appears to have been specific to her and not to her larger family; no evidence exists of Lafayette ever writing to Eliza’s father or her eventual husband, despite being acquainted with both. The ten letters he wrote to Eliza from 1824 to 1834 are not only one of his most substantial correspondences with women during the period, but also one of the larger purely personal (as opposed to political) correspondences of the last decade of his life. Lafayette’s letters to Eliza are equal in number and frequency to those he wrote to Major General Samuel Smith of Baltimore during the same period.6

Samuel Smith provides an apt point of comparison for Lafayette’s non-political correspondence. He was a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, a decorated veteran of both the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812—and a person whom Lafayette named as one of his closest friends. After Smith was wounded in battle, Lafayette tried to recruit Smith to his command staff during the American Revolution, and during the War of 1812, Smith rose to international fame after commanding the successful defense of Baltimore. The two maintained a long correspondence after the Revolution; following Lafayette’s grand tour of the United States in 1824–1825, Smith wrote Lafayette an average of one letter per year, receiving a roughly equal number of responses. Eliza herself received the same number of letters from Lafayette during the period without being nearly so regular a respondent—making Lafayette’s persistence in writing her all the more telling of his affection and regard.7

Meeting

The exact timing and circumstances of Eliza and Lafayette’s first meeting are currently unclear. Oral history traditions in the Ridgely family suggest two occasions: when the Marquis de Lafayette dined with her father Nicholas Greenbury Ridgely (1770–1829) in Baltimore and with her future father-in-law Charles Carnan Ridgely (1760–1829) at Hampton. Unfortunately, this oral history has not preserved exact dates, and these visits are not explicitly corroborated in Auguste Levasseur’s travel memoir, Lafayette in America in 1824 and 1825. As a result, identifying the pair’s possible meeting(s) requires evaluating the existing evidence and inferring the most likely circumstances.8

The most likely possibilities for interaction between the Marquis de Lafayette and Eliza during his 1824–1825 travels in the United States occurred during his five visits to Baltimore:

- October 7–11, 1824,
- November 24–29, 1824,
- December 26–29, 1824,
January 19–24, 1825, and July 30–August 1, 1825.

It is also possible that Eliza and the Marquis met and interacted at one of the many events in nearby cities, a number of which are documented as having Baltimore residents present. These included:

The August 1, 1825, newspaper article in the *American and Commercial Advertiser* showing Lafayette's having dined with Nicholas G. Ridgely. The second meal, listed in the article as hosted by William Patterson (1752–1835, the namesake of Baltimore’s Patterson Park), was an official dinner organized in the latter’s capacity as the head of the city’s greeting committee for Lafayette’s July 1825 visit.

*Author’s private collection*
August 19, 1824: Upon arriving in New York City, Lafayette received delegations from several American cities, including Baltimore.

December 15, 1824: Lafayette attended a commencement at Columbia College (now George Washington University) in Washington, D.C.

December 16–21, 1824: Lafayette attended various events in Annapolis, including dinners, receptions, and a grand ball.

September 1–4, 1825: Various public and private celebrations held before Lafayette’s return to France.

However, the *terminus* for their first meeting is December 28, 1824: Lafayette’s first-known letter to Eliza, dated the following day (MdL-01), stated that he did not see her at the December 28 ball. Because the same letter also noted his disappointment at having “missed every opportunity to pay [his] respects,” this suggests that their first meeting and meaningful acquaintance predated the December 26–29 visit.

The distinction of “meaningful acquaintance” is important, as Lafayette’s travels were filled with large public events of ceremony and rapid-fire social interactions—events that might have provided an initial acquaintance, but without the detailed discussions referenced in their later correspondence. Barring travel outside of Baltimore and its environs, the most likely context for a meaningful acquaintance between Eliza and the Marquis de Lafayette was one of the balls and receptions held on October 8 or October 9, 1824, where Eliza (being a young, single woman of society) might have danced with the general. This social context is a more likely source of meaningful conversation than any of the large civic dinners that Lafayette attended, where other citizens would likely have taken precedence. It is also more likely than the various public introductions involving young women of Baltimore, as these took place amongst large-scale pomp and circumstance that would not have easily afforded the substantial conversation referenced in their correspondence.

No clarification is provided for the two possible private contexts suggested in Ridgely family lore: one with the Ridgelys of Hampton (the unrelated family into which Eliza would eventually marry), and one with the Ridgelys of Baltimore. According to the former, Eliza entertained Lafayette during a dinner at the Hampton Mansion owned by her future father-in-law Charles Carnan Ridgely. While not implausible, there is no direct corroborating evidence to this effect in contemporary newspapers or Levasseur’s account, none of which record a separate trip to Hampton. Elements in favor of this event taking place include Charles Carnan Ridgely’s position as one of the state’s leading patricians: a former governor, celebrated breeder of racing horses, and renowned host. Charles Carnan Ridgely’s meeting with the Marquis de Lafayette is documented, as he was one of the three representatives of the Maryland Agricultural Society who
Lady with a Harp: Eliza Ridgely, Thomas Sully, 1818. This full-size portrait of Eliza at age fifteen was prominently displayed in the Baltimore townhouse owned by Nicholas G. Ridgely, where they entertained Lafayette. The single-action harp in the portrait was a state-of-the-art instrument in the late eighteenth century, but not ideally suited to the rapid-changing harmonies and chromaticism that were increasingly used in nineteenth-century harp music. Courtesy National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1945.9.1
invited Lafayette to attend the Western Shore Cattle Show organized by the society (which the Marquis did in fact attend, after it was rescheduled to accommodate his itinerary). This large exhibition had more in common with today’s state fairs, being a multifaceted exhibition of technology, agriculture, horticulture, crafts, and livestock. However, Charles Carnan Ridgely was himself sick and not present on the day that Lafayette chose to visit. While Lafayette attended two dinners associated with the Cattle Show, no contemporary accounts either place these at Hampton or suggest that Eliza might have been in attendance.11

A somewhat better-documented meeting is a dinner for Lafayette hosted by Eliza’s father Nicholas G. Ridgely at his Baltimore house on July 30, 1825. This dinner was briefly documented in a Baltimore newspaper and obliquely referenced in an 1826 letter.
by Lafayette (MdL-03), but is also absent in Levasseur’s account. It cannot have been their first meeting, however, because the dinner postdates the Marquis de Lafayette’s first letter by seven months.\textsuperscript{12}

No written invitation or other direct evidence is known to have survived to show how this dinner encounter was arranged. Whether the invitation was delivered orally or in writing, it is likely that Nicholas G. Ridgely communicated the invitation to Lafayette in person. This may have taken place with Nicholas being part of the Baltimore deputation that greeted Lafayette en route, or as part of the large crowd that greeted Lafayette’s arrival at the city docks. Whatever the logistics, Lafayette found his way to the Baltimore townhouse shared by Eliza and her father at 25 Hanover Street. This townhouse was a more suitable venue than Hampton for Eliza to showcase her musical abilities, being equipped with all of the necessary musical accoutrements: Eliza’s famous 1818 Érard concert harp, an 1819 piano, and a blossoming collection of rare French and Italian music.\textsuperscript{13}

This dinner was probably not the first occasion where Lafayette heard Eliza perform—she appears to have been one of the singers at the Sunday mass that Lafayette attended at Baltimore’s Cathedral on October 10, 1824. She is also one of the most likely candidates for the harpist who performed in an elaborate musical piece written for Lafayette by her music teacher Henri-Noël Gilles. At any rate, the dinner at the Ridgely home and its entertainments appear to have engendered remarks about Lafayette’s own musically talented granddaughters, who similarly sang and played the harp and piano, referenced in Lafayette and Eliza’s later correspondence. A physical reminder of the event is an ornate silver ewer on display at the Hampton National Historic Site. This ewer is identified in Ridgely family lore as having first been given to Eliza’s father by the Marquis after he dined in Nicholas G. Ridgely’s Baltimore house, passing into the possession of the Ridgelys of Hampton with Eliza’s marriage.\textsuperscript{14}
Grounding this chronology in the actual letters exchanged by Eliza and Lafayette is especially important because numerous factual errors have crept into the popular account of the pair, thanks to the vagaries of oral history and ungrounded inferences. For example, Lubov Keefer stated in *Baltimore’s Music* that Eliza’s famous 1818 portrait by Thomas Sully showed “her in the process of plucking the strings of her harp for the Marquis,” a claim that continues to be repeated despite the six-year gap between the painting’s well-documented creation and Lafayette’s 1824–1825 visit.15

**New Letters**

A reconstructed chronology of the correspondence between Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely and the Marquis de Lafayette is summarized in the Table below. This chronology includes the three recently (re)discovered autograph letters by Eliza, notes on two missing letters by Eliza, a letter by Samuel Smith to the Marquis announcing Eliza’s upcoming travels, and the ten surviving letters from the Marquis de Lafayette to Eliza that were published by *Maryland Historical Magazine* in 1957. Although the present whereabouts and full contents of the two missing letters (EER-01 and EER-05) remain unknown, some details of their contents can be inferred from internal references in MdL-02 and MdL-09. The letters by Eliza and Samuel Smith are transcribed in full below.16
Notably, none of the presently identified letters by Eliza Ridgely informed the Marquis de Lafayette of her impending 1833–1834 visit to Europe—a visit that included staying with the Marquis at his family estate in La Grange. Given the many repeated invitations issued by Lafayette to Eliza, such an omission might seem surprising—except for the letter of introduction (SS-01) written by their mutual acquaintance Samuel Smith, which fulfilled the function of informing Lafayette. Smith’s letter to the Marquis de Lafayette illustrates the social convention of introductions and claimed privileges, with Smith claiming two duties: informing Lafayette of the Ridgelys’ visit to Europe, and introducing their traveling companion, Miss Sophia Campbell, to him.

More broadly, SS-01 sits within the multi-decade stream of correspondence among the members of the Society of the Cincinnati, in which members increasingly claimed the privileges of introduction as an excuse to write each other.

Based on the 1957 article published in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* and the information reconstructed from extant letters, a chronology of correspondence between Eliza Ridgely and Marquis de Lafayette runs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date, sender, and recipient</th>
<th>Key Contents &amp; Notes</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 29, 1824 Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Marquis de Lafayette’s (MdL) regret at not seeing Eliza Ridgely (EER) again.</td>
<td>MdL-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, c. September 7, 1825 Ridgely to Lafayette</td>
<td>Missing. Hand-delivered by Nicholas G. Ridgely (NGR) on September 8, 1825.</td>
<td>EER-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 9, 1825 Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Regret at not seeing EER again. Acknowledges receipt of a letter from EER hand-delivered by her father, right before the sailing of the <em>Brandywine</em>. Refers to “the first days of their acquaintance.” Refers to conversations with EER and NGR about EER’s visiting Europe.</td>
<td>MdL-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29, 1826 Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Reports conversing with Lt. Dennis Hart Mahan about EER. Visits of the Gallantin family of Baltimore to Paris, and the visits of six Americans to La Grange. Inquires about the marriage of a Miss Magruder.1</td>
<td>MdL-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 1827 Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Refers back to conversation with NGR about EER’s visiting Europe. Refers to “the pleasure to talk of my Baltimore friends” with visitors. Marriages and election to office. Engagement of Natalie de Lafayette.2 Appreciation for “the beautiful music book” given earlier.</td>
<td>MdL-04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Lt. Mahan later became a famous professor at West Point and was the father of the famous naval theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan (1840–1914).
2 Natalie Renée Emilie du Motier de la Fayette (1803–1878).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date, sender, and recipient</th>
<th>Key Contents &amp; Notes</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 1827&lt;br&gt;Ridgely to Lafayette</td>
<td>Relays desire to visit La Grange and the concerns of NGR about the health-related dangers of a sea voyage. Reports on health of Revolutionary War acquaintances. News about Miss Magruder, politics. Mention of Natalie de Lafayette.</td>
<td>EER-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30, 1828&lt;br&gt;Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Congratulates EER on her marriage to John Carnan Ridgely (1790–1867), about which Lafayette read in a Baltimore newspaper. Marriage of Natalie de Lafayette and other granddaughter. Deaths of friends and family.</td>
<td>MdL-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26, 1828&lt;br&gt;Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Refers to reports of John Carnan Ridgely’s marital happiness with EER. Introduction for Miss Verveer.</td>
<td>MdL-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10, 1829&lt;br&gt;Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Refers to lack of response to MdL-05. Remembrances of Miss Magruder, the music book, etc. Birth of Natalie de Lafayette’s child, politics.</td>
<td>MdL-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 1829&lt;br&gt;Ridgely to Lafayette</td>
<td>Reports birth of daughter Eliza and happiness as new parent. Delicate health. Death of Andrew Jackson’s wife. Failure to meet Miss Verveer in person. Hopes for visit to La Grange when family circumstances change.</td>
<td>EER-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 28, 1831&lt;br&gt;Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Refers back to old medical advice for travel to Europe. Inability to visit the U.S. due to French politics. Cause of Polish independence.</td>
<td>MdL-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 1832&lt;br&gt;Ridgely to Lafayette</td>
<td>Notes the 29-month gap in their correspondence. Reports looking for news of MdL. Death of NGR, births of two more children. Hopes to visit France.</td>
<td>EER-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 1833&lt;br&gt;Smith to Lafayette</td>
<td>Letter of introduction for EER’s traveling companion, Miss Sophia Campbell.</td>
<td>SS-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown, c. December 1833–January 1834&lt;br&gt;Ridgely to Lafayette</td>
<td><em>Missing. Referenced in MdL-09 (“I received your good letter, my dear friend…”).</em></td>
<td>EER-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 1834&lt;br&gt;Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>Refers to EER’s visit to La Grange. French politics. Recommendation to see Maria Malibran. Written in French.</td>
<td>MdL-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 16, 1834&lt;br&gt;Lafayette to Ridgely</td>
<td>MdL’s illness. Refers to secondhand reports about EER’s travels in Italy. Death of Cadwallader Colden.</td>
<td>MdL-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first recorded letter by Eliza to the Marquis (EER-01) is referenced in his September 9, 1825, letter (MdL-02):

The disappointment I have felt, in being deprived of the gratification to see you once more, dear Miss Ridgely, could not receive a more soothing consolation than from the kind letter with which you have been pleased to bless me.

Lafayette’s response was written the same day that he sailed back to France on the Brandywine—one of only three that he is known to have written that day, and the only one not concerning his business interests.\(^{19}\)
This letter was spurred in part by the events of the previous day (September 8), when a contingent of citizens from Baltimore had traveled down the Chesapeake via steamer to wish him a final farewell. If Lafayette had been on-schedule, this meeting would never have happened: he had, after all, already given his official farewell in Washington, D.C. However, he elected to enjoy a formal dinner and a second round of farewells with naval officials at St. Mary’s City, Maryland, near the mouth of the Potomac River. The delay allowed the Baltimore contingent just enough time to intercept Lafayette, just as the Brandywine prepared to weigh anchor. As noted in MdL-04, this contingent included Eliza’s father, Nicholas G. Ridgely, who personally presented a letter from his daughter (EER-01) to Lafayette.

Missing in these letters is that the Ridgelys had actually come to Washington, D.C., the previous week to try to visit Lafayette. Whether they were successful is unclear — Lafayette’s packed itinerary included dining at Mount Vernon, a White House reception, receiving a diplomatic delegation from Colombia, and other engagements — but the Ridgely entourage lodged at Washington’s Franklin House Hotel from September 1 to September 4, 1825, before returning to Baltimore. Their hotel bill shows that the traveling entourage was composed of four people: Nicholas G. Ridgely, two ladies (most likely Eliza and her frequent companion Sarah Hand Coleman), and their driver. Whatever their success, they returned to a Baltimore still suffused by Lafayette mania, and on September 8, an all-male group of citizens decided to charter the steamboat Constitution and catch Lafayette one last time. Nicholas G. Ridgely joined this expedition, carrying with him Eliza’s letter, and evidently spoke at some length with Lafayette. Eliza, like the rest of Baltimore’s women, was excluded from the voyage.20

After replying to EER-01 in a letter dated September 9, 1825 (MdL-02), the Marquis de Lafayette wrote Eliza again in 1826 (MdL-03) and 1827 (MdL-04) before receiving a response. The 1827 letter (EER-02) is preserved in the Lafayette family papers that still reside at the family’s historic estate in La Grange, France. Although on-site research access to the La Grange collections, managed by the Fondation Josée-et-René-de-Chambrun has been unavailable due to renovations, the collection is undergoing digitization and is expected to become available to scholars during the fall of 2019. Eliza’s letter was written in Baltimore, carried across the Atlantic via New York on the packet ship Queen Mab, and delivered to Lafayette in Paris via the port of Le Havre: 21

Eliza Ridgely to Marquis de Lafayette (EER-02): 22

Baltimore, October 1st [1827]

A most delightful surprise awaited me on my return from a summer excursion, in your kind and affectionate letter, my dear General. It was doubly gratifying, because [it was] altogether unexpected, for I dared not flatter myself with the hope that you would still continue to feel interested in an individual, whose only claims upon your regard, are a feeling of the
most exalted respect and reverence for your public character, and the warmest gratitude and affection for numerous instances of your condescending kindness. I have been hitherto deterred from writing to you by a fear of obtruding upon that valuable time, which is always occupied in forming or maturing schemes for the benefit of mankind, and I felt that I had no right to withdraw you, even for a short period, from your useful and benevolent pursuits. I am now relieved from that apprehension by the flattering desire which you express to hear from me, and eagerly embrace the first opportunity of thanking you for permitting me to continue a correspondence, productive of so much pride & happiness.

Had it depended upon my own wishes, your kind invitation to La Grange would have been accepted long ere this. But unfortunately my father has conceived the idea that his delicate health was first occasioned by a sea voyage, and he is afraid that another might prove fatal to him. I very often attempt to combat this (in my opinion) erroneous notion, but it is so strongly impressed upon his mind that it will be a long time, I fear, before it is entirely removed. But I do not altogether despair of success as I know his wishes are in my favour, and if persuasion on my part can accomplish this much desired voyage it will yet be effected. We frequently recall the happy period of your visit to our country, that year of jubilee when every part of the Union resounded with acclamations of delighted welcome to our benefactor and friend. It would be almost too much to expect to witness another such joyful spectacle, but we cannot help indulging a hope that America may once more receive you upon her shores.

Your old friend, Col. Howard[,] is becoming rather infirm, but Mr. Carroll still continues to enjoy uninterrupted health and his faculties unimpaired by age. His 90th anniversary was celebrated at the Manor the week before last by a large and gay company. You enquire about the marriage of Miss Magruder, but it was not your friend Helen[,] who continues single. Poor girl, she has been very unfortunate within the last two years in the loss of several members of her family. Both her parents, a brother & a sister have within that period been removed by Death. The last, died only a few days ago, of a slow consumption. She herself has been in good health and makes frequent mention of you when we meet.23

As you are in the constant habit of reading American papers, you are aware that the Presidential question still occupies the attention of the political world, and as the period of the election approaches, public excitement continues to increase. You can probably form a more correct judgement as
to the prospects of success of each candidate than an American citizen, being unbiased by partiality or prejudice.

Permit me to offer my congratulations upon the marriages of your granddaughters and my sincere wishes for their future happiness. I have always felt a peculiar interest in Natalie since you told me she was of the same age with myself, and I still hope to become personally acquainted with her and the rest of your family. To all of them I beg to be respectfully presented. Papa desires to be affectionately remembered to you & to your son, and we both hope always to retain the same portion of your regard that we now enjoy.24

Yours sincerely & respectfully
Eliza E Ridgely.

Eliza’s mention of the Marquis de Lafayette’s granddaughter Natalie not only replies to news of her engagement, but also bespeaks earlier conversation about Lafayette’s granddaughters. This “peculiar interest,” as Eliza described it, reflects their similar age and preoccupations. Many guests at La Grange described Natalie’s beauty, charm, broad literary interests, and musical gifts—which, as with Eliza, included singing, piano, and harp. (Natalie seems also to have borne some physical resemblance to Eliza.) The discussion of the U.S. presidential election of 1828 recalls the controversial election of John Quincy Adams of 1824, which was a frequent topic of conversation during Lafayette’s tour.25

Three more letters from the Marquis de Lafayette (MdL-05, MdL-06, MdL-07) arrived before Eliza’s next recorded response. In them, Lafayette discussed a variety of political and domestic events and congratulated Eliza on her marriage to John Carnan Ridgely (son of Charles Carnan Ridgely), which the Marquis had read about in an imported Baltimore newspaper. While the physical location of this 1829 letter (EER-03) is currently unknown, it is preserved in a microfilm copy at the Archives nationales de France. In it, Eliza replied to the Marquis de Lafayette’s July 26, 1828, letter (MdL-06), reporting on the birth of her first daughter, her father’s activities, and news of President Andrew Jackson and society’s response to the death of his wife.26

Eliza Ridgely to Marquis de Lafayette (EER-03):

Baltimore, Feb 21st 1829

The flattering evidences of regard with which you have honored me, dear General, can never cease to be remembered with pride and gratitudes, although my delay in acknowledging the receipt of your letters may have caused me to appear unmindful of them. But since I last wrote to you, the new duties descending upon me by the change of my situation occupied me so exclusively as to render me negligent of the claims of my correspondents and of society, and since the birth of my little girl which took place about 3 months ago, the delicacy of my health for a time, and since then, the attractions of my novel situation as a mother have confined me a great deal to the nursery. No new ties, however, can lessen the interest that I feel in every thing which concerns you, and the sympathy which I feel for any of you, Honorable General, and the exaltation with which I hear of every new evidences of the public veneration for Your virtues, and the same, as they have once been. And I cannot avoid entertaining the gratifying, [sic] consciousness of that interest being reciprocated, and that it will afford to your noble & benevolent disposition the utmost pleasure to learn that my married life has been hitherto one of unvaried happiness, and that I have found in my husband the same devoted affection and indulgences that have been lavished upon me from my earliest infancy by my dear father. A new
sense of happiness has been added by the birth of my child and the interest with which my father regards the little creature and the great amusement that she appears to afford him by her endearing ways, make her existence doubly welcome to me. He is at present on a visit of business to New York and will only return in time to witness the inauguration of his favourite candidate for the presidency, General Jackson. You will, of course, have heard ere this of the loss that the latter has met with in the death of his lady. All accounts concur in representing him in great affliction at the unexpected event; indeed there was a rumour here that his distress had proved fatal to him, and that his death had quickly succeeded hers, but the alarms of his friends were speedily removed by a contradiction of the report, and intelligence that he was on His way to the seat of government.

I was greatly disappointed that the short stay of Miss Verveer in Baltimore deprived me of an opportunity of making the acquaintance of one who had the happiness of enjoying your esteem. She remained here only two days and although we exchanged visits, we did not meet. She accompanied her father to New York, from whence he intended to embark to Mexico, and she was to return to spend the winter in Washington with the family of the Swedish Ambassador. I hoped that she would make a longer stay in Baltimore on her way to the city, but having received no answer to my repeated inquiries for her I must suppose that she passed speedily through Baltimore.27

My husband desires to present his best regards to you. May I not obtain for him a portion of the regard with which you have honored me? It would gratify him as much as myself to visit you at La Grange but as it does not seem practicable at present we must indulge the hope of doing so at some future period. With my best wishes for your continued health and happiness, I remain with the utmost veneration & regard,

Your sincere friend
E.E. Ridgely.

Comparing the contents of EER-03 with Lafayette’s other correspondence shows several salient details. Notably, details about Eliza’s attempts to meet the “Miss V—” introduced in MdL-06 allow for the latter’s identification as the daughter of Major-General Jan Verveer, a Dutch soldier and diplomat of note. Lafayette also wrote about his meeting with the Verveers to Dr. Benjamin Silliman of New Haven:

Both acquaintances [Major-General Jan Verveer and his daughter] left me the regret [sic] of their sudden departure, as they are to sail by the next packet. I
found Miss Verveer a most agreeable young lady, and what won my heart, a most decided Connecticut patriot, as she has been educated in New Haven, and is returning to your so justly beloved city. I would feel a great pleasure to think I may somewhat contribute to the welcome to which her accomplishments and American feelings justly entitle her, and I thought the object would be in some measure attained by giving her the pleasant charge of a letter to you.

The timing of this latter letter, dated four days after Lafayette’s letter to Eliza, illustrates the relative esteem with which Lafayette held Eliza amongst his many correspondents. The timing and detail about the Verveers’ imminent departure further suggests that MdL-06 was written to send via the very same mail packet ship taken by the Verveer family. Because it was very common for travelers to carry friends and associates’ letters across the Atlantic, one reason for this haste may have been Lafayette’s asking the Verveers to convey MdL-06 on his behalf—providing an occasion for one of the visits that Miss Verveer exchanged with Eliza.

A full year and a half passed before the next letter between Eliza and the Marquis. This interval was marked on one side of the Atlantic by growing unrest in France, the Revolution of 1830, and the establishment of the July Monarchy of Louis-Phillipe—events that drew Lafayette back into the forefront of the political sphere. On the American shore, several family events conspired to hold Eliza’s attention. First, her father-in-law Charles Carnan Ridgely suffered a series of paralytic attacks in May and July of 1829, succumbing to the latter and dying on July 27; an even greater trauma followed when Eliza’s own father Nicholas G. Ridgely died on December 28. Dispersing the assets of each estate and managing their disparate financial entanglements was a drawn-out affair including multiple lawsuits, on top of which came the reorganization of the (much smaller after subdivision) Hampton estate and ongoing allout from the manumission of many of its enslaved workers.

Another event during the interval was the birth of Eliza’s son Charles Ridgely, on March 22, 1830—a welcome joy, but also a significant draw on Eliza’s time and attention during an already busy and transformative period. Thus, when Lafayette opened his September 28, 1831, letter to Eliza (MdL-08) with the words “It is an age since I had the pleasure to hear from you,” it is fair to say that both were living in different periods in their life than when they had first met. His world was increasingly circumscribed by advancing age and the political turmoil of the July Monarchy, and hers by motherhood and becoming the mistress of a large agricultural estate.

There are several notable aspects of this letter that clarify aspects of the pair’s relationship and American interactions. Lafayette referred to “the acquaintance of Mr. Ridgely with this side of the Atlantic,” a reference to John C. Ridgely’s own Grand Tour of Europe during the summer of 1823. Since this information was not mentioned in EER-02 or EER-03, it suggests that Lafayette had become acquainted with Eliza’s future husband during his 1824–1825 tour of America—perhaps at the hypothesized
but still unconfirmed dinner at Hampton. Lafayette also referred to Eliza’s “inclination a few years ago” and “old medical advice” to visit Europe. The first is now recognizable as a reference to sentiments expressed in EER-02, and the latter as a reference to Eliza’s protracted illness from June 1818 to March 1819 — during which her father spent a small fortune on medicines and several doctors suggested a trip to southern Europe to recuperate.30

Lafayette (right) embracing Louis-Phillipe, King of France in a propaganda image by Antoine Maurin. Lithograph by de Lemercier, 1830. The caption reads “Here is the king that we needed. It is the best of republics,” a remark commonly attributed to Lafayette. Lafayette College, Skillman Library, Special Collections & College Archives, Marquis de Lafayette Prints Collection, XI.17.b
Lafayette also mentioned in this letter that he asked American travelers for news about Eliza. This was not an idle social remark, but in fact a regular habit corroborated by multiple travelers to La Grange. The account by D. S. Wilson is of particular interest, noting that,

As soon as he [Lafayette] had read the letter which I delivered, he began to enquire about his Baltimore friends, exhibiting the greatest interest and the most perfect recollection. He enquired particularly about the young ladies of his acquaintance and wished to know who was married since he left us. He spoke of Miss Ridgely who is a great favourite of his and wished that her father would bring her to France . . . .31

Wilson’s recollection of Lafayette’s granddaughter Matilda is also noteworthy, as it suggests (as with Natalie) a number of striking parallels with Eliza:

A most beautiful and fascinating little creature, having a fair complexion, lovely blue eyes and a profusion of rather light brown hair luxuriantly shading her forehead. She is very lively, her manner extremely charming and she speaks English in the prettiest manner imaginable and very correctly. She is quite accomplished, understanding something of Italian also and having read a great many English books, all of Walter Scott’s works, Lord Byron’s, Cooper’s, &c.32

Seven months elapsed before Eliza took up her pen to write a response to Lafayette’s 1831 letter. This letter (EER-04, dated only as “April 20th”) is preserved in Cornell University’s Arthur H. and Mary Marden Dean Lafayette Collection. Although the letter’s written date does not include a year, internal references to Eliza’s children establish it as having been written in 1832. This time, Eliza cited the tender age of her children as the sole remaining barrier to visiting Lafayette, as her husband was (unlike her reticent and health-conscious father) an eager guardian for such a journey.33
Eliza Ridgely to Marquis de Lafayette (EER-04):³

Baltimore April 20th [1832]

It was with infinite pride and delight that I received such a gratifying proof of remembrance from my venerated friend as his letter afforded. So long an interval had elapsed without hearing from him, that I dared not flatter myself he still remembered the individual in whom he once so kindly interested himself.

It has always been a source of the highest gratification for one to learn through the medium of the newspaper of your welfare, for on the arrival of every packet from Europe, they never fail to contain information upon a subject so interesting to every American. By them, we are apprised of your constant efforts to procure for the whole civilized world that liberty of
which you have ever been the consistent champion. How then could I expect to be remembered when so many weighty and important affairs occupy your valuable time? You may imagine then how pleasing a surprise I experienced when your letter was delivered to me.

Many changes have occurred to me since I last wrote to you. Of the death of my dear father you doubtless learned and it is needless for me to touch upon the anguish it occasioned as you can well imagine how much I must have felt the loss of such an indulgent parent. I am now the mother of three children, two girls and a boy, the eldest of which 3 years and a half, the youngest four months old. I will not apologize for these domestik [sic] details, as I cannot help flattering myself that you will feel an interest in whatever concerns me, besides it explains the reason why it was not in my power to accept your repeated invitations to visit France, my children being too young to undertake the voyage and I could not think of going without them. My husband would I believe willingly go with me for he is always disposed to be indulgent to my wishes. We still hope to accomplish the voyage at some future time, in the meanwhile we shall not despair of seeing you once again in the country where you are regarded as a father. Present me, dear General to your amiable family, with whom I hope at some future day to become personally acquainted.

And believe me with the highest respect and veneration your friend

E E Ridgely.35

Samuel Smith

Perhaps the most conspicuous omission from the Ridgely-Lafayette correspondence is the lack of a letter from Eliza to the Marquis to apprise him of her and John C. Ridgely’s impending 1834–1835 tour of Europe. While a detailed itinerary of this tour has yet to be reconstructed and details of its advance planning are unclear, the omission should be understood in the context of the early-nineteenth-century practice of letters of introduction. The honor of informing Lafayette fell to (or, more precisely, was claimed by) a mutual friend: General Samuel Smith of Baltimore.

As mentioned before, Smith was no stranger to Lafayette. He was also a highly public figure in Maryland, who followed his Revolutionary War service with a distinguished, four-decade Congressional career that did not stop him from serving as a major general during the War of 1812. Throughout his political career, Smith kept in touch with Lafayette through letters. This warmth was reciprocated: in the fall of 1824, with the first stages of Lafayette’s American tour underway, Lafayette wrote Smith to
express his excitement at their pending reunion in Baltimore. When Lafayette made his triumphant entrance into Baltimore on October 8, 1824, Samuel Smith was one of the high-ranking military officers assembled to greet him. Lafayette even singled out his friend for praise during his remarks to the assembled crowd. A measure of their friendship—and, it seems likely, Lafayette’s interest in Eliza—is the fact that Samuel Smith and Nicholas G. Ridgely were the only two private citizens whose invitations to dinner Lafayette accepted.36

By 1833, Samuel Smith and Lafayette were corresponding at a frequency of roughly once per year, writing about a mix of state and personal business. Following Lafayette’s American tour, the focus of many of their letters increasingly shifted from the common reporting on mutual acquaintances and political events to each introducing travelers and employment-seekers to the other. This was in many ways a natural reflection of their increasing age and ability to use a well-developed network of social contacts, but also the sort of activity in which many other retired politicians indulged. Smith’s letter to Lafayette (SS-01) introducing Sophia Campbell, in which he almost incidentally mentioned Eliza Ridgely’s pending visit, therefore sits squarely within their correspondence stream and the practice of writing letters of introduction—some mailed, some hand-delivered. This practice is documented in Dunbar’s 1834 Complete Handbook of Etiquette, whose contemporaneous guidelines closely match the contents of Smith’s brief letter:

A letter of introduction must be carefully worded, stating clearly the name of the person introduced, but with as few personal remarks as possible. It suffices, in most cases, to say that so-and-so is a friend of yours whom you trust your other friend will receive with attention . . . . you should never give such a letter unless you can speak highly of the bearer.37

A notable detail in Smith’s letter is that Miss Campbell was traveling with the general’s groomsmen for escort. This testifies to a lingering social and practical requirement that women travel with male escorts—the same requirement that prevented Eliza from visiting the Marquis in France during the first nine years of their acquaintance. In her 1827 letter to the Marquis de Lafayette, Eliza mentioned her father escorting her as an intrinsic part of any proposal for overseas travel. Because Nicholas G. Ridgely had feared that either of them might take seriously ill during a sea voyage and the pair had suffered several health scares in the 1810s and 1820s, his fears ultimately vetoed any overseas travel by Eliza prior to her marriage. After Eliza’s marriage, her husband John C. Ridgely could claim primacy as her escort—but by that point childbearing and other events intervened to make it impractical so long as she had infant children.38

Samuel Smith’s letter, written a year and a day after the last exchange between Eliza and the Marquis, reads as follows:
Samuel Smith to Marquis de Lafayette (SS-01):\textsuperscript{39}

Baltimore 21 April 1833

General La Fayette

My dear Sir,

Permit me to have the honor of presenting Miss Sophia Campbell, a young lady who you have been presented to in this city. She visits France in company with your friend Mrs. Ridgely\[[,]\] whose health is delicate, and which it is hoped will be restored by a Sea Voyage. The family of Miss Campbell are becoming the most respectable of your adopted country and\[[,]\] since, my most respectable friend\[\]s.

Accept my sincere thanks for your polite attention to my Groomsman

William Fistor\[[,]\]

and believe me\[[,]\] I am\[[,]\]

Your Sincere Friend

and Brother Soldier

S. Smith

The allusion to Eliza's delicate health is an important detail—as is what goes unmentioned. Earlier that year, Eliza's daughter Priscilla had passed away from illness, a parental trauma that doubtless magnified perceptions of Eliza's own illness. Fully a decade and a half after a doctor first proposed that Eliza take an extended voyage to Europe to regain her health, Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely finally decided to take that trip. One of the first stops was to visit Lafayette and his family at La Grange.\textsuperscript{40}

Epilogue

No detailed accounts are currently known of the Ridgely family's visit to La Grange, but secondary evidence suggests that the party was warmly received and celebrated. By winter, however, the Ridgelys were in central and southern Italy; after visiting Rome, Eliza penned a now-missing letter to the Marquis (EER-05) to update him on their travels. Lafayette's reply (MdL-09), written on Valentine's Day of 1834, suggests that he sent them off with a list of travel recommendations and several letters of introduction, including one used by the Ridgelys to meet the French Ambassador to the Papal States.\textsuperscript{41}

There are several notable features about the contents of the letter MdL-09. Unlike the rest of their surviving correspondence, it was written by a secretary and written in French. The use of a secretary was attributed by Lafayette to his being bedridden by illness. The choice of French, unremarked upon in the letter itself, may be no more than a concession to the secretary's own language fluencies. However, it also serves as one of the best contemporary attestations for Eliza's ongoing proficiency in French,
which she had studied extensively in boarding school. Lafayette’s request that she give his regards to “la petite voyageuse” suggests a grandfather-like enchantment with small children, particularly as coupled with a similar report on the health of one of his great-grandchildren. He also recommends that Eliza see the famous opera singer Maria Malibran performing in Bologna.42

There is much still to be written about Lafayette’s relationship with Maria Malibran, a person with whom he corresponded regularly. Lafayette and Malibran referred to each other in their letters in terms of intimate friendship; Lafayette also attempted to intervene in both personal and political matters (with mixed success) to try and facilitate the singer’s divorce. When writing to Eliza, however, Lafayette omitted these background details, instead referring to Malibran more distantly as being “endowed with the most amiable qualities” and “the greatest singer and actor in Europe.” It was a worthy recommendation, informed by Lafayette’s regular visits to the Paris Opera and reflecting their mutual interest in that art form. While it is unclear whether Eliza was able to meet Malibran, Eliza did make many purchases of sheet music and opera scores during the trip— including some corresponding to roles that Malibran played.43

MdL-09 also referenced information in EER-05, including Eliza’s intention to extend a planned return visit to Paris (and, likely, her European travels in general). This explains Lafayette’s many detailed remarks about the weather, including the statement that “There has not been one day with ice.” This comment echoed earlier remarks in MdL-07 where the Marquis downplayed the cold of the Parisian climate, comparing La Grange favorably to Baltimore. This view was expressed in his last letter to Eliza, dated
March 16, 1834 (MdL-10), where he called the winter “uncommonly mild.” Sadly, that hoped-for final visit did not take place: the Marquis de Lafayette passed away from his protracted illness on May 20, 1834, before the Ridgelys’ return to Paris. Before his passing, though, the Marquis noted in his last letter that he had heard tales of the Ridgelys’ travels in Italy from other Americans—the last bridge in a decade-long, transatlantic correspondence and an intimate but platonic friendship between the “Lady with a Harp” and the “Hero of the Two Worlds.”
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**NOTES**

1. A remnant of the Hampton estate, comprising the mansion, numerous outbuildings, and sixty-two acres of the grounds, has been owned and operated by the National Park Service as the Hampton National Historic Site since 1948. Eliza is referred to in some later sources as Eliza Eichelberger (Ridgely) Ridgely, so as to distinguish her from her other family members and to acknowledge that Ridgely was her name before and after her marriage. Throughout her life, however, Eliza herself signed her name as, variously, “Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely,” “Eliza E. Ridgely,” “E. E. Ridgely,” and “E.E.R.” Following her marriage, Eliza’s friends tended to refer to her in writing as “Mrs. Ridgely,” while newspapers and magazines used “Mrs. John Ridgely,” “Mrs. John C. Ridgely,” and “Mrs. Ridgely of Hampton.”

3. In addition to logistical and safety concerns, some female travelers worried about social stigmas that might arise from traveling without male family company. Two spinster sisters from Scotland, Frances and Camilla Wright, accompanied Lafayette on some of his 1824–1825 travels. Before setting out, Frances famously proposed that Lafayette legally adopt them to silence anticipated criticisms and claims that they were having an affair. Lafayette did not consent to the adoption request and required that they travel and lodge separately from his main entourage, although the Wrights were also lodged by Thomas Jefferson at Monticello. The outspoken Frances, among other things a crossdresser and opponent of marriage, was pilloried in public and private by both contemporary and later writers. Lloyd Kramer, *Lafayette in Two Worlds: Public Cultures and Personal Identities in an Age of Revolutions* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 158.


5. This practice was not limited to a particular region or newspaper. An article on Lafayette’s visit in the Richmond *Enquirer*, for example, listed twenty-five local men by name and no women. The *Baltimore Patriot* listed twenty local men by name in its account of a Masonic dinner with Lafayette. A piece in the *New Hampshire Gazette* on Lafayette’s arrival in Boston listed seventeen men by name; its only mention of women in a crowd of more than 70,000 was “the continual waving of the white handkerchiefs of our fair country women.” See: “Domestic. Gen. La Fayette in Virginia,” *Enquirer*, October 26, 1824, 1; “Boston, Aug. 25–Our Nation and City’s Benefactor,” *New Hampshire Gazette*, August 31, 1824, 2; “Masonic Dinner to Lafayette,” *Baltimore Patriot and Mercantile Advertiser*, December 28, 1824, 2.

6. Gottschalk et al., *Lafayette: A Guide*, 269–88. The letters to women that do not bear names either begin with feminine addresses (e.g. “Madame”) or terms of endearment (“Amie”).


8. Nicholas G. Ridgely’s middle name is spelled “Greenberry” in some sources. Levasseur does note visits to “several farms in the vicinity” after attending the Western Shore Cattle Show. Auguste Levasseur, *Lafayette en Amérique en 1824 et 1825, ou Journal d’un Voyage aux Etats-unis* (Paris: Baudouin, 1829), 2:3. The story of Lafayette dining at Hampton was col-
lected by National Park Service researchers from interviews with members of the Ridgely family, and separately told to me by descendants of the family. It is also related as fact in Bess Paterson Shipe, “Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely, the ‘Lady with a Harp,’” *Maryland Historical Magazine* 77, no. 3 (Fall 1982), 232, and briefly referenced on page 4 of the finding aid for the Ridgely Family Papers, ca. 1750–1980, MS 001, Hampton National Historic Site, Towson, MD, accessed on May 1, 2019, nps.gov/hamp/learn/historyculture/upload/RIDGELY%20FAMILY%20PAPERS%20Finding%20Aid.pdf.

9. This is how the Baltimore delegation to New York in August 1824 was described in a contemporary newspaper: “The Mayor of Baltimore has sent a committee of citizens to New York to congratulate LA FAYETTE on his arrival, and welcome him to Baltimore, whenever it shall suit his convenience to come.” Unknown newspaper clipping, Arthur H. and Mary Marden Dean Lafayette Collection, #4611, Box 7, Folder 12, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, NY. The dates for the listed visits are taken from J. Bennett Nolan, *Lafayette in America Day by Day* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1934), 244, 253, 260–61, 264–67, 269–70, 299–300, 305. Nolan provides a useful but far from comprehensive guide to domestic newspaper coverage of Lafayette’s activities. The various sources do not always agree. For example, Foster, “Lafayette’s Letters,” 235, reports Lafayette as being in Baltimore on October 12, 1824; however, Levasseur reports that Lafayette and his entourage actually spent the night of October 11–12 at an inn between Baltimore and Washington. Foster, 234–35, similarly conflicts with Levasseur by reporting the second visit as November 23–29 and the third visit as December 26–28.

10. Lafayette’s arrival in Baltimore on October 8, 1824, was greeted by a group of young women: “At the entrance of Baltimore was a very handsome triumphal arch, supported on four beautiful Ionic columns. Under this arch, twenty-four young ladies, dressed in white and crowned with myrtle, each holding a lance on which was written the name of a State, and thus representing the twenty-four States of the Union, received the Nation’s Guest, encircled him with garlands, and crowned him with laurel.” [Eliza Ware Farrar], *The Story of the Life of Lafayette, as Told by a Father to His Children* (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, Little, & Wilkins, 1831), 185. The problems of conversing in a large public gathering were noted by contemporaries—*Niles’ Register* noted that on October 8, 1824, at the dinner and ball in Lafayette’s honor at the Holliday Street Theatre and adjacent Assembly Rooms, “those [ladies] who wished a more particular introduction, took an opportunity of obtaining it at some other convenient time of the evening.” H. Niles, ed., “The Nation’s Guest,” *Niles’ Weekly Register*, vol. 27, pt. 3 (September 1824–March 1825): 108. This was in contrast to the supper preceding the October 8, 1824, ball, when ladies (but not men) were cycled out of the room in groups, allowing more people to say that they had dined with the General. *Ibid.*, 109. At other occasions, such as on October 9, 1824, “When the General returned to his lodgings he was engaged from twelve to two o’clock in receiving the visits and congratulations of the ladies of Baltimore, a very large number of whom eagerly availed themselves of this opportunity to be presented to him.” *Ibid.*, 110.

11. Few specifics on this alleged dinner (and meeting) have come down through the years. Several versions were told to me by various Ridgely family descendants in 2018 and 2019, all notably lacking on specifics. Examples of this claim being relayed include: Henry George Hahn and Carl Behm, *Towson: A Pictorial History of a Maryland Town* (Norfolk: Donning Co., 1977), 21; Alexander Bird, “The Hampton Mansion and the Ridgely Estate,” *Towson Lifestyle*, February 28, 2018, towsonlifestyle.com/2018/02/28/the-hampton-mansion-
and-the-ridgely-estate; Maryland State Society DAR Historic Preservation Committee, “Hampton National Historic Site,” Daughters of the American Revolution, accessed May 1, 2019, dar.org/national-society/historic-sites-and-properties/hampton-national-historic-site. Shipe described it as fact, stating “Lafayette was entertained at Hampton. He dined with the family in their dining room, sitting at the head of the table,” but without citing sources. Bess Paterson Shipe, “Eliza Eichelberger Ridgely,” 232. This dinner is not described by Levasseur, who acknowledged some gaps in his account because of a shipwreck in which Lafayette’s whole entourage lost many letters and papers. Levasseur, Lafayette en Amérique, 2: 354–56. It is not inconceivable that Eliza and Nicholas would have been present at a dinner hosted by Charles Carnan Ridgely, as Eliza’s father Nicholas G. Ridgely was also a member of the Maryland Agricultural Society and owned a farming estate in addition to his city business. The two families also both attended St. Paul’s Episcopal Church in Baltimore. For information on the Maryland Agricultural Society’s invitation to Lafayette, see: “Proceedings of a special meeting of members of the Maryland agricultural society,” The American Farmer, Containing Original Essays and Selections on Rural Economy and Internal Improvements, with Illustrative Engravings and Prices Current of County Produce (1819–1834) 6, no. 30 (Oct. 15, 1824): 239–40.


14. While Eliza herself was Episcopalian and gently mocked Catholicism in private letters, Lafayette’s visit inspired many churches along his itinerary to mount elaborate musical services and concerts. These required mobilizing whatever skilled singers and instrumentalists were available, regardless of denomination. The service at the Baltimore Cathedral thus had the normal choir augmented by a group of women studying with its choirmaster John Nenninger and assistant choirmaster Henri-Noël Gilles—both of whom were Eliza’s respected music teachers. Levasseur found this to be noteworthy, commenting on the “large number of distinguished pupils” in the choir and the women’s skill in particular. Levasseur, Lafayette en Amérique, 1:348. The specific Mass setting remarked on by Levasseur is likely the unpublished “Messe à 4 voix par H. N. Gilles” preserved in the MdHS sheet music collection’s Box 108, Gilles MSS, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. The exact performance date of the concert piece written by Gilles is not known. See: Henri-Noël Gilles, Soirée donnée au Gl. La Fayette chez un ancien compagnon d’armes par Mr. H. Gilles et ses élèves, paroles de Mr. E. Ducatel, choeur et solo avec accompagnement de piano, harpe et clarinette, with English poetry, adapted to the music (Baltimore: G. Willig, n.d.). The silver ewer is not individually listed amongst Nicholas G. Ridgely’s various wills or inventories, which aggregate his collection of silver plate by weight and value in these lists. See: Hoyt collection of Ridgely papers, 1716–1970, Series VI: Nicholas Greenberry Ridgely Papers (1814–1882), MS2891, Box 3, Folders 62–63, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. For a description of the ewer (HAMP3509), see also the Hampton National Historic Site, Towson, MD, accessed on May 1, 2019, nps.
15. Lubov Keefer, *Baltimore's Music: The Haven of the American Composer* (Baltimore: J. H. Furst Co., 1962), 79. Keefer also misstates Eliza’s birth year and attributes specific repertoire to her based on inferences from the musical scores owned by the Hampton National Historic Site, rather than concrete evidence. Aside from internal records at Hampton, there is not currently a comprehensive catalogue of this music, hereafter referred to as the Ridgely Family Music Collection. An in-depth cataloguing by this author is forthcoming of the collection portions acquired by Eliza.


17. Lt. Mahan (1802–1871) later became a famous professor at West Point and was the father of the famous naval theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan (1840–1914).


20. Bill from Franklin House Hotel to Nicholas Ridgely, September 1825, Ridgely Papers, 1664–1882, MS692, Box 10, Reel 12, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

21. I am grateful to Marie-Alpais Dumoulin-Torcheboeuf from the Foundation for identifying this letter in response to my query, and for providing a digital copy of this letter. For information on the *Queen Mab* and the transatlantic postal process, see: Mary W. M. Har- greaves and James F. Hopkins, eds., *The Papers of Henry Clay, Volume 6: Secretary of State 1827* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1981), 59.

22. Eliza E. Ridgely to Lafayette, October 1, n.y., Fonds Lafayette, CP306, Fondation Josée-et-René-de-Chambrun, Courpalay, France. Research inquiries and requests to access holdings should be addressed to the Fondation Josée et René de Chambrun, 6 bis place du Palais-Bourbon 75007 Paris, contact@fondationchambrun.org. The back of the letter contains two French postage stamp impressions indicating that the letter was processed in Le Havre, France, and was postmarked there on November 17, 1827. In each transcription, I have elected to preserve the original punctuation, capitalization, and spelling, as these often provide revealing details about the writers. Eliza’s letters, for example, show many archaisms that have clear connections to her literary tastes, such as her love of Walter Scott novels. In a few cases, clarifying details and punctuation have been added in square brackets for the benefit of the reader.

23. John Eager Howard (1752–1827) was a decorated veteran of the Battle of Cowpens, delegate to the Continental Congress, governor of Maryland (1788–1791), and U.S. senator (1796–1803). He was one of many Revolutionary War heroes who greeted Lafayette on his 1824 return to Baltimore. Some twenty-four years after this letter, his granddaughter Margaretta Sophia Howard married Eliza’s son Charles. Charles Carroll of Carrollton (1737–1832), the longest-lived signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a Ridgely family friend; Lafayette visited Carroll during his 1824–1825 travels. The birthday celebrations that Eliza
refers to were counted by Charles Carroll himself as his ninety-first (counting from Year 1, rather than Year 0), took place on September 18, 1827, and are described at length in Ralph D. Gray and Gerald E. Hartdagen, "A Glimpse of Baltimore Society in 1827: Letters by Henry D. Gilpin," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 69, no. 3 (Fall 1974), 266–69. Eliza’s close friend Martha Helen Magruder (d. 1833 or 1834), the daughter of Maryland judge Richard B. Magruder, married Charles Tiernan on April 27, 1831. “Married,” *Baltimore Patriot and Mercantile Advertiser*, April 28, 1831, 2; the wedding day is listed incorrectly as April 28 in Charles B. Tiernan, *The Tiernan Family in Maryland* (Baltimore: Gallery & McCann, 1898), 159–60. David H. Williams, ed. *The American Almanac and Repository of Useful Knowledge* (Boston: David H. Williams, 1843), 16:319.

24. Natalie Renée Emilie du Motier de La Fayette (1803–1878) was one of the Marquis de Lafayette’s granddaughters. She was mentioned in MdL-09 as “Natalie Périer,” her married name.

25. For a description of Natalie circa 1829, see: Robert Dale Owen, *Threading My Way: Twenty-Seven Years of Autobiography* (New York: G. W. Carleton & Co., 1874), 283. Natalie was painted several times by Ary Scheffer in the 1810s and 1820s, who also used her face and figure as a model in several of his more famous paintings. Owen thought the resemblance especially true to life in Scheffer’s *Mignon aspirant au ciel*, which shows a woman in white with light brown hair, lithe figure, and facial features similar to Eliza’s in her 1818 portrait by Thomas Sully. For a discussion of the election, see: Levasseur, *Lafayette en Amérique*, 2:47–50, 576–78.

26. The newspaper was likely *Niles’ Weekly Register*, which Lafayette praised as one of his favorite newspapers. D. S. Wilson, “Visit to General Lafayette at La Grange, November 18, 1826. [Extract from a letter of D. S. Wilson, Esq.],” *Maryland Historical Magazine* 2, no. 4 (December 1907), 312. The microfilm copy of EER-03 is deposited in Fonds Lafayette (XVIIIe–XIXe siècles), MI 215, Boules 8, Archives nationales, Paris, France. This film is labeled as based on the archives of Cornell University; however, the letter is not currently recorded in the latter’s collection catalogue. It was identified through an exhaustive review of Lafayette microfilms at the Archives nationales.

27. Jan Verveer (1775–1838), a native of the Netherlands, was the Dutch military governor of St. Maarten from 1807 to 1810. His later career included diplomatic service in Central America, including representing the Netherlands at the 1826 Congress of Panama. In 1828, he was charged with negotiating a treaty with the Federal Republic of Central America to build a transoceanic canal in modern-day; Verveer and his daughter visited Baltimore and New York City through the invitation of U.S. Secretary of State Henry Clay, who offered the family free passage to New York to Curaçao on a U.S. navy vessel. Robert Seager II, *The Papers of Henry Clay. Volume 7: Secretary of State, January 1, 1828–March 4, 1829* (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1982), 418–419.

28. Lafayette to Benjamin Silliman, New Haven, July 30, 1828, reprinted in George Park Fisher, *Life of Benjamin Silliman, M.D. Late Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Geology in Yale College* (Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1866), 1:330–331. Lafayette’s statement that Miss Verveer had been educated “in New Haven,” given the limited options for women’s formal education at the time, suggests that she had been a student at the New Haven Female Seminary (f.1819). Private travelers carrying letters across the Atlantic was a common favor at the time, often indicated by either the lack of postmark on an envelope or the presence of only a domestic postmark on a clearly international letter. Lafayette used the


30. Jackson Kemper, the husband of Eliza’s schoolmaster Jerusha Lyman, even invited Eliza to join his family on a trip to Pisa for this purpose: Jackson Kemper to N. G. Ridgely, July 28, 1818, Ridgely papers, 1664–1882, MS692, Box 7, Reel 7, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. There is no indication that Eliza’s husband and Lafayette ever corresponded; aside from business correspondence, few personal letters by John Carnan Ridgely survive.


33. Although the bulk of the parent collection at Cornell University was acquired in the 1960s, detailed cataloguing was not complete until the 1990s, well after the 1975 publication of Gottschalk et al., *Lafayette: A Guide to the Letters, Documents, and Manuscripts in the United States*. This lag in collection cataloguing is not uncommon, and continues to limit awareness of and research on other collections of Lafayette papers. I first identified the letter using Cornell University’s updated finding aid for the collection (rmc.library.cornell.edu/EAD/htmldocs/RMM04611.html), then matched the signature against other documents. This letter can be conclusively dated to 1832 based on the ages given internally for Eliza Ridgely White Buckler (the eldest child) and Priscilla Ridgely (the youngest).

34. E. E. Ridgely to Lafayette, April 20, n.y.: Arthur H. and Mary Marden Dean Lafayette Collection, #4611, Box 79, Folder 42, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, Ithaca, NY.

35. Eliza’s children were Charles Ridgely (1830–1872), Eliza Ridgely White Buckler (1828–1894), and Priscilla Ridgely (1831–1833).

36. Marquis de Lafayette to Samuel Smith, New York, September 21, 1824. This letter was sold at auction at Christie’s on June 19, 2014: “Lot 17: LAFAYETTE, Gilbert du Motier,
Marquis (1757–1834), Revolutionary war general. Autograph letter signed ("Lafayette"), to Samuel Smith (1752–1839), New York, 21 September 1824, accessed on May 1, 2019, christies.com/lotfinder/books-manuscripts/lafayette-gilbert-du-motier-marquis-revolution-5808850-details.aspx, and its whereabouts are currently unknown. See also: Samuel L. Knapp, ed., Memoirs of General Lafayette. With an account of his visit to America, and of his reception by the people of the United States; from his arrival, August 15th, to the celebration at Yorktown, October 19th, 1824 (Boston: E. G. House, 1824), 231–32. Smith's mother had hosted Lafayette for a visit during the Revolution. Frank A. Cassell, Merchant Congress-man in the Young Republic: Samuel Smith of Maryland, 1752–1839 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1971), 233. Smith also served as the vice president of the Maryland State Colonization Society in 1828—an organization in which Eliza was later known to have been active—and served as Mayor of Baltimore from 1835 to 1838, after he retired from the Senate for the last time. John S. Pancake, Samuel Smith and the Politics of Business, 1752–1839 (University, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1972), 173.


38. Attitudes towards unmarried and/or unescorted women traveling overseas in the nineteenth century varied tremendously by place and period, and defy easy categorization or trend-mapping. For a brief survey of trailblazing women travelers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, see: Rachel G. Fuchs and Victoria E. Thompson, Women in Nineteenth-Century Europe (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 121–23.


40. Nicholas G. Ridgely spent a small fortune on medical care and pharmaceuticals for himself and his extended family. He was sufficiently worried by angina pectoris in 1821 that he pre-emptively drew up a new will. See, for example: F. Ridgely, Baltimore, to Nicholas G. Ridgely, Baltimore, September 21, 1821, Ridgely Papers, 1664–1882, MS692, Box 8, Reel 8, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore. For Eliza’s health issues, see, for example: Nicholas G. Ridgely to Dr. George Brown, Baltimore, July 2, 1818, and Nicholas G. Ridgely to Dr. Dorsey, Philadelphia, July 2, 1818, Ridgely Papers, 1664–1882, MS692, Box 8, Reel 8, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

41. Louis-Clair de Beaupoil, comte de Saint-Aulaire (1778–1854).

42. As Priscilla Ridgely died shortly before Eliza’s first voyage to Europe, “la petite voyageuse” refers to Eliza’s eldest daughter, the future Eliza Ridgely White Buckler.

43. Malibran’s husband strongly resisted Lafayette’s entreaty that he cooperate with Malibran’s attempts to divorce him. When that failed, Lafayette lobbied legislators to re-legalize divorce in France. This measure passed in the lower house of the French legislature but was ultimately vetoed by the Chamber of Peers. See, for example: Howard Bushnell, Maria Malibran: A Biography of the Singer (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1979), 125. More than a dozen opera scores in the Ridgely Family Music Collection at the Hampton National Historic Site correlate with operas playing in cities that Eliza visited during her 1833–1834 tour of Europe.
Harry Darcey Gough, attributed to Gilbert Stuart, oil on canvas, c.1860. Collection of the Maryland State Archives, MSA SC 1545-296
Harry Dorsey Gough and Agricultural Improvement in Maryland, 1774–1808

BENJAMIN HUDSON

In 1799, an English expatriate named Richard Parkinson was renting a property called Orange Hill outside Baltimore. One day he paid a call on his neighbor Harry Dorsey Gough. Parkinson recalled that, in the course of their conversation,

[Mr. Gough] told me that he thought of being a Mr. Bakewell: but it would not do in America. He put me in mind of the quaker [sic] in England, who, being asked in court by a counsellor what he meant by saying likewise and also? replied—"Lord Kenyon is a great lawyer; thou art also, but not like-wise."—Thus Mr. Gough was also, but not like-wise, as Mr. Bakewell.¹

Perhaps one had to be there in order to appreciate Parkinson’s witticism, but he made a valid point. Historians will recognize the reference to Robert Bakewell of Dishley at Longborough in Leicestershire, England, who revolutionized livestock breeding with his experiments in line-breeding that produced Longhorn cattle and Dishley (now known as Improved Leicester) sheep. More obscure is the other man, Maryland native Harry Dorsey Gough (1745–1808). He was one of America’s agricultural pioneers and his career spanned four decades, from the eve of the Revolutionary War to almost the eve of the War of 1812. On his estate called Perry Hall, located about fifteen miles north of Baltimore harbor along the Gunpowder River, Gough employed new methods in cultivation and stock-rearing that he exhibited to visitors, including Richard Parkinson. Among his innovations was the importation of the first improved breed of cattle—Shorthorns—into North America.²

Harry Dorsey Gough was active during the agricultural revolution of the eighteenth century, which made possible the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century. Prior to the War of Independence, Britain’s North American colonies were a part of an Anglo-Atlantic agricultural network that extended from the British Isles to the West Indies to the western shores of the North Atlantic. In addition to commodities, ideas
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from individuals at all levels of society circulated. There was the promotion of crop rotation and innovations in livestock feed made by Charles, second Viscount Townshend (popularly known as “Turnip Townshend”), or the seed drill developed by the lawyer Jethro Tull, in addition to tenant farmers Robert and Charles Colling’s cattle improvement work. Early agricultural improvement in North America is often viewed as mere imitation of European—specifically, British—methods. There is some truth in this and few men, such as Marylander John Beale Bordley of Annapolis, one of the founders of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, did more than fumigate at the poor practices they saw around them. But experimentalists were active on the western shores of the Atlantic, too, such as Jared Eliot of Connecticut, who published his *Essay upon Field-Husbandry in New-England as It Is or May be Ordered* in 1748, after being inspired by Jethro Tull’s *The New Horse-Houghing Husbandry* (1731). Even though Harry Gough admired men such as Robert Bakewell, he did not blindly imitate them in his experiments with livestock and crops. Conditions were different in the Americas and he used trial and error as well as replication. Gough understood, moreover, that success or failure was not limited to what he produced, but included the promotion and marketing of his wares.3

Maryland during Gough’s lifetime was ready and well-situated for the dissemination of fresh ideas and practices. The earliest British settlers in Maryland had been supplied through the Anglo-Atlantic network; they purchased livestock from their neighbors in Virginia while the Chesapeake Bay provided contact with other parts of the British Empire such as Barbados, from which ships brought cattle and hogs. For decades there was general indifference to livestock production or the cultivation of crops beyond tobacco, the primary interest of the colony’s proprietors. Horses, cattle, and swine foraged in the forests and only sheep, who suffered from the ravages of wolves, received close attention, but they were relatively few in number. All this changed after 1783, when the population of Maryland, driven by the expansion of the port of Baltimore, began to increase. The state was in the middle of the new nation in both location and population. The latitudinal midway point of the thirteen colonies that became the United States was near what is now Parkton, Maryland, about fifteen miles northwest of Perry Hall. The demographic center of the United States in 1790 was eight miles east of Baltimore and ten years later it was eighteen miles west of the city. Harry Dorsey Gough conducted his experiments in agricultural improvement in, literally, the center of the new nation.4

### Origins and Early Career

Harry Dorsey Gough was born on January 28, 1745, in Annapolis, Maryland, to Thomas Gough and his second wife Sophia (née Dorsey). Thomas was a cultured ne’er-do-well who failed at every occupation he undertook. However, as a church warden in Annapolis and visitor to the celebrated Tuesday Club, he was one of the intellectual lights of the colony, even when attempting to farm about a mile from the Patapsco...
Ferry. Sophia was a daughter of Caleb “Ironmaster” and Elinor (née Warfield) Dorsey, members of the industrial elite of colonial Maryland. When Harry was a year and a half old, Thomas was forced to disperse his plantation goods on September 18, 1746, in order to discharge his debts of £76. Afterward, the Goughs survived on charity from their families. Thomas received a modest inheritance from his uncle, William Gough of Bristol, England. Elinor Dorsey, who had the measure of her son-in-law, made a complex provision in her will in which she bequeathed goods to her son Edward so that he could pay a yearly stipend to his sister Sophia, with strict instructions that Thomas Gough was to have no claim.5

At the age of twenty, Harry Gough’s fortunes changed when he inherited roughly £40,000 upon the death of his English cousin Isaac Burgess, a woolen draper of Bristol, on June 3, 1765. His inheritance consisted of cash and a number of properties in southwest England that Gough devoted years to selling. On May 2, 1771, the twenty-six-year-old Harry married sixteen-year-old Prudence Carnan, the daughter of Baltimore merchant John Carnan and his wife Achsah (née Ridgely). Harry’s new family connections were impressive. Prudence’s mother came from one of the wealthiest and most influential families in the Middle Atlantic region. Achsah’s first husband was Dr. Robert Holliday (died 1747), and, after the death of her second husband John Carnan (1767), her final marriage was to Daniel Chamier. Achsah’s younger brother Charles Ridgely built the mansion at Hampton, which remains a showpiece of colonial architecture to this day. John Holliday, Achsah’s son from her first marriage, built the estate called Epsom. Prudence’s brother Charles Ridgely Carnan became the protégé of their uncle and changed his name by act of legislature to Charles Carnan Ridgely in order to inherit Hampton; he was governor of Maryland from 1815 to 1818.6

Although usually described as a merchant, Gough was also a philanthropist, an early supporter of Methodism, a slave owner, and a not-too-successful politician. His main occupation, however, was land speculation/development in and around Baltimore. The monies for this came from his inheritance and in 1769 he wrote to his London attorneys James Russell and Hugh Hamersley: “I have made several very considerable purchases of land therefore I shall be in want of cash” and in a separate letter on the same day to Hugh Hamersley, “I have made several valuable purchases of land and many great bargains.” After his marriage, Gough was uncertain about remaining in Maryland. Shortly before the start of the American Revolution, however, he decided to stay and, in a letter to Russell and Hamersley of August 5, 1773, he wrote “As I am now settled in this part of the world, I think it most prudent to dispose of all my estates with you, both real and personal.”7

**Becoming an Agricultural Improver**

On April 16, 1774, the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* listed for sale a property called The Adventure of roughly 1,129 acres in northeastern Baltimore County. The main residence was a two-story brick house, 65-by-45 feet in dimension, with four
rooms on each floor and a large passage, but it was only partially completed. About 350 acres of the land had been cleared. Nonetheless, this was an impressive estate in an area where the average farm was between 100 and 250 acres. Gough agreed to buy it, but negotiations to acquire The Adventure took some time and the funds to pay for it came from Britain. Gough instructed Russell and Hamersley to draw “to about £3000.” Upon taking possession of his purchase, Gough renamed it Perry Hall, which happened to be the name of the estate of Sir Henry Gough near Birmingham, England, although any relationship with Harry is uncertain.8

The purchase of The Adventure/Perry Hall provided the land for Harry Gough’s excursions into agricultural improvement, four of which will be investigated in this essay: horses, cattle, sheep, and fruit. His interest in horses was the earliest. There were plenty of horses in Maryland, but many were stunted progeny of earlier English importations that had gone feral, while beach ponies were found on the islands such as Chincoteague. Efforts to improve horses had begun in New York in mid-century with hunters, but racing was the passion of the landed class. Even before purchasing Perry Hall, Harry maintained a stable. The Maryland Gazette of May 26, 1774, announced that “Mr. Gough’s Garrick” had won the purse of £30 on the second day of the Maryland Races, the last race-meeting for several years. After taking possession of Perry Hall, Harry Gough introduced his first improvement scheme: providing superior stallions of the coach horse (a sturdy animal that was fluid in its movements) variety for the local brood mares; the mating would produce a hunter, used for either carriage or saddle. The use of coaches reflected the increasing prosperity of the citizenry in the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Gough publicized his stallions in a newspaper known as an “advertiser,” a commercial journal oriented towards the business community. The front page of the Maryland Journal and the Baltimore Advertiser for February 27, 1775, has the item: “Sterling, The Property of Harry Dorsey Gough, stands at Perry Hall, Baltimore county.” The notice includes a description of the animal (“5 years old . . . upwards of 15 hands high”) and a brief pedigree (“got by Colonel Sharp’s noted Othello, and out of a remarkable fine English dray mare”). The next year, Harry added images to his
advertising and in Dunlap’s Maryland Gazette on April 16, 1776, the offer of Sterling’s services was accompanied with a woodcut of a horse in a stable and the extra incentive of “exceeding good pastures for Mares, at two shillings and sixpence per week.” Stock images varied among printers and there was a different woodcut of a horse when Gough advertised Sterling in the Maryland Journal of April 7, 1778. Agriculture was not immune from politics and as colonial currency became less accepted during the War of Independence, barter took its place. When Sterling was removed to Joppa and his place at Perry Hall taken by a stallion named Farmer, the advertisement in the Maryland Journal on March 14, 1780, made reference to the currency problem by quoting the fee as “ten bushels of merchantable [sic] wheat (or equivalent in cash).”

The great distances in America meant that there was interest in sales of stallions. Harry therefore occasionally combined offers to sell horses with stud fees if there was no sale. For example, Gough offered for sale his stallion Montezuma in 1797; the advertisement in the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser on March 18 had the provision that if he were not sold by April 15, then he would return to his breeding duties “on the same terms and at the same place he did last season.” There was also a warning to those who intended to bid low: “To save trouble, 1000 dollars have been refused for him. His price is 1200.” Once again, Gough used a block cut of a horse in the advertisement. As a side note, Gough used images only for his horses. For a dozen years, his contribution to livestock improvement was producing superior horses and he differed little from dozens of other men around Baltimore. All this changed during the years 1785 and 1786.

Horses might have been Harry Gough’s earliest interest, but, beginning in 1785, cattle would ensure that he was remembered as a pioneer in American agriculture. Cattle
in early Maryland have called forth little comment; by the last quarter of the eighteenth century they were an amalgam of cattle from Devon that had been brought into New England, Dutch cattle from New York, and the Spanish-influenced cattle of the Carolinas. There were few efforts at management and the cattle pastured in the woodlands. Gough’s involvement with cattle was tied to political affairs. The peace ushered in by the Treaty of Paris, ending hostilities between Britain and her now former colonies, reopened trade. During the winter of 1785, Gough wrote to his English solicitor Hugh Hamersley: “[Y]ou may fully expect to see me in Spring or Early Summer, when you may depend on having the refusal of all my property in England.” Once again, revenues from his English inheritance paid for several purchases made by Gough, who a dozen years later recalled: “In the year 1785, I imported from England three cows and a bull of the best kind then to be procured. The cows were all in calf when exported and calved after they arrived in this country. About three years later a friend in England sent me another cow, with which I was like fortunate.” Supplementary information is provided by Richard Parkinson: “Gough, at Perry Hall . . . has procured some imported cattle from near York, in England, something of the Teeswater kind.” Teeswater, referring to the region round the river Tees in northeast England, is one of several names—among which, in North America, was the Gough breed—given to what later became known as Shorthorn cattle, a popular breed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Unlike Bakewell’s Longhorns that produced little milk, Teeswater/Shorthorn cattle were suitable for dairy as well as beef. More importantly for businessmen such as Harry Gough, they matured quickly and gained weight rapidly—points that, as will be seen, were emphasized repeatedly in advertisements. Significantly, Harry Dorsey Gough was developing Shorthorn cattle at the same time as Robert Bakewell’s pupil Charles Colling and his brother Robert, men usually considered to be the pioneers of the breed, were developing their Shorthorn cattle.10

While his horses and cattle would be an influence in American agriculture, it is ironic that experiments with his favorite animal—sheep—did not survive Gough. Unlike our dependence on advertising for information about his horses or asides in
memoirs for the cattle, information about Gough's sheep improvement effort comes from correspondence with his friend and fellow enthusiast George Washington, which gives an insight into the ideals of agricultural reform held by men at the highest levels of American society. On February 1, 1792, Gough sent a quarter carcass of mutton to Washington and accompanied it with a letter of explanation, which is worth quoting at some length as it gives an insight into the mentality and method of the agricultural improver:

In the year 1786 I procured from Curassow [correctly Curaçao] a broad tailed Persian Ram; the intermixture of this Breed with the Common Sheep of the Country has added Considerably to the Beauty, and value of my Flock, the Individuals are larger and the Mouton [sic] in general equally fine with that which is now presented to your Excellency. I cannot speak so favourably of the Wool the Quantity is increased but the Quality inferior to that which is Shorne from the common Sheep of the Country; Still it is well suited to the making of Coarse Cloth.

The reply from George Washington, dated February 4, 1792, was enthusiastic:

During the time of my residing at home, between the close of the war and the entrance on my present office, I had paid much attention to my Sheep, and was proud in being able to produce perhaps the largest mutton & the greatest quantity of Wool from my Sheep that could be then produced. But I was not satisfied with this, and contemplated further improvements both in the flesh and wool by the introduction of other breeds, which I should by this time have carried into effect, had I been permitted to pursue my favorite occupation.

When Gough's stock was inventoried in 1808 in preparation for probating his will, sheep were the most numerous animals at Perry Hall.11

A departure from livestock was Harry Gough's orchards. A generation before the famous exploits of “Johnny Appleseed” (Jonathan Chapman), Harry Gough was developing improved stock of apples and peaches in his orchards at Perry Hall. Neither fruit is indigenous to North America, so their introduction was a significant addition to the nutritional health of the new nation. Some indication of the orchards' size is given the year after Harry's death, when his son-in-law and executor James Carroll offered for sale fruit from 3,000 apple trees and 900 peach trees. The fruit trees were separate from the well-tended grounds of the mansion. Not only fruit, but also saplings were sold by Gough from his nursery; the advertisement in the Maryland Journal of March 30, 1790, gave a brief history: “Among them are some grafted and innoculated [sic], so that it is possible a Purchaser may get a curious variety of good Fruit, that Mr. GOUGH has been carefully collecting, these fifteen years, from France, Philadelphia, and New
York.” Fifteen years earlier was 1775, which implies that Harry began his orchard very soon after purchasing Perry Hall. His collection from France could mean either that he added a trip across the English Channel during his visit to Britain in 1785, or he might have purchased the stock from a merchant vessel. Gough’s apple trees provided the fruit for the making of cider and his distillery is discussed below.

Harry Gough, of course, did not do any of the actual labor at Perry Hall. He oversaw the buying and selling of his beasts and his name appeared on the advertisements. This does not mean that finding others to do the work was easy. As was true throughout this region, Gough had to deal with a chronic labor shortage. The men who oversaw the day-to-day operations were the farm managers and they occasionally are named in newspaper advertisements. The first known manager at Perry Hall was John Govane of Drumquehale, who signed the advertisement offering the services of Sterling. Govane was followed by Nicholas Dorsey, who signed the advertisement for Sterling’s successor Farmer that appeared in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* on March 14, 1780. The manager supervised the free laborers and the unfree indentured servants and enslaved individuals. Among the freemen were specialists, such as the gardener who saw to the maintenance of the grounds round the mansion and the extensive orchard.

Gough advertised in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* on April 22, 1785: “I want to employ a complete gardener at Perry Hall . . . to undertake the management of a spacious, elegant Garden and Orchard . . . I desire that no Person will apply, but those that are perfect Masters of the Profession, with unquestionable Characters.” The advertisement was repeated in 1788 and 1790, in the latter year the gardener was John Norwood.12

Little is known about the unfree members of Perry Hall’s workforce. Indentured servants worked until they paid off their debts, usually the cost of their journey to North America. Gough seems to have had trouble keeping them and, in the *Maryland Journal* of April 5, 1785, he offered a reward of eighty dollars for five German “redemptioners” who had left Perry Hall for Baltimore before completing their time of service. The largest part of the work force at Perry Hall was enslaved. According to the Methodist preacher Thomas Rankin, who visited Perry Hall in July 1775, there were about seventy enslaved individuals. Owning slaves presented Harry Gough with two personal difficulties. First, the gradual emancipation of slaves in Pennsylvania after the war meant that the journey to freedom from his plantation was only thirty miles. The second problem was a personal matter: he had become a Methodist in his late twenties and Methodists frowned on slavery. Gough found a solution of sorts to both problems in 1780 when he manumitted forty individuals, but with a condition. The stipulation was that they continue to work for him for a period of several years afterwards. Not everyone was willing to wait. One was Will Bates who had been manumitted, but was serving a sentence for “a most atrocious crime” when he fled Perry Hall in 1783. He was a blacksmith, a skilled trade that was essential for the operation of the plantation, as well as a barber and shoe-maker. Bates was recaptured and fled again in 1785, when
Gough again advertised for his apprehension, noting the earlier flight, in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* of September 2, 1785.¹³

---

**Improvement**

What methods did Harry Dorsey Gough use for improving animals or plants? One guide he mentions repeatedly in newspaper and correspondence was lineage or pedigree—what today would be described as genetics. Whether describing animals or fruit, Gough brought forth ancestry as a reason why his products were to be preferred. Taking costly space in newspapers to give a lineage for his stallions such as “Venetian . . . by Venetian . . . out of Rattle . . . by American Godolphin” in the *Baltimore Daily Advertiser* of April 22, 1794, showed that, like his colleagues in England, Gough believed that “like begat like.” Unlike contemporary English improvers such as Robert Bakewell, Gough believed in the benefits of out-breeding (mixing family lines) rather than in-breeding (using one family to the exclusion of all others). Pedigree, however, was merely a means to an end. A useful example of lineage in practice is Gough’s ideal cow. In agreement with English stockmen such as the brothers Colling, he preferred a larger animal. “Nothing would please,” complained English breeder George Culley in 1786, “but Elephants or Giants.” A bovine celebrity was Charles Colling’s “Durham Ox.” The ox was exhibited throughout England (traveling in his custom-made carriage) from 1799 to 1807 and made the Shorthorn breed famous. Gough might have entertained a similar idea about breeding a bovine monster: a hint comes from an announcement in the *Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser* for December 23, 1803:
Yesterday, a bullock, four years old last spring, raised by Harry Dorsey Gough, esquire, at Perry Hall, and sold by that gentleman to Mr. Jacob Deal, (butcher) of this city, was taken to one of the public scales, and there weighed by Mr. Richard Boulding, (a sworn officer) in the presence of several gentlemen, particularly col. John O’Donnel [sic], who assisted in examining his weight, and extraordinary to tell, it amounted to two thousand five hundred and twenty pounds, net weight. N.B. Mr. Deal will exhibit the above Bullock tomorrow morning, neatly butchered, in his stall, No. 11, Centre-market.

As a point of comparison, the Durham Ox weighed 2,646 pounds when it was slaughtered.14

Not everyone agreed, however, on the issue of size. Richard Parkinson declared that Gough was “distinguished for breeding short-horned and large cattle; although very improper for America, as no poor land ought to have large animals upon it;” he also thought that Gough was not a good judge of cattle, because he thought that “big was best.” Gough made no secret of his preferences, however, and neither did his customers. They wanted larger and earlier maturing animals than those available locally. Gough employed what is now a standard metric in the evaluation of cattle: the weight per day of age. “On yesterday two of Mr. Gough’s bull calves, from his imported English cattle, were weighed, one of which was 24 weeks and 4 days old, and weighed 420 lb. the other, about two weeks older, weighed 432 lb” was an anonymous news item in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser of October 31, 1788. Another unsigned notice (probably written by Gough) in the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser for June 16, 1798, informed readers: “A Bull, the property of Mr. Gough, of Perry Hall, near Baltimore, and four CALVES, of his breed, not 8 months old, were yesterday weighed at the hay-scales. Weight of the Bull, 1792 lbs., Calf, no.q, 685, Ditto, c, 673, Ditto, 3, 651, and Ditto, 4. 686 N.B. the Bull is only 3 years old.” Gough’s customers imitated his type of promotion. John Threlkeld, advertising in the Washington Spy (published in Hagerstown) of July 7, 1795, noted: “A calf, one year old, the property of Mr. John Threlkeld, of this town, and purchased of Mr. Gough of Baltimore, was put into the scale on the eighteenth instant, and weighed one thousand and thirty six pounds.” Similarly, Gough and his customers preferred larger sheep. The City Gazette and Daily Advertiser of Charleston, South Carolina, had a notice on April 23, 1805: “A sheep of the Cape of Good Hope Breed . . . [the tail] was found to be 23 ½ inches in circumference, weighing 10 ½ pounds. It was raised at Perry-Hall, the estate of H.D. Gough, esq., and does credit to the agricultural advancement of our country.” The phrase “agricultural advancement” was a part of the vocabulary used to describe farming improvement.15

Less measurable attributes were also part of progress. One of these was the temperament of animals, which was a concern in a country as large as America. Animals left unattended and grazing over vast distances could become too wild to be handled. Gough’s hero Robert Bakewell had made the docility of his beasts famous and it is clear
that Gough was imitating him, as can be seen in the notice that appeared in the *Federal Gazette* for July 17, 1800: “For Sale, Several valuable young BULLS & HEIFERS, of my noted English breed; the bulls fit for immediate use. They are perfectly docile and can with ease be taken from Baltimore by water or by land from Perry Hall, to any part of the United States.”

Agricultural improvement was not, however, without its challenges. An illustration comes, again, from Gough’s correspondence with George Washington who, in a letter of August 13, 1797, wrote: “Having occasion to send a light carriage to Baltimore, I have directed the person (Mr Jno. Anderson son of my Manager) who has charge of it, to call upon you & get a ram, and two ewe lambs of the Cape (broad tail) sheep, if you have any to dispose of, & such as you would recommend for breeding.” Gough was forced to reply on August 17 that disease had so ravaged his flocks that he strongly urges that they be kept off the farm: “I wish it was *sic* in my power to send the Sheep you desire; some few years ago I took much Delight in that part of my Stock and brought it to great perfection, but they have unfortunately been since diseased *sic* and so much degenerated that I would not recommend their introduction on your Farm.”

Washington was sympathetic and in a letter written on August 23 he confessed to a similar misfortune: “I am sorry to hear of the disease & consequent degeneracy of your Sheep. Before I left home in the spring of 1789 I had improved that species of my stock so much as to get 5¼ lbs. of Wool as the average of the fleeces of my whole flock; and at the last shearing they did not yield me 2½ lbs.”

**Picturing Improvement**

What did Gough’s improvements look like? A partial answer comes from several paintings he commissioned of Perry Hall in the early nineteenth century that show his family members, work force, buildings, and livestock. Two particularly informative paintings are *Perry Hall, Home of Harry Dorsey Gough*, and *Perry Hall Slave Quarters with Field Hands at Work*. The artist of the former is unknown, but the latter is attributed to Francis Guy (circa 1760–1820), an English artist who lived in Maryland between 1798 and 1817. He developed a clientele as a painter after his efforts to set up a dye works in Baltimore failed. The first painting—*Perry Hall, Home of Harry Dorsey Gough*—shows Gough on horseback, while walking in the foreground are his wife Prudence, daughter Sophia, son-in-law James Carroll, and two grandchildren with their nurse. The mansion is on a hill almost in the center of the painting. Here are pictured all three of Gough’s livestock improvements: horse, cattle, and sheep. Harry Gough and his mount are in the lower left of the painting. The horse is a hunter and Gough gestures with his crop as a hunting dog gambols in front.

At the bottom of the painting are three head of cattle (left corner) and three sheep (center). One of the cattle is a white cow nursing a calf. The cow has short horns and a large frame with pronounced muscling in the hindquarter, matching descriptions of
an early Shorthorn female. The third animal is a roan bull lying behind her and he, too, has short horns, but also a heavily muscled torso. This is pure speculation, but the bull might be Gough’s famous herd sire “Leopard,” mentioned in his advertisement in the *Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser* on September 1, 1798. The three sheep are from Gough’s aforementioned Persian breed, which was famous for the diameter of its tail, where fat was stored. To emphasize the point, one of the sheep is turned with its tail clearly visible. Various buildings are noticeable in the painting in addition to the Perry Hall mansion. In the distance on the right side are the farm buildings that feature in the next painting to be discussed, *Perry Hall, Slave Quarters with Field Hands at Work*. On the right is a shed that is now indistinct because of cracks in the paint, but it seems to be a sheep fold with what might be several sheep in front of it.
Other buildings are on either side of the mansion and farther back, they appear to be standing in isolation in the fields, but are so indistinct that their function is uncertain.  

The livestock are incidental in *Perry Hall, Home of Harry Dorsey Gough*, but cattle are the main objects in the second painting, *Perry Hall, Slave Quarters with Field Hands at Work*. In this painting, the farm buildings are in the background with, in front of them, a crew of enslaved individuals and indentured white servants making hay. Dominating the painting are two bulls in the foreground. The animal on the left is white with long horns, while the beast on the right is white with red markings and has shorter horns. The former is clearly descended from one of Bakewell’s Longhorns while the latter is an early Shorthorn with a small, refined head, and noticeably short horns. More importantly, the depth of his brisket (a choice cut of the day) and deep quarter set him apart from his neighbor. He is also noticeably bigger, which brings to mind Parkinson’s criticism of Gough’s preference for large animals.

The painting is a reminder that early agricultural improvers purchased animals from within a network of other improvers and experimented with a variety of types. The Longhorn bull in *Perry Hall, Slave Quarters with Field Hands at Work* might be connected with another Maryland agricultural leader, the aforementioned John O’Donnell. Richard Parkinson recorded his visit to O’Donnell’s Canton Plantation (named after the Chinese city where he had made much of his fortune) in the company of Harry
Gough and his brother-in-law (and future Maryland governor) Charles Ridgely. While the journey ostensibly was to see a bull that Gough had sold to O’Donnell, the visitors also wanted to see three head of cattle (a male and two females) newly imported from Robert Bakewell’s nephew Robert Honeybourne, his successor at Dishley in England. Parkinson was characteristically uncharitable about the animals, but Gough was enthusiastic about the imported bull and agreed to purchase his first male calf. Although Parkinson’s memoirs are chronologically vague, the visit seems to have occurred about 1800, but no later than 1801, while the painting is dated circa 1805 and it is possible that the Longhorn bull was the animal purchased by Gough.19

Contemporary descriptions of Gough’s livestock reinforce the impression of superior bloodstock found in the paintings. One example is a letter from Cecil County lawyer and Revolutionary War veteran Nathaniel Ramsay to George Washington dated August 7, 1797. Washington had purchased a calf from the Lloyd family of Wye Plantation, which they had imported from Robert Honeybourne, and asked Ramsay to retrieve him. In the letter, notifying Washington of the animal’s safe arrival, Ramsay compared the size of the Lloyd calf with Gough’s stock: “I have the pleasure to inform you that the Calf you expected from the Eastern Shore arrived yesterday. It is a beautifull [sic] formed Animal and well grown Calf, but not near as large as some I have seen of Mr. Gough’s raising at the same Age. It is said to be about five months old.” Another oblique description of Gough’s stock comes from a stray animal notice that was placed in the Federal Intelligencer on August 18, 1795. Baltimore auctioneer Thomas Yates asked for the return of a 6-month-old bull calf that had strayed from Springfield. The calf had been raised by Gough and three weeks earlier had weighed 532 pounds; “his size, weight, and beautiful form is so very remarkably [sic], that I conceive further description unnecessary.” He concluded by noting there was also a second, older stray though inferior in size and weight to the Gough-bred calf.20

Making Money

Why did Harry Dorsey Gough champion agricultural innovation? Transporting livestock across the Atlantic Ocean, to take one aspect, was expensive. The answer was: greater return on his investment. Gough was a businessman, not a hobbyist, so his horses, imported cattle, improved sheep, and selected apple varieties were expected to be profitable. In the aforecited piece from the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser of May 10, 1798, Gough wrote: “It has been an opinion generally adopted, that cattle raised in this country, from the best breeds that can be imported, are always inferior to the original flock, and continue yearly to degenerate in size and shape—this remark I have the satisfaction to prove unjust, where care has been bestowed.” While recognizing the self-serving promotion of his animals, this appears to be an accurate justification of his improvement schemes. George Washington echoed Gough’s views when he noted in the aforementioned letter of February 4, 1792: “I have ever been satisfied in my
own mind, that by a proper attention to our Sheep (particularly in Maryland [sic] and Virginia, where the climate and other circumstances seem to be peculiarly favourable to the object) they might be made not only a most profitable subject to the farmer, but rendered highly important in a public view.”

Not all were impressed by Gough’s ambitions. As imported livestock entered the country, there was a reaction from individuals who championed native animals. The “nativists,” such as William Steenbergen of Shenandoah, Virginia, claimed that the apparent superiority of the incomers was due to better feed and care, while continued interbreeding with imported animals led to degeneracy of type. Not surprisingly, Richard Parkinson was among their number and in connection with Gough’s cattle, he wrote: “The butchers will not buy a calf at that kind, if they know it, they complain of the flesh being coarse and black.” In modern terms, Parkinson was claiming that Gough’s cattle were well-muscled with more lean meat than was usual.21

Harry Gough experimented not only with animals, but also with their marketing. One method was the farm auction. Three years after his buying trip to England, the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser carried the following advertisement on October 18, 1788: “To be sold, at Perry Hall, Baltimore County, on Tuesday the 28th instant, about twelve o’clock, several remarkable fine young bulls, from Mr. Gough’s imported English cattle, among which is one that weighed at six weeks, 253 lb. Also some fine half bloods, with sundry valuable mares and colts of the blooded and dray breeds. – The above stock will be sold for cash only.” The sale was a failure. An explanation appeared in the same newspaper three days following the auction: “As the day appointed for the sale of Mr. Gough’s stock, at Perry Hall, proved rainy, there was none of it disposed of. – It will be offered for sale on Thursday the 6th day of November next at twelve o’clock. If that day should be unfavourable, on account of rain, the next fair day.” Complaint about the weather was not special pleading. Poor condition of the roads was one of the reasons why eighteenth-century American farmers found it difficult to move their produce to market, even if they lived near a town or city. Competition for economic dominance between Baltimore and Philadelphia was the catalyst for improvements in road conditions.22

By the last decade of the century, Gough tried another method of sale: directly to consumers at a fixed price. A notice dated March 6, 1792, invited prospective purchasers of his Persian ram lambs to make known their intentions via letter because “not recalling the Names of the Applicants, he thinks it is proper to give the following Public Notice, that every Gentleman desirous to obtain them, must, on or before the 10th Day of April next, inform him thereof, by Letter, at the same time naming some Person, in Baltimore Town, to whom they are to be delivered.” The lambs cost $20 and were delivered on September 3. This method of selling must have been successful, because the following year, in a note dated February 26, Gough made the same offer again, with the added mention, “Some Gentlemen were disappointed last year by not applying in Time . . . .” The deadline was extended to April 20. Two years later, Gough added cattle to this
method of selling and a notice dated March 31, 1794, published in *Edward’s Baltimore Daily Advertiser* offers: “I have by Importations from *England*, *Persia*, etc., stocked my farm at Perry-Hall with a very superior breed of *CATTLE* and *SHEEP*, and propose raising *Calves* and *Lambs* for *sale*. I have now a number of both kinds, which I will deliver in Baltimore-town, to the order of such who may apply, which must be done in six weeks from this date, directing to whom they are to be delivered. The price of the *Calves* is from [8] 7.10 to 17.15, and the price of the *Lambs* from 8 to 20 *Dollars*.” Those prices were expensive. Richard Parkinson claimed that fat calves, for example, sold for between $4 and $8. He did note, however, that imported English stock commanded premium prices. An example comes from the inventory of the livestock owned by Gough’s contemporary Henry Miller of Virginia, made in order to settle his estate in 1796. Miller owned three imported animals: a bull valued at £90; a cow at £80; and a heifer at £70. His native-bred animals averaged between £5 and £8.23

The premium commanded by imported stock ensured that only the well-to-do were able to afford Gough’s stock, but even they thought his prices expensive. Among them was George Washington. In the last months of his second presidential term, he wrote to his estate manager James Anderson explaining: “A Mr. Gough near Baltimore has the imported breed and sells them high; the bulls especially; but I should not stand so much upon the price, provided the breed’s to be depended upon.” Washington returned to the topic in a letter to Anderson three weeks later: “By next post I will myself write to Mr. Gough to let me know whether he can spare me some of his best breed of *Horned Cattle* and on what terms.” The negotiations were not successful, as Washington confided to his friend and Maryland lawyer Gustavus Scott: “[I] had enquiry made of Mr. Gough of any young bulls of his English breed for sale. The result was that he had only one (except calves) of about 8 months old for which he asked $200. Thinking this high for one so young, I authorized another purchase.”24

Gough also catered to the love of a bargain. He placed the following notice in a supplement to the *Federal Gazette* of July 18, 1799, for another farm auction:

**Public Sale, On Wednesday, the 25th September next, about ten o’clock, in the vicinity of Perry Hall, will commence the sale of the following very valuable stock, viz.** Fifty-three of my noted breed of English cattle, consisting of cows with young calves; cows in calf; young bulls and heifers, with several yoke of well broke half-blooded oxen—Also a number of high bred brood mares, with and without young colts, four of the mares have been to general Ridgeley’s grey horse Medley, the last season, and the rest to other valuable horses. Also, several young horses and fillies. . . . So valuable a flock has perhaps never been offered for sale in the state of Maryland, nor would it have been now the case, had not the extreme drought in the neighborhood of my farms occasioned so great a scarcity of provender, that I could not, except with much difficulty and expence [sic], feed them through the succeeding winter, as highly as they merit.
Gough’s orchard provided several outlets for sales. A nursery had been set up at Perry Hall to provide saplings and by 1790 more were being grown than was needed. Gough offered 2,000 apple tree saplings for sale in an advertisement in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* on March 30 of that year; the price was 9 pence each with a minimum purchase of 25. In the last years of his life, Gough brought his cider into Baltimore to sell and both promoted his product and set the terms for its purchase in the *American Commercial Daily Advertiser* of February 6, 1807: “In my cellar, near Griffith’s Bridge, A quantity of CIDER, in hogsheads, made of choice fruit at Perry Hall, pressed in sheets, refined, racked, and fit for immediate use, either for draught or bottling. The price $20 per [hogshead]. To be full when delivered, and when empty returned, on being called for.” By April the sales had been moved to no. 83, Front Street, Old Town.25

**The Public Face of Maryland Agriculture**

At the same time that he was profitably employing his agricultural innovations, Harry Dorsey Gough enjoyed celebrity within the agricultural community as a leader and improver. He was a founding member and first president of a society for the improvement of agriculture in Maryland. The first such society in the Americas was the New York Society for Promoting Arts, founded by 1766 and followed by similar societies in South Carolina (1784) and Pennsylvania (1785). Agricultural societies have been dismissed as clubs for gentlemen, but they provided a forum for discussion of problems faced by all farmers, and many of them were members of the mercantile class. After returning from England with his improved cattle, Harry Gough was elected an honorary member of the Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Agriculture on April 4, 1786. A month earlier, on March 5, Harry Gough and other agricultural leaders had organized the Society of Maryland for the Improvement of Agriculture, to which Gough was elected president, according to the news item in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser* of March 24, 1786. The constitution of the new society and Gough’s presidential address were published four days later. On April 18, the first general meeting of the new society was held at Grant’s Tavern when the admission fee for membership was set at 35 shillings together with a yearly subscription of £3.26

The most public exhibition of Harry Gough’s place as a leader of the agricultural community came on May 6, 1788, in a Baltimore parade to celebrate the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. The participants paraded in craft groups and, according to the notice in the *Maryland Journal* of that date, Gough led the agricultural section of the procession. While the participants were, like Harry, Federalists (i.e. supporters of a strong central government), it is significant that he chose to appear as a farmer rather than as a businessman. Nonetheless, neither enterprise was too far removed from the other, as is clear in Gough’s public service in the establishment of the Baltimore stockyards. By an act of the Maryland Assembly on December 28, 1793, the creation of a stockyard
for Baltimore was enacted. Gough was selected to be a member of the commission to purchase ten acres of land in or near Baltimore and lay out the pens and stalls. This was a public service for both the livestock producers as well as the butchers; it also benefitted someone with plenty of stock to sell, such as Gough.27

Harry Gough was proud of his improved land and animal management, so occasionally he exhibited them to the public. Richard Parkinson visited Perry Hall during one of those “open days” and recorded his observations. The occasion did little to change his opinion of Gough’s livestock, operation of the estate, or sagacity: “I went to a show of Mr. Gough’s, of cattle, and horses of the blood kind; and he had some hogs of the Chinese breed. This was at Perry-Hall, fourteen miles from Baltimore. He has great conveniences for cattle in the winter, only improperly constructed. He has a very large tract of land under cultivation, chiefly Indian corn and rye, with some clover.” Others had different opinions, such as John Eager Howard, who had been an officer in the Continental Army, a United States Senator, and former governor of Maryland. During George Washington’s ultimately unsuccessful attempt to purchase one of Gough’s bulls, Howard had been asked by the President to make enquiries. He and Gough were old acquintances; they had marched together with the farmers’ delegation in the Constitution celebration parade of 1788 and served on the commission for the development of the Baltimore Livestock Yards. Howard’s reply to Washington dated April 7, 1797, was fulsome: “Some of our farmers have greatly improved their breed of cattle by purchasing bull calves of [Gough], and we have young farmers who are eager to purchase, many of them before they have the means of taking proper care of them, however there is such a demand for his cattle that he can always get his price for them.” Gough’s animals were so coveted that his customers made the association in advertising, as seen in this announcement from the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser published on July 17, 1800: “A beautiful young Bull, bred by Mr. Gough, stands at Green Fields, about one mile and a half east of the city of Baltimore, and covers Cows at One Dollar the season.” Joshua Bell, the manager of John Merryman’s farm (outside of Baltimore), offered for sale in the Republican, or Anti-Democrat of May 6, 1802: “a large BULL, five years old. He was purchased from Mr. Gough as a calf, he is very conformable [sic] on the farm.”28

How much of this notoriety was owed to self-promotion through the newspapers and how much to the quality of Gough’s animals is uncertain. The newspaper items presented information supposedly for general information, but they all reflected well on Gough’s animals. Two pieces that appeared in newspapers along the Atlantic coast during the year 1796 are illuminating examples. The first appeared in Kline’s Carlisle [PA] Weekly Gazette on May 1, 1796, with the title “Encouragement for Farmers:” “A calf was sold yesterday for two hundred dollars. The animal was raised by Harry D. Gough, Esqr. and sold by him to Mr. Ashbel Welles, who means to send it to Boston. It is 14 months old, and weighs one thousand and twenty-two pounds.” This was reprinted in the Boston Gazette and Weekly Republican Journal on June 13; and in the Rutland
[VT] Herald on June 20. The information could vary and the Philadelphia Gazette and Universal Daily Advertiser of May 27 increased the weight of the bull to 2,022 pounds while the Augusta [GA] Chronicle of June 11 decreased the selling price to $100.

Gough apparently was satisfied because several months later the Gazette of the United States and Philadelphia Daily Advertiser carried the following news item on September 22, 1796: “On the 3rd inst. were sold by Harry Dorsey Gough of Baltimore, nine bull calves, which are from a cross of the famous Mr. Bakewell’s breed and Lincolnshire at the following prices . . . .” There follows a list of the animals with their ages and prices, which ranged from $195 to $40, averaging about $90. The report continues with the information that a bull weighing 1,022 pounds had been sold by Gough for $200, apparently referring to the animal purchased by Ashbel Welles. After calling attention to the breeding of the bulls, the article ends with the information that an importation society had been organized in Baltimore for the purpose of bringing into the country the best animals from England. Once again the information was quickly reprinted by newspapers along the Atlantic coast. The Philadelphia Gazette printed the item the following day, the Newport [RI] Mercury published it on October 4, the American Telegraph and Fairfield Co. [Bridgeport, CT] Gazette printed it on October 19, the Norwich [CT] Packet published it on November 3, and the Medley or New Bedford [MA] Marine Journal printed it on November 4.

As those two news items demonstrate, Harry Gough was selling his livestock widely along the Atlantic seaboard. In addition to sheep sold to South Carolina, there was Ashbel Welles who lived at West Hartford, Connecticut, while Joseph Rice’s sale of livestock in Fauquier County, Virginia, on October 26, 1797, included a 3-year-old bull he purchased from Gough for $100 when 5 months old, and weighing 688 pounds at the time. Gough made no secret of his satisfaction about the area over which his livestock sold. In the aforementioned news item/memoir from (initially) the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser (March 18, 1798), Gough names several of his more important customers including George Washington (Virginia) and Jeremiah Wantworth (Connecticut) in addition to buyers from Maryland that included his brother-in-law Charles Ridgely of Hampton. He concludes by giving notice of a sale of 21 calves to be held on June 21 with the suggestion that some of the calves would weigh 100 pounds for each month of age.

**Conclusion**

By the time of his death on May 8, 1808, Harry Dorsey Gough had reduced the number of his livestock. An inventory of his estate made for the probating of his will lists 40 horses of various ages, 120 sheep, and 36 head of cattle at Perry Hall, of which 6 were oxen and one was a “large white steer.” The remainder consisted of 20 cows, “one thereof a cripple,” two mature bulls, five yearlings, and two heifers without any details about their breeding or any individual characteristics. The few head was probably the result of
the previously-mentioned sale he held about ten years earlier, in 1798, when he disposed of “the greater part of my English breed,” according to the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser of September 1, 1798. The horse trade continued and in 1809, ten riding horses (between four and six years old) were advertised in the Federal Republican and Commercial Gazette of April 24, 1809, for a sale on May 3 at Griffith’s Stables in Baltimore. His orchards also were continued and a month after his death, Gough’s son-in-law and executor James Carroll placed an advertisement in the North American and Mercantile Daily Advertiser (June 16, 1808) in which he offered for sale the fruit from Perry Hall’s orchards in addition to the use of a distillery with two stills, a screw cider press and living quarters plus ancillary buildings. He ended the item with the statement: “There are few places in the U.S. where more or better fruit is collected than Perry Hall, Mr. Gough for many years at expense and pains to increase and improve it.”

Harry Gough’s agricultural improvements had an influence beyond his death. When George Presbury advertised his farm for sale in the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser on November 22, 1809, he noted that the original stock for its large orchard of apple and peach trees had come from Harry Gough. Among his animals, the cattle made the greatest contribution after Gough’s death. Now acknowledged as the man who introduced Shorthorns into the United States, his cattle breeding program was remembered for years. John O’Donnell of Canton Plantation had a sale of livestock the year after Gough died. His advertisement in the Republican Star or Eastern Shore General Advertiser of January 31, 1809, announced that among the merits of his cattle was the descent of many from Gough’s animals and a buyer had “an opportunity of supplying himself with a stock, superior to any other in this country.” Some of Gough’s work was continued within his own family, particularly by his brother-in-law Charles Ridgely, who was attempting to develop his own breed of cattle using Gough’s animals as the foundation stock. An item in the first agricultural journal in the United States, the American Farmer published by Baltimorean John Skinner, made the claim, “It is probable that fatter and finer cattle were never slaughtered in any country” and included as Maryland’s representative “A heifer raised by Governor ridgely [sic] . . . of the Bakewell crossed with the Gough Breed.” At the semi-annual meeting of the Maryland agricultural society, held at the Pavilion Gardens on June 7, 1820, Ridgely exhibited an animal described as a “dun bull, fifteen sixteenths of the Bakewell breed, by repeated crossings from an English cow, imported by the late Harry Dorsey Gough, Esq.”

One reason for the notoriety of his cattle is that they were visually distinct, as notices in the American Farmer make clear. The issue for May 30, 1822 (p. 74), carries a letter from Mr. Curwen of Philadelphia in which he claims that he could identify cattle tracing back to the Gough importations. One of his cues might have been size. The issue of the American Farmer for April 27, 1821 (p. 36), gives the weight of cattle exhibited at Philadelphia the previous March where the heaviest average weight, 1,347 pounds, is from the first sixteen animals, designated of “the Gough breed.” While they were far heavier than any other group of cattle, there is no indication if they were older
or younger than the other animals or how long they had been on feed. Louis Clapier of Highlands was the feeder and the report notes that he had purchased them from Kentucky, but a footnote mentions that the original home of the Gough cattle was unknown. The value for American cattle generally is seen in a memoir written by the president of the Maryland agriculture society a generation after Gough’s death. Writing in 1841, he noted that the weight of cattle and sheep had doubled since 1800.  

Harry Dorsey Gough’s career as an agricultural innovator provides an example of how improvement was made. While he admired British agriculturalists such as Robert Bakewell, Gough discovered that advancement was different in North America. He used trial and error in order to find the breeding and marketing that was best suited to the circumstances of his time and place. Selling stallions and bulls rather than leasing them, using newspapers to advertise his produce as well as announcing his improvements, featuring his livestock and agricultural buildings in paintings, and employing metrics to measure improvement (such as the weight-per-day-of-age) all show how he implemented his plans for enhancement. Even though the improvements in orchard crops were a part of Gough’s general interests, his best publicized work was in livestock: horses, cattle and sheep. The cattle appear to have been the least of his interests, yet it was the importation of early Shorthorns that assured his place, even if only in a footnote, in the histories of agriculture. Like his friend George Washington, sheep were Harry Gough’s main interest, but his involvement with them failed to survive him.

Existing accounts suggest that Harry Gough was successful in making a profit on his improved stock. He sold calves and lambs at top prices and the sums commanded by his breeding stock reflected the increasing affluence of American farmers. After the French Revolution disrupted Atlantic trade, farmers in the United States seized the opportunity to supply the Atlantic network. They wanted the best seed stock and men such as Gough provided it. His willingness to expand his network of customers beyond the Baltimore region was a matter of satisfaction to him, which Gough publicized. One measure of that success is the geographic distribution of his sales along the Atlantic coast. Harry Gough’s endeavors led to recognition in his lifetime as an agricultural leader. Gough’s support for the creation of a Maryland agricultural society was crucial and his election to the presidency shows the esteem in which he was held by his peers. While it is true that many of his fellow enthusiasts were wealthy men, they could afford to risk experiments with crops and animals, unlike less affluent farmers who lived on a knife’s edge of survival. Throughout his career, Harry Gough promoted agricultural progress in correspondence with other agriculturalists, while at the same time using newspapers to spread information about his activities. A tribute came a dozen years after his death, when John Skinner wrote, “There is not a drove of fat Cattle brought to our market, which may not be recognized as the descendants of the Stock imported from time to time by . . . the late Mr. Gough.” The son of a failed plantation owner was remembered as a symbol of agriculture in Maryland and one of the pioneers of agricultural advancement in the United States.
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NOTES


6. Burgess was the first cousin of Harry’s father Thomas and his will is now in the National Archives (U.K.), made October 25, 1753, and probated May 6, 1767 (PROB 11/934/12), discovery.nationalarchives.gov.uk/details/t/PROB11/934/12; copies are in Wilton and Swindon Archives (U.K.) (MS 9/61/187), together with a brief genealogy, and Maryland Historical Society (Harry Dorsey Gough Papers, 1673–1895, MS 2560, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, MdHS, Baltimore). Burgess named Harry Dorsey Gough as the chief beneficiary, but in Hilary term (January 7 to March 25) 1766 another group of kinsmen brought a Bill in the Exchequer Court (PRO 11/12/1651/1440, National Archives, U.K.), claiming that Burgess had died intestate and that the estate should go to his cousin Thomas Fletcher, the dean of Kildare. Burgess’s trustees kept Gough apprised of the situation; one of the trustees named Jeremiah Ames sent a letter to him dated June 17, 1765, announcing Burgess’s death and naming the trustees, while a separate letter was sent by another trustee named Nathaniel Merriman on July 6, 1765 (Harry Dorsey Gough Papers, 1745–1808, MS 401, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore).

7. Gough to Russell and Hamersley, August 9, 1769, and Gough to Hamersley, August 9, 1769, Harry Dorsey Gough Account Books, 1753–1852, MS 400, Box 1, Letterbook 1768–1785, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, MdHS, Baltimore.

8. Farm size is mentioned by Max Grivno, Gleanings of Freedom: Free and Slave Labor along the Mason-Dixon Line, 1790–1860 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2011), 11. Details about the purchase of Perry Hall are found in Gough to Russell and Hamersley, September 15, 1774, Harry Dorsey Gough Account Books, 1753–1852, MS 400, Box 1, Letterbook 1768–1785, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, MdHS, Baltimore. The purchase price was paid in installments beginning with the initial payments of £300, £150, and £100 made in September. The balance was rendered on December 20 with payments of £600, three payments of £500, and £300. For a study of the house, see Sean Kief and Jeffrey Smith, Perry Hall Mansion (Charleston, SC: Arcadia Press, 2013).


10. The letter is Gough to Hugh Hamersley, January 8, 1785, Harry Dorsey Gough Account Books, 1753–1852, MS 400, Letterbook 1768–1785, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, MdHS, Baltimore. Gough’s reminiscence was published in the Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser, May 10, 1798. This item was also published in Porcupine’s Gazette (Philadelphia, PA), May 12, 1798, and Farmer’s Register (Chambersburg, PA), August 15, 1798. For Parkin-son, see Tour in America, 290.

12. The labor shortage is discussed by Grivno, *Gleanings of Freedom*, 7. For an additional comment on the orchards, see: Barbara Wells Sarudy, *Gardens and Gardening in the Chesapeake, 1700–1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 89; Govane appears in the advertisement for Sterling in *Dunlap’s Maryland Gazette*, April 16, 1776; and John Norwood is mentioned in the *Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser*, March 30, 1790.


18. Grivno sees this painting (which is, incidentally, the cover illustration for his book) as an expression of Gough’s wealth (Gleanings of Freedom, 24–25).

19. Parkinson, Tour in America, 79.


21. For Steenbergen, see the American Farmer, Containing Original Essays and Selections on Rural Economy and Internal Improvements, with Illustrative Engravings and the Prices Current of Country Produce, 3 (1821–22): 140; his comments are consistently misquoted, see, for example N. F. Cabell, with notes by E. G. Swem, “Some Fragments of an Intended Report on the Post Revolutionary History of Agriculture in Virginia,” William and Mary Quarterly, first series, 26, no. 3 (January 1918): 145–168 (at 168). Parkinson, Tour in America, 287–90.

22. Grivno, Gleanings of Freedom, 16.


29. “Harry Dorsey Gough Estate Inventory and Settlement 1808 made by Thomas Lee and Philips Rogers,” Harry Dorsey Gough Papers, 1745–1808, MS401, H. Furlong Baldwin Library, MdHS, Baltimore: manuscript page 27; in addition, there were three cows and a bull at a separate farm called Heathcote Cottage (manuscript page 30).


Book Reviews

This War Ain’t Over: Fighting the Civil War in New Deal America. By Nina Silber. (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2018. 232 pages. Notes, bibliography, index. Cloth, $32.95.)

Nina Silber has made an impressive contribution to the essential historical understanding of how the past influences the present and how the memory of past events, specifically the Civil War, resonated in New Deal America. “This book,” she writes in her introduction to This War Ain’t Over, is an “attempt to understand how Americans across the social, political and economic spectrum found a ‘usable past’ in the US Civil War, [and] how they shaped a history that often spoke directly to their present-day concerns.” Americans did not remember the Civil War in the same way, and Silber probes the various contested scripts in which opinion makers of the 1930s and ’40s constructed their memories in a particular way to suit their experience in that particular time. She concludes this well-researched book with a chapter on how Civil War symbols and sentiments were edited, yet again, to make sense of World War II.

This War Ain’t Over is, then, a classic example of a new genre the academy calls “memory studies.” Of course history, both oral and written, has always been about remembrance; “footfalls echo in the memory,” as the poet T. S. Eliot once wrote. But in the 1980s historians, influenced by Maurice Halbwachs’s work on collective memory, began using the remembrance of past events as a means of dealing with current circumstances. Because memory is a construction, not a reproduction—there is no single objective presentation of the Civil War—the ways in which memory was used served as a means of understanding contemporary events. Silber, a professor at Boston University, is a skilled practitioner, having used memory studies earlier in her analysis of Reconstruction, The Romance of Reunion, Northerners and the South, 1865–1900 (1997).

By the 1930s, Silber writes, most participants in the Civil War who had earlier shaped war remembrances were dead. The Civil War was now an abstraction, remembered in film, novels, history books, and monuments. Rather than calling up other events in their past such as the Revolution, Americans during the Depression turned to the Civil War. Both were periods of chaos; both presented the necessity of resiliency, and both required the expansion of the federal government. Memory-making during the New Deal had new sponsors, principally the federal government with its WPA arts programs such as the Federal Writers Project. Hollywood also emerged as an important influence, evaluated by one observer as “a memory industry . . . ready to capitalize on history by selling memory to consumers hooked on nostalgia.” In a time of economic, political and military turmoil, there were other formulators—the African American community, the Popular Front, and never to be overlooked, President Franklin Roosevelt. Silber isolates
three specific subject areas in which the contests over memory were most significant:
slavery, Abraham Lincoln, and the Lost Cause.

In Silber’s argument, African American slavery of the Civil War period connected
to the sense of white economic enslavement during the Depression. In the process, Civil
War racial slavery became a more benign institution shared by whites, thereby losing
its specific brutal racial setting. Thus, in *The Prisoners of Shark Island*, John Ford’s film
about the imprisonment of Dr. Samuel Mudd, white men figure prominently as victims
of enslavement. Later during World War II, memories of the ever-fungible institution
of slavery fueled American narratives about the need to fight against the slavery of fas-
cism. As Silber makes clear, not all Americans accepted this facile neutering of slavery: African Americans offered a different memory of slavery as *their* heritage.

It was Lincoln who, along with slavery and the Lost Cause narrative, became a
central focus of American remembrances, undergoing in the process transformations
that made him, to various groups, an avatar of federal power and racial justice, a race-
neutral humanitarian, a common man, and during the war, a powerful leader. The
attention given to Lincoln—Silber calls it “an addiction”—is linked to the period’s
need for a figure of salvation. In film, federal theater presentations, and Carl Sandburg’s
influential biography, the sixteenth president was celebrated, although conservatives and
supporters of the Lost Cause tried to remove Lincoln from any positive associations.

Finally, Civil War memories during the New Deal years centered on the power-
ful Lost Cause narrative that promoted the concept of a plucky, romanticized white
South, led by brave generals fighting for states’ rights against long odds. Propelled by
influential groups such as the United Daughters of the Confederacy, these views coin-
cided with the contemporary need for overcoming adversity and pushing back against
labor organizers and northern interference by Communists, the latter connecting to
the southern version of Reconstruction. New Deal programs and black activists chal-
lenged this view: *Gone with the Wind*, however historically defective, was not *Birth of
a Nation*. Silber’s fascinating analysis of Margaret Mitchell and the making of the film
reveals the growing challenges to the original Lost Cause narrative.

If Americans today need confirmation of the durable legacy of the Civil War, they
have only to look to contemporary events: Confederate battle flags waving in parades,
white supremacists relying on distorted views of the war, and arguments, seemingly
everywhere, about removing Lost Cause symbols. Indeed, in the title of Silber’s impor-
tant book, *This War Ain’t Over*. Still.

Jean H. Baker
Professor emerita, Goucher College

When one thinks of Baltimore and its leading industries, World War II, espionage and discrimination against immigrants, cork does not immediately pop to mind. But these are the subjects that David Taylor weaves together in his most recent work, Cork Wars. Drawing heavily on oral histories and materials from the National Archives, Taylor tells the story of one of the war’s lesser-appreciated industries and the risks it faced through the eyes of a host of characters, most notably: Charles McManus Sr., the CEO of Crown Cork and Seal, and his eldest son Charles McManus, Jr.; Melchor Marsa Sr., Crown’s Spanish-born manager in Portugal, as well as a spy for the U.S. government during World War II, and his daughter, Gloria; Frank DiCara, a young Italian American factory worker and soldier from Baltimore’s Highlandtown neighborhood; and Woodbridge Metcalf, the forester from the University of California, Berkeley, who sought to address the potential shortage of cork by planting cork trees across North America.

Taylor sets the tone for his work in his opening vignette, where he describes a massive fire that burned down Crown Cork and Seal’s Highlandtown plant in the fall of 1940. The cause of the biggest fire anybody in the city could remember, according to Taylor, remained a mystery. Had Nazi agents who recognized the strategic value of cork to the United States sabotaged the plant? Did Italian Americans, whose allegiance remained suspect, play a role? And regardless of its causes, would Charles McManus, Sr., who had built Crown Cork and Seal into a Fortune 500 company, be able to overcome this and other challenges, ranging from German submarines, which threatened the shipment of cork from Portugal, Spain, and Algeria to the United States, to the rise of the plastics as a potential alternative to cork?

Throughout, Taylor switches perspectives, devoting separate chapters to individual characters. In this sense, he seeks to present a history of the World War II era from the bottom up. For example, he describes the experiences of an average American during World War II from the perspective of Frank DiCara, the son of an Italian immigrant, who was born in Highlandtown, Baltimore, worked at a Crown factory building warplanes, and then shipped off to the Philippines where he awaited the invasion of Japan when the atomic bombs were dropped. Likewise, we gain a sense of the development of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), particularly the ways it recruited agents and its operations on the Iberian Peninsula and in North Africa, from the vantage point of Melchor Marsa. By sprinkling these descriptions with anecdotes about everyday life, from DiCara’s courtship of fellow Baltimorean Irma Castagnera to Melchor’s dinners with his intrepid daughter, Gloria, Taylor reminds us that even in the midst of precarious Ian Fleming-like James Bond escapades, ordinary life went on. (We also learn that Ian Fleming, like Marsa, was a secret British agent in Portugal.)
Taylor also presents a good deal of contextual material on a wide variety of subjects. Readers will probably learn a lot from his rich descriptions of the cork industry, from where cork trees are grown and how they are harvested to their multiple uses as sealants in everything from bottle caps to engine gaskets. Taylor examines Nazi-directed espionage efforts in the United States and abroad and the OSS’s efforts to counter them. He delves into government policies and actions that restricted the liberties of Italian Americans. And he relates some of the views that business leaders had about government wartime regulations—the owner of Crown Cork and Seal’s main rival vociferously opposed Franklin D. Roosevelt and the growth of the federal government while McManus, Sr., did not. Indeed, while the bulk of Cork Wars is told from the bottom up, Taylor’s ultimately seeks to prod readers to ponder issues that remain prevalent today, particularly the persistence of anti-immigrant sentiments, and the difficulties soldiers, spies, factory workers, businessmen, and their families face during wartime.

Perhaps because the source of much of his work touched him so personally, most particularly his interviews with the sons and daughters of his main characters, Taylor’s work sacrifices some analytical and critical judgement in favor of sentimentality. For instance, while Taylor hints at the prevalence of racial prejudice in Baltimore, he skirts examining how the persistence of Jim Crow attitudes and policies during and after the war disparately impacted black and white Baltimoreans. Likewise, Taylor verges on equating the discrimination that some Italian Americans endured with the treatment that virtually all Japanese Americans faced. This said, for those who enjoy a good story, particularly one that expands their knowledge of an under-appreciated industry and centers on the experiences of ordinary Americans, as well as Baltimore, Cork Wars is worth the read.

Peter B. Levy
York College


This is a book that needs to be read and consulted two ways, in print and online. The tactile reading of a traditional paper book allows for a better implanting in memory of overarching themes, unanswered questions, and specific examples posited by the author. Reading electronically tends to pull the reader off on tangents because, while perhaps entertaining, it also moves the reader from the central narrative to distractions of detail. In this book, Loren Schweninger has provided a dense narrative of the legal efforts by and on behalf of enslaved individuals and their descendants to obtain a measure of liberty under the law of the land as it operated at the local level. He has provided a detailed analysis of the process and the arguments made by literally hundreds
of enslaved and formerly enslaved individuals, their descendants, and their lawyers in the face of counter-arguments designed to keep black men and women in perpetual or term bondage. The story is not a pretty one, but because there was a deepening sense of the importance of the law in governing the lives of U.S. citizens and non-citizens, there was some hope for justice in all the states prior to the Civil War. The legal system did become more oppressive for blacks, especially below the Mason-Dixon line and out into the Western territories, as the nation grew older and further from the challenging philosophy of the Declaration of Independence. This is clear from the laws that were passed in the states to limit suits for freedom, while national legal decisions at the U.S. Supreme Court level only added considerable fuel to the fire.

From a readability standpoint, it would have been better if the introductory material in the book had been reorganized. For example, the conclusion would have worked better as an introductory overview to smooth the reader’s transition into the details of the different aspects and changing parameters of what was possible under the law in the slave-holding states and in the states to which slaves had fled for their liberty.

There are ten informative, topic-centered chapters that deal with the results of hundreds of cases, mostly throughout the South, in which there are pleas for personal liberty on the part of (formerly) enslaved individuals and their families. They range from examining why white mothers could be the cause of liberty with black descendants to the consequences of religious movements (read: Methodism and the Quakers) that inspired their members to manumit, albeit after death and after requiring those manumitted to work as slaves for the better part of their lives. While the sequence in which the author takes up his topics perhaps could be better, they are nonetheless an extraordinarily powerful analysis of what the law in each of the jurisdictions examined would or would not permit. Underlying everything presented in court is the constant struggle to define in law and practice what rights, if any, people of color have in a nation that embraces slavery or at least seeks to contain it.

The book is based on one of the most important, comprehensive surveys of surviving court records undertaken with regard to the institution of slavery in the United States since Helen Tunnicliff Catterall’s pioneering work. Professor Schweninger did it right and indexed his findings superbly on the website he instituted, not only explaining well the cases, but also linking them to actual images of the surviving paper to enable further study and amplification. He and John Hope Franklin even brought compilations of the cases to print in a series of volumes suitable for traditional course texts. It is a model that the curating institutions (State Archives, courts, and special collections—depositories of the original case files) should have embraced and collaborated on online, but did not. For example, the only surviving record of the trial and transportation of a free-born black from Baltimore in the late 1820s is to be found in an 1840s Tennessee court case.

yet neither the Tennessee State Archives nor the Maryland State Archives link to what Dr. Schweninger uncovered.2

While the book is about appeals for liberty throughout the South, what the author reveals about the operation of the courts in Maryland with regard to freedom suits is of particular interest to students of slavery in Maryland. There on the middle ground, the largest free black urban population and well-intentioned abolitionists battled for containing, constraining, and eliminating slavery altogether. Lundy and Garrison began their fight there, both intellectually and literally, in conflict on the streets of Baltimore. But it was also in the midst of a significant struggle to define options for liberty which included evacuation of free blacks and slaves to Canada, Africa, and other points beyond. Darius Stokes, a brilliant black preacher, fought his own Baltimore (Bethel) congregation over the merits of removal to Africa, leaving behind a court case detailed by Professor Schweninger that not only helps comprehend the argument, but also, name by name, who opposed him in the congregation down to the two black women who physically assaulted him for his views.

The strongest of the colonization efforts were centered in Baltimore and, to a lesser degree, the District of Columbia, whose legal system was based on Maryland law, and some of the best known lawyers of the day (Robert Goodloe Harper, Francis Scott Key, and John H. B. Latrobe), waged legal war within the system not only to secure freedom for blacks under Maryland law, but also to find ways to export the “problem” out of sight and the minds of those who remained. Robert Goodloe Harper loved his boyhood friend and thought him capable of being well-educated, but he did not welcome him into his parlor and instead sought to give him a “better” home in Africa. While much has been written of late about the free black population of Maryland, what Professor Schweninger provides is a path to a better understanding of the individuals who fought their way through the courts to a modicum of liberty within the framework of a slave-holding world, which brings us back to why the Kindle edition of Dr. Schweninger’s book and his Digital Library on American Slavery at UNC Greensboro (available at library.uncg.edu/slavery) is so important.

With the Kindle edition and the database search tools, it is an easy matter to track individuals and the differing arguments for what should and should not be permitted within the law, both in the local context and as addressed across state lines. Peter Sweeper was convicted of aiding slaves to escape through Maryland to Pennsylvania in 1826. Seven years of his life were sold by the Baltimore County Court to Austin Wool-

---

2 The Tennessee State Archives does have available better images of the case in point and on request was most helpful in tracking them down when asked about them. My concern is not with the quality of the professional assistance at the curating institutions, which is exceptionally high, but that institutionally they do not make the public aware of the added value to their records that Dr. Schweninger provides, nor do they make the images of those records, as they have them, readily accessible without charge.
folk’s brother who took him to his own father’s plantation in Tennessee, where he was held in bondage for seven years beyond his sentence without his consent. When he, or perhaps a relative in Maryland, finally protested in the Tennessee courts, Maryland law prevailed. He received his freedom, but apparently no damages for wages lost. The record of his “success,” as well as his sentence, only exists in Tennessee along with an accounting of the other slaves purchased by Woolfolk at the same time as he acquired Peter. If we are to understand the full impact of the legal system on slavery in America, we also need to better understand the case studies of the people who were affected by the appeals for liberty.

In attempting to fathom the mysteries of the legal system as it relates to the appeals for liberty, and the emerging concepts of what is and ought to be the definition of rights, liberties, and ultimately the obligations of full “citizenship,” both nationally and locally, Professor Schweninger’s book moves the needle a considerable distance farther along the road to successfully confronting our own innate racism and xenophobia. It ought not to be read in isolation, however, as the recent academic work of Professors Jones, Moss, and Diemer testifies. In different ways, they address the struggle for liberty and defining citizenship that goes beyond what the court records reveal, even though in all three cases their narrative also would have benefited from a close reading of Professor Schweninger’s work.

Edward C. Papenfuse
Baltimore, Maryland

---

3 Peter Sweeper’s case was noted in Tunnicliff Catterall’s Judicial Cases, 2:511–512. What Professor Schweninger’s research uncovers is the names and the extent of the community in Maryland that made Peter Sweeper’s plea sustainable, including a witness from Hampstead, Maryland, who traveled 800 miles to testify on his behalf.

Professor Martha S. Jones has spent the better part of her professional life defending and teaching about the citizenship rights of the poor, the oppressed, and educationally deprived, people whose lives are criticized, denigrated, and pushed aside by the larger community who fail to respect or acknowledge any rights they may still have remaining. Her opening preface, “First the Streets, Then the Archives,” hints at her journey that follows from the lower Manhattan halls of justice to the now underutilized magnificent reading room of the Baltimore Bar Library in search of understanding the ways and legal means in which “Charm City” defined and to a degree defended the rights of its black residents, enslaved and free, prior to the Civil War. In doing so she brings a fresh and informed eye to the narrative, making use of the data, arguments, and opinions produced in court cases set in the context of contemporary writings by blacks and whites, which scholars often have ignored, misinterpreted, and misidentified in their efforts to explain the meaning of citizenship to the black community. Her beginning with the writings of William Yates is a typical example. Yates addressed in print what he felt were the two basic ingredients of citizenship denied to antebellum blacks: suffrage and full participation in the legal system, from unfettered testimony to jury duty. The only problem for her initially, and for anyone reading him was whose voice Yates represented. It turns out that there were two men of that name. The Baltimore William Yates was a black voice who fled Baltimore for California, where his views on black citizenship were to be found mostly in his reported sermons and the newspapers. The author William Yates was a white abolitionist who wrote about what should be the citizenship rights of black Americans. Professor Jones was in search of black voices on the definition of citizenship and she found them, both speaking through the printed word and in the often obscure details of court cases.

What constituted a citizen in America has never been clear and was always obscured by perceptions of privilege assigned by the color of the skin and how clearly an individual expressed him or herself in King’s English. Baltimore is a particularly good place to explore the nuances of what should, could, and did pass as citizenship, and the desire for citizenship. It was a seafaring town in which large numbers of blacks could be free to form their own religious communities, buy and sell property and services (to a degree important to understand), and to aid, abet, and move on fugitives from perpetual bondage. Given the obstacles placed in their way, their achievements were remarkable, perhaps even miraculous. Within the forties, the Watkineses, the Paynes, the Samuel Ward Chases (she overlooks Chase) succeeded in schooling a bright community of leaders, some of whom remained to fight the battles in the courts and the classrooms at home, whole others fled to Canada, California, Liberia, and England, to wage the still ongoing battle for equal rights, equal justice, and equal opportunity with and without the law.
The challenge to defining citizenship, as Professor Jones points out, was not all based on an argument of equal intellectual acumen and ability, but in part on the practical issue of the rights of Americans abroad, particularly hard working, ill-educated, black seamen. In the U.S. Merchant Marine and to a much lesser degree the U.S. Navy, black men from the Chesapeake were highly regarded as seamen, cooks, and body servants to officers. During the War of 1812, the vast majority of black seamen incarcerated in Dartmoor prison claimed to be from the Chesapeake and were accorded rights as full citizens of America even if back home they could not practice them. South Carolina even refused to let them land when they got back to being sailors. Professor Jones uses the example of William Watkins to illustrate the problem of national citizenship as defined by employment at sea, but he was not the typical example that proves the rule. A better choice might have been the Baltimore men of Dartmoor whose taste of international freedom led their leaders to move their post-war homes to somewhat safer environments like Boston. Still, there was brisk business in seamen’s papers in the Baltimore marketplaces, as Frederick Douglass discovered and used to his advantage in seeking his path to freedom and citizenship.

Professor Jones’s chapters on “making congregants citizens” and “courthouse claims and the contours of citizenship” are particularly enlightening. In them, the role of the churches and their ministers in fostering community resistance and education is delineated in an absorbing and compelling narrative, as is her saga of internal divisions and endless court cases that touched on a wide range of rights and privileges attributed to citizenship that blacks were permitted to argue for within the legal system in Maryland and particularly Baltimore. What she is missing, to her disadvantage, is the extensive research and analysis of Loren Schweninger (see above for the review of his book Appealing for Liberty: Freedom Suits in the South, published the same year as Birthright Citizens), which provides a deeper and more profound understanding of the actions of the people and cases she does discuss.

She might also have drawn on the work of Hilary J. Moss and Andrew K. Diemer (see note 4 above), who have also studied extensively the efforts of blacks in Baltimore to become educated citizens and soldiers. Moss’s work would have been helpful to explain that the struggles to define citizenship for Baltimore blacks was sustained by a networking of churches and itinerant ministers from Portland, Maine, to Baltimore, and from Baltimore westward into Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, and California. That can be seen clearly in the careers of Thomas W. Henry, Samuel Ward Chase, Daniel Payne, Darius Stokes, and the community of communication among congregations that they fostered and led. Diemer’s work is also important to Professor Jones’s analysis in that he broadens the story of the struggle to define citizenship to the assertion of the right to bear arms in defense of the Union.

Without question, Professor Jones has brought new evidence and readable narrative to understanding the struggle of Baltimore blacks to be acknowledged as full citizens. She might have dug deeper in the surviving evidence to understand the nature and
extent of the struggles, particularly with some of the case studies she cites. For example, her discussion of Charity Govan misses an important aspect of her contributions to the cause of citizenship. Professor Jones found Charity by accident when examining court proceedings in which travel passes were granted to non-whites. She did find that Charity had a history of resistance to allowing blacks to compete as artists and craftsmen in city wide fairs, but she did not look closely at her source or her battle against the Maryland Institute, one of those institutions that would continue to foster racism and separation long after the Civil War. If she had, she would have realized that despite the racism that precluded Charity from the fair, her work was judged superior by the white women who rejected it (she had probably been trained by the Oblate Sisters), and that it was not simply her ability to gild a frame gold. Furthermore, the reason for the pass and why Charity wanted to travel is significant and discoverable. Charity wanted the pass to be able to travel to Toronto to visit the fugitive slave community there, and to come home to continue her life as a skilled weaver and seamstress. While it will never be known for certain, it is most probable that she was part of the hidden underground network that helped move those slaves who could manage it to escape bondage and the oppressive hand of slavery, and there can be no doubt that she continued to add her voice and humble earnings to the defense of her civil rights as she defined them in her own hometown until the day she was buried in the now desecrated Laurel Cemetery out on Belair Road.

On the whole, Professor Jones’s book is one that no person interested in what it means and takes to be a citizen of these United States should fail to read. There are lessons in it that reach to the present, full of warning about how oppressive racism and xenophobia can be and how disastrous the future will be for all of us if we do not eradicate it from at least our public policies, if not our souls.

Edward C. Papenfuse
Baltimore, Maryland


Maryland history aficionados have reason to break into applause at the appearance of the second edition of Maryland: A History, first published in 1986. The output of a notable collection of historians of our state and nation, led by Suzanne Ellery Chappelle (professor emerita, Morgan State University) and Jean B. Russo (Maryland State Archives; Historic Annapolis), the work is a visual mélange of photographs, maps, graphs, and tables, beautifully designed by the Johns Hopkins University Press and sure to please readers seeking visually stimulating ways of learning.

The book’s engaging eight chapters cover Maryland’s history from the “formative years,” 1634–1763, to the modern period, 1985–2015. Intervening chapters are devoted
to the Revolutionary War era; the state’s role in the new nation; the Civil War and early years of Reconstruction; industrial growth, immigration, political reform, and the rise of progressivism; depression and war; and the post-war era. The verso page of each chapter opener features a quick chronological reference of major events, in Maryland, the nation, and the world—where else can one find, at a glance, the year that saw both the opening of the Baltimore Beltway and the Cuban Missile Crisis? There it is, 1962!

Books with multiple authors often reflect individual writing styles that make for choppy reading, but in this new edition, Chappelle and Russo—with an impressive supporting cast of Jean H. Baker, Dean R. Esslinger, Edward C. Papenfuse, Constance B. Schulz, and Gregory A. Stiverson—have ensured that the prose flows smoothly and seamlessly. The previously mentioned graphics reinforce the inviting text—ever wonder about the extent of Maryland’s network of railroads and canals? The map of Maryland transportation in 1890, on page 172, shows it all, in living color. What must be hundreds of photographs, culled in a monumental effort by the authors from a wide range of collections such as the Library of Congress, the Maryland Historical Society, the Maryland State Archives, NASA, the Baltimore Sun, the Enoch Pratt Library, and even Precision Rafting (which offered up a great action shot of whitewater rafters) further illuminate the Maryland story in an aesthetically pleasing layout. Blocks of boxed text with colored background, offering detail on specific topics and incidents, are amply placed throughout the work—a vivid account of the Baltimore Fire of 1904, combined with a captivating photo of citizens standing amidst the scorched rubble, contemplating the destruction (page 180), is an excellent example.

This new edition of Maryland: A History is no esoteric work destined for oblivion in dusty stacks; any Marylander, native or transplant, will find it an appealing resource for absorbing the fascinating history of our small but vital state—one of the thirteen original colonies, one of four slave states that remained loyal to the Union, a state that both inflicted Spiro Agnew on the national body politic and gave the country the towering figure of Frederick Douglass. Useful resources appear at the end of the book: maps depicting the state’s counties and county seats, its geographic regions (Appalachian, Piedmont, Coastal Plain), settlement patterns and evolution of counties; a chronological list of Maryland governors, from the colonial governor Leonard Calvert (full disclosure: an ancestor of this reviewer) to the 2015 inauguration of Lawrence J. Hogan, Jr.; suggestions for further reading for each chapter; a glossary; and a detailed index.

High school and college students studying the history of Maryland should find this work on their reading lists, and school and public libraries at all levels would do well to have copies available for their communities. Organizations in the state may find it a worthwhile ingredient in a welcome package for new employees moving to Maryland. Maryland: A History is a welcome addition to the literature on the state, an impressive and accessible work that fills the void in the story of Maryland that has loomed since Robert J. Brugger’s masterful work, Maryland: A Middle Temperament, 1634–1980, appeared in 1988.

Charles W. Mitchell
Baltimore, Maryland
This biography of Gloria Richardson is one monograph in a series, Civil Rights and the Struggle for Black Equality in the Twentieth Century, published by The University Press of Kentucky with the goal of making available scholarly material on overlooked aspects of the civil rights movement. The book traces the life and work of Gloria Richardson, who gained national renown during the 1960s as she led a movement in the small city of Cambridge on Maryland’s still largely rural Eastern Shore. Her local roots and connections are recounted as well as her contacts and interactions with important national activists. Chapter 1, “Foundations,” describes the legacy of her mother’s family, descended from a long line of free African Americans who lived and accumulated substantial property on the Eastern Shore, actively supported education for black students, and held elective office on the Cambridge City Council beginning in the 1880s, and of her father’s family, who had been enslaved in Mecklenburg County in Virginia where, after the Civil War, family members began to accumulate property and to rise to local prominence. Richardson herself was born in Baltimore, to parents who were members of the city’s African American elite and who taught her by word and example to carry on their work in “race service.” When the Depression of the 1930s took hold, Richardson’s father, a pharmacist, moved the family to Cambridge and opened a drugstore to serve the black community there. The family prospered in that largely segregated town. Like her father, Gloria Richardson graduated from Howard University in Washington, D.C.

Fitzgerald stresses the importance that local movements played in the development of protest leaders and in the civil rights movement as a whole. Gloria Richardson became one of those leaders at the time when the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) were assuming active leadership roles in the struggle. Many of the young people, including Richardson, who worked with those and other organizations were students and recent graduates of HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities) as well as of majority-white colleges in the North. The author does include northern white participation in his accounts of events. Particularly interesting to students of Maryland history are the differences that Fitzgerald points out between the movement in the South and the movement in Maryland and points further north and west. He notes that, in the Deep South, the emphasis was on voting rights and desegregation. In Maryland and further north, where African Americans did vote continuously after 1877, the emphasis often was on access to good jobs, the availability of rigorous public education, and decent housing. In Cambridge, protests were against segregated facilities, including stores and places of entertainment, as well as against the lack of availability of good jobs with equal pay for black and white workers, the lack of schools equal to those for white students, and segregation of housing for African Americans into neighborhoods without adequate space and functioning public utilities.
This study chronicles the events in Cambridge from the early, non-violent protests to a boycott of segregated businesses to violent confrontations that began with white violence against African American protestors. The Maryland National Guard was called in to maintain order and protect the lives and property of both sides. The author emphasizes the tactics, goals, and increasingly militant philosophy of the Cambridge movement and of Richardson herself as she built the Cambridge Nonviolent Action Committee (CNAC), became part of a national network of activists, met with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and developed a close working relationship with Malcolm X. Fitzgerald notes Richardson’s egalitarian principles, realized in part because she was a woman who assumed a major leadership position and additionally because she accepted as equals all volunteers regardless of their economic class or education level. In 1964, Gloria Richardson moved to New York City and ended her direct involvement as leader of the Cambridge struggle, although she was back in Cambridge in 1967 and also continued to be involved with civil rights and black power leaders and activities. This biography follows her life beyond the 1960s and analyzes her importance as a female leader and her belief that, for any movement to be successful, people must create grass-roots movements that will draw in adherents based on local needs and concerns.

In writing this, Fitzgerald conducted numerous interviews with Richardson herself and with many others who knew and worked with her; she also used both primary and secondary sources. Several concerns arise in connection with factual details that should make any reader double-check such entries. For example, on page 37 the author states that “black people could not serve on Maryland juries until the mid-1930s.” This is incorrect. Once enfranchised, i.e. after 1877, a few African Americans did, in fact serve on juries, initially even on the Eastern Shore. Until the 1930s, African Americans generally did not serve on Eastern Shore juries but they did continue to serve on occasion in Baltimore and some other parts of the state. The extensive endnotes clump many sources together, which sometimes limits identifying a specific source, but perhaps there was no good alternative here since the author used such a wide range of material. In conclusion, this book provides an in-depth account of Gloria Richardson’s life and work and also a fascinating view of this period in the history of the Eastern Shore of Maryland. It is engagingly written, extensively researched, and of interest to anyone interested in Maryland history, in the history of the Eastern Shore in particular, in African American history, in the civil rights movement, and in women’s history.

Suzanne E. Chapelle
Professor emerita, Morgan State University

Juilene Osborne-McKnight’s The Story We Carry in Our Bones is an introductory text for those who have no knowledge of Irish history. Although the author indicates that her work is directed primarily at Irish Americans, the book would be useful to anyone with a passing curiosity regarding the Emerald Isle.

The text is broken into four parts, focusing on prehistoric Ireland, early Christian Ireland, the involvement of the English state in Irish affairs, and the history of Irish Americans since the mid-nineteenth century. The writing style is informal and accessible to any reader, photographs and illustrations are sprinkled liberally throughout the book, and the inclusion of literary extracts (most of which have been penned by the author herself) help breathe life into the events being recounted. In short, it is an entertaining yet informative read.

This style works best in the chapters on the Irish famine, with Osborne-McKnight doing an excellent job depicting the horrors experienced by the Irish population while also explaining the wider political and social circumstances that led to the crisis. The last section of the book, dedicated to Irish America, manages to celebrate the story of Irish immigrants and their ancestors in the United States without avoiding some of the negative aspects of this history.

That being said, there are issues with this book. Numerous errors (the Celtic languages are inaccurately referred to as the Gaelic language family and the modern Irish population is recorded as 4.5 million, rather than 6.5 million), anachronisms (the author refers to the British state and Northern Ireland centuries before these entities came into existence), and exaggerations (ancient Irish wolfhounds apparently were “head and shoulders taller than a man,” while Irish famine victims in Mayo were supposedly so thin that they were blown by the wind into a nearby lake and drowned) litter the book. The sources used by Osborne-McKnight tend to be popular histories rather than academic works, and many of the more nuanced evaluations of certain events by well-regarded Irish historians are ignored. Hence the Battle of Clontarf in 1014 is presented, unduly simplistically, as a struggle between Irish and Viking armies, while the Cromwellian massacres are highlighted but the context within which they took place is not mentioned. It is also notable that the author has very little to say about the history of Ireland after Cromwell’s campaign, with the exception of the famine. The 1798 rebellion—indeed, the entire eighteenth century—is absent from the book, while twentieth-century Irish history, including the struggle for independence from Britain and the violence in Northern Ireland, receive the briefest of passing comments.

Furthermore, there are times, particularly in the first half of the book, when certain aspects of Irish history are misrepresented. Despite the fact that several scholars have raised questions about whether the Celts ever migrated to Ireland, Osborne-McKnight writes at length about the characteristics of Celtic Ireland. This need not be problem-
atic in and of itself, except that the supposed Celtic connection seemingly justifies the author’s decision to use Julius Caesar’s account of his wars in Gaul and Pliny the Elder’s description of Gaulish druids as the basis for her discussion of warfare and religious practices in ancient Irish society. Therefore we get statements like “Irish warriors . . . rode magnificent horses and the very best of them were driven to battle in wickerwork chariots” (52) despite the fact that there is no archeological evidence that chariots were ever used in Ireland. Although the author is on safer ground in using Irish legends as a window to understanding pre-Christian Ireland, at times it might be difficult for a novice in Irish history to appreciate where the myth ends and the history begins, especially with her own literary extracts mixed in.

The most glaring misrepresentation comes when Osborne-McKnight writes “Unlike the Romans or later medieval societies dominated by men, ancient Irish society was remarkably nonsexist” (47). While there are certain aspects of old Irish law that could be considered comparatively enlightened in terms of women’s rights (at least for those in the aristocratic classes), Gaelic Ireland was unquestionably and unambiguously a patriarchal society. The author gives the impression that women regularly rose to attain the rank of chieftain, lawyer or druid, but the evidence for this is scant. It is telling that Osborne-McKnight has to point to a nineteenth-century painting (The Druids: Bringing In the Mistletoe by George Henry and Edward Atkinson Hornel) and a modern series of fictional novels (the Sister Fidelma mysteries by Peter Tremayne) to emphasize the prominent role she claims women played in early Christian Ireland.

In short, The Story in Our Bones offers a lively and enjoyable starting point for newcomers to Irish history, but those who seek an in-depth understanding of Ireland’s past, especially that of recent centuries, must look elsewhere.

Caoimhín De Barra
Gonzaga University


Colin G. Calloway’s The Indian World of George Washington aims to reevaluate the traditional glorification of national expansion and Indian conquest that dominates most histories of early American expansion. Instead, Calloway seeks to show the power of the Indian nations and the complexity behind Indian relations in the story of America’s founding; he wants to restore the story of the Indian population to its rightful place in the story of the founding of the United States. To accomplish this goal, Calloway seeks to reestablish the Indian story in the George Washington story. Calloway argues that “Washington’s life, like the lives of so many of his contemporaries, was inextricably linked to Native America, a reality we have forgotten as our historical hindsight has separated Indians and early Americans so sharply, and prematurely, into winners and losers.”
In writing this book, Calloway shies away from a strict biography of Washington but employs “a biographical framework to show how Native America shaped the life of the man who shaped the nation. Tracing Washington's life through the Indian world of his time, and revealing the multiple points where his life intersected with, affected, and was affected by Indian people, Indian lands, and Indian affairs, offers an unfamiliar but more complete telling of what some would say is the American story.” In this, Calloway excels. *The Indian World of George Washington* is broken into three sections encompassing Washington's military and political career.

Part one, “Learning Curves,” explores Washington’s early interactions with the Native American population in Virginia and the Ohio River Valley. Looking through the biographical lens, Calloway explores Washington's life as a surveyor, land speculator, and soldier during the French and Indian War. The reader is introduced to an alternate and little-seen view of George Washington: one where land, wealth, and status are at the forefront of Washington's goals in his early life. Rather than viewing the Native Americans as indigenous people who lived on the land for hundreds of years before he was born, Washington viewed the Native Americans as secondary and only objects that needed to be dealt with to achieve his goals. In addition to the biography of Washington and his interactions with Native Americans, Calloway shows the complicated relationships between the many Native American tribes themselves and the colonies, with a case study, two chapters worth, of the Cherokee-Thirteen Colonies relationship.

In the second part of the book, Calloway progresses with Washington's life moments by examining Washington's relationship with the Native Americans during the American Revolution. While this part is not solely focused on Washington, with the chapters exploring the Continental Congress's policies on the Native Americans, Washington and his views of the Native Americans are featured heavily. Just as with his early philosophy relating to Indians, Calloway argues that “The need and opportunities for Indian Allies demanded his [Washington's] attention at critical times during the Revolution, but he was always more interested in Indian lands than in Indian allies.” For Washington, while the revolution offered new political opportunities, it also offered opportunities to previously inaccessible land. Washington's personal goals of western expansion would extend from the French and Indian War to the American Revolution, and finally into his presidency and early American national goals.

In the third and final section of *The Indian World of George Washington*, entitled “The First President and the First Americans,” Calloway explores Washington the president and his relationship with Native Americans. Although Washington’s, and the United States’s, goal was westward expansion, Washington found himself facing similar challenges of expansion faced by the Crown government. In a bit of irony, highlighted by Calloway, Washington was forced to sign into law the Trade and Intercourse Act of 1790—an act similar to those by the Crown that a young Washington fought so hard to end as a land speculator. Calloway shows the United States's Native American policy as one where the Native Americans would give up their land voluntarily, through treaties or purchase, or, if necessary, through conflict and conquest. Calloway then explores the
policies in-depth in the next few chapters by examining how the policy took shape in the north, south, and west, highlighting that the policy ultimately aimed at assimilating Native Americans into white American culture.

_The Indian World of George Washington_ is a remarkably well written and researched book that historians have come to expect from Colin Calloway. Although the book is easily accessible to general history readers, for those less versed in the history of Native American tribes, locations, and tribal relations, _The Indian World of George Washington_ does pose some minor challenges. That said, Calloway achieves his argument and provides the reader with a new, correct, and more complete understanding of the Native American-colonial/American relationships. _The Indian World of George Washington_ will not only appeal to Washington and Native American scholars, but to the general reader interested in early American-Native American relationships.

Alexander H. Lothstein
Maryland Historical Society


When Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg, he reminded his listeners that they were gathered not just to dedicate a cemetery for the dead, but “rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.” If, as Lincoln suggested, that unfinished work was the task of bringing forth “a new birth of freedom,” then Reconstruction represents the most serious attempt at completing it. Eric Foner has spent much of his illustrious career exploring this topic, most notably in _Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution_. In his latest book, _The Second Founding: How the Civil War and Reconstruction Remade the Constitution_, Foner continues that exploration, examining “the origins, enactment, and objectives of the Reconstruction amendments and the contest over their meaning that followed ratification” (xx).

Foner begins with a lengthy introduction that offers a brief but useful summary of slavery’s pre-war legal status before moving on to a fascinating discussion of antebellum understandings of citizenship. As one member of Congress remarked during Reconstruction, “those who examined” the question before the war “must have been pained by the fruitless search in the law books and records of our courts for a clear and satisfactory definition” of citizenship (3). No one could agree on just who was entitled to American citizenship or the rights it conferred. Rejecting the various definitions of citizenship propounded by men committed to slavery and white supremacy, abolitionists and free African Americans developed an expansive definition of their own, one that heavily influenced the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments.

Foner devotes a separate chapter to each of the Reconstruction amendments. “What is Freedom? The Thirteenth Amendment” traces the evolution of Republican antislavery
policies over the course of the Civil War, a process which culminated in the abolition of slavery through constitutional amendment. In one particularly interesting passage, Foner reveals how the Women’s Loyal National League, founded by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, played a critical role in Congressional Republicans’ decision to go down that path, organizing a major petition drive that rallied public opinion behind amending the constitution (29).

In “Toward Equality: The Fourteenth Amendment,” Foner explains how the amendment that redefined citizenship and the federal government’s relationship with the states was a result of compromises between various Republican factions that left no one truly satisfied. Many in the growing women’s movement, for instance, felt betrayed by the insertion of the word “male” into the Constitution for the first time. While they had played a critical role in generating public support for the Thirteenth Amendment, many white women’s rights activists opposed the Fourteenth Amendment and increasingly resorted to arguments grounded in white supremacism (81).

African Americans and their more committed allies, of course, were disappointed by the Fourteenth Amendment’s failure to guarantee black voting rights and called for an additional constitutional amendment to rectify this. Foner tells that story in “The Right to Vote: The Fifteenth Amendment.” Despite the chapter’s title, the Fifteenth Amendment did not actually create a “positive” right to vote. As Foner explains, Republicans had to choose between “an amendment establishing a uniform national standard that enfranchised virtually all adult male citizens, or a ‘negative’ one barring the use of race or other criteria to limit the right to vote but otherwise leaving qualifications in the hands of the states.” Lawmakers chose the latter option. The alternative “represents a road not taken that would have barred the methods used by southern states in the late nineteenth century to disenfranchise their black populations as well as most state voter suppression measures today” (99).

After discussing the origins and enactment of each amendment, Foner moves into his final and most interesting section. “Justice and Jurisprudence” explains how, in the decades after Reconstruction, the Supreme Court gutted the amendments in a series of decisions culminating in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. Foner expertly explores the cases both individually and collectively. If there is a hero in this story, it is Justice John Marshall Harlan, whose dissents form part of what Foner calls a “counter-interpretation” of the Reconstruction amendments, an interpretation that today “remains available, if the political environment changes” (174–175).

More than three decades after publication of his masterful history of Reconstruction, Foner remains one of the leading authorities on the period. While readers looking for a comprehensive history of the era would do better to pick up his earlier work, Foner’s new book is an excellent history of the constitutional changes Reconstruction produced.

Peter A. Sicher
Independent researcher
Maryland History Bibliography, 2018: A Selected List

ANNE S. K. TURKOS and ELIZABETH CARINGOLA, Compilers

From 1975 on, the *Maryland Historical Magazine* has published regular compilations of books, articles, and doctoral dissertations relating to Maryland history. The following list includes materials published during 2018, as well as earlier works that have been brought to our attention.

Bibliographers must live with the fact that their work is never finished. Please notify us of any significant omissions so that they may be included in the next list. Send additional items to:

Anne S. K. Turkos
Special Collections and University Archives
3210K Hornbake Library
4130 Campus Drive
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Previous years’ installments of the Maryland History Bibliography are now searchable online. Please visit lib.umd.edu/dcr/collections/mdhc/ for more information about this database and to search for older titles on Maryland history and culture.

GENERAL


AFRICAN AMERICAN

Alvarez, Beth. “Caroline Cramphin and her Children—the Little Known Descendants of George Calvert.” *Riversdale*, no. 35 (Fall 2018): 5–7.


Brock, Jared A. The Road to Dawn: Josiah Henson and the Story that Sparked the Civil War. New York, NY: PublicAffairs, Hachette Book Group, [2018].

Callcott, Margaret L. “George Calvert’s ‘Other Family.’” Riversdale, no. 35 (Spring 2018): 7–8.


Doster, Dennis A. “‘This Independent Fight We Are Making is Local’: The Election of 1920 and Electoral Politics in Black Baltimore.” Journal of Urban History, no. 44 (March 2018): 134–52.


Levine, Robert S. “Frederick Douglass Once Turned to Fiction to Describe What He Considered True Heroism.” *Humanities*, no. 39 (Spring 2018): 5.


“Towson University Faculty Produce Film on Jim Crow-Era Baltimore.” *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education (Online)*, March 7, 2018.


Winn, Melissa A. “Poor Old Nick: The North’s First Casualty was a Former Slave.” *Civil War Times*, no. 57 (February 2018): 39.
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