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Mathias Hammond

According to the inscription on his tombstone, Mathias Hammond\(^1\) was born on May 24, 1748, the youngest son and youngest child of Philip and Rachel Brice Hammond.\(^2\) The tombstone inscription provides the only evidence for the date of Hammond’s birth, a point of concern as a birthdate of 1748 makes a few subsequent events in Hammond’s life appear to be unusual.\(^3\) An alternative and more plausible date of birth is not readily apparent, however. Hammond’s siblings were born in June 1729, May 1731, April 1735, April 1739, May 1740, March 1742/43, and 1746. The most likely alternative birthdate for Mathias would be May 1743—a misreading of 1743, as 1748 thus accounting for the tombstone inscription—but if Denton were born in 1742 by the pre-1752 calendar, that is 1743 N.S., Mathias obviously could not have been born in May of the same year. He could have been born in 1744 or 1745 but a confusion of either of those years for 1748 seems less likely. Mathias’s position as the youngest son appears to be confirmed by his father’s will, in which he is the last-named son, and by the disposition of his father’s estate in 1772: Mathias received lot #7, the last of the lots of slaves and silver to be divided among the seven heirs.\(^4\) Having no documented alternative birthdate, the assumption must be that the 1748 birthdate is correct, despite the questions that it raises.

Mathias Hammond first appears in the public records in 1760, with the probate of his father’s will. The will, written in 1753 when Mathias was barely five years old, leaves specific bequests only to Rachel Hammond and to three of Philip’s children: Charles and John, the two oldest sons, and Ann. Charles receives a legacy as compensation for serving as executor of his father’s estate, John inherits £500 sterling to pay for his education; and Ann is to receive £1000 sterling, half at her marriage at age twenty-one and half within two years of the first payment. Hammond’s six sons share the balance of the real and personal estate equally as tenants in common, and all minor children are to be supported by the estate until they come of age. The age of majority is not explicitly specified in the will; it should, therefore, have been age twenty-one.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Eighteenth-century usage tended to spell Hammond’s name as Matthias, but current usage puts only one ‘t’ in his name. The latter usage will be employed in this report.


\(^3\) Or so they appeared to be in 1992. Having later read the will of Elizabeth Bordley, witnessed by John Philemon Paca, at age c. eighteen, and still later deeds for which one party was between the ages of 18 and 21, Hammond’s activities seem less outside the norm. One Somerset sheriff named his fourteen-year-old son as an undersheriff, which might appear definitively unusual, but apparently not, as discussed by Holly Brewer in *By Birth or Consent: Children, Law, and the Anglo-American Revolution in Authority* (University of North Carolina Press, 2005), for those who would like to explore this question further.

\(^4\) Prerogative Court Accounts 67/112-20, 1772

\(^5\) Prerogative Court Wills, 31/92, 1760
In 1761, when Mathias was almost thirteen years old, his brother Charles, as executor to their father’s estate, submitted an inventory of the estate to the Prerogative Court. The inventory was not a complete recording of Philip Hammond’s personal property, however; it listed only Hammond’s slaves, 107 in number valued at £3604.50, and his plate, 528 oz. valued at £224.80. As was required for all inventories, two of Philip Hammond’s kin—his sons John and Philip—and two of his creditors--Nathaniel Hammond, Jr., and Richard Toortell--signed the inventory to indicate their agreement with the list and valuation of the assets. Neighbors H. Griffith and H. Ridgely acted as appraisers.

Mathias Hammond next appears in public view in 1764 at the age of sixteen when he joined the Forensic Club. The minutes of the club for August 27 made note that “Mr. Mathias Hammond being proposed as Member of the Club was approved of, had notice of his admission, appeared, and took his Seat accordingly.” Hammond’s acceptance as a member of the Forensic Club is one of the two episodes in his life that call into question the 1748 birthdate. A youth of sixteen seems a very unlikely and unusual associate for club members who were mostly gentlemen in their twenties and thirties. Mathias Hammond attended the monthly meetings of the club on an erratic basis, giving “satisfactory reasons for his absences” when he missed more than four meetings.

On May 7 1765, when Hammond was still sixteen—a few weeks short of his seventeenth birthday—he witnessed the sale of Magothy River property by William Woodward of Annapolis to his son William Garrett Woodward Jr. Again, Hammond’s participation in this sale was unusual. Legally he was not yet of age and therefore should not have been a valid witness to this transaction.

Hammond’s behavior during 1766, as reported in the Forensic Club minutes, might suggest a lack of maturity on the part of the seventeen-year-old. The secretary recorded on February 24th that “Mr. Hammond was fined 2s. 6d. for not making good a Motion made by him agt. Mr. James Brice.” Hammond was also fined 2s. 6d. for “impious language.” A later, undated entry records a fine for indecent behavior, but does not specify the offense. Such fines were not unusual, however; members of the club were fined frequently for offensive language or behavior.

During the next few years, Hammond’s public role consisted of management of his land, both buying new tracts and establishing his title to land he already held. In 1768, after obtaining a resurvey certificate, assigned to him by his brother Denton, for 109 acres of Abington, he patented the resurveyed land in his own name. Neighbors Gerard Hopkins, Benjamin Gaither, and William Woodward witnessed the boundaries of the resurveyed tract.

In May 1769, the year he turned twenty-one, Hammond sued in the provincial court to obtain possession from Abraham Barnes, gentleman of St. Mary’s County, of a 100-acre tract

---

6 Prerogative Court Inventories 76/89, March 1761
7 Forensic Club Minutes, Maryland State Archives, MdHR #1211
9 The survey, dated 10/24/1767, is recorded in Patents, 117/339. It was assigned to Matthias Hammond on 6/2/1768. The patent is recorded in Patents 113/194, and is dated 6/8/1768
called Brookes Land, on the Chesapeake Bay in St. Mary’s County. The court ruled in favor of Hammond, ordering the county sheriff to deliver full seisin, or possession, to Hammond. The sheriff appears in court the following October to testify that the seisin had been delivered.10

During the same month, Mathias and his brother Denton witness a deed by which their brother John purchased land from Griffith Collins.11

During the next few years, Mathias Hammond continued to add to his landholdings. In January 1770, he obtained a warrant for 38 acres.12 In April, he purchased 22 acres of Abington from Amos Gaither for £85 sterling. The land that he acquired lay adjacent to the portion of Abington that he already owned, on the road to the chapel and to Rezin Gaither’s land. Robert Couden and G. Watts witnessed the deed.13 The following month, Hammond purchased lot 90 in Annapolis from his brother Denton, paying £105 sterling for the property. His brothers Philip and Rezin witnessed this deed. In both purchases, Hammond is referred to as “Matthias Hammond, of Annapolis, gentleman.”14 Hammond also witnessed one deed in 1770: a sale by Nicholas Maccubin to Anne Gaither.15 Despite Hammond’s identification as a resident of Annapolis, his dealings with the county court shows him deeply involved with his neighbors in the Gambrills area.

Mathias Hammond began 1771 in the same way that he had started the previous year, with a warrant for 10 acres of land.16 In February, Hammond bought 941 acres on the north side of the Severn from Colonel Charles Hammond for £550 sterling. The properties were Sewell’s Increase (870 acres) and Addition (71 acres); Philip Thomas Lee witnessed the deed.17 Mathias Hammond did not witness many deeds and rarely witnessed transactions that did not involve family members, but in March 1771 he and William Iams signed a deed witnessing the sale of land in Anne Arundel by Jeremiah Jacob of Frederick to shipwright Samuel Tull of Anne Arundel. The land was part of the tract known as Iams Purchase.18 Hammond witnessed, with Henry Arnold, a second sale by a Frederick land owner in September of the same year. Thomas Wells sold George Wells, Sr., of Prince George’s County, a quarter share of the tract Strife.19

A rare clue as to the status of Hammond’s Annapolis property is contained in the deed of sale from Samuel Chase to Edward Lloyd for lot 107. The description of the metes and bounds began at a post on North East Street (Maryland Avenue) “at the north east end of a messuage or house now in the tenure of Richard Beard, tenants to Matthias Hammond, and running with the gable end of said house… to the lot now in possession of Mrs. Anne Ogle.”20 Hammond’s property, with the house rented by Richard Beard, fronted on Maryland Avenue between Prince

---

10 Provincial Court, DD15/444 and 651, docket #226, and DD16/121 and 299, docket #91.
11 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB & JB 1/381, 5/29/1769
12 Land Office, Patents 125/201
13 Anne Arundel County Land Records IB2/115, 4/12/1770
14 Anne Arundel County Land Records IB2/159, 5/15/1770
15 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB2/94, 4/21/1770. John Johnson was the second witness.
16 Land Office, Patents, 125/200
17 Anne Arundel Country Land Records, IB2/333. 2/19/1771
18 Provincial Court, Land Records, DD5/156, 3/20/1771
19 Provincial Court, Land Records 1770-1774, DD 5/22, 9/18/1771
20 Provincial Court Deeds, DD5/259, 7/27/1771
George Street and the property now known as the Chase-Lloyd House. The house possessed by Mrs. Anne Ogle is now [1992] the U.S.N.A. Alumni House.

In the same year, Mathias and his five brothers settled a claim against the estate of Burridge Scott of Anne Arundel County. Scott mortgaged property in 1750 to Philip Hammond. Scott defaulted on the mortgaged, making the mortgaged land and personalty the property of Philip Hammond. Hammond took possession of the slaves involved but had not obtained a conveyance of the land before his death. By the terms of a deed executed in August 1771, Scott’s son Richard released all of his claims, as his father’s heir, to the land in question.21

During the same month, Mathias Hammond’s name appears for the first time in the voluminous correspondence between Charles Carroll of Annapolis and his son Charles Carroll of Carrollton. Carroll of Annapolis had been engaged in a dispute with Samuel Howard over the ownership of land in Anne Arundel. He wrote to his son Charles in August that “I Heard one of the Hammonds are in treaty with Howard to Exchange Lands, if Howards sells to them, no hopes of getting the land from them.”22 The senior Carroll, who never lacked for advice for his son, urged Charles to press their agent to reach a settlement with Howard before the proposed exchange took place. He raised the issue again in a letter written in November of the same year. “[Y]ou wrote me that Wallace told you Howard would not Hearken to my proposals from Him until He was off with Hammond, Put Wallace in mind of this & press Him to ask Howard whether he has Concluded with Hammond & if off to know His terms.”23

In 1772, the heirs of Philip Hammond finally acted to settle his estate by dividing its assets among themselves as the will had directed. The slaves and silver plate, the only property that had been inventoried, were apportioned into seven roughly equal lots and allocated to the heirs “in lieu of further claims on the estate.” Mathias Hammond received sixteen slaves and fifteen silver items with a total value of £556.6.24 His slaves included Jenny’s son Ned and his wife Bet, two boys Vachel and Nacey, Toby, Hannah, old Betty, and Joshua and Bett Ruth’s three children, Ruth, Bungy, and Array. Hammond’s share of the silver consisted of a silver can, pepper caster, salt seller, five large spoons, four teaspoons, a salt shovel, and two large waiters.

Hammond’s sons, who had inherited their father’s lands as tenants in common, also began to vest title to those properties in single heirs by a process of each son deeding his rights to portions of the property to one or the other of his brothers. In March, Mathias, “of Anne Arundel County, gentleman,” executed a deed relinquishing to his brother John his claim to Acton, Philip’s Annapolis estate, and its one hundred acres, to an adjoining one-acre lot just within the city gate, and to nine other tracts totaling just over twenty-five hundred acres.25 On the same day,

21 Anne Arundel County Land Records, 1771-1173, MdHR #4793, IB 3/126
22 Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 8/26/1771, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers, Maryland Historical Society.
23 Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 11/8/1771, Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers, Maryland Historical Society.
24 Prerogative Court Accounts, 67/112.
a second deed transferred Mathias’s rights to other tracts to his brother Denton.\(^{26}\) At the same time, a deed from John to Mathias ceded John’s rights to a one-sixth share of twenty-two tracts, with a total size of 3785 acres.\(^{27}\)

On the same day that Mathias acquired John’s rights to his own share of their father’s land, he also purchased property from John, buying five tracts containing nearly twelve hundred acres for £1,800 sterling.\(^{28}\) A week later, Mathias purchased Sewell’s Fancy, a three-hundred acre tract above the head of the Severn River, from William Woodward. Sr., of Baltimore, for £57 sterling.\(^{29}\) Two months later, however, Mathis sold the property to his brother Denton for the same price.

Charles Carroll of Annapolis, still concerned about the possible loss of the land contested with Samuel Howard, scolded his son in March 1772 for failing to resolve the matter. “I hope Hammond,” he wrote, “had not bought the Land in Dispute between us & Howard, I think you neglected pressing Wallace as often as you ought Scheming and thinking without action will never bring Business to a wished conclusion. You hate to stir from Home.”\(^{30}\) Nine days later, Carroll urged his son to let “Fish” Hammond [Mathias], “a prospective buyer of Howard land, know of the Carroll claim and that they were prepared to prosecute and defend it.”\(^{31}\)

The exchange of lands that Carroll feared began to take effect the following month. John Brice of Annapolis had held a mortgage on the Howard land, a mortgage that Brice’s heirs had sold to Rezin Hammond. On April 10, Rezin Hammond sold his mortgage rights to the property—five tracts contained nearly nine hundred acres—to Mathias for £435 sterling, a sum that represented payment of the principal and interest due on the mortgage.\(^{32}\) Three days later, Samuel Howard, planter of Anne Arundel, executed a deed to exchange property with Mathias Hammond of Anne Arundel, gentleman. Howard was the entailed heir of his father’s property while Hammond now held the mortgage on the same land. The two men agreed that Hammond would buy the property and “dock the tail,” that is, remove the restriction entailing the land to Howard’s male heirs. Hammond bought five tracts in exchange for the four hundred acres of Delaware Bottom and Woodford as well as £325 sterling.\(^{33}\) Charles Steward and Thomas Sappington witnessed this deed. In the same month John Hall sued Matias Hammond in provincial court for title to the five tracts, which included the land that was in dispute between Howard and Carroll. Howard acted as Hammond’s witness for his ownership of the land, but the witness Howard offered to support his—Howard’s—right to sell the land did not appear in court.

---

\(^{26}\) Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 3/312, 3/24/1772. The description of the tracts involved is mostly missing, as the page on which they were recorded has been removed from the volume. The names of three tracts remain in the record; two of the three totaled 1370 acres.

\(^{27}\) Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 3/396, 3/24/1772.

\(^{28}\) Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 3/408, 3/24/1772.

\(^{29}\) Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 3/368, 3/31/1772.

\(^{30}\) Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 3/17/1772, Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers, Maryland Historical Society.

\(^{31}\) Note to letter no.181, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers.

\(^{32}\) Anne Arundel County Deeds, IB 3/260, 4/10/1772.

\(^{33}\) Provincial Court Land Record, DD 5/313, 4/13/1772.
The court ruled, therefore, in favor of John Hall, granting him full seisin of the disputed property.\textsuperscript{34}

Ownership of the land in question would continue to be the subject of dispute, however. The rent roll for Anne Arundel County, completed some time in the early 1770s, testifies to the uncertainty surrounding these lands. The rent roll recorded that the tract of Warner’s Neck, two hundred acres surveyed for James Warner in 1651 near the Severn River, had been resurveyed into Howard’s Inheritance; that 120 acres had been entered again as the Remainder of Warner’s Neck; and finally that Mathias Hammond had acquired 320 acres from Warner’s Neck from Samuel Howard in April 1772. Howard’s Inheritance was described as a 449-acre tract that included 100 acres of Chance and 200 acres from Warner’s Neck as well as surplus land. Chance, a 200-acre tract on the south side of the Severn, was noted as having been sold by Samuel Howard to John Brice in 1751, by Samuel Howard to Thomas Jenings in 1752 and by Samuel Howard to Mathias Hammond in 1772.\textsuperscript{35}

In September 1772 Hammond executed two deeds that exchanged property with Edward Lloyd, bringing him the first two of the lots on which he built his town house. Hammond sold lot 90 to Lloyd and Lloyd sold lots 92 and 105 to Hammond, the price for each sale being five shillings.\textsuperscript{36} Both men were identified as gentlemen of Annapolis, although Lloyd’s primary residence was in Talbot County.

Mathias Hammond also added to his landholdings in 1772 by continuing to survey and patent land for which he held warrants. In January he obtained a survey of a six-acre addition to Hood’s Hall and Ben’s Luck, consisting of land lying between the two tracts; he received a patent for this tract in May 1772.\textsuperscript{37} A six-and-one-half-acre Additions to Hazard, a three-acre Second Addition to Hazard, an eight-and-one-quarter Addition to Porter’s Care, ad a six-acre Addition to Kendall’s Delight, all surveyed in January, received patents in May.\textsuperscript{38} The January survey of the twenty-five-acre Addition to Green Spring was patented in June, while the survey of Mill Meadow, originally undertaken in July 1771 for John Hammond to eliminate land included in older surveys and to add vacant land, was transferred to Mathias in March and patented by Mathias as a thirty-nine-and-one-half acre tract.\textsuperscript{40} By these various transactions, Hammond sought to rationalize the boundaries of his land, incorporating vacant land that had been omitted from early surveys when surveying techniques were less precise.

\textsuperscript{34} Provincial Court Judgments, September 1771-April 1772, MdHR #810, DD 18/178, 277, 556, Docket 3265, April term 1772.
\textsuperscript{35} Land Office Rent Roll, #1, Anne Arundel County, ff. 62, 74, 92, and 69.
\textsuperscript{37} Land Office Patents, 125/201, January 1772, and 119/523, May 1772.
\textsuperscript{38} Land Office Patents, 125/201 and 122/311; 125/200 and 119/526; 125/202 and 119/522; and 125/203 and 119/525.
\textsuperscript{39} Land Office Patents 125/201. January 1772, and 122/353, June 1772.
\textsuperscript{40} Land Office Patents, 125/197 and 122/356.
Mathias Hammond continued to add to his landholdings in 1773. In January he paid five shillings to purchase the rights of William Gaither, an Anne Arundel merchant, to the mill and twenty-eight acres that comprised Gaither’s Mill (part of Phelp’s Increase), on the north side of the Severn River, for five shillings. A week later, James Disney, an Anne Arundel millwright, sold Hammond twenty acres of Phelps Increase and the rights to a second twenty acres, also part of Philip’s [sic] Increase, adjacent to Piney Grove and also for five shillings.41

In February, Hammond leased part of his Annapolis lots to local tradesmen who belonged to a group known as the Well-Meaning Society.42 “Actuated by a desire to promote the intention of so worthy a society,” Hammond was willing to lease them a piece of ground for the rent of one penny current money, payable each year on the first of March. The lease extended for ninety-nine years, renewable forever, on the condition that the group build a house on the property at their own cost within three years and that if the group ceased to meet for more than six months the lease would be void, the house would be sold at public sale, and a new lease executed to the purchaser by Hammond or his heirs for £4 sterling per year. The lot, a 40-by-40-square, was located on Prince George Street somewhere between North East Street and the lot belonging to William Paca; the boundaries were marked only by locust posts and not by any identifiable landmarks.

Mathias Hammond assumed his first major civic role in April 1773 when he and Allen Quyn were chosen as vestrymen by the members of St. Anne’s Parish.43 Hammond attended meetings in August, November, and December of that year, in the company of fellow vestrymen John Bullen, William Woodward Sr., William Woodward Jr., and William Paca. Quyn was nearly fifty and Paca almost thirty-three, while Hammond was just short of his twenty-fifth birthday.

The association between Hammond and Paca was furthered in May 1773 when both men were elected to represent the City of Annapolis as delegates to the General Assembly. In that body, Hammond served on the Committee of Elections and Privileges as well as on a number of ad hoc committees for such purposes as investigating a petition from the Anne Arundel County trustees of the poor. Hammond also served a number of times as a messenger to the Upper House, relaying requests for information or bills from the Lower House.44 The delegates met from June 15 to July 3, again from November 16 to December 23, and in a third session from March 23 to April 19, 1774.45

41 Anne Arundel County Land Records, 1773-1774, MdHR 34794, IB 4/74 and 77.
42 Annapolis Mayor’s Court, Land Records, 1721-1784, MdHR #7833-3, B/365, 2/19/1773. The purchasers were James Maynard, William Tuck, Philip Meroney, Francis Fairbrother, Robert Howard, William Ricketts, Charles Bryan, Thomas Sparrow, John Steele, Charles O’Neale, John Carty, Patrick Tonry, Gabriel Kingsbury, and William Johnson, members of the Well-Meaning Society.
43 St. Anne’s Parish, Vestry Minutes, D15 (6), 1764-1818, ff. 69, 72, 74, and 75.
In July 1773, Mathias Hammond and three of his other brothers completed the division of their father’s property. Charles Hammond deeded his one-sixth share of the land held in common, plus two parcels of another tract totaling twenty-six acres; Philip Hammond conveyed his rights plus half of one-sixth of the tract of Woodford; and Rezin Hammond transferred his rights to their father’s land. Although each deed listed approximately twenty tracts of land, the deeds did not all convey exactly the same tracts and acreages, although there was substantial overlap. Mathias Hammond conveyed his rights to his brother Charles on the same date, but did not transfer those rights to Philip and Denton until January 1774. In the same month, he finally acquired from Denton the last rights needed for full title to his own land. An exchange of deeds between Mathias and Charles Hammond also divided the tract of Woodford between the two men.

In August Hammond regained the title to his full lot on Prince George Street. The members of the Well-Meaning Society, “finding it inconvenient” to build he house within the time limit stipulated in their lease from Hammond, sold the lease back to him for five shillings. The following month Hammond, sold 237 acres of Stephen’s Forest to Brice Howard of Anne Arundel County for £415 sterling and in October witnessed a purchase by his brother Denton. On the same day, he bought ninety-three acres of Howard and Porter’s Fancy from Joseph Sewell, an Anne Arundel County planter. John Sewell and Rezin Hammond witnessed the transfer, for which Hammond paid five shillings. The following month Hammond purchased two hundred acres of the same tract from Thomas Elliott, also an Anne Arundel County planter, for £150 sterling, with Rezin Hammond again the witness. Clearly, the sale by Sewell was of his rights to the land, not of the land itself.

Hammond sold the parcels of Phelps Increase, including Gaither’s mill that he had acquired from James Disney and William Gaither, to his brother Denton in November 1773 for five shillings. Two days later, he bought two acres, part of The Diamond, from his brother Charles. Mathias is identified as a resident of Annapolis in the first deed and of Anne Arundel County in the second.

Charles Carroll of Annapolis wrote to his son in November 1773 that “The Hammonds can not forgive my taking 500 acres by the resurvey of Chance that their father intended to take.

46 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/134 (Charles Hammond), 160 (Philip Hammond), and 165 (Rezin Hammond), 7/28/1773.
47 Anne Arundel County Land Record IB 4/209, 7/28/1773.
48 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/457 (Philip Hammond) and 502 (Denton Hammond).
49 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/514. Again the tracts involved do not correspond exactly to those listed in the other deeds.
50 Anne Arundel County Land Records IB 4/289 (Mathis to Charles) and 292 (Charles to Mathias), 7/29/1773.
51 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/261, 8/21/1773.
52 Anne Arundel County Land Records IB/4/175, 9/27/1773
53 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/215, 10/13/1773.
54 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/218, 10/13/1773.
55 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/221, 11/7/1773.
56 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/357, 11/13/1773 (Mathias to Denton) and IB 4/291, 11/15/1773 (Charles to Mathias).
As to what any of them say it is not to be minded. They all are noted for not observing their word. Had I gone to Rezin Hammond I must have entered into a long disagreeable controversy with a noisy obstinate fool, not to be convinced tho quite in the wrong.” The Hammonds contested Carroll’s claim to Chance, claiming that the commissioners assigned to identify the boundaries between the adjoining Carroll and Hammond lands did not act impartially.57

Mathias Hammond and Samuel Howard continued their exchange of lands in 1774. Hammond deeded four hundred acres, part of Delaware Bottom and Woodford, to Howard for five shillings and Howard conveyed four familiar properties—Warner’s Neck, Chance, Howard’s Inheritance, and Porter’s Hill—to Hammond for £1,100 sterling.58 In May Howard mortgaged the Delaware Bottom and Woodford land to Hammond for £613 sterling, payable with legal interest in 1777.59

Hammond continued as a member of the St. Anne’s vestry in 1774, but did not attend meetings in March, April, May, September, or October.60 He displayed considerably more activity, however, as a member of the General Assembly when the third session met in March 1774. Hammond served on numerous ad hoc committees, considering bills for speedy recovery of small debts, regulation of attorney’s fees, establishing boundaries and lines of land by procession, erecting a church for St. Anne’s Parish, and repairing the public roads. He also served on the standing committees of correspondence and inquiry and for elections and privileges.61

In March 1774, during the opening day of the Assembly, Hammond completed his four-lot block of land on North East Street by buying lots 91 and 106 from his brother Denton for five shillings.62 Rezin Hammond and Rezin Gaither witnessed the conveyance. The conventional use of five shillings as the purchase price for transfer of property between family members makes it impossible to know whether or not there were any improvements on the land being sold. Lot 106 is the lot on which Hammond built this house, which was the final masterpiece of architect William Buckland (1734-1174), completed just before his death that November. Documentary evidence combined with stylistic analysis of the carvings indicate that Buckland completed the designs for Hammond’s house, but that the actual carving was the work mostly of Thomas Hall and perhaps James Reynolds, two of Buckland’s indentured craftsmen.63

The dispute between the Carrolls and the Hammond carried over into politics as parliamentary actions and colonial reactions became more heated. Mathias and Rezin Hammond allied with John Hall to form a more radical faction within the incipient revolutionary movement.

58 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/296 (Hammond to Howard and 394 (Howard to Hammond, 1/20/1774.
59 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/408, 5/19/1774.
60 St. Anne’s Parish, Vestry Minutes, ff. 76, 78, 80, 81, 82
Hall and Hammond in April 1774 successfully resisted efforts by Thomas Johnson, Samuel Chase, and William Paca to reach a compromise with Governor Robert Eden on enactment of the new fee schedule for proprietary officials. Johnson, a member of the proprietary party, described the impasse in a letter to former governor Horatio Sharpe: “Our Assembly is just broken up, after sitting a long time and doing very little as usual. There is a schism among the Patriots. Hall and young Hammond (Matthias) are as violent in their oppositions to Chase, Johnson and Paca, as the latter ever were to the measures of the government. Their differences have arose so high that the three last mentioned gentlemen have resolved to appear no more in the assembly.”64

An appeal from the Boston Committee of Correspondence for nonimportation and nonexportation pacts in response to the Boston Port Act led to a public meeting in Annapolis on May 25, 1774, to discuss the request. Rezin and Mathias Hammond and John Hall opposed the attempt by Paca, Chase, and Charles Carroll of Carrollton to head the group, leading to a compromise by which members of both factions were elected to the Anne Arundel committee of correspondence. The passions aroused by the rivalry between the two groups, each seeking to gain support by attacking British policy, led to passage of a highly radical resolution directing lawyers not to initiate suits for collections of debt owed to British creditors as long as the Port Act remained in effect.65

Legislative duties and popular politics did not prevent Mathias Hammond from witnessing, with his brother Rezin, a sale by Rezin Gaither to yet another brother, Denton,66 and one by Denton to Gaither,67 nor from selling Denton four tracts of land totaling over six hundred acres. The sale price for this transaction was five shillings, indicating that this sale and Denton’s sale of the Annapolis lots to Mathias may actual have been an exchange of land.68

In June Hammond bought 114 acres of Huckleberry Forest, on the north side of the Magothy River, from William Garrett Woodward for £100 current money.69 In October, Rezin, John, Philip, Denton, and Mathias Hammond loaned John Barlow £72.14 sterling with Barlow’s land, a 100-acre tract called Half Pone, mortgaged as security for the loan.70 Barlow defaulted on the mortgage but no suit was instituted to collect the debt until Rezin and the representatives of the heirs of his other brothers acted in October 1800, fourteen years after Mathias’s death.71

October 1774 found Mathias Hammond one of the leaders of the radical group that forced merchant Anthony Stewart to set fire to his vessel, the Peggy Stewart, because her cargo included tea on which the tax had been paid, in violation of the nonimportation agreement.72

---

64 Hoffman, Spirit of Dissension, pp. 126-27. The insertion of Mathias’s name in parentheses is probably a clarification by Ronald Hoffman of Johnson’s meaning.
65 Hoffman, Spirit of Dissension, pp.128-29.
67 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/462.
69 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 4/490, 6/9/1774.
70 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 5/189, 10/24/1774.
71 Chancery Court Proceedings, B46/351, October 1800 court.
72 Papenfuse, Biographical Dictionary, p.395.
From June 1774 until August 1775, Mathias Hammond was increasingly involved in the movement toward revolution and independence through his service in the first through fifth conventions, the extra-legal bodies that governed Maryland from June 1774 until the election of a state assembly in 1777. “During the years 1774-1776, the powers of government increasingly came to be exercised by the extra-legal assemblies. In all there were nine meetings of six appointed or duly elected provincial conventions… The First Convention was an informal meeting of the ninety-delegates from the counties charged with formulating Maryland’s response to the Boston Port Act. As the revolutionary movement grew, the convention evolved into formal assemblies of representatives elected in much the same manner as the proprietary Lower House. These conventions were concerned with financial, legal, and military matters and gradually became the *de facto*, if not *de jure*, government.”

Mathias Hammond also continued to sit as a member of the St. Anne’s vestry, attending the meetings of that group in January and April of 1775 but not those held in the second half of the year. In April, he found time amidst the maneuvers taking place in the assembly to acquire the rights of two additional Sewell sons, Samuel and Joseph, to their father Henry’s property, Howard and Porter’s Range. A rural neighbor, Lancelot Warfield, witnessed the deed.

The Hammond family elicited a lengthy commentary from Charles Carroll of Annapolis in June 1775, as the Hammonds and the radical faction sought support by aligning themselves with the members of the militia. Carroll wrote that “[t]he Elk Ridge Committee met the 5th instant to Enquier into Fish Hammonds conduct who is reported to have sayed that the Provinciall convention or many of them were against arming & mustering. To prevent an Enquiry & as I suppose to awe the committee Fish, Rezin, the two Hoods & Thos Howard it is sayed came armed with pistols, that the Hammonds had got their overseers & tenants to attend to support them, that Fish began by abusing Dr. Howard. He returned the abuse upon with Cha: Hammond took up the quarrel, snatched a stick out of Hoods hand & was goeing to strike Howard who with a tuck made a pass at Hammond by some bodys interposition the tuck past through Hammonds coat sleeve. The confusions was such that no business was done, the Committee is to meet next Monday on this business & I hear depositions will be taken to prove a premeditated & concerted designs by the Hammonds to insult the Doctor.”

On July 26, 1775, Hammond signed the Association of the Freemen of Maryland, a manifesto designed by the patriot group to force Maryland men to take a public position in opposition to British policy. The following month, Hammond voted in favor of shutting the courts of justice. An undated receipt, attributed to 1775, contains the account of money received by Charles Wallace for the use of the delegates at the Constitutional Convention in
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Philadelphia. Wallace collected money from Elk Ridge by John Dorsey, from Mathias Hammond, from St. James Parish by Stephen Seward, and from Annapolis by Gabriel Duvall.\textsuperscript{79} The wording of the document leaves ambiguous the area from which Hammond was collecting money, but the implication is that he was living in the Gambrills area at the time and not in Annapolis.

Revolutionary affairs did not completely preoccupy Hammond during these months, however. In August he purchased the rights to Howard and Porters Range from Philip Sewell, another of Henry Sewell’s sons and heirs.\textsuperscript{80} Two months later Hammond bought Ricketts Addition, fifty-five acres, and part of Hickory Hills, fifty acres, from Gerrard Hopkins, Jr.\textsuperscript{81} Hammond made one other purchase in October, one of the few personal items for which evidence survives. Charles Willson Peale recorded in his diary that he “sold my sulky to Mr. Mathias Hammond for 18 £cy.”\textsuperscript{82}

Mathias Hammond’s term of service on the St. Anne’s vestry ended in April 1776, when John Bullen and Abraham Woodward replaced Hammond and Quynn. He never served again either as vestryman or churchwarden (Quynn and Woodward, Jr., began terms as churchwardens in April 1776).\textsuperscript{83} Similarly, Hammond’s last known term of service in the provisional Conventions occurred when he was a member of the Fifth Convention from July to August 1775. The known members of the Sixth through Eighth Conventions, elected in September 1775, consisted of Charles Carroll Barrister, Thomas Johnson, Samuel Chase, William Paca, and Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the more conservative leaders of the Patriot party.\textsuperscript{84} It may be that the Hammonds and others of their party were considered too radical to be elected by the voters of Anne Arundel County in 1775.

The radical party continued to press its cause, however. Charles Carroll of Annapolis learned of the activities of the group in a letter written by Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer in June 1776. “Rezin & Fishy Hammond, with their Colleague Benn Galloway are very busy with the people to prevail upon them to adopt a plan of Government with a New Code of Laws which they have drawn up. The Drs. Howard and Warfield it is said, have concurred in the above mentioned plan.”\textsuperscript{85} “At a meeting dominated by Hall and the Hammonds on June 26, the Anne Arundel County militia proposed a radical form of government, which was made public in the middle of July. Essentially, the militia program outlined a governmental system very democratic and decentralized in structure consisting of three branches, with the legislative the most powerful.” In advocating this plan, the Hall-Hammond faction enlarged its democratic aspects by proposing that all freemen who paid taxed be allowed to vote.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{79} Calendar, p.61.  
\textsuperscript{80} Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 5/234, 8/19/1775.  
\textsuperscript{81} Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 5/255, 10/12/1775.  
\textsuperscript{82} Lillian Miller, ed., Charles Willson Peale, p.148, 10/13/1775.  
\textsuperscript{83} St. Anne’s Parish, Vestry Minutes, f. 92.  
\textsuperscript{84} Papenfuse, Biographical Dictionary, p.72.  
\textsuperscript{85} Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer to Charles Carroll of Annapolis, 6/16/1776, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers, Maryland Historical Society.  
\textsuperscript{86} Hoffman, Spirit of Dissension, p. 178.
A broadened franchise played a role in the concurrent elections for a new Convention. On July 3 the provincial convention called for an election on the first day of August for delegates to a convention that would draw up a new constitution. The election order stipulated that the property qualifications for voting during the proprietary era were to remain in effect, but on election day, five counties flagrantly ignored the prescribed voting regulations… [The] election results suggest that the discontented political forces were at work… [The] very leaders of the popular party came under strong attack. In Anne Arundel County, they ran into strong and well-organized opposition. The earliest election reports indicated a trend against them.” Thomas Johnson, William Paca, and Charles Carroll of Carrollton were unseated and “the popular party’s adversary, the Hall-Hammond faction, achieved an important victory in placing Rezin Hammond on the county’s delegation. By continuing to emphasize their democratic sympathies, particularly on election day, the Hall-Hammond faction appeared to be cutting into the popular party’s political base.

“A post election investigation into possible voting irregularities in Anne Arundel County graphically revealed the rhetoric and tactics employed by the Hall-Hammond people… [T]he polls had just opened when ‘Mr. R. Hammond told the people present that every man that bore arms in defense of his country had a right to vote, and if they were allowed no vote they had no right to bear arms.’… Because of Hammond’s fiery rhetoric, which played on the genuine dissatisfaction of those people excluded from voting, an election disturbance of some sort occurred at the Anne Arundel polls.

“The presiding officials judiciously adjourned the proceedings briefly [when unqualified men demanded the right to vote], but when they reopened the polls, several people again presented themselves to vote who were not qualified. Prominent among those… were soldiers of a military unit, the ‘Flying Camp,’ which was proceeding northward to join the Continental forces. One of their officers, upon seeing his men’s actions, interposed and told them bluntly that they were not qualified. Angry over the rebuff, a group of enlisted men then ‘drew up on Gallows Hill, and there was recommended to lay down their arms and go home, and if any of their officers interrupted them to knock them down—and if they did not support Mr. Hammond’s election, they would all be slaves and if they did, they would all be free.’ The committee [investigating the disturbance] found out that the men encouraging this action were Thomas Harwood and Matthias Hammond, Rezin’s brother. Samuel Godman overheard Matthias Hammond tell the soldiers the evening of the dispute, ‘gentlemen, Mr. Rezin Hammond has stood as a candidate for this county and as many of you think him worthy of your trust, we hope will come and vote for him.’ But the soldiers were by then discouraged. One of them plainly told Hammond ‘that they could not vote unless they were worth 40 sterling at least,’ and another observed sarcastically that ‘the whole company was not worth 40 sterling.’”87

In addition to the testimony quoted above, Jonathan Sellman, Jr. deposed that “Matthias Hammond and Thomas Harwood came to the field where he was exercising part of the flying camp; Matthias Hammond recommended Rezin Hammond as one who would defend their rights

---

and advised the men to lay down their arms and vote in small groups...” Lt. Joseph Burgess stated that “he heard Thomas Harwood urge the men to vote according to the resolves of the Convention, and the election ‘was carried on with great Strictness’; Rezin Hammond asked the men of Capt. Dorsey’s company who were qualified to vote for him...”. Harwood himself swore that he explained to the soldiers “the requirements for voting and recommended that relief be sought at the next Convention; they agreed and the election proceeded quietly. In answer to a question by [Capt. William] Brogden, Harwood said he never heard Matthias Hammond recommend to the men that they insist on the right of voting or lay down their arms...”

The radical group succeeded in electing Rezin Hammond to the Convention but the popular party held the balance of power in the delegation and in the Convention as a whole. The reports of Mathias Hammond’s exhortations to the troops gathered on Gallows Hill, urging them to insist on the right to vote, are the last accounts of a public, political, or civic role played by Hammond. No evidence has come to light, however, to provide definitive conclusions for his withdrawal from politics and public life. Suggestions of illness do not seem plausible as Hammond continued to take an active role in the management of his private business affairs, as will be seen shortly. A more likely explanation lies in the failure of the Hall-Hammond faction to achieve their goals in the summer of 1776. John Hall’s subsequent positions as a member of the Anne Arundel delegation indicated a break in the unity of the faction; “Hall, for unknown reasons, adopted an independent attitude and did not align himself with any specific faction.”

The Constitutional Convention drew up and achieved passage of a conservative constitution for the new state. Hammond may have felt that there was little reason to continue the fight for a more democratic franchise, whether motivated by principle or by desire for political advantage.

Mathias Hammond next appears in the public record in April 1777 when he sold his brother Denton two tracts of land: Howard & Porters Range, the title to which he had so carefully acquired from the Sewell heirs, and Howard & Porters Fancy. He acquired part of Addition from Rezin in the same month and on the same day transferred his rights to Rezin’s share of their father’s estate to his brother Rezin.

In 1778, probably in March, Mathias Hammond took the oath of allegiance in Anne Arundel County. In May, Hammond hired Joseph Roberts as his substitute for military service, a common practice for gentlemen. His brothers Rezin, Denton and John also hired substitutes, as did Col. Edward Lloyd, whose Annapolis home faced Hammond’s across North East Street.

March 1779 witnessed Mathias Hammond selling several tracts of land lying on Elk Ridge in Anne Arundel County to Thomas Usher, a Baltimore Town merchant, for £8,482.10.0 current money. The tracts totaled nearly seventeen hundred acres. In September Denton
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Hammond conveyed three hundred acres of Delaware Bottom & Woodford, at the westernmost falls of the main falls of the Patapsco River and adjacent to Samuel Howard’s portion of the same tract, to Mathias for five shillings. Edward Gaither, Jr. was one of the two witnesses to the deed.94 Two months later, Philip and Rezin sold their rights to the two parcels of Wood’s Inclosure in Frederick County, with an area of 180 acres, to Mathias Hammond of Annapolis for five shillings. Mathias, again identified as a resident of Annapolis, then transferred the rights to Benjamin Warfield for the same sum. Warfield in turn sold Hammond, of Annapolis, his rights to his undivided portion of Luggox, in accordance with the terms of his father Joshua’s will.95 Most land records executed after 1775 identify Hammond as a resident of Anne Arundel; there three are among the few that place him in Annapolis.

The dispute between Charles Carroll over the ownership of Chance reappeared in 1780. Charles Carroll of Carrollton wrote to his father in April that “I told you before you left town that Mathias Hammond had agreed to refer to Arbitration our mutual claims. He has altered his mind since: he told me yesterday he would only consent to refer to arbitration his claim on us, vitz. For what land he claims on the south, or left hand of the road as you go up to Elkridge, but would not refer my claim on him to lands on the north, or right hand of the road. I told him I would give him an answer in a week’s time… Old Shipley has been running out of land; I wish you would send for Shipley, and sound him as to Hammond’s intentions: perhaps you may discover by his means, what new evidence Hammond can produce to support Samuel Howard’s pretentions not proved at the former trial.”96

Carroll’s father replied, “If You cannot get Hammond to Submit both claims to arbitration, I think for the reasons You give, You will doe well to Submit his claim to arbitration. But I would have You for some time seem averse to it & peremptory, He may perhaps by Such behavior be induced to Submit Yours as well as His claim[..] I need not suggest the reasons You may offer to induce Him to consent, nor recommend Such a conduct, were He a Man of the least Honor.”97 A following letter informed his son that “Before I saw Jas: Howard, He had seen Shipley, who told Howard, that Hammond would submit His dispute with us to arbitration [..] Howard will be more particular with Shipley soon, having instructed Him to be so.”98

The following day, Carroll of Carrollton had a new report for his father. “Hammond & I had Some conversation this morning about our law suit [..] He has served his ejectment [..] he is willing to refer his claim on us to Arbitration but seems determined not to Submit our claim on him to the Same mode of decision. However we are to meet when I return from Frederick

94 Anne Arundel County Land Records, IB 5/660, 9/6/1779.
96 Charles Carroll of Carrollton to Charles Carroll of Annapolis, April 8, 1780, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers, Meiland Historical Society.
97 Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 4/16/1780, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers, Maryland Historical Society.
98 Charles Carroll of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 4/21/1780, Charles Carroll of Carrollton Papers, Maryland Historical Society.
County which I hope will be some time about the middle of May.”

In August Hammond petitioned the Land Commission to determine the boundaries of one of his properties, a tract called Huckleberry Forest. The Commission appointed a committee consisting of Rezin Gaither, Philemon Warfield, Lancelot Warfield, and William Woodward, Jr., to hear testimony concerning the boundaries of the land. The committee held a hearing on January 29 the following year, taking depositions from Richard Shipley, age about seventy-one years; Rezin Gaither, age about fifty-two years; and Jacob Fields, age about fifty-three years. All testified that they had been shown the boundaries by William Smith, Sr., or William Smith, Jr.. In Shipley’s case, he had received his information in 1751. In conducting its hearing, the committee followed the usual practice of calling together the oldest residents in the neighborhood of the disputed land and asking them to describe this boundary markers that had been identified to them in the past. Richard Shipley may well have been the “Old Shipley” who was determining the boundary lines of the land claimed by both the Carrolls and Mathias Hammond.

Mathias Hammond added to his landholdings in 1780 by two purchases. In September he acquired Freeborn’s Progress, 130 acres, and the right to Kendall’s Delight from his mother, Rachel Hammond for £1 sterling. Two months later he bought four tracts totaling nearly 850 acres, from John Hammond of Baltimore County, the son of Thomas Hammond, for five shillings.

Traces of Hammond’s activities in the 1780s continued to be limited to land transactions. In 1781, he purchased Contest, 100 acres, and Canaan, 60 acres, from William Garrett Woodward in January 1781 and sold his rights to Canaan to Vachel Stevens, the Anne Arundel County surveyor, two months later. In February Hammond sold part of Stevens Forest, 237 acres, to Brice Howard. The following month he and Elijah Gaither witnessed the sale of land by Mary Meek to Rezin Hammond. Hammond was located in Annapolis according to the Woodward and Harwood deeds but in Anne Arundel County in the Stevens deed.

In June Charles Carroll of Carrollton updated his father on the progress of their case against Hammond: “Mr. Stone thinks we can’t fail of casting Hammond if the lands are properly laid down. He approves my proposed location of them.” This letter contains the last reference to the case during Hammond’s lifetime.

As the year drew to a close, Hammond sold Nathaniel Owings part of the land he had acquired from his mother earlier in the year. He transferred title to Freeborns’ Progress,
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“heretofore conveyed to Mrs. Rachel Hammond, by the Commissioners of the Loan Office,” for £22,329.8.2 continental currency.\textsuperscript{104} Although the purchase price seems excessively high, the denomination of the sale in continental currency accounts for its inflated value. The sale was made as the military activity of the Revolutionary War was drawing to a close but trade was still disrupted and sound currency extremely scarce. Continental money had depreciated drastically during the war years and prices of all goods had risen correspondingly.

Hammond’s brother Philip died by 1782, apparently naming Mathias and Rezin as the executors of his estate. None of the probate court documents that should have accompanied the administration of the estate have survived, however; there is no record of a will, inventory, bond, or account. The timing of the death, the evident writing of a will, and the roles of Mathias and Rezin are known only from a chancery court case instituted in 1799 by Rezin Hammond as the surviving executor.\textsuperscript{105}

Mathias Hammond continued the process of rationalizing his landholdings that he had begun in the early 1770s, a goal that must have been interrupted by his political involvement early in the revolutionary years and then by the disruptions of the war. In April and June of 1782 he obtained approximately five warrants for surveying and patenting vacant land. The surveys were completed early in 1783 and the lands patented in March, April, and August of 1784. The acquisitions included Addition to Hammond’s Quarter, one hundred thirty-five acres; Addition to Luggox, twenty acres; Patuxent Slipe, six acres; Second Addition to Green Spring, fourteen and three-quarters acres; Second Addition to Hood Hall & Bens Luck, twelve and three-quarters acres; Second Addition to Kendall’s Delight, eight and three-quarters acres; Fourth Addition, one-quarter acre; and Fifth Addition, four and one-half acres. Hammond’s Quarter, located on a branch of the Magothy River, was a seventy-seven acre tract left to Mathias by his brother Denton; Mathias resurveyed the land with an additional fifty-eight vacant acres. Denton’s death, like Philip’s, is unrecorded in the probate records, although Denton wrote a will in order to leave the land to Mathias.\textsuperscript{106}

Hammond also consolidated his title to Luggox in May 1783 by purchasing the rights to fifty acres of the property devised to Elizabeth Warfield Wells by her first husband, Joshua Warfield. He acquired the rights from Wells’ heirs: her second husband, Joseph Wells, of Prince George’s County, and her son Benjamin, of Frederick County.\textsuperscript{107} Joshua Warfield also left fifty acres of Luggox to his daughters Mary and Eleanor. In December 1783 Hammond purchased their shares of the land for £100 specie gold and silver current money. Neighbor Elijah Gaither witnessed the transaction.\textsuperscript{108}
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Only twice during the twenty-five years of Mathias Hammond’s adult life does he appear in the list of debts owed to any estate probated in Anne Arundel County during those years. The account of the estate of Joshua Griffith, recorded in the probate records in June 1783, lists debts of 10 shillings, 4 pence owed by Hammond to the estate. On the second occasion, Hammond owed £1.17.0 to the estate of Anne Catherine Green, publisher of the Maryland Gazette. The sum, due to her estate sometime in 1786, probably represented the cost of Hammond’s subscription to the paper, as he does not appear to have placed an advertisement at any time.

The year 1783 also provides the first accurate portrayal of Mathias Hammond’s wealth. In that year, the State of Maryland taxed all real and some personal property to raise money to pay Revolutionary War debts. The assessment for Anne Arundel County lists property for Mathias Hammond in four hundreds (county subdivisions) and the City of Annapolis. In Severn Hundred, along the south side of that river, he owned “part of serval tracts” amounting to five hundred acres and valued at £500. In addition, the assessment charged Hammond with eleven enslaved individuals under the age of eight (£110), seven males between the ages of fourteen and forty-five (£490), six females between the ages of fourteen and thirty-six (£360), and three over age (£150), as well as 180 ounces of plate (£70), ten horses (£75), six head of cattle (£10), and £5 of other taxable property. The total assessment came to £1,770. Hammond’s Severn Hundred household included one white male between the ages of fifteen and fifty and one female. Rachel, Philip, Rezin, and John Hammond are charged with property in the same hundred, although there are no white residents on Philip’s land. Because Mathias Hammond kept his silver plate in the Severn Hundred residence, that was undoubtedly his home.

Kendall’s Delight and Woodford & Delaware Bottom, totaling 320 acres, were located in Elk Ridge Hundred and valued at £400. Hammond held eight enslaved children under eight, two between eight and fourteen, one adult male and one adult female of prime working age, and five superannuated [not taxable] adults. Twelve horses and twenty-eight head of cattle grazed on this land, and the estate contained £13 of other taxable property. The total assessed value amounted to £895. The assessment recorded no white inhabitants of Hammond’s Elk Ridge land. Middle Neck Hundred contained the disputed tracts of Chance, Warner’s Neck, and Howard’s Inheritance as well as two other tracts for a total acreage of just over one thousand acres, valued at £2,074. Six enslaved persons (one youth, three adult males, and two adult women) worked the land, which pastured four horses, twenty-four head of cattle, and thirty sheep. Total assessed value for the land, bondspeople, livestock, and other property amounted to £2,534. The household on this land consisted of two males and two females, with one of the men between the ages of sixteen and fifty.

Hammond’s largest landholdings lay in Town Neck Hundred, between the Severn and Magothy Rivers, where he held eight tracts containing sixteen hundred acres valued at £2,345. The land supported a correspondingly larger work force, consisting of four enslaved children under eight, one between eight and fourteen years, four male adults of prime working age, two
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women of similar value, and two superannuated adults, and larger herds of livestock, with twelve horses, fifty-one cattle, and thirty-eight sheep. The assessors valued the entire estate at £3,048. This land also had no white residents.

In the City of Annapolis, Mathias Hammond owned four lots containing four acres of land, valued at £410. He was charged with no other property in the city for a household consisting of one white male between the ages of sixteen and fifty.111

In all, Mathias Hammond owned 3400 acres of rural land and four town lots, value at £5,729. He held sixty-three enslaved men, women, and children; thirty-eight horses, eighty-one head of cattle, and ninety-six sheep; and owned one hundred sixty-eight ounces of plate. His total assessed wealth in the county amounted to £8,657. Hammond’s assets placed him in the top 5 percent by wealth of property owners in the state in 1783.112

In 1783 Mathias Hammond made his only appearance in the Anne Arundel County court as either plaintiff or defendant. In that year he was sued by Isaac McHard, an Annapolis tavernkeeper, for recovery of a debt of £4.8.0 current money. Attorney Jeremiah Townley Chase represented Hammond. The case was carried over for several sessions before a judgment was issued in August 1784, finding in favor of the plaintiff and assessing Hammond court costs in addition to payment of the debt.113 Tavernkeepers usually sued to recover unpaid tavern bills—charges extending over a period of months or years for beverages, meals, lodging, and pasturage. The court record did not include a copy of the charges covered by the suit.

Mathias Hammond sold fifty acres of land on the road from Annapolis to Elkridge to Mary Robbosson, wife of Elijah Robbosson, one of the county’s justice of the peace, in February 1785. The following December, Rezin Hammond executed a deed to Mathias to document that a mortgage initially taken from Robert Davis in 1764 by John Hammond and conveyed by John’s son and heir William Hammond to Rezin was actually the property equally of Rezin and Mathias.114

Mathias Hammond performed one visible act as administrator of the estate of his brother Philip sometime prior to April 1785, when he received a payment of £5 from the administrator of Daniel Sewell, who had been one of Philip’s debtors.115

In February 1786 Hammond appeared before justices John Brice and Elijah Robbosson to release Samuel Howard from a mortgage executed in May 1774.116 On the same day, Hammond
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sold Dr. Lyde Godwin of Baltimore the part of Delaware Bottom and Woodford that he had acquired in 1779 from his brother Denton.\textsuperscript{117} In September, he sold Goodwin thirteen tracts of land, including most of the small pieces surveyed and patented in the 1780s. He also sold two enslaved women and their six children to Goodwin on the same date. The following month Goodwin purchased 269 acres from Mathias, part of Huckleberry Forest on the Magothy River.\textsuperscript{118}

Rachel Hammond, Mathias’s mother, died sometime prior to April 1786, the month in which her will was filed for probate. The will, written in September 1781, left Mathias three pieces of land—Hazard, Addition to Hazard, and Second Addition to Hazard—(Mathias was not the only member of the family given to augmenting existing holdings with adjacent vacant land), sixteen enslaved individuals, a silver pot engraved with a coat of arms, an engraved silver teapot, silver stand and silver waiter, a silver tankard, and twelve silver teaspoons, tongs and strainer, as well as “all my household stuff and furniture,” “all the crop on the several plantations I occupy,” all the livestock—hogs, horses, cattle, and sheep—on that land, and all the plantation equipment. Rachel’s specific bequests to her other surviving sons consisted of seven enslaved people to Denton and two to Rezin. The balance of her estate was to be divided equally among the three sons, whom she named as her executors. Rachel requested that no inventory be made of her property and none was recorded in the probate records.

With Denton’s death between September 1781 and September 1782, Rachel added a codicil, on September 6, 1782, distributing the human property originally intended for Denton; she left one individual to Rezin and the remaining six to Mathias. The two surviving sons were now to share the balance of the estate equally and jointly serve as executors. The same neighbors who witnessed many of the Hammond deeds also witnessed Rachel’s will and the codicil: Philemon Warfield, Luke Warfield, Richard Warfield, and Nathaniel Sappington for the will, and William Sappington, Rezin Gaither, and Thomas Warfield for the codicil.\textsuperscript{119}

Rachel’s disposition of her estate does not suggest that Mathias suffered from any illness or physical disability that required his withdrawal from public life. She left her youngest son the bulk of her property when she wrote the will in 1781, continued to favor him when she revised the will in 1782, and never considered it necessary to alter the distribution at any subsequent time prior to her death in 1786. Mathias Hammond drew up his own will in January 1786; he may have been spurred to take this action by the [imminent] death of his mother and the prospect of an enlarged estate that needed thoughtful management in the event of his own death without heirs.

Mathias Hammond participated in the execution of five deeds in October 1786 to settle the ownership of the Warfield property of Luggox. The final outcome appears to be that Mathias
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retained ownership of Henry Warfield’s share of the property, and that Caleb Warfield and Thomas Warfield each acquired full rights to their shares.\textsuperscript{120}

The \textit{Maryland Gazette} issue of 16 November 1786 announced that “[o]n Saturday last departed this life, Mr. Mathias Hammond, a gentleman of a most amiable and benevolent disposition, who was much respected and [illegible] by all his neighbors and relations.”\textsuperscript{121}

Mathias Hammond’s will, written in January 1786, was filed for probate on November 29, 1786. Hammond left his property to the sons of his deceased brother Charles. Philip received forty-four tracts, including a saw and grist mill, while John inherited fifteen tracts, plus “the lots in Annapolis on part of which are my house and building in said city.” Hammond also named Philip executor of his estate. Lyde Goodwin, who had just purchased a number of Hammond’s landholdings, and three members of the neighboring Warfield family—John, Richard, and Henrietta—witnessed the will.\textsuperscript{122}

Philip Hammond, with Rezin Hammond (Mathias’s brother) and Charles Hammond, son of Charles (probably Philip’s brother) as security, filed an administration bond in March 1887 in the amount of £10,000 current money as executor of the estate.\textsuperscript{123} No inventory or account of the estate was ever filed, however, so the extent of Hammond’s wealth at the time of his death is unknown. Hammond was buried in the family graveyard near Gambrills. The tombstone erected over his grave reads: “Here lies the remains of Mr. Mathias Hammond, Son of Philip Hammond, Esquire, who was born the 21\textsuperscript{st} of May 1748, and departed this life the 11\textsuperscript{th} day of November, 1786 to the great grief and [illegible] all his Relations, Friends, and acquaintances. A gentleman of an amiable and benevolent disposition, Hospitable, Chara [table?] and Human[e].”\textsuperscript{124}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{120} Anne Arundel County Land Records, NH 2/531, 10/21/1786, Hammond to Thomas Warfield, Benjamin Warfield’s share exchanged or Henry Warfield’s share; NH 2/533, 10/21/1786, Hammond and Thomas Warfield to Caleb Warfield, Caleb Warfield’s share; NH 2/536, 10/21/1786, Hammond and Caleb Warfield to Thomas Warfield, right to Thomas Warfield’s share and part of Benjamin Warfield’s share; NH 2/568, 10/21/1786, Thomas Warfield to Hammond, Henry Warfield’s share; and NH 2/570, 10/21/1786, Caleb and Thomas Warfield to Mathias Hammond, rights to Henry Warfield’s share.
\textsuperscript{121} Maryland Gazette, M1283 Maryland State Archives, 11/16/1786.
\textsuperscript{122} Anne Arundel County Register of Wills, Wills, TG 1/346, 11/29/1786.
\textsuperscript{123} Anne Arundel County Register of Wills, Administration Bonds, TG 2/183, 3/14/1787.
\textsuperscript{124} Mrs. Howard Victor Hall, compiler, “List of gravestones in private cemeteries in Anne Arundel County, Md., Annapolis, 1941, p.13.
\end{flushleft}
The home that Mathias Hammond built in Annapolis in the early 1770s was one of nearly a dozen grand Georgian homes built in the city in the 1760s and 1770s. Understanding the commitment represented by this house can be aided by comparing Hammond with the builders of other homes. In order of the estimated dates of construction, the builders were:¹²⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date Married</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Paca</td>
<td>1763-65</td>
<td>m. 1763</td>
<td>Age 23</td>
<td>£4,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Carroll of Carrollton</td>
<td>c. 1764</td>
<td>m. 1768</td>
<td>Age 27</td>
<td>£6,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Carrollton of Barrister</td>
<td>c. 1764</td>
<td>m. 1763</td>
<td>Age 40</td>
<td>£3,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ridout</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>m. 1764</td>
<td>Age 30</td>
<td>£3,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Scott</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brice III</td>
<td>c. 1766</td>
<td>m. 1766</td>
<td>Age 28</td>
<td>£2,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Brice</td>
<td>1767-76</td>
<td>m. 1781</td>
<td>Age 21</td>
<td>£4,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Chase &amp; Edward Lloyd</td>
<td>1769 (1771)</td>
<td>m. 1763</td>
<td>Age 28</td>
<td>£2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m. 1767</td>
<td>Age 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Dulany</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age 29</td>
<td>£2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Rutland</td>
<td>c. 1772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathias Hammond</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>Unm.</td>
<td>Age 26</td>
<td>£4,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the exception of William Paca, who began work on his house upon his marriage to Mary Chew, and of James Brice, Mathias Hammond was the youngest of the builders, although most were between 26 and 30 when they began construction of their homes. Hammond and James Brice are the only two, of those whose dates of marriage are known, to have begun construction prior to marriage. [The status of Charles Carroll of Carrollton is uncertain as the date of construction of the present Carroll house is not clear.] Mathias Hammond, therefore, is an

unusual member of this group, because he began to build his house at a relatively young age without the prospect of a family to occupy the large home.

Annapolis folklore provides an explanation, of course, for this anomaly. According to local legend, Hammond was engaged to be married and began construction of the house as a wedding present for his bride-to-be. In the most elaborate version of the story, Hammond’s preoccupation with the details of his building project so annoyed his fiancée that she finally broke off the engagement and married another man. There is, however, no documentary evidence to support this story, while there does exist correspondence describing a similar episode in the life of a different member of the family. It is probable that the incongruity of a bachelor building such a large and elegant home led to the attachment of the story of the broken Hammond engagement to Mathias Hammond as a way of explaining that incongruity.

Hammond is unusual in that he never married—most men and women in the eighteenth century did marry unless some physical or mental disability precluded marriage—but Rezin never married, nor, apparently did Philip and Denton. Nor, for that matter, did Stephen Bordley. The question remains of why a single man would build such an imposing house without a family or the prospect of one to occupy it. Perhaps the example of James Brice is instructive. Brice did not marry until fourteen years after he began building his home—and even larger mansion—on East Street. Mathias Hammond died within thirteen years of the constructions of his house. There is no way to know what might have happened had he lived a year longer.

A second question also remains. Did Mathias Hammond ever live in his Annapolis house? He remained a member of the legislature, centered in Annapolis, until 1775. Carroll family correspondence placed him in Annapolis during the 1780s. Deeds identify him as Mathias Hammond “of Annapolis” from time to time throughout the 1770s and 1780s. Hammond could have been lodging with Isaac McHard or others of Annapolis’s many tavernkeeper during the time that he was in town. Or he could have been staying in his own house, possibly in the north wing while the remainder of the house was rented to a tenant. An adult white male was recorded as resident in 1783, when the Annapolis assessors made the rounds of the town. This individual could have been Mathias Hammond, on a visit to Annapolis that coincided with the making of the assessment; it could have been a tenant; or it could have been a caretaker. What does seem certain is that Hammond never made the house in Annapolis his principle residence. He kept his silver in the family house at Gambrills, he made no purchases in Annapolis from any of the local merchants whose account books survive, and he was more frequently identified in the contemporary records as a resident of Anne Arundel County. In short, while he left few traces of his activities after 1776 in any form, virtually all of them point to residence on his rural estate and almost none to residence in Annapolis.

---

126 See, for example, John Martin Hammond, Colonial Mansions of Maryland and Delaware, (Philadelphia, 1914), p.29.
127 Personal communication from Barbara Brand, Hammond-Harwood House.
128 The lack of any probate records for Philip and Denton suggests that they died without direct heirs. Hammond’s nephew—Philip, son of Charles, and William, son of John—also never married.
Previous histories of Hammond and the Hammond-Harwood House have identified Sarah and James Nourse as tenants of Mathias Hammond in 1783-1784. This conclusion was reached on the basis of an entry in their son Joseph’s journal to the effect that his parents rented “Mr. Hammond’s elegant house… near the city of Annapolis… on the water…”. A document prepared in London 1805, however, regarding the division of Mrs. Nourse’s London property, states that “Sarah Nourse (late Fouace) departed this life at the seat of John Hammond, Esq. near the said city of Annapolis on or about the seventh day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty four…”. Acton, John Hammond’s home, was located just outside the city limits of Annapolis and its gardens extended back to Spa Creek. Unlike Hammond-Harwood House, therefore, it is both near the city of Annapolis and on the water.129

Orlando Ridout V has theorized that the builders of the large Georgian mansions of the late colonial period stored their wealth in land until they were ready to build and then cashed in that wealth by selling off excess land to finance construction. The records of Mathias Hammond’s land transactions do not suggest that he followed such a pattern, however. Hammond bought more land than he sold in the early 1770s. One must assume that he used any cash received from his father’s estate, which was settled in the early 1770s, and the returns from his plantation to finance his Annapolis home. James Brice borrowed heavily from family members to finance his building project, but there is nothing to suggest that Hammond relied on family members for his funds.

Hammond’s many land transactions, while not designed to raise money for the construction of his home, were not atypical of the period either. A careful analysis of the parties involved and of the metes and bounds of the various tracts would reveal, I believe, that Hammond generally purchased land adjacent to his major holdings or to assist in clearly the titles of neighboring landowners whose property bordered his. The Carroll correspondence quoted above is suggestive of the intense interest that both Carroll of Annapolis and Carroll of Carrollton took in the management of their property holdings, including enlarging the bounds of existing tracts and protecting title to disputed land. A similar pattern of detailed attention to real property reveals itself in the papers of Hammond’s contemporary and neighbor Edward Lloyd IV. Land was still the most significant financial asset that an eighteenth-century gentleman could hold; banks did not yet exist, stock companies had not yet developed, enslaved labor needed productive employment to be a profitable investment. The opportunities for investing surplus cash were thus extremely limited; without a family to support, Mathias Hammond undoubtedly had such surpluses to invest from the profits of his plantation.

***

Chares Stein, in his work Origin and History of Howard County, Maryland, suggests that Mathias Hammond owned and raced horses. He states that “Figaro, the famous horse of Dr. Mathias Hammond, won the great sweepstakes at Annapolis in 1767.” Figaro did win the

Annapolis race in that year but he was not owned by Dr. Hamilton, nor by Dr. Mathias Hammond. Dr. Mathias Hammond, moreover, was a member of the next generation of Hammonds; he would not have been the owner of a race horse in 1767. And Mathias Hammond was only nineteen in 1767; he should not have been racing horses either.\textsuperscript{130}

Mathias Hammond has often been identified as a lawyer. There is no evidence whatsoever to support this conclusion. The assumption is, most likely, a misinterpretation of the occasional use of a power of attorney to represent another party in court, a power that does not convey the right to practice as an attorney. There is no record that Mathias Hammond was admitted to practice in any country or provincial court.

Research on the life of Mathias Hammond was been supported by funds from the Maryland Humanities Council, awarded to the Hammond-Harwood House through a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.
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