

The African-American Experience at the Hammond-Harwood House Tour

Tour Created by Christopher Mielke



Shoe found in chimney in former slave quarters

FRONT OF THE HOUSE

Background of Slavery in Annapolis and Maryland

I think beginning with a tour of the history of slavery in Maryland would be a good starting point for this tour. African slaves were brought over to St. Mary's City in 1642, but laws establishing slavery for life for African-Americans were not enacted until the 1660s. The main reasons why slaves from Africa were imported to the colonies in the western hemisphere mostly had to do with the labor-intensive nature of growing and planting tobacco, reluctance of new indentured servants to come from Britain, and the preference for slave labor on the part of major plantation owners on the Chesapeake. During the construction of the Hammond-Harwood House, in 1774 measures in Maryland aimed to prohibit the

importation of slaves from Africa; imports of new slaves were banned entirely in 1783, but by this point slavery was firmly entrenched in the United States.

Those of you familiar with the house will know that the architect of this house was William Buckland. In working on this house, Buckland used the labor of both indentured servants and enslaved men and women. Upon his death, his property was inventoried and put up for sale – this included both the slaves as well as the contracts for the indentured servants. At his death, Buckland would have owned a total of five slaves and contracts for six indentured servants¹, all of whom were advertised for sale by Buckland's widow in 1774. One stands out in particular. An enslaved man by the name of **Oxford** was purchased by William Buckland along with a farm in Virginia in 1765. Oxford was valued at 60 pounds when he, his wife Sue and their children were sold off;² he was Buckland's most valuable possession, indicating that he might have had some craft, trade or specialty. Buckland's indentured servants included carpenters, painters, bricklayers, and joiners, and Oxford might have been part of that trade.³

¹ James Gilliard was also an indentured servant that came with the farm – he either was sold or finished his term before 1772. Rosamond Randall Beirne and John HJ. Scarff, *William Buckland 1734-1774: Architect of Virginia and Maryland* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1970), 38, 147

² Randall Beirne and Scarff, *William Buckland 1734-1774*, 38, 44, 147.

³ There are several advertisements Buckland posted for runaway indentured servants. One is in the Virginia Gazette from August 1, 1771 describing Samuel Bailey. Bailey and John Ewing/Ewen/Ewin were both joiners and chronic runaways described as “remarkably dull and stupid” looking. Bailey is mentioned in Buckland's inventory. Another one is in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, November 27 to December 30, 1773, for a plasterer and two bricklayers. Two joiners and two plasterers ran away in March and April of 1774. John Randall, who had inherited a slave from Virginia, also posted a runaway

While we're outside, it's worth looking across the street at the Chase-Lloyd House. **Sall Wilks**, known as **Annapolis Sall**, lived at the Chase-Lloyd House with her daughters, often unaccompanied. She was an enslaved woman owned by Edward Lloyd IV, but she was the favorite of Lloyd's wife, Elizabeth Taylor Lloyd. She was able to secure freedom for all of her daughters and married them to free men of color in town, though she was unable to secure freedom for her son William who was subsequently auctioned off in Baltimore.⁴ In spite of the tragic fate of her son William, Annapolis Sall is still remembered as one of the rare cases of a success story for an enslaved woman in antebellum Annapolis.

advertisement in June of 1774. Both were in the Maryland Gazette, April 3-28, 1774 and June 13-September 8, 1774. Randall Beirne and Scarff, *William Buckland 1734-1774*, 45, 99, 105, 163 n 30.

⁴ Janice Hayes Williams, "Our Legacy: On Maryland Day, experience the African-American story" Capital Gazette, March 20, 2014, <http://www.capitalgazette.com/cg2-arc-140320cc-legacy-20140320-story.html> Accessed August 1, 2016.

The house was built originally by **Matthias Hammond**, though he never in fact lived in the house. There are very detailed records about the slaves he inherited from his own parents as well as the ones he passed onto his nephew – he lists eleven by name in his will, but in all of his agricultural estates, he would have owned 63 total in the Assessment Records of 1783.⁵ After his death in 1786 the house went first to his nephew John Hammond, and then to John's brother, Philip Hammond. Like their uncle, they never lived in the house, but they would have let the house out for rent, most likely to state officials. I'm taking a moment to point out Philip Hammond because he posted up three runaway slave advertisements in the Maryland Gazette from 1797 to 1824. These are fantastic sources of information for several reasons – on the one hand, it gives specific information about the men and women seeking their freedom such as descriptions of their appearance and personal attributes. Jacob has a speech impediment, Sam Bosen (or Bobson) has a sister who lives in Baltimore, and Ned was a mixed-race man who ran away wearing a coarse linen shirt and wool coat. These advertisements also show us just how dangerous the act of escaping slavery was and the pains slaveholders took to secure their return. It also shows the determination of the people involved. Sam Bosen/Bobson seems to have escaped the plantation not only once in 1797 but again the following year while Ned was advertised as an escaped slave for nearly a year.⁶

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ *Maryland Gazette* September 7-14, 1797; August 23, 1798; October 16 1800-September 3 1801; September 9-November 4, 1824 (MSA SC 2731, 3403).

THE KITCHEN AND SERVICE WING

We're starting off the tour of the inside usually where it ends; the service wing. At the moment, we're here in the kitchen; behind that wall would have presumably been the laundry room, and above our heads would have been the residences of the enslaved men and woman and the servants, at least in the first few decades of the house's occupation.

Sources such as letters and census records indicate that in the first half of the nineteenth century, when Richard and Frances Lookerman were living in the Hammond-Harwood House, there were about two to five enslaved men and women living in the house. People associated with the house such as Philip Hammond and Amelia Pinkney would have also had free African-American men and women as part of their households, but at present it is unknown if there were any that were part of this household before the Civil War. The focus of this tour will center on the lives of three women from the 1820s to the 1840s: Mary Matthews, her sister Matilda Matthews, and another enslaved woman named Juliet. You will hear more about them when we go into the main block of the house.

I would like to point out a few artifacts related here to some of the tasks and occupations of the people living in this wing. First, you can see the massive fireplace right here; it had to be constantly burning and was most likely attended by a young girl who would have even slept in this room. This fireplace was related not only to providing heat and light, but also to cooking; we have several cookbooks of the Lookerman and Harwood families who would have been living here. There were no legal prohibitions for slaves to learn how to read in Maryland, though those of you who have read the *Autobiography of Frederick Douglass* are very well familiar with how it was discouraged. I bring this up to point out that if the enslaved women working in the kitchen might not have necessarily needed a cookbook to make meals for the family, but they could have been familiar with the recipes nonetheless.

Archaeology has also turned up several artifacts which point to other occupations of the enslaved African-Americans in this house. Here is the remains of a soap dish that was found on the site; I point this out in conjunction with the laundry area which we think would have been in the other room. Laundry itself was not a glamorous task and usually all of the clothing, linens, and fabric in the house would have to be washed once a week; clothes would be washed one day, dried one or two days, pressed and ironed one or two days and then folded one day. Usually slaves and servants had to do all their own laundry and washing within the space of one day.⁷ This house would have originally sat on four acres and the grounds would have had not only a stable, but also a springhouse, an orchard, a vegetable garden, and an outhouse which some neighbors burned down after the Civil War. Tasks which might be considered unskilled today usually required a great degree of strength and skill. The jobs themselves often exposed the workers to all sorts of dangers – blades, heights, corrosive substances, and so on. The southwestern corner of the yard would have recovered many bones from undesirable parts of cows, sheep and pig indicating that it was either a site where the animals were butchers or where the enslaved people and servants would have had their meals.

One of the key artifacts found at the Hammond-Harwood House is a **shoe** from the end of the 18th century, which you can see here. This is one of several shoes that were found not only in the chimney here but also wedged in the roof. It appears that this shoe was tied to African religious practices; since witches were believed to enter houses through liminal spaces like cracks in the ceiling or the chimney, the belief was that they would be distracted

⁷ Ibid

by the smell of feet and unable to move. This is a fascinating artifact that shows how beliefs from Africa survived the Middle Passage.

MAIN ENTRY HALL

Jeremiah Townley Chase, a legal man, would have owned several slaves himself. Eight of them would have lived at his townhouse in Annapolis while nineteen would have lived at his estate in the county known as Bellmount Farm. Thus far, what little we know about the slaves of Judge Chase comes from his will and from the inventory taken of his property after his death in 1828. That being said, there are several key pieces to the puzzle regarding the identity of the enslaved men and women who would have lived in this house. Several important provisions are made in his will, particularly the stipulation that all slaves under his service were to be manumitted when they reached the age of 31. For enslaved men and women who were well beyond that age, they were given anywhere from six months to 3 years of service left before they were allowed their freedom. Since they still had time left before they were manumitted, the will divides the twenty-seven men and women he owned amongst his five children. One of the families that was broken up was the Matthews family.

In 1828, Sarah Matthews would have been 35 years old, and it seems she would have had four children: two daughters named **Mary** and **Matilda**, and two sons named Henry and Ben. Five years prior, in 1823, Mary and Matilda had been sent to the Hammond-Harwood House as a gift to Chase's granddaughters, Hester Ann Loockerman and Matilda Loockerman. As we have seen, Chase's son-in-law Richard was notoriously terrible with money and a consistent gambler, so much of his policy towards his eldest daughter Frances was to give her things that she could use but that she could not own. If Frances had owned the house or Mary and Matilda herself, then they were Richard's property to do with what he pleased, which could mean gambling or selling them off. Mary it seems stayed at the Hammond-Harwood House between 1823 and Judge Chase's death in 1828 from a letter of Richard Loockerman. This is a very interesting letter, as it was essentially a squabble over Judge Chase's estate between Richard Loockerman and Judge Chase's son, also named Richard. Loockerman states that since Mary had been living at the Hammond-Harwood House since 1823, which is why she was not included in the inventory upon his death. Matilda, however, had been sent back to the Chase household shortly after 1823 because, and I quote, the Loockermans did not have "sufficient employment" for both of them.⁸ In 1823, Matilda would have been around 8 years old, so if Mary was the elder sister that might explain why they kept Mary and not Matilda at that point. In any case, the tone of Loockerman's letter indicates that he wishes for Matilda to return to the Hammond-Harwood House which, by the terms of Judge Chase's will, would have been the legal thing to do. While we do not know Mary's age, by the terms of the will, if Matilda had been born around 1815, she should have legally received her freedom sometime around 1845-1847.

The story does not end there for the Matthews family. As I mentioned earlier, Mary and Matilda would have had a mother, Sarah and two brothers, Henry and Ben; Ben would have been born around 1816 and Henry around 1817. According to the terms of the will, By the death of Judge Chase in 1828, they would have already been separated as well. Sarah Matthews would have gone to Hester Ann Chase, and in 1832 she was given her certificate of freedom by Anne Arundel County.⁹ Henry would have been in the county working at Bellmount Farm while Ben would have been in Annapolis. [There is a possible runaway slave advertisement for Ben Matthews posted in 1838. This Ben Matthews is described as being nearly six feet high and bearded with scaly skin on his hands and feet. He would have been owned by a man from the vicinity of Annapolis, but at the time of his escape he would have

⁸ Maryland Historical Society MS 278

⁹ MSA C45-1, Folio 127-128

been working in Montgomery County at the Colesville factory.]¹⁰ A jail record from Baltimore shows that his freedom was short-lived, however.¹¹ While it is possible that this advertisement may refer to another Ben Matthews, the Ben Matthews we are interested in eventually received his certificate of freedom in 1848.¹²

One of the miniatures painted by James Peale, a younger brother of Charles Willson Peale, in our collection depicts **Edward Lloyd V** as a young man. He was governor of Maryland and he owned the Chase-Lloyd House across the street – you can hear more about him there. I point him out here because he is a central figure in the autobiography of **Frederick Douglass**, the famous abolitionist, writer and politician. Douglass was owned by one of Lloyd's overseers at Wye House, on the Eastern Shore, and discusses a great deal how brutally Lloyd treated the several hundred enslaved men and women he owned. One of the anecdotes Douglass recounts was how Lloyd asked an slave on the plantation whether or not his master treated him well; after the man (who did not recognize Lloyd) responded honestly, he was found later, clapped in irons and sold off to a plantation in Georgia.¹³

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Ibid

¹² Ibid

¹³ Autobiography of Frederick Douglass; Ana Lucia Araujo, *Shadows of the Slave Past: Memory, Heritage and Slavery* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 114-115.

THE STUDY

The Hammond-Harwood House is renowned for two major collection: its collection of John Shaw furniture and its collection of Peale paintings. I'd like to take a moment here to focus on the latter, particularly the famous painter Charles Willson Peale. When Peale was living in Annapolis, he was given two slaves as payment for a portrait that had been painted. Their names were Scarborough and Lucy, and while they were living in Annapolis, the couple had a son around 1775 who was given the name **Moses Williams**. After the Peale family moved to Philadelphia, Scarborough and Lucy were given their freedom in 1786; at this point, Scarborough discarded the name he was given and instead chose the name of John Williams for himself. While John Williams and his wife Lucy were free, by Pennsylvania law, Moses Williams would not be free until he reached the age of twenty-eight, so while he lived with the Peale family for his childhood and early adulthood, he was distinctly different and not afforded the same opportunities as the other sons of Charles Willson Peale to learn. That being said, in 1802, Peale's Museum in Philadelphia acquired a device known as a physiognotrace; this invention made it possible to trace a silhouette of someone and have four copies of it being available. Since this was before the invention of photography, this device was incredibly popular and nearly every visitor of the Peale Museum would have their silhouette drawn. The man who ended up operating the physiognotrace and cutting out the profiles of visitors was none other than Moses Williams himself. You can see some examples of his work here, as several examples of his silhouettes of members of the Peale family survive to present day. An article from 2014 has even raised the possibility that Williams himself cut out his own silhouette which can be seen here. Moses was apparently so talented and skilled with this work that Peale granted him his freedom one year before he was legally obliged to do so. The guests who had four copies of their silhouettes were charged eight cents total, and Williams was able to save up enough money from this job to buy himself a house in Philadelphia and to get married. The story of Williams does end on a sad note, however, as when the popularity of silhouettes declined, so did his career and in the end he had to sell his house and died impoverished.¹⁴

I would also like to take a moment to point out the **map** in the corner of Virginia and Maryland from 1751. This was drawn by Joshua Fry and Peter Jefferson, the father of Thomas Jefferson. This is a significant piece because if you look very closely at the cartouche, you can clearly see that it is the only depiction in the house at this moment which includes people of color. If you look at a close-up here, you can see a dockside scene with enslaved Africans working both domestic and industrial jobs, particularly packing and shipping barrels.

One of the pieces in this reception room is a Campeche chair. It was originally at Marietta Mansion in Prince George's County, in the possession of Gabriel Duvall; it was given to Duvall by Thomas Jefferson. The story gets even more interesting when you consider that the man who most likely would have made this chair was called **John Hemmings**. Does that last name ring a bell for anyone? He would have been a half-brother to Sally Hemmings and like her he would have been mixed-race and enslaved. John Hemmings was a very talented woodworker and cabinet-maker and would have been an assistant to the joiner who worked on Monticello; Hemmings would have done most of the

¹⁴ Gwendolyn Dubois Shaw, "Moses Williams, Cutter of Profiles': Silhouettes and African American Identity in the Early Republic" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 149/1 (2005), 22-39.

interior woodwork at Jefferson's house at Poplar Forest. In addition to fine, high-quality woodworking he also made the wooden furnishings for a carriage Jefferson designed in 1814 as well as making toys and furniture for Jefferson's grandchildren; we can see from this chair here and the other examples mentioned that John was a very talented and capable craftsman. Upon Jefferson's death in 1826, John Hemmings would have been given his freedom at 50 years of age. He was also allowed to keep his joinery tools and to have two assistants, Madison and Easton Hemmings – they were the sons of Sally Hemmings by Thomas Jefferson. They would have been allowed their freedom only when they turned 21 years old.¹⁵

The Hammond-Harwood House is known not only for its collection of Peale paintings but also its collection of **John Shaw** furniture. John Shaw was a highly respected cabinet-maker here in Annapolis. We can see a piece of his work here in this elaborate desk and bookcase; the twin of this piece can be found in the White House. John Shaw was also a slaveholder himself, and upon his death in 1829, the seven slaves in his possession were divided up amongst his children and grandchildren. The terms of his will stipulates in regard to one slave by the name of John, and I quote “...it is my wish and desire that my son Thomas should immediately after my death take possession of the said negro John so that he should not be permitted to remain with the family or in Annapolis.” Other slaves of John Shaw had their families divided up: Deborah Tootell's son James was separated from his mother and sister while Kitty Carroll's son Henry was separated from his mother as well.¹⁶

¹⁶ MSA C153-10 folio 23-27; MSA C88-18, folios 177-181; William Voss Elder III and Lu Bartlett, *John Shaw: Cabinetmaker of Annapolis* (Baltimore: BMA, 1983), 169-171.

BEST BEDCHAMBER

I want us all to take a look around here – usually when we enter a room like this, our eye is drawn to the pretty things and indeed, this is a room meant to be admired for its beautiful things. For prestigious visitors of the house, this would have been the most lavish guest bedrooms as evidenced by the rich fabrics and furniture. For the slaves working in the house, this would have been a very pretty workspace. For domestic workers, part of their duties in arising early was to make sure that the fires were lit before the members of the household were awake.¹⁷ It is worth remembering all sorts of viewpoints of historical spaces when interpreting and reconstructing them.

In the previous room, I mentioned that John Shaw was a cabinet-maker here in town. The most popular and luxurious wood to work with during this time was **mahogany**, which we can see right here in this lovely pie-crust table. As a smooth grain wood with a satin finish, mahogany was very popular in the 18th century and many John Shaw pieces were made either using the wood for the whole piece or as a veneer. That being said, mahogany was integral in Central-American and Caribbean slavery in the 18th and 19th centuries. Most of the mahogany plantations used slave labor and the demand for the wood was such that many of the mahogany forests of Jamaica, Cuba, and Central America were totally decimated.¹⁸

One recommendation for cleaning mahogany was dipping a flannel in beer and rubbing until it was clean.¹⁹

DINING ROOM

I think the dining room is a good place to follow up on the remark that I made earlier about how different spaces would be viewed. Here, we see everything laid out very nicely for several guests, but women like Mary, Matilda and Juliet would have all had various different tasks associated with getting this room set up, getting food here from the kitchen, and waiting on the family and their guests. One great insight into the mechanics of this is *The House Servant's Directory* written by **Robert Roberts**, a free black man in 1827 who would have had decades of experience as a butler. It's an invaluable source on every single particular of keeping an Early American household running efficiently with advice on everything from candlesticks to placement of plates and glasses. Much of the arrangement in this room and in the ballroom upstairs was laid out according to his advice. The one particular thing I would like to impress though, is how while the family would be sitting at the table talking over all sorts of political happenings and discourses, the slaves waiting on the family would be seen in this room, but not heard. You can see this in the painting of a **Dinner Party by Henry Sargent**.

¹⁷ Robert Roberts, *The House Servant's Directory*, 41-42.

¹⁸ Jennifer Anderson, *Mahogany: The Costs of Luxury in Early America* (2012).

¹⁹ Robert Roberts

UPSTAIRS: BIG BEDROOM

As we have seen in other instances, Richard Loockerman was constantly short of money. This not only affected his immediate family, but also the enslaved men and women he owned. One of the legal briefs in the Maryland Chancery Court is a bill of complaint wherein Richard Loockerman had mortgaged a slave of his named Juliet to a local man by the name of Nicholas Watkins for a total of \$126.58 in 1821. The terms of the loan were that Watkins would supply the ready cash and have the services of Juliet for one year, after which Loockerman would pay back the amount and Juliet would return to the Hammond-Harwood House. Keeping within character, the bill of the complaint is that not only has Loockerman failed to pay back the amount after the year, but that he openly refused to do so; Watkins thus requested a subpoena from Loockerman to answer these charges and to begin procedure to foreclose this mortgage, meaning that Watkins would keep Juliet. How the situation was resolved is unknown, as the charges were eventually dismissed by Watkins himself, indicating that they had settled the matter outside the courtroom sometime by 1823. For Juliet, these two years would have been incredibly uncertain as the two slaveholders were haggling and bickering.

Twenty years later, a letter from Frances Loockerman to her daughter Hester Harwood makes mention of a woman who is possibly the same Juliet. In writing about her household affairs to Hester in 1842, Frances states “I keep two servants, Juliet went to Baltimore last August for her health and has not returned yet.” As this letter was written in March of 1842, it seems that Juliet would have been in Baltimore for about 9 months. This begs all sorts of questions – what was the problem with her health? Where was she being treated? What sort of treatment was she undergoing? Was she at an institution that was integrated or one that was segregated? There are all sorts of questions about her life that I hope will be elucidated in the near future.

UPSTAIRS: BALLROOM

If you're very observant here, you will notice that the band around the ceiling of the urn patterns was clearly done at a later date, probably the early nineteenth century. I wanted to point that out here because while William Buckland is the famous architect associated with this house, it would have been finished by a man named John Randall, a man who had been Buckland's apprentice and junior partner and who had lived with him for eleven years.²⁰ John Randall's fifth son Richard was a physician, a student of St. John's College and an active member of the **American Colonization Society**. In 1828, Richard Randall was appointed the governor of Liberia.²¹ The goal of the American Colonization Society was to establish a settlement in Africa where free African-Americans could live. Though initially popular in the 1810s, it soon became very heavily criticized as being not only under the thumb of slaveholders but also for the fact that by the 1830s, its underlying mission was to eliminate the presence of free blacks in America. Its mission was fundamentally altered by the Nat Turner Uprising. One other fundamental nature of change in the Society's mission after the death of Richard Randall is the fact that decades prior, many of the enslaved men and women were first or second generation with some remaining familial and mnemonic ties to Africa. By the 1830s this was no longer the case as the importation of new slaves from Africa had been illegal for at least one generation. ~~Though the international slave trade had been made a felony in 1805, Randall reports that many American vessels were engaging in the slave trade illegally and that efforts to stop it then had very little impact.~~²²

I would also like to take a moment to point out that the glasses on the sideboard are arranged in the manner directed by Robert Roberts in his House Servants' Directory.

²⁰ Randall Beirne and Scarff, *William Buckland 1734-1774*, 44, 113.

²¹ Jane W. McWilliams, *Annapolis, City on the Severn; A History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 142.

²² Teah Wulah, *Back to Africa: A Liberian Tragedy* (Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2009), 205-208.

UPSTAIRS: GAME ROOM

The census of 1810 indicates that Ninian **Pinkney** would have owned three slaves – this would have been right around the time that he moved into the Hammond-Harwood House. Sadly, nothing is known at present of the specific enslaved men and women who would have lived in the house then, but it is worth spending a moment talking about the Pinkney’s family relationship with slavery. Ninian junior’s brother, William Pinkney, was also a slaveholder, but his views on slavery are a bit more complex to dissect. In 1788, while a member of the Maryland House of Delegates, he gave a speech entitled “For the Relief of Slaves” where he refers to slavery as an “inhuman policy” which is a “disgrace to the Colony, a dishonor to the Legislature, and a scandal to human nature.”²³ His main concern was that slavery as it existed then was not something that could continue as is, and the period that he gave this speech is also important to remember; the following two years, in 1789 and 1790, the Maryland General Assembly was petitioned to enact a gradual emancipation law like those which had been enacted in Pennsylvania and other northern territories; these petitions were ultimately unsuccessful.²⁴ That being said, he is mostly remembered for a speech in 1820 which has usually been interpreted as a pro-slavery speech in the US Senate. What he was actually arguing, based on the language of his text, is the right of the state of Missouri to enter the Union as a slave state, rather than for slavery itself.²⁵ He also fought strenuously to repeal a bill that outlawed slaveholders to manumit their slaves upon their death; this bill allowing conditional manumission was finally passed in 1790.²⁶ That being said, in the same session of the General Assembly, Pinkney also condemned the Maryland Society for the Promotion of Abolition, stating that the organization behaved in a “most uncandid, unjustifiable and oppressive manner.”²⁷ We also know that in his will, William Pinkney stipulated that John Williams and his mother Sarah, the two slaves in his possession, should be freed immediately after his death. The will also stipulates that he bequeaths to Sarah her bed and bedding which she already used.²⁸ I think that the case of William Pinkney is a very important one to highlight here as it shows the variety and complexity of viewpoints about slavery in Maryland at that time.

A final coda to the Pinkney family is that William Pinkney’s nephew, an Episcopal minister also named William Pinkney, who had been born in this house around 1810 was invited in 1855 to evangelize to the Black Community in Prince George’s County, an offer which he ultimately declined.²⁹

As for Richard Loockerman himself, there are two competing stories about his death which I think are worth sharing for this tour. He died rather suddenly in November 1834 at his estate in Caroline County in Bennets Toulson. The following month, his cousin

²³ <http://www.bartleby.com/268/8/19.html> Accessed August 1 2016.

²⁴ *A Guide to the History of Slavery in Maryland* (2007), 28.

²⁵

²⁶

²⁷ Max P. Allen, “William Pinkney’s Public Career, 1788-1796” *Maryland Historical Magazine* XL (1945), 215-219.

²⁸

²⁹ Orlando Hutton, *Life of the Right Reverend William Pinkney, D.D., LL.D., Fifth Bishop of Maryland* (Washington DC: Gibson Bros., 1890), 1, 72-75.

Theodore writes to Richard's widow Frances assuring her that her late husband had been given to the care of a nurse named Hicks and that every possible medical attention was seen to, though in the end all they could do was make him comfortable before he died. The same day Theodore wrote this letter, a family friend writes a letter to her son which has quite a different take on Richard Loockerman's death. She writes as follows:

“You saw Richard Loockerman's death in the Gazette. What won't the love of strong drink do. He came over to Caroline on business, got in a drunken frolick and continued so about three weeks, was taken ill among the black people who lived on his farm and actually breathed his last in a black man's house, thus my dear, has closed the temporary career of one of the handsomest, most sensible and well informed men of our age.”

For those of you who are interested in seeing the original copy of the letter itself, the Hammond-Harwood has it in the temporary exhibition gallery, a purchase from a little place called eBay.

CONCLUDING SEGMENT

LAW OFFICE/GARDEN OUTSIDE OFFICE HYPHEN:

The northern wing of the Hammond-Harwood House was originally intended to be leased out for office space, and one of the men who had his law office there before eventually buying it was a man by the name of Jeremiah Townley Chase. He was a very well renowned judge and even a delegate to the Constitutional Congress – a very big name. He bought the Hammond-Harwood House in 1811 for his eldest daughter Frances to live there with her husband, Richard Loockerman, and their growing family – Richard and Frances would eventually have ten children in total, seven of whom lived beyond infancy. What I want to focus on at this moment is the judge as a legal man, because well after his legal career was established and thriving, he decided to take on several cases related to descendants of a woman named **Eleanor Bulter**, an indentured servant also known as Irish Nell. In the 1680s, Eleanor married an enslaved African-American man named Charles, though slaves could not legally be married. One of the consequences of this marriage was that it sparked the first of several laws prohibiting marriages between enslaved and free people, particularly criminalizing unions between enslaved African-American men and white women. In spite of the hostile conditions and the fact that there was no legal recognition of their marriage, Eleanor Butler and Charles had several children who would go on to have descendants of their own. About a century later, in 1786, Maryland courts began to hear cases from enslaved men and women who claimed descent from free white women. Between 1788 and 1792, Jeremiah Townley Chase represented about nineteen descendants of Butler and Charles who were petitioning for their freedom – it seems that many of them were successful as well.

Hammond-Harwood House in the 20th-21st Centuries:

At present, the Hammond-Harwood House is happy to have a man by the name of Dale Tippens as part of our staff. He started on here in 2001 and has been the caretaker ever since. Since coming on board here he has also worked at Londontown and Historic Annapolis, getting the chance to engage in the active maintenance and upkeep of many historical buildings here in Anne Arundel County. He has said that history was always his favorite subject when he was in school, and this is a way for him to work after retiring from the School Board in a field he enjoys.

Lastly, I think it is worth pointing out that while slavery is illegal in practically every country in the world as of 2007, it is nonetheless estimated that almost 21 million people worldwide are in some sort of forced labor or child labor. If you compare that with the American census in 1860, there were only 4 million enslaved African-Americans then. That being said, there are groups like the Polaris Project and Historians against Slavery which seek to address this growing problem. I urge you to check them out.

Acknowledgements

Annapolis Rotary Club

Banneker-Douglass Museum

Maryland State Archives

Jean Russo

Janice Hayes-McWilliams

Jane McWilliams