The visible evidence of the firm establishment of government and jurisdiction was, for Penn, during the winter of 1682-1683, the successful planting of his first settlement. Although Thomas Holme's *Portraiture of a City* was the initial expression of that evidence, the plan it represented did not reflect Penn's original concept of a settled community. It was a compromise necessitated by local conditions and the demands of his colonists.

When any conceptual design is developed from a rough sketch to the finished product, the course is fluid, not static. Some alteration—a correction here, an addition there, to refine or enhance the whole—is inevitable. So it was with the plan shown on the *Portraiture*. As occasion demanded, various adjustments were made without hesitation and incorporated in its practical execution. None of them destroyed its basic pattern; many of them served to improve its composition. Penn's reference to the future prospects of the Free Society of Traders applied with equal truth to his attitude toward
the emergent settlement: "I am sure, I have not turned my back upon any offer, that tended to its prosperity."*

The Planting

Undoubtedly there was considerable clearing of ground in the city over the winter, but little official surveying was accomplished. The weather was unfavorable for such work, the number of surveyors was inadequate, and late in January, 1683, official attention was distracted by a ship from Bristol which deposited a new influx of settlers needing immediate accommodation. In February an election was held for members of Penn's Council and for delegates to the first regular session of the Assembly. Sitting from March 12 to April 3, that newly formed body studied the revised Frame of Government Penn presented for its approval, and passed eighty bills spelling out in greater detail the laws under which the colonists henceforth would live. The session was barely over when a second shipload of settlers arrived to swell the population.1

Because of such pressing necessities, less than a dozen lots were officially surveyed on Delaware side up to April, 1683, and none at all on Schuylkill side. When Schuylkill Front Street was laid out, its location was determined by the extent of marshland between High and Songhurst Streets, where the worst conditions were on either side of the mouth of the Kentin Tomessin. In this area, nearly a thousand feet were affected by tidal conditions, so that at High Street the nearest firm ground was a good 800 feet back from the river bank. However, at the northwest and southwest ends of town, where the river swung westward, the street followed the river's course with the result that lots at these ends, between Front and Second Streets, were of greater depth than those nearer High Street.2

* From Penn's letter to the Free Society of Traders, in Proud, 264. Full citations referred to in this and following notes are given in Part I. Dates in citations of original documents are expressed in modern form. All manuscripts hereinafter cited are from the collections of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania unless otherwise designated.

1 For the 1683 ships, see Marion Balderston, "Pennsylvania's 1683 Ships and Some of Their Passengers," PGM, XXIV (1965), 69-110. The first ship to arrive was the Bristol Merchant, the second the Thomas & Anne from London.

2 Schuylkill Front Street (present Twenty-second Street) was never moved west, nearer the river, as John Reed claimed in 1774. A comparison of the distance between Delaware Second
By early April, 1683, the lines of Schuylkill Front, Second, and Third Streets were staked out, but only five lots were surveyed on them during the month. Four of these were Front lots assigned to original Irish purchasers, two of whom had bought 5,000 acres each, and were laid out at the behest of an agent they had sent over. The fifth lot, at Holme and Schuylkill Third, had been assigned to another absent purchaser. It was warranted and surveyed to John Culcopp, a "silk throster" from London, who agreed to rent it until the owner claimed it. On Delaware side, sixteen lots were surveyed during April. Except for one lot on Front Street, they were all on the "backward streets" for men such as weavers, tailors, coopers, carpenters or joiners who, apparently, were more anxious to establish themselves or their claims than larger purchasers.

When Penn arrived in the Delaware he had assumed the prerogative of issuing warrants for the survey of lands, relieving Markham and Holme of that responsibility. Consequently, during the Proprietor's absences from town the issuance of warrants for city lots or liberty land came to a halt. Such was the case during most of May and Schuylkill Second Streets, taken from the 1685 survey of the Free Society's city lots, from James Mease's "Picture of Philadelphia in 1811" in Thomas Wilson, Picture of Philadelphia for 1824 (Philadelphia, 1823), and from Scharf and Westcott's 1884 History of Philadelphia, shows a variance of only four feet, and that the present Twenty-second Street, even now wider than other north-south streets, was the original Schuylkill Front Street. Surveys giving the varying lot depths along Schuylkill Front at the south end of town are in Warrants and Surveys, III, 247, 248, for Charles Marshall and Co. and for John Boyer; at the north end of town for Thomas Rudyard in ibid., I, 799. The swampy conditions along the river bank are shown in the surveys cited in Note 51, Part I.

As agent for the Irish purchasers, Christopher Pennock had the lots surveyed Apr. 5, 1683, under a warrant issued in his name. Warrants and Surveys, I, 855, and III, 234. Culcopp's lot was assigned to the purchaser Thomas Cam of Camsgill, Westmoreland, who did not apply for a warrant for it until 1707, as recited in Pennsylvania Archives, Second Series, XIX, 485.

The one lot surveyed in April on the Front, between Songhurst and Valley Streets, was for John Day of London, a purchaser of 1,250 acres and a carpenter by trade. Warrants and Surveys, III, 231. The pattern of lots within the squares shown on Holme's Portraiture was generally adhered to during the first two years, but one alteration, made in mid-April, 1683, subsequently was followed on both sides of town in the two squares between Second and Third north of Arch Street. On the plan, in these squares the deep lots fronting Second Street, assigned to 500-acre purchasers, are shown backed by only two pairs of lots running parallel to Third Street, with narrow fronts on Arch, Race, and Vine. This was altered by reducing the depth of Second Street lots and adding a row of lots fronting Third Street similar to those on Second Street. The survey for Jane Batchelor, a Welcome passenger, for her lot at the northeast corner of Arch and Third set the pattern. Ibid., III, 239.
when he was with Thomas Holme in East Jersey, and then down in New Castle for another meeting with Lord Baltimore. Only a dozen lots were surveyed that month, three of them on the east side of Schuylkill Second near Holme Street, the others all on Delaware side. Following Penn's return in early June, surveying picked up. Thirty-six more lots were surveyed, the most to be laid out in any one month during the entire first two years of settlement. Twenty-nine of these were on Delaware side, the others on Schuylkill side.

With the advent of summer, the rate dropped off again, but by the end of July the total number of lots known to have been laid out was just over one hundred. There were now twenty-two on Schuylkill side: eight along Front above High; five on Schuylkill Second scattered between Pool on the south and the town's northern bounds; four along the High Street between Schuylkill Front and Fourth; one on Songhurst west of Fourth; and four on Holme Street, by now staked out as far as Schuylkill Eighth. There, at the northwest corner, two adjoining lots on unassigned ground were laid out for renters, Thomas Millard and Thomas Jones. No lots had been surveyed on Wynne Street.

On Delaware side by the end of July, the seventy-nine surveyed lots cut out of the forest provided the community with a more settled appearance. Along the river front, between the Swamp, later called the Dock, at the south and Valley Street at the north end, sixteen Front lots were officially laid out. Two of them were for Griffith Jones, the Blue Anchor Tavern's owner. His Front lot above High was surveyed early in May. Six weeks later he persuaded the Proprietor, "more by importunity than money," as Penn later claimed, to grant him two adjoining lots at the north corner of Pool Street, assigned to the Quaker ministers, George Fox and Alexander Parker, neither of whom was likely to emigrate. At the end of June, Jones had those lots surveyed as one seventy-foot lot with the intention of building his chief town dwelling at the corner.

5 Penn's presence in East Jersey is noted in a letter from Thomas Rudyard, May 30, 1683, in Samuel Smith, History of the Colony of Nova Caesaria or New Jersey . . . to the year 1721 (Philadelphia, 1765), 167–171. The meeting with Baltimore on May 29, is in Peare, William Penn, 274, cited in Note 3, Part I.

6 Penn to James Logan, Apr. 30, 1705. The comment on Jones is in the postscript dated May 10, 1705. Penn MSS, Letters of the Penn Family, I, 233½. Exemplification Book 1, 28: Apr. 13, 1684, Patent to Griffith Jones.
A month later the first lot in the square south of Pool Street was surveyed. Along there the large front lots were only roughly staked off and were not improved except at the corner, where James Claypoole's log house was slowly taking shape. On Holme's "Platform," as Penn called the plan, the first two front lots (including Claypoole's) were shown clear of the Swamp, the third just touching its northern limits. In reality, the waters of the Swamp extended north all the way to Claypoole's corner lot and eliminated entirely some of the frontage on Second Street where the water crossed it. The fact that further south the Swamp's basin divided the remaining front lots into two unconnected parcels having a total area less than other front lots was not considered a serious disadvantage; most of them had been assigned to London merchants, purchasers of one or two thousand acres. Silas Crispin even preferred it. Believing this location so near the center of activity had more future than that assigned his father at the extreme north end of town, he gave up the latter lot in exchange for a forty-foot lot laid out for him by the Swamp. This ground was surveyed about sixty feet south of Claypoole's lot on the site previously assigned to two of the London merchants.7

West of Delaware Second Street, where nearly all assigned lots were laid out, along Pool as far west as Delaware Fifth, and on Wynne and Holme Streets up to Fourth, surveyed lots penetrated the woods. On the unassigned ground on the north side of Wynne, two were surveyed for renters: one at the northwest corner of Third for John Austin, a ship carpenter; and further along in the same square another for Anthony Weston, a small shopkeeper. Six lots were strung out along High Street, now staked out up to Seventh. On all of them, as well as on many of those taken up but not yet officially laid out, "fencing and building thereon according to regulations" had been accomplished in some degree. Penn could not have been far wrong when he wrote on July 28, that there were then "built about 80 houses" in town.8

7 Crispin's survey is recited in Deed Book E-1-5, 37: June 3, 1684, Silas Crispin to William Frampton. The Crispin lot at the north end of town was surveyed and patented to Thomas Rudyard a year later. Exemplification Book 1, 80: June 26, 1684, Patent to Thomas Rudyard. Subsequently, Rudyard sold the lot and other lands to Andrew Robeson.

8 The Austin and Weston surveys are in Warrants and Surveys, II, 11, and III, 501. Their placement on unassigned ground suggests their arrival after the assignment list was filled. The number of houses built, as given by Penn, is in his letter to the Earl of Sunderland, July 28, 1683, Society Miscellaneous Collection.
Most of these surveyed lots were for those to whom they were assigned. A number of them, however, were not for original purchasers under Penn. So intent was the Proprietor on speeding the emergence of his first settlement that during the winter and early spring months of 1683, when Penn was assigning lots, anyone could have one assigned to him provided he would clear and build on it promptly. If he agreed to buy acreage in the country from an original purchaser, or from Penn himself, he might have one of the lots designed for such purchasers and marked off on Holme's plan, providing it was in a location appropriate to the size of the purchase.

John Southworth, clerk of the Assembly, and Richard Ingelo, clerk of the Provincial Council, who were assigned "back" lots 22 and 23 on Delaware Second Street, were typical examples of such purchasers. Southworth had bought 500 acres from Thomas Wynne only a month before his lot was surveyed in March, while Ingelo had bought only the right to the city lot appurtenant to the 500-acre original purchase of Walter Martin, who had settled in Chester County. On Schuylkill side, back lot 26 on Second Street, assigned to the ship carpenter John Longworthy, was surveyed for him in May in right of his "late" purchase of 200 acres acquired the same month. George Randall, variously designated a late or "new" purchaser of 150 acres, was assigned lot 86 on the north side of Holme between Delaware Third and Fourth.\(^9\)

Two prominent New York Quaker merchants, William Frampton and Humphrey Morrey, were also assigned lots as purchasers. They had been doing business in the Delaware for some years and now looked to establish a base of operation in the rising Quaker community. At the time of their applications all the choice front lots were assigned, so they agreed to take lots elsewhere, hoping that later, if the progress of the place warranted the expense, they might be able to buy front lots from original purchasers. To accommodate the brew and bake house Frampton intended to build, Penn assigned him lot 10 on Delaware Second Street. Its location,

immediately south of Pool Street next to the stream flowing into the northern corner of the Swamp, provided him with access to the river. For Humphrey Morrey, Penn assigned lot 119 on the north side of Holme between Fourth and Fifth Streets, close to the waters of the Coaquannock. Each assignment was predicated on the eventual purchase of country land.  

While assigning lots for those other than original purchasers, Penn did not forget artisans and small tradesmen with little or no capital to invest, the “second sort” he had in mind when he published his first prospectus. Practical considerations determined their inclusion in the assignment list; their various skills and talents must be readily available. Hence it was for the best interests of all that they be placed in the center of activity, unless they preferred otherwise. An evident intention by such people to acquire land when able, and the will to clear and improve a city lot were all that was essential. In the meantime they could rent until able to buy.

A case in point was that of the Irish cooper from Antrim, Archibald Mickle. With a brewhouse going up, his talents should be readily available. Assigned back lot 100 at the southeast corner of Pool and Fourth Streets, it was surveyed for him as a renter late in April. George Guest was a whitesmith from West Jersey, where recently he had acquired from his brother-in-law part of a share of a propriety in that colony. He was assigned the west half of lot 121 at the southwest corner of Delaware Fourth and Songhurst. The other half was assigned to Joseph Knight, presumably a friend or associate. Their lots were surveyed for them as renters in mid-August. Another renter assigned a lot was Thomas Rouse, apparently a relative by marriage of George Fox’s step-daughter Margaret.

10 William Frampton was admitted a freeman of New York on Oct. 1, 1683. PMHB, XVIII (1894), 420n. By the following December he had begun building his “great brewhouse.” James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, Dec. 2, 1683, Claypoole Letter Book, 426-428. The first located mention of Frampton in Philadelphia is Feb. 20, 1683/4, in Colonial Records, I, 93. His lot was surveyed in March, 1684, 102 feet wide, after Penn granted him the adjacent and unassigned lot 9. No survey for Morrey’s lot has been found; the recital in his patent states it was surveyed in 1683, “but no return made.” Exemplification Book 1, 193, July 17, 1694, Patent to Humphrey Morrey.

Fell. As such he was held in high esteem. In early April, Rouse asked "to take up Land for building an House & [to] Settle upon it." Penn assigned him back lot 89 at the southwest corner of Delaware Third and Wynne, directing that the lot should be laid out fifty feet wide "and in length as other lots of that street run." Before this ground was surveyed for Rouse, Penn added forty-nine feet to its breadth.  

Some purchasers, it appears, were not satisfied with the location of lots assigned them; by mid-summer a number of their holdings had been surveyed on entirely different sites. Sarah Fuller, a purchaser of 1,000 acres, was assigned part of lot 36 on Schuylkill Front Street. In March she asked for a lot near her stepfather, John Barnes of Sussex, whose lot was at the northwest corner of Songhurst and Delaware Second. To accommodate her, Penn also let her have lot 54 adjoining Barnes' lot, "in lieu of one of 1000 acres in the [front] street." It was surveyed seventy-five feet in breadth on the same day in June when Barnes' lot was laid out. Robert Hart, a "plasterer" from London, had also been assigned a lot on Schuylkill side, appropriate to his purchase of 250 acres. However, the lot laid out for him in July was on the north side of Pool between Delaware Fourth and Fifth, on a site reserved for an absent purchaser.  

Three of the seven High Street lots on Delaware side surveyed by August, were also not in accordance with the assignment list. Christopher Taylor's lot, the first to be laid out, was surveyed in January at the northeast corner of Fourth, instead of on the south side of the street where it had been designated. In June, Thomas Holme's lot was established at the northwest corner of Sixth, though it had been assigned to the southwest corner. In July, three months before

12 The Guest and Knight surveys are in Warrants and Surveys, II, 52, 74. Guest's holdings in New Jersey can be traced in New Jersey Archives, First Series, XXI, cited in Note 34, Part I. Knight was perhaps the victualer who died intestate in the spring of 1702, for whom see Administration Book A, 388, cited in PGM, XIX, 276. Rouse's warrant and survey are in Warrants and Surveys, I, 859, and II, 104. This lot, where Clarke's Hall later was built, he sold for £120 to William Clarke in 1694, as recited in Deed Book F-4, 349: Mar. 20, 1704/5, William Clarke, Sr., to William Clarke, Jr.  

13 Sarah Fuller's warrant and survey are in Warrants and Surveys, I, 357, and III, 507; Hart's is in ibid., III, 227. For his purchase from William Boswell before emigration, see Pennsylvania Archives, Second Series, XIX, 286.
his arrival in the province, Robert Turner's lot was surveyed on the site originally assigned to Holme.\textsuperscript{14}

The survey of lots promoted land transactions. In addition to Taylor's sale to Thomas Hooten, several other transfers of property were arranged during the first six months of the year. In mid-January, before his assigned Front lot was surveyed, Charles Pickering, a purchaser from Cheshire of 1,000 acres, sold to John Test for £4 “current Boston money” the right to the east end of his lot north of Wynne Street “in the street next to ye Main river.” Test, a cordwainer from London, had invested in Fenwick's colony in West Jersey and was now High Sheriff of Penn's colony. In March, he obtained a warrant from Penn and had the entire lot surveyed in his own name. By the end of June, after he had erected a house on the eastern portion, he agreed to sell the property to Elizabeth Shorter, a widow, for £30 “old English money.” Isaac Martin, a feltmaker, assigned lot 20 on Delaware Second Street “between the streets (as yet called Wynne and Poole),” died before it was surveyed. His widow Katherine had the lot laid out in June in right of her husband's purchase, and a month later sold it “with appurtenances” for £7 10s. The buyer was Patrick Robinson, a young man with an eye to the future, who was living in Passayunk with a Negro servant, Robert Neverbegood.\textsuperscript{15}

None of these various modifications in the city's basic plan occasioned by actual survey—the location of Schuylkill Front Street, the greater extent of the Swamp, the subdivision or exchange of lots, or the specific allocation to renters of lots in unassigned areas—were ever incorporated in Holme's \textit{Portraiture}. Nor were any names altered in the assignment list after it was first filled in, or added to it later when numbered lots, unassigned on the list, were finally allotted.

Undoubtedly, the decision to let both plan and list stand as first drawn was influenced by Penn's worsening relations with Lord

\textsuperscript{14}Taylor's survey is in Warrants and Surveys, II, 128; Holme's and Turner's in III, 220, 506.

\textsuperscript{15}Deed Book E-2-5, 3: Jan. 17, 1682/3, Charles Pickering to John Test; Warrants and Surveys, III, 190; Deed Book E-2-5, 5: June 25, 1683, Letter of attorney, Test to John Shellson. Deed Book E-1-5, 42: July 9, 1683, Katherine Martin to Patrick Robinson; Warrants and Surveys, II, 81. Robinson's Passayunk land, twelve acres of which were cleared, is from John Cock's Account of Land Returned, Penn Letters and Ancient Documents, 182, APS, cited in Note 70, Part I.
Baltimore. In the spring, Baltimore had circulated a proclamation inviting settlement in the lower counties at rents lower than those established by Penn. Until confronted with attested copies of the proclamation when he met with Penn in May, Baltimore denied having issued them, then admitted doing so only “to renew his claim [to the Delaware], not that he would encourage any to plant there.” When later, in mid-summer, word reached town that Baltimore was sending to England an account of his conferences with Penn, the Quaker felt it was imperative to counter with his own version lest his “silence might be interpreted neglect.”

Speed was essential.

Penn selected his cousin Markham to present his side of the controversy and act as agent at Court. Late in August, Markham left for England armed with letters to influential persons Penn hoped would support him. In glowing but vague terms, these letters described the progress of the colony. “Things here go on very prosperously & with God’s help & ye King’s & my Noble Friends favor I doubt not in 7 years to equal plantations 40 years old, as in a Town (ye life of a Province) I have already outdone some,” he wrote to several. Besides the “fourscore houses and cottages, such as they are, where merchants and handicrafts are following their vocations as fast as they can,” he reported that there were at least 300 farms “to help us with provisions & ye Merchants & Mechanics to accomodate them with goods.”

In his letter to the London committee of the Free Society, he advised them that, in addition to their city lot of “near one hundred acres,” the company had “four hundred acres in the city-liberties,” and sites for a tannery with plenty of bark, for a sawmill with timber, and for a glasshouse, all as conveniently located for water transportation as their city lot at the Dock. To this letter he ap-

---


17 Penn to Earl of Sunderland, July 28, 1683, cited in Note 8; Penn to Henry Savell, July 30, 1683, Pennsylvania Archives, First Series, I, 68–69. Penn’s letter to the Free Society is in Proud, I, 262–264, and in Hazard, Register, I, 433. In Thomas Fairman’s bill of charges, cited in Note 17, Part I, he included “A Journey with the Proprietor &ca to search out a Swamp for the Societys Tannor with three of my Horses: 12l.”
pended a draft of Holme's plan of the city "in which those who are purchasers of me, will find their names and interests." But, just as he failed to make clear that none of the Society's properties were as yet surveyed, or that the mill was the only one in operation, so he said nothing to indicate that the town, as laid out so far, was in any way altered from its representation in the plan. Adjustments occasioned by actual survey were unimportant details compared to his need for presenting a favorable picture of progress on the Delaware.

The Flourishing Garden

The unrevised draft of the plan, sent off as a visible example of Penn's enterprise, apparently was accepted in England as a true delineation of the actual city. Within a year it appeared as the Portraiture in a promotional booklet, printed in London, which included Penn's letter to the Free Society, and Holme's "Advertisement," prefacing the assignment list of lot-holders. According to Philip Ford, "as for the map of the city, it was needful it should be printed; it will do us a kindness, as we were at a loss for want of something to show the people." Such unequivocal acceptance did not prevent further alterations in the city's plan as occasion demanded. Before the year was out another major alteration in it, and further divergence from the assignment list, were in effect. Still rustic in its initial aspect, the emergence of the urban community was no less progressive because of those changes.

In the weeks before and after Markham's departure, only a dozen lots were laid out. Three were surveyed on Schuylkill side in August, none at all in September. Partly responsible for this temporary slowdown was the arrival of four ships from London and Liverpool with more settlers to be accommodated. Penn's absence in New York the latter half of September was a further deterrent, since no warrants could be issued.

While he was away an unwelcome visitor from Maryland arrived in town. Appearing unheralded, Colonel George Talbot brought with him a commission from Lord Baltimore peremptorily demanding the

18 Philip Ford to Thomas Holme, Mar. 21, 1684, Pennsylvania Archives, Third Series, III, 306. Since Ford also wanted to know the number of houses in town, it is likely those shown on the engraved plan were added in London from information Holme sent.
relinquishment by Penn of all land on the west side of the Delaware "now wrongfully detained by said William Penn." Dr. Nicholas More, as Penn's deputy in his absence, received Talbot, lodging him in the Proprietor's completed house fronting the Delaware. But as neither More, nor any one else, had authority to act in the face of such a demand, Talbot cut his visit short. It served, however, to raise a question in the minds of the inhabitants as to the firmness of their land titles under Penn.

In spite of that uncertainty, as soon as the Proprietor returned, the tempo of surveying increased. In October more than a score of lots were laid out, six of them on Schuylkill side. There Penn agreed to let Philip England, lately arrived from Dublin, keep a tavern and establish a much-needed ferry. Twelve acres on the west side of the Schuylkill, and a lot opposite at the end of High Street, were set aside for his use.

On Delaware side, six of the fifteen lots surveyed in October were additional front lots between the Swamp and Pool Street. The southernmost was for Enoch Flower, a schoolmaster of long standing from Wiltshire and purchaser of 2,000 acres. Out of these he had reserved 500 acres for himself and sold the remainder to six friends and neighbors who had empowered him to take up their land. As a recent arrival uncertain of regulations, he inquired of Thomas Holme "whether or not it was the Governour's pleasure to grant every purchaser of 2,000 acres of Land two several proportionable city lots, The one in Fore-street, the other in High-street." If it were, he asked, "what is the Breadth & length of each?"

It was a reasonable question, since the lot assigned to him on Front Street was one of those divided by the Swamp, there some 180 feet wide, and presented problems of division among his six under-purchasers, assuming that such a subdivision was to be made. What was surveyed for him two weeks after his arrival were two thirty-foot lots opposite each other on either side of the Swamp. The one on Front Street had a maximum depth of 148 feet, the other, on

the east side of Second Street, seventy-five feet. The following week, five more lots were laid out north of Flower's on either side of Silas Crispin's lot; because of the Swamp, none of them had any frontage on Second Street.21

Meanwhile, as surveying progressed during the summer from each river front toward the center, one thing had become apparent. The high point of the watershed was not equidistant from the two rivers, as originally supposed and as indicated on Holme's plan, but was nearly a thousand feet closer to the Schuylkill. Presumably this was discovered soon after Thomas Millard's lot, at the corner of Schuylkill Eighth and Holme Streets, was surveyed early in July. His lot lay in the valley formed by the confluence of the headwaters of the Kentin Tomessin's main stream. The courses of these headwaters surrounded three sides of a plateau, higher than any adjacent ground, which formed the actual watershed. This highest point within the city, much nearer the Schuylkill than at first believed, was the obvious site for the central square Holme had shown on the Portraiture. As the axial—though not the geographic—center of the plan, once this fact was recognized it determined the location of Broad Street—approximately where Schuylkill Ninth was to have been established. Since the alteration eliminated entirely Schuylkill Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Streets, to compensate for their disappearance two new streets east of Broad Street were added—Delaware Twelfth and Delaware Thirteenth.22

Before the Square's location was known precisely, members of the Philadelphia Meeting had consulted with Penn "touching a convenient place" for a permanent meeting house. Although the Delaware side of town was developing faster, there were some settlers on Schuylkill side and more were to be expected. There were also those Friends living across the Schuylkill who, for want of a proper meeting house, had been gathering for services at Thomas Duckett's on the river's west bank. Thus, when the Center Square's actual

---

21 Flower's warrant and survey are in Warrants and Surveys, I, 375, and III, 508. In 1684, each of the London merchants sold their rights to Richard Whitpaine, butcher of London, for whom "a great house" of brick was built on the two northernmost lots before 1687. Long known as the "burnt buildings," its location on the bank, as cited in Watson, I, 428, is incorrect.

22 The sources and courses of the headwaters are shown on Reading HowelFs 1st and 3rd Survey District Ordinance Maps, cited in Note 51, Part I. The 1685 survey of the Society's city lots confirms the revised location of Broad Street. Warrants and Surveys, II, 118.
location was fixed, Friends agreed to Penn's recommendation that, since the Square was intended for public buildings, it was the logical place for the meeting house, reasonably accessible as it was to settlers on both river fronts. And since a burying ground was also needed, its location, "in the middle of the City, in the same ground where the meeting house is appointed," was likewise settled. In October, Christopher Taylor, at whose house on Delaware Front the "present" meetings were held, Thomas Wynne, and a new arrival, Thomas Lloyd, were instructed by the Meeting to have the ground surveyed for those purposes, but they took no immediate action.23

The only lot surveyed at this time anywhere near the Center Square was on unassigned ground. Either absentmindedly or unaware a change had been made in the plan, Penn on October 12 granted identically worded warrants to two renters, John Fields and Thomas Harding. A lot for each of them, he directed, was to be laid out "on Schuylkill Tenth where he shall like." That same day Field's lot was surveyed at the northeast corner of Holme and Delaware Twelfth Street; Harding's was laid out in mid-December opposite Field's lot, at the northwest corner.24

By then a further development at the Center Square was in evidence. The large open area indicated in the Portraiture was divided into four quadrants, with the southwest one intended for the meeting house. To achieve these quadrants, High and Broad Streets were projected through the Square, and a subordinate passageway was planned around its perimeter so as to retain the Square's basic form but separate it from adjacent lots. This passageway, called Market Alley, was laid out along the north side of the Square by December 5. On that day, at the northwest corner of Broad Street and the Alley, the first lot was surveyed for James Thomas, a renter.25

24 The Field and Harding warrants are in Warrants and Surveys, I, 365, 459, the surveys in II, 45, and III, 229. Field sold his lot to Anthony Weston in 1686, as recited in Deed Book E-I-5, 477: Jan. 21, 1686/7, Anthony Weston to Richard Roberts.
25 Thomas' survey is in Warrants and Surveys, III, 255. He sold his lot to Samuel Atkins, as recited in Deed Book E-2-5, 330: May 2, 1696, Release, James Thomas to Thomas Stapelford. An undated and incomplete plan of the Square, showing Thomas' and other lots, is in Pennsylvania Land Papers, 1683-1830, James Clark Moore and W. Colver Moore Collection, Am.2988. The location of the meeting house is given in Watson, I, 391-392.
During these last two months of 1683, nearly fifty new lots were surveyed in town. In November, while the weather held, the number laid out equalled that of the previous June, but in December it dwindled to a dozen. By the end of the year, on Schuylkill side the number of surveyed lots had doubled since July. About a dozen fronted the river and almost as many the Second Street. Half a dozen were scattered along the north side of High as far east as Sixth, about as many along Holme near the Kentin Tomessin, and the balance were here and there on Songhurst and Schuylkill Third. About a third of the lots were for renters, six of them on unassigned ground.

On Delaware side, front lots were laid out in every square by the end of the year. Between Wynne and Pool Streets, all the assigned lots on Second Street were cleared or improved in some fashion, as were most of those between Holme and Songhurst. Besides the Field and Harding lots, at least nine others fronted Holme between the river and Delaware Twelfth, but on Songhurst the Guest and Knight lots at Fourth, and one other in the same square, were the only clearings. At the south end of town, newly surveyed lots extended Wynne and Pool west to Sixth Street.

Dozens of new faces were to be seen about town. Nearly a third of the 3,000 "soules"—men, women, and children disembarked within the previous fifteen months, had arrived since the first of October on a dozen or more vessels. About a quarter of these recent arrivals took up city lots as renters before the year was out. There were also new purchasers. The Barbados merchants Henry Jones and John Weale, Jr., were granted adjacent unassigned lots at the northwest corner of Wynne and Second Streets. For the New York Quaker Francis Richardson, a merchant-mariner and "new purchaser" of 400 acres, Penn granted an unassigned lot at the southwest corner of Second and Pool, across the creek from the brewhouse William Frampton was building. Matthew Souley, a "late purchaser" of 300 acres, obtained an unassigned lot on the north side of Wynne between Fourth and Fifth. The corner lot at Fourth Street, next to Souley, was granted to Henry Patrick, another

26 James Claypoole to Edward Claypoole, Dec. 2, 1683, Claypoole Letter Book, 426-428; Penn to John Alloway, Nov. 29, 1683, Swarthmore MSS, VI, No. 68, Friends' House, London, photostats in HSP. Penn said about forty-five ships in all had arrived up to the end of November, 1683.
mariner and "late purchaser" of 500 acres. All of these lots were
surveyed before the beginning of December.27

Although there were less than a third as many clearings on
Schuylkill side as on the Delaware, the forest crowding both rivers
was no longer as dense and forbidding as it had been when Penn
first viewed it. He could be pardoned his enthusiasm when, in late
November, he wrote that "Whatever men may say, our Wildernesse
flourishes as a Garden, and our desert springs like a Greene field."
He judged that in town there were now "about 600 people in it & 100
houses built," and "many hundred Farms settled and settling about
her" in the countryside.28

From the few surviving contemporary accounts of these first
dwellings, the picture of Philadelphia which emerges is essentially
that of a frontier settlement, of necessity crude and primitive in
appearance. Beyond quantities of nails, wrought iron, and a fair
amount of window glass, little in the way of heavy building materials
was brought over for use in the settlement. In 1682, only four ship-
ments of bricks and three of roofing tiles arrived; in 1683, no ship-
ments are recorded.29 The colonists looked to the new land for their
building needs.

No doubt, the first dwellings were similar to those seen by the
Dutchman Jasper Daenkaerts in 1679 when he visited the area:

. . . being made according to the Swedish mode . . . which are block-
houses, or houses of hewn logs, being nothing else than entire trees, split
through the middle or somewhat squared out of the rough[,] these trees are
laid in the form of a square upon each other as high as they wish to have

27 Exemplification Book 1, 43, 44: Oct. 24, 1683, Patents to Henry Jones and John Weale,
Jr. On their adjoining lots, in time known as the Barbados lot, the merchants erected a small
one-story frame warehouse or store which, about 1695, was rented to the Baptists and Presby-
terians for a place of worship. Watson, I, 447. The Richardson warrant and survey are in
Warrants and Surveys, I, 855, and III, 242, his patent in Exemplification Book 1, 186, Aug. 2,
1684. For Souley's warrant and survey, see Warrants and Surveys, I, 880, and III, 219; for
Patrick's survey, III, 497. In 1686, his house and corner lot were appraised at £21, and the 500
acres at £35, as recited in Deed Book E-2-5, 215: Aug. 10, 1691, John King to Nicholas Scull.
King had obtained a judgment against Patrick for debts due and was selling the country land,
"about twelve miles" from town, to Scull.

28 Penn to John Alloway, Nov. 29, 1683, cited above. At the end of the year, surveys for
139 lots on Delaware side and forty-three on Schuylkill side are known to have been completed.
Penn's estimate of 100 houses therefore seems low in view of the total of 182 lots laid out.

29 In 1682, the Free Society sent over 14,000 bricks, Philip Ford, 10,000, Joseph Taylor,
1,000, Griffith Jones, 15,000 bricks and tiles, and John Sheene, 8,000 tiles. There were twenty
the house; the ends of these timbers are let into each other, about a foot from the ends of them. So stands the whole building without a nail or spike; the ceiling and roof do not show much finer work, except among the most particular who also have all the ceiling planked, and also a glass window.  

This "Swedish mode" was further described early in 1683 by Thomas Paschall. "They employ in their buildings little or no iron. They will build for you a house without any other implement than an axe. With the same implement they will cut down a tree and have it in pieces in less time than two other men would spend in sawing it, and with this implement and some wooden wedges they split it and make boards of it or anything else they please with much skill."  

A promotional tract, published in London in 1682 for the information of "Such Persons as are inclined . . . to the Province of Pennsylvania," gave more detailed directions for the sort of one-story structure which could be erected.

To build then, an House of thirty foot long and eighteen foot broad, with a partition near the middle, and another to divide one end of the House into two small Rooms, there must be eight Trees of about sixteen Inches square, and cut off, to Posts of about fifteen foot long, which the House must stand upon, and four pieces, two of thirty foot long, and two of eighteen foot long, for Plates, which must lie upon the top of those Posts, the whole length and breadth of the House, for the Gists [joists] to rest upon. There must be ten Gists of twenty foot long, to bear the Loft, and two false Plates of thirty foot long to lie upon the ends of the Gists for the Rafters to be fixed upon, twelve pare of Rafters of about twenty foot, to bear the Roof of the House, with several other small pieces; as Wind-beams, Braces, Studs, &c. which are made out of the Waste Timber. For Covering the House, Ends and Sides, and for the Loft, we use Clabboard which is Rived feather-edged, of five foot and a half long, that well Drawn, lyes close and smooth: The Lodging Room may be lined with the same, and fill'd up between, which is very Warm.

---

30 See Daenkaerts' "Journal," cited in Note 24, Part I.
31 Thomas Paschall to J. J. Chippenham, Feb. 10, 1682/3, PMHB, VI (1882), 324.
32 "Information and Direction to Such Persons as are inclined to America . . .," PMHB, IV (1880), 334-335.
According to this account, such a dwelling, costing about £9 including carpenter’s wages and diet, though built of green lumber from trees felled on the site, would “usually endure ten years without Repair.”

A contract entered into some years later in Chester County called for a similar dwelling to be built:

Twenty four foot in Length and Eighteen foot in Width and Ten foot in hight Between Sell [sill] and Wale [wall] plate[,] Two pertictons [partitions] below and a Closett and One pertion above with a Closett [below?] And to face the Roof wth Clapboards in the Inside and to make the Botom flore wth Sufecient plank and the first Loft wth sufcient inch board and to Cover the house Sufciently wth Shingles and to doe all the Timber Worke about the making of one Chimley, and to make fflower Windowes[,] two below and two above and a porch to the ffront of the house and little windowes to the afore Said Closetts, and one peare of Steares and to face all the whole house in the Inside. . . .

Such a house, though designed for the country, was similar to the little one a carpenter, Thomas Masters, early in 1684 agreed to build on Enoch Flower’s Front Street lot. That was to be

. . . ten foot wide by fifteen foot long by seven foot high in the post, enclosed with dale [deal] boards, plained on both sides, and to be shingled with such shingles as Flower should provide, two floors, and to plaine the boards on one side and the joysts of the upper floor to be plained, with a partition across the lower roome with windows and doors sufficient for the said house, with a flat stept-ladder to goe to the upper floor.

In the same agreement, Masters was also to build a dwelling on Flower’s liberty land. It was to be “sixteen foot broad by twenty four foot long, fifteen foot high with a roof shingled, with windows and three floors of joysts,” Flower providing all materials. Upon completion of this work, Masters was to receive the High Street lot laid out for Flower the previous October.

In Pool Street west of Fifth, a lot and dwelling about the same size, “sixteen foot square by estimate,” with “one Bedstead alreadie placed in aforesaid house,” in 1685 was sold for £6 by a mariner,
Samuel Satchell, to John Fisher. The house ready for James Claypoole when he arrived with his family in October, 1683, was considerably larger. He described it as a "house like a barne without a chimney," twenty feet wide by forty feet long, with "a good dry cellar under it which proved an extraordinary convenience for securing goods. . . ." By early December, Claypoole had added a kitchen which was "20 foot square, where I am to have a double Chimney." He hoped it would "be up in 8 or 12 days." The house alone, he complained, cost him nearly £60 sterling because his man "had run me up for dyet—& work."

Less affluent settlers sometimes took advantage of such hillocks as their town lots afforded when building their first shelters, much as the immigrants of 1682 had done along the river bank. A lot was surveyed in July, 1683, on the north side of Songhurst, between Fourth and Fifth, for Robert Presmall, a ship carpenter. When he sold it for £8 in 1685, there was "a cave built thereon."

Another who built "a little house one-half under the earth and half above" was Francis Daniel Pastorius. Agent for a party of Germans who had contracted through Benjamin Furly to buy 15,000 acres from Penn, Pastorius and the first three German families had arrived in August on the America. To his dismay he learned that no city lots or liberty land were assigned to his principals because their sales were concluded after Penn left England. A persistent man, Pastorius reasoned with Penn that he and those who had come with him "were the forerunners of all Germans," including the Crefelt purchasers expected shortly, and as such should "have more consideration." Finally, Penn agreed to allow the German purchasers three back-to-back lots, each 100 feet in breadth, down at the south end of town below the Dock and the Society's warehouse. He gave Pastorius permission to stake them out between Delaware Front, Second, and Third Streets, on land Pastorius understood Penn had

The lot, surveyed in November, 1683, for Satchell as a renter, was assigned to Thomas Burbary, a London shoemaker and purchaser of 250 acres. Satchell's sale is in Deed Book E-1-5, 224: May 12, 1685.


Presmall (Priestmal) bought half of the original 500-acre purchase of John Martin, a Southampton maltster, as recited in Pennsylvania Archives, Second Series, XIX, 456. The sale of the city lot is in Deed Book E-1-5, 122: Oct. 7, 1685, Robert Presmall to Philisha Green.
reserved for his little son, William Penn, Jr. Before they were surveyed, Pastorius, with the help of his servant, built a so-called cave, "thirty foot long and fifteen broad." It was large enough to accommodate twenty of the Crefelders when they arrived in October on the Concord with James Claypoole.  

Such, then, was the variety of houses going up in the woods between the Delaware and the Schuylkill. Philadelphia's familiar urban image of cobbled streets lined with rows of neat brick houses, each supporting its neighbor, was yet to appear. Instead, tree stumps still cluttered the rutted roadways where pigs and fowl searched the dust or mud for nuts or seeds; houses were wooden, and only an occasional brick chimney thrust its stack above the rooflines.

Crude as they were, these houses served the immediate purpose of providing shelter until more substantial buildings could be erected. Such would soon be started, for in November Penn granted to George Guest, the former whitesmith from West Jersey, a warrant for two acres of land "to make Bricks on where he with his men hath begun to work by the Swamp" near the Coaquannock.

The Rise of Discontent

Even as the amorphous community was achieving form and coherence, a curious ambivalence developed in the inhabitants once they emerged from their absorption in the initial quest for mutual security. When the anxiety of first settlement had passed, there was time to assess the opportunities offered by the new environment, to venture into fields of endeavor beyond each day's immediate demand. Entities, heretofore submerged by the sense of common purpose, again became disparate. Veneration for the Proprietor's Quaker philosophy and a "concern" for the spiritual welfare of the community remained constant, but private ambition and personal attitudes began pushing to one side the initial enthusiasm and willing acceptance of his stewardship. When that touched on matters pertaining to their business affairs, it also touched their pocketbooks.

38 Pastorius' account of his dealings with Penn is in Pennypacker, Settlement of Germantown, 81-99, especially 91-94, cited in Note 78, Part I.
39 For Guest's warrant, see Warrants and Surveys, I, 397.
Framed as it was in the feudal concept of lord of the manor, a similar dualism gradually appeared in Penn’s own approach to the achievement of a stable settlement and government. He maintained a continuing interest in the success of the venture he had initiated, especially when it was threatened by criticism or adverse conditions. But when the very freedoms and privileges he had conferred on his tenants began to encroach on the prerogatives due an overlord, his initial dedication to their individual enterprises diminished. His had been “a troublesome work”; when his purse and position as overlord were threatened, his benevolence lessened.

The first symptoms of an emergent discontent grew out of commerce and trade. Traffic on the Delaware had increased as coastal vessels with goods for barter or sale from New England, New York, Virginia, and Maryland appeared in mounting numbers. Although “current pay” for local trade within the province was established as “Merchantable wheat, Rye, Indian-corn, Barley, Oats, Pork, Beef & Tobacco,” these were still in short supply and the strangers from other colonies generally demanded cash for their goods. The consequent flow of hard money out of the province quickly depleted what silver the colonists had brought with them. A misguided attempt to supply the deficiency resulted in a flurry of counterfeiting. Charles Pickering and Samuel Buckley, brought to trial in October for coining “New Bitts and New England shillings,” were ordered to make restitution “in good and currant pay,” and to contribute as well fifty pounds toward the construction of a county court house.40

In the absence of an adequate supply of either cash or current pay to satisfy creditors, to the “Great Grevance of Tradesmen’s Exactions” in the collection of debts, was joined the complaint that “fees due to several officers” in the performance of their duties were denied and went unpaid. The Assembly, heartily agreeing it was “both unreasonable and impossible that men should wait upon and serve other person’s occasions in any Capacity in the government without just satisfaction,” hastened to pass regulations permitting execution in the county courts when such overdue fees were not paid promptly. In future, accounts were to be made up

once a year, that “Differences and unnecessarie Law Suits about Dealing” might be lessened.  

Tradesmen and local officials were not alone in being hard pressed for funds. In the spring of 1683, the Assembly, having authorized county courts to levy taxes for defraying “the requisite charges incident to the publick business and service” within each county, offered Penn “an impost upon certain goods imported and exported.” This, as Penn wrote to the Free Society, “after my acknowledgment of their affection, I did as freely remit to the province and the traders in it.” As a result, unlike other provincial governors, he as yet had received “neither Custom, nor Taxes” to maintain his table and the officers of government he had appointed. Since then he had expended large sums in buying land from the Indians in order to obtain clear titles, and from early settlers to secure land for the town and its bounds. Those expenses, the support of his retinue and officers, and the charge of building the house on Letitia’s lot had all so depleted his purse that early in November, 1683, he sent James Atkinson through the counties with a warrant to gather in his quitrents for his “Winter Supply.” Although the rents were not due until 1684, Penn hoped his “loving Friends and Tenants” would “not take it hard” that he pressed them at this time for his due, but would all “strive to answer herein and so engage the Kindness of your Friend & Landlord.” From Atkinson’s lack of success it was plain that few were willing to part with what little they had at this early stage of settlement.

41 Ibid., I, 91; Duke of York Laws, 165. A typical “dealing” was John Test’s complaint to the Provincial Council concerning £120 sterling owed by Griffith Jones “upon the account of a Contract for a plantation.” Test alleged Jones had “given Earnest in order to purchase the same,” but had unjustly refused to complete the bargain. The matter dragged on for four months, and when arbitrators, appointed by the Philadelphia Monthly Meeting, failed to resolve it, the Council sent the case to the county court for settlement, taking from Jones and Christopher Taylor a bond for £500 sterling as security for their appearance. Colonial Records, I, 67, 78; PGSP, I, 255, 256.

42 Proud, I, 262. Penn to “Loving Friends and Tenants,” Nov. 9, 1683, Robert Proud Papers, No. 2, 33, Parrish Collection. Penn had made seven purchases of land from the Indians for which, he said, “in Pay and Presents they have received at least twelve hundred pounds of me.” “Further Account . . . .” PMHB, IX (1885), 79; the purchases are listed in Hazard, Register, XII (1833), 300–301. In 1686, Penn figured he had spent £5,000 in the settling of the province, then in 1705 raised it to £10,000 spent in the first two years. Penn to James Harrison, Sept. 23, 1686, Penn MSS, Domestic and Miscellaneous Letters, 29; Penn to James Logan, Sept. 4, 1705, ibid., Letters of the Penn Family, I, 25.
The Free Society’s resident agents and officers were also unsuccessful in getting payment for the trade goods sent over from London. “People will not pay in 6 or 9 months,” Claypoole, the Society’s treasurer, complained after his arrival. He found that goods shipped in 1682, though disposed of readily enough and at “great profit, but upon trust,” were still unpaid for a year later and that the company had “neither credit nor money.” Well before the president, Nicholas More, piqued at the loss of the company’s prestige and privileges denied it by the Assembly, finally resigned, it was evident that “things were not so well managed as they might have been,” and that it was hard to see how the company could really prosper.43 Because of the complexities of the Society’s business, Claypoole found he had little time for his own trading activities; in the event the Society collapsed entirely, the perquisites and dignity of some public office would help to supplement his purse and bolster his position. But when Christopher Taylor, who had been Register General for the probate of estates since the spring of 1683, moved down to Tinicum Island44 and asked Claypoole to act as his deputy in town, offering him “a share of the gain,” Claypoole declined.

Claypoole felt, as he told Taylor, that “putting in deputys for a share of the gain may be an ill President [sic] and made use of to the peoples wrong in times to come.” But he would, he hastened to add, accept “a Pattent for the Office” under his own name if the Proprietor was agreeable, and would “signe & Seale” an obligation to pay Taylor a third of the profits of the office: “I do not propose to have a pattent for the office for any advantage or profit beyond what I have in being thy deputy, for I desire but two-thirds as above but to prevent reflections wch has been grossly given already in public.” Claypoole did not insist on the place for himself; Taylor


44 Penn’s appointment in December, 1683, of Enoch Flower as “Schoolmaster for ye Instruction & Sober Education of Youth in the towne of Philadelphia,” may have influenced Taylor’s removal to Tinicum. Colonial Records, I, 91. Although he was still a member of Penn’s Council, Taylor, after his move to Tinicum, set up a school of his own, and for a time called the place “College Island.” George Smith, History of Delaware County, 505, cited in Note 18, Part I.
might dispose of it as he chose, but, wrote Claypoole, "as deputy, I am not, will not serve."

Although the Society’s business may not have been as flourishing as its agents would have liked, activity at the Swamp, soon to be called the Dock, had mounted steadily as the population increased. There, in addition to coastal vessels, overseas ships disembarked colonists and their household goods in rapid succession, freeing their holds for cargoes of furs and skins, timber and staves to be exported on private accounts. Canoes and light craft from the Jersey shore or from downriver brought the produce of the waters and “garden stuff and grain” for sale at the twice-weekly markets, cluttering the harbor’s already overcrowded sandy shores. By the end of the summer it was evident that lighter traffic should be transferred to a less congested spot.

The removal of the market to the higher bank at the north end of the square between High and Holme Streets was all that induced Robert Turner to accept the Front lot which had been assigned and surveyed for him at the south corner of Holme Street before his arrival. As one of the Proprietor’s earliest and larger investors, when he saw the lot’s location he felt that he should have been placed nearer the Dock where the major portion of trade was centered. On Turner’s voicing his dissatisfaction, Penn was constrained to remind him how often he had said he “loved to Live quiet.” If he had been assigned a lot at the south end of town, he would have found “it was like to be unquiett by reason of seamen & busell there.” Penn’s “incurridgment” that not only the local market, but the first yearly market or fair, to be held in mid-November, would be on the bank in front of Turner’s lot—where there was more than a

46 Claypoole to Christopher Taylor, Feb. 12, 1683/4, Claypoole Letter Book, 437. Apparently Claypoole’s eldest son John had no such scruples about acting in a subsidiary capacity. A fortnight later he was “writing for the Register,” presumably as a clerk. Claypoole to Gawen Lawrie, Feb. 24, 1683/4, ibid., 438-443.

46 Evidence the market was held there is in Colonial Records, I, 388, 391, and in Exemplification Book 7, 248: June 6, 1698, Jacob Coffin to Samuel Atkins, wherein was conveyed a house “on Old Market hill with a piece of bank lot where it stands over against [opposite] Robert Turner’s lot bought of Joseph Fisher.” Between Market and Arch Streets the west line of Delaware Front Street, as it was first laid out, did not parallel the river. The alteration increasing the depth of Front Street lots in this block by extending them some twenty feet eastward was made about 1689 or 1690, for which see Exemplification Book 1, 211, 214: Dec. 25, 1689, Aug. 11, 1691, Patents to Robert Turner.
hundred feet of ground before it shelved down to the river's edge—finally persuaded Turner to accept its location.47

Financial insecurity, private grievances, and the general discomfort of frontier living were compounded by the severe cold weather which arrived in December and continued all through January. The river froze, a fierce north wind penetrated the crevices of hastily built dwellings, game disappeared from the woods. Such conditions only added to resentment at demands on slender resources; grumbling and complaints at hardships endured were frequent. By the New Year Penn was reported to be mingling “strong and impressive sighs” with his prayers “because the true Philadelphia and brother love is not to be met with as freely in this our Philadelphia as he on his part desires.”48 By mid-January, 1684, the discontent was becoming more vocal and pointed.

Certain proposals, their precise nature carefully omitted in the official record, were submitted to Penn and the Council by Anthony Weston. He and more substantial citizens, including a number of original purchasers, had “mett at Tho. Hootens and there chose him to draw up Proposals . . . which Proposals were mended by Tho. Wynn,” and which “Jno. Songhurst, Jno. Parsons, Tho. Duckett and Others, would stand to.”49 These proposals Penn and the Council summarily rejected as being “of great presumption and Contempt of this Government and authority.” Thomas Wynne was “reproved for doeing of the same,” and the “freemen that Subscribed to Antho. Weston’s proposals” were ordered “to give for their good behaviour to ye governm*” a single recognizance of fifty pounds “till such

47 Robert Turner to William Penn, June 15, 1692, Letters and Papers of William Penn, 69, Dreer Collection. Pastorius said the first yearly market was held Nov. 16, 1683. Pennypacker, Settlement of Germantown, 96. One of the seventeen servants Turner transported with him was Robert Salford, a brickmaker. Making use of his services, early in 1684 Turner began laying the foundation of the first brick house to be built in Philadelphia. “Further Account . . . ,” PMHB, IX (1885), 74.

48 That the winter of 1683-1684 was very severe is reported in several accounts, e.g., Paschal’s letter to J. J. Chippenham, cited in Note 31; James Claypoole to Thomas Cooke, Feb. 1, 1683/4, Claypoole Letter Book, 433-435; Pennypacker, Settlement of Germantown, 87, 97, 98.

49 The previous spring, Weston and his wife were indicted and fined for selling strong drink without a license. When he petitioned the Council in November, his fine was remitted, but not hers. The indictment is in Penn Letters and Ancient Documents, 74, APS, cited in Note 70, Part. I. That case, and the present proposals he submitted, are in Colonial Records, I, 95, 92.
tyme as ye genea" Assembly shall next sett." Weston, as the insti-
gator, was to "be Whypt at ye Market place on Market daye three
times, Each time to have Tenn Lashes, at 12 of the Clock at noone,
this being the first day." As the town prison was not finished, William
Clayton was engaged to build a "Cage . . . 7 foot high, 7 foot
long & 5 foot broad." 50

Thomas Wynne's participation in the "presumptious" proposals
very likely reflected in some degree his growing restiveness at re-
strictions not to his taste. Assigned no part of either a Front or
High Street lot, even when he was assured the omission was in-
advertent and he could share the other half of the lot on Schuylkill
side assigned his co-purchaser, John ap John, he still was not satisfied.
Like Robert Turner, he wanted to be near the Dock and the center
of business, not two miles distant at the Schuylkill. Determined to
locate near the Dock, Wynne entered into negotiations with Dennis
Rochford, who was living on the Orian tract fronting the Schuylkill,
and owned his brother-in-law Thomas Herriot's right to the Dela-
ware Front lot north of Wynne Street. Accordingly, in September
Rochford obtained a warrant to have half of his lots surveyed on
Delaware side, "and on Schuylkill side the other half, being half the
Lotts exchanged with Thomas Wynne for his purchase." After
three months passed without further action, Wynne, impatient at
the delay, took matters into his own hands. Obtaining his own war-
rant, the day before the Weston proposals came before the Council,
he succeeded in having two fifty-one foot lots surveyed for himself
and John ap John on the site assigned to Herriot, adjoining Charles
Pickering's lot. 51

Adding to the discontent simmering in town were apparent errors
committed by surveyors. Early in 1683, Barnabas Willcox, a rope-
maker of Bristol, and his second son Joseph came over with the in-

50 The cage was erected at the intersection of Second and High Streets, as illustrated in the
draft of the area in Warrants and Surveys, II, 102. At the end of March, 1684, the prison ap-
parently still was not finished, according to the tenor of Samuel Hersent's petition to the

51 As surveyed, Wynne's lot was on the north, adjoining Pickering's, but Parson's
"Draughts," and subsequent transfers of property, show that Wynne took possession of the
southern lot laid out for John ap John. Rochford's and Wynne's warrants are in Warrants and
Surveys, I, 839, and III, 238. See also Exemplification Book 1, 15, 16: July 31, 1684, Patents to
Thomas Wynne and John ap John.
tention of buying 800 acres in the new colony. But Penn, intent on drawing into his orbit whoever might enhance the town’s industrial development, suggested instead that if Willcox took “a whole thousand acres” he would allow him the “privileges of a First Purchaser,” and proportionate lots in town. Willcox agreeing, Penn directed Thomas Holme to have two lots surveyed for the ropemaker. “Be sure to let Barnaby have good lotts,” Penn is reported to have said, “for he will build none of ye worst Houses.” Accordingly, the two Willcoxes, accompanied by their Bristol friend John Barnes, watched as Richard Noble laid off a twenty-foot Front lot between High and Holme, and a forty-foot High Street lot at the corner of Second Street. Then, with a warrant for country land dated February 26, 1682/3, the father and son went back to England.

On their return “about eight months later,” the elder Willcox, “fatigued with the Trouble and business incident to new Settlements, especially with Great familys” (he had six children, the eldest just sixteen), made no application for confirmation of his lots “till some months after his arrival.” Then he found that his name was not included in the assignment list, and on his lots were improvements begun by others. The Front lot, he learned, had been laid out four months after his departure at the request of Christopher Mason, one of the servants William Stanley had sent over in 1682 to take up his lots and country land. The log house used for a prison on Second Street, at the north end of the corner High Street lot, had all the appearance of being an encroachment on the land Willcox assumed was his own. Not a little put out, Willcox complained to Penn and was assured that “he should have satisfaction in Lotts elsewhere”; in the meantime Penn gave him a warrant for his ropewalk land.

52 On the assignment list, an unassigned lot between that of Thomas Callowhill and of William Stanley may at first have been reserved for Willeox, but, because he had not paid his money, his name was not inserted on the list. No surveys for either of these first Willcox lots are on record. The corner lot at Second, marked N.N. on the assignment list, was one of those Penn originally intended to reserve for his children. Joseph Willcox to William Penn, Aug. 1, 1701, Penn-Physick MSS, Correspondence, 1682–1788, I, 15. This petition of Joseph Willcox is digested in Pennsylvania Archives, Second Series, XIX, 210–211. Willcox’s warrant for country land is in Warrants and Surveys, VI, 122.

53 For the warrant to Christopher Mason, Stanley’s servant, see Warrants and Surveys, I, 889, and for the survey, III, 500. The prison, begun by Samuel Hersent, was apparently finished by Lasse Cock. In 1685, Cock was granted the “Logg-House in ye second street intended
In spite of personal grievances and disappointments, of dissatisfaction stemming from various situations, improvements to the town continued. As the number of surveyed lots multiplied, it was easier for those unwilling or unable to lay out money for official surveys to locate their own lots and get their own improvements under way. Early in February, 1684, Penn wrote that the place now had "about 150 very tolerable houses for wooden ones," an advance of fifty since November. But in the first ten days of January, only five lots were laid out on Schuylkill side, here and there along the Front, Second, Third, and Holme Streets. Thomas Wynne's lots on Delaware Front, and a High Street lot for James Harrison, now settled in Bucks County, were laid out the middle of the month. At the end of January, a front lot for Arthur Cooke, a Quaker merchant of Portsmouth, Rhode Island, was surveyed north of Enoch Flower's lot south of Poole Street. Since 1681, Cooke had acquired several interests in West Jersey—part of a proprietary and a house and lot in Burlington—and recently had contracted with Francis Burroughs, an original purchaser presently of Boston, for the latter's unimproved Front lot. The only other lot surveyed at the end of the month was for a renter, bricklayer John Redman, at the corner of Schuylkill Eighth and Holme, opposite Thomas Millard's lot.

Of the nine lots surveyed during February, only three were on Delaware side. One of these was a second lot for Humphrey Morrey, who was still a resident of New York when, in early January, he arranged to buy the Front lot assigned to the widow Mercy Jef-
ferson, with the "house thereon erected." That improved lot, at the southwest corner of Wynne, was surveyed for Morrey in the middle of February, five days after Penn granted him a warrant which added twelve feet to the lot's breadth; the excess presumably was the result of a miscalculation by the surveyors when the street was first laid out.56 On Schuylkill side, half of the surveyed lots were for renters, either on unassigned ground or on lots of absentee owners. The growing community of lots cleared by these renters along Holme and the upper reaches of the Kentin Tomessin seemed to indicate interest in the Center Square nearby. To foster it, Penn urged Thomas Holme to place other renters around the Square whenever possible.57

Weatherwise, March appears to have started mildly: on the first, three lots were laid out on Delaware side, and during the following week four on Schuylkill side. One of those fronting the Delaware was for another New England merchant, John Wheeler of Boston, who had agreed with James Harrison for the latter's Front lot. On the assignment list, this was the eighth lot north of the south bounds of town, and on the Portraiture was shown as one of those broken by the waters of the Dock into two separate tracts. Actual conditions, however, did not conform to those shown on the plan, for the Dock's channel running out into the Delaware, much wider than the plan indicated, pre-empted the site of Harrison's lot. Once more previous concepts were adjusted to accommodate site situations. Inasmuch as Front Street ended at the channel, Wheeler agreed to take two 102-foot lots on Second Street instead—one fronting the east side extending to the Dockside, the other on the west side of the street extending to the back end of the Third Street lots. Three weeks later, William Frampton, who had been traveling back and forth between town and New York during the winter, had his Second Street lots surveyed where his brewhouse was going up.

56 Morrey's contract, in which he promised to pay £50 before the end of the year, was made through Thomas Phillips, the widow's agent, whom she married a short time later. Deed Book E-1-5, 226: Feb. 11, 1683/4, Thomas Phillips to Humphrey Morrey; Warrants and Surveys, III, 538.

57 In June, Penn directed Holme to "plant the back of the City Square forthwith with Renters notwithstanding other warrants dated Two months before this not yet executed." Warrants and Surveys, I, 875. These earlier warrants are not on record and presumably were vacated when new ones were issued.
Expecting to settle in Philadelphia later in the spring, he was also bargaining with Silas Crispin for the latter's Front lot near the Blue Anchor.\textsuperscript{58}

During the balance of the month surveying was sporadic; only three more lots were laid out on Delaware side, and seven on Schuylkill side. One of the latter was for the renter Thomas Marie, a carpenter whose lot was surveyed west of Broad Street on the north side of Holme. It was on the west of another lot Marle had taken up earlier under a warrant issued the previous August to a fellow

\textsuperscript{58} For Wheeler's survey see \textit{ibid.}, III, 243. He later mortgaged the lots to Robert Turner for £26 tot., but died before he had redeemed them, and before Harrison had received his full purchase price. Edward Shippen, by clearing the debts, acquired the entire property, as recited in Deed Book E-2-5, 270: Apr. 14, 1693, Release, Phineas Pemberton, \textit{et al.}, to Edward Shippen. The Society Hill high-rise apartments stand on part of this ground. Frampton's certificate of removal from Oyster Bay Meeting, L.I., was dated June 20, 1684. Albert Cook Myers, \textit{Quaker Arrivals at Philadelphia, 1682-1750} (Baltimore, 1957), 4. Warrants and Surveys, III, 227, gives the date of survey for Frampton's lot as Mar. 24, 1683/4.
carpenter, Edward Carter. Another renter, John Hutchins, was already clearing the as yet unsurveyed land next to that first lot.⁵⁹

Meanwhile, as the end of winter drew near, evidence of increasing unrest in another direction appeared when rumors of renewed hostility on Baltimore’s part seeped up from the lower counties. Proclamations had been broadcast “inviting not only all ye inhabitants of those Counties, but those of that part of ye Province which Lyeth betwixt New Castle County & ye River of Schulkil” to submit to Baltimore. It was reported that he was “threatening to take away ye lands” of those who refused to submit, and that he had forbidden payment of quitrents to Penn. He had also sent Colonel Talbot with a band of armed men to “the bridge upon Christina River, being within six miles of ye town of New Castle, where he in a hostile manner upon a spott of land belonging to ye Widow Ogle . . . did forthwith cause a fort to be erected.” Charles Pickering reported that in Kent County he suspected that most of the people there were “resolved to revolt.” They said Penn had “broken his Promise by not entering & clearing ye Vessels at New Castle; also if they do it [revolt] Baltimore will stand by them.” Still others had “made complaint agst this Govt & to Baltimore that they were Taxt too much.”⁶⁰

As he listened with growing concern to these and similar reports, the overriding importance of Baltimore’s continuing pretensions and inimical attitude became the factor which determined Penn’s course of action. Baltimore’s persistence in claiming jurisdiction over the entire Delaware valley was not only a threat to Penn’s sovereignty but to the ultimate success of his “holy experiment.” It was undermining the harmonious union he hoped to maintain between his upper counties, settled by his first purchasers and investors, and the diverse population of the lower counties, largely made up of long-settled Dutch, Swedes, and Anglican English. If he hoped to weld these elements into a stable government, he must

⁵⁹ Marie’s surveys are in Warrants and Surveys, III, 230, 242. No survey date is entered on the survey for the one laid out in right of Edward Carter who had been assigned a lot on Holme Street further west, but had chosen to settle in Chester County. In 1686, Marie was in charge of “boarding and shingling” the roof of the Center Meeting House, and, although he later moved closer to the Delaware, was taking up lots on Race and Broad Streets as late as 1694. PGSP, II, 100; Warrants and Surveys, III, 276.

quash Baltimore's claims in such a manner as would forever remain unquestioned. This was no longer a matter he could leave to his agents: to refute Baltimore's allegations his own presence at Whitehall was essential.

By the end of March, Penn had reached the decision to return to England, but before he could leave the province in the care of novice law-makers and increasingly contentious settlers there was much to be done. To forestall possible outbreaks in the lower counties, he commissioned three of his Council "to raise the country" where necessary. They were instructed to learn what they could of the motives "inducing to disaffections," and to "refute them as dangerous, foolish and ungrateful on their side." The unwarranted refusal to pay quitrents in those parts was an affront to the Crown, since half of the rents were due the Duke of York under Penn's deed of feoffment for the land. Certainly Penn's half, "to supply me with bread," should "not be made a reason of rebellion by men in their witts that love their lives and letters"—the patents under which they held their land. If any persisted in resisting his authority, the commissioners were to "suppress all Rioutous & Rebellious practices & them to apprehend & imprison" so that they might be proceeded against according to law. Two others of his Council he sent to New York to apprise the governor of Baltimore's actions.

To hasten his departure, the time for convening the annual Assembly, set for May 20, Penn moved up to May 10, and to placate the lower counties he changed the Assembly's place of meeting from Philadelphia to New Castle. Convinced that "Government, Like Clocks, go from the Motion Men give them," he spent two weeks with his Council drawing up laws for the Assembly's approval. His government must not run down in his absence. To provide for the appellate justice he and the Council exercised, the appointment of provincial judges must be proposed; the sessions and jurisdiction of special courts must be regularly fixed. An increase in the size of the Council was considered; a poll tax for the support of local govern-

61 He may have made up his mind earlier, but when, on Mar. 21, 1684, he moved up by ten days the Assembly's convening date, his intention to finish all business as quickly as possible seems evident.

62 Penn to John Simcock, Apr. 2, 1684, Robert Proud Papers, No. 2, 278, Parrish Collection; Pennsylvania Archives, First Series, I, 85, 86; Colonial Records, I, 103.
ment should be laid. To provide funds for Penn’s passage to England, the impost, which he had remitted to the province the previous year, should be continued, but this year Penn hoped to raise through its means enough to fill his purse.63

Once his session with the Council was concluded, there was Samuel Carpenter’s proposal to build a wharf or key out into the Delaware to be considered. Such an undertaking had advantages not to be ignored but, in setting a precedent for similar projects, provisions had to be established safeguarding the future development of the river bank, still cluttered as it was with unsightly caves occupied by some of the first-comers. In consultation with Carpenter, it was agreed that any initial outlay would be at the charge of the individual undertaker who would be recompensed by the right to charge a fee for the privilege of shipping or unloading goods at the wharf. Wharves, Penn ruled, should not run out into the river further than 250 feet. Access to them was to be provided by each undertaker, “in a convenient time,” by the opening of a thirty-foot cartway along the front of the bank “for the common use of all persons in the day tyme,” and by the building and keeping in repair of two pairs of stairs, “one from the water to the wharf and [one] from the wharf up to the front street upon the top of the river bank.” Carpenter and Penn agreed that no building on either wharf or bank was to rise higher than four feet above the top of the bank; such a height would serve as a protective balustrade for pedestrian and other traffic, and would not obstruct visibility up and down the river. Penn determined not to sell any ground on the bank, but to lease it for a term of years. At the term’s expiration, the “annual value” of land and improvements was to be impartially valued and one-third of it thereafter paid yearly to the Proprietor. By such an agreement, Penn not only would retain control of the river front but secure income for himself and his heirs.64

63 Ibid., I, 96–99; Votes of Assembly, I, xlvii.
64 Carpenter’s undated petition for the bank lot includes only a few details which were not among the provisions in standard bank-lot patents subsequently issued. For example, he wanted his wharf to run out into the river “soe far as I may now or hereafter think fit—soe far as goods may be safely and commodiously landed or shipt at the Lowest Ebb—soe far out that a ship of 100 tons or upward may come and unload or load on it.” He also wanted to “dig cellars or vaults between the Edge of the bank and my own land provided it be done and kept without prejudice to the Road above,” and wanted to “erect chimneys that may be ornamental
Once these basic regulations were settled, the size of Carpenter's particular bank lot and his lease were considered. When Carpenter maintained that 102 feet—the width of his Front lot—was not enough to allow for the dock or slip he wanted to build, Penn allowed him 204 feet, "beginning about twenty feet from the end of the bank, sixty feet distant" from the front line of his and Christopher Taylor's adjoining lot. The lease they fixed at fifty-one years, and the annual rent at twenty-five shillings current money of the province. As soon as those details were settled, the bank lot, to be known as Carpenter's Wharf, was surveyed in mid-April.65

Expecting that the establishment of Philip England's ferry over the Schuylkill, at the end of High Street, would stimulate settlement of liberty land across the river, Penn had directed Holme to lay out on that side, opposite High Street, two or three streets up on firm ground along the river's west bank. By extending the city across the Schuylkill and providing lots66 for small tradesmen and shopkeepers, the emergence of a small commercial center on that side, close to the ferry, would be an added inducement to locate liberty land nearby. However, only a few tracts had been surveyed in the liberties on either side of the Schuylkill during the past year, although Penn had issued more than sixty warrants for such land. No large tracts had been laid out west of the Schuylkill, and there appeared to be considerable reluctance among the larger purchasers to accept less than a full dividend east of the river. Only three eighty-acre tracts had been surveyed on the east side in 1683—Thomas Bowman's in October, and Claypoole's and Carpenter's in November. Up to April, 1684, only one additional eighty-acre

---

65 No warrant or survey for Carpenter's bank lot appear to be on record. The date of survey, Apr. 14, 1684, is in Pennsylvania Archives, Third Series, III, 385; the terms are in his patent in Exemplification Book 1, 145: Aug. 4, 1684. A sketch of the wharf he proposed building is included in his petition.

66 A Front and Second Street had been laid out on the west side of the Schuylkill by the end of April, 1684, when a 30 by 200-foot lot for John Gardner was surveyed. In May, Penn also gave Joseph Brown, then or later in partnership with George Guest, the brickmaker, a warrant for "a city lot on the west side of the Schuylkill" which was surveyed the following December, 60 by 200 feet, also between Front and Second Street, Warrants and Surveys, III, 206, 249.
tract, for the widow Elizabeth Palmer, who was about to remarry, had been laid out.67

Typical of the evident reluctance to accept less than a full dividend was that displayed by Dennis Rochford. Living on the Orian tract which had been granted him in exchange for the Clayton plantation he had first purchased, Rochford was well aware of the extent of unsurveyed land around him. There seemed to be no valid reason why he should not be allotted a full dividend of liberty land, since his warrant called for one hundred acres to be laid out “joining to his settlement he at present liveth upon provided it be not taken up already.” When Rochford had applied for its survey, however, Holme demurred, and sent a note to Penn reminding the Proprietor that he had ordered Holme “to allow no more than 80 acres to any whosoever. Please to afford me thy positive pleasure,” Holme wrote, “for that he is not willing to accept of less than 100 acres.”68

Any deficiency of land was even harder to credit in the spring of 1684, when, at the Proprietor’s direction a stone quarry was opened on Jeacox’s former Mt. Seippit land overlooking the Schuylkill. Penn had renamed the place Fairmount. Spread out a hundred feet below its summit was the beautiful verdant panorama of the emergent city. Reminiscent of his home at Warminghurst (Warminghurst) on its eminence in southern Sussex, and adjacent to his own 300 acres of liberty land, he envisioned Fairmount as a splendid site for a manor house. It was close to the city and more convenient for the transaction of the government’s business than the farm he was planning to develop at Pennsbury, twenty miles upriver in

67 The only liberty land surveyed on the west side of Schuylkill in 1683, of which a record has been found, was for Francis Fincher. It was laid out along the north side of the present West Market Street, then simply called “a street or road.” Warrants and Surveys, III, 216. The eighty-acre tracts were all located on water: Bowman’s on the upper reaches of the Tumanaromaning Creek; Claypoole’s and Carpenter’s on Gunnar’s Creek, one of its branches; and Elizabeth Palmer’s on the Cohocksink. Her tract was surveyed at this time in order to assure her children of their patrimony before her second marriage. Warrants and Surveys, III, 194, 238, 246, 519; PGSP, I, 265.
68 Rochford’s warrant, dated Dec. 20, 1683, is in Warrants and Surveys, I, 837, and Holme’s note to Penn in Pennsylvania Archives, Third Series, III, 313. Since all warrants Penn issued were for a full two per cent dividend, the implication seems clear that he was leaving the choice of location up to the individual. After he returned to England, however, his commissioners of property specified whether the land was to be laid out as a full or reduced dividend.
Bucks County. The little house on Letitia’s lot would scarcely be appropriate to a Proprietor’s dignity once the city was fully established. But such a seat as Fairmount—surrounded by its own demesne lands and perhaps augmented in time by such liberty land as would accrue from purchasers who took up their land across the Schuylkill—would be consonant with the manor houses he knew in England, and a proper seat for the manor he called Springettsberry after his eldest son, Springett. If the Lord willed, Springett would inherit it. Fairmount’s development, however, would have to wait until his return after the trouble with Baltimore was settled.

Some of these plans Penn intimated to Barnaby Willcox that spring as they watched John Gardner opening the quarry. When Willcox reminded the Proprietor that he had yet to receive the city lots promised him, Penn is reported to have said:

Barnaby, I would advise thee not to be Uneasy about those lotts on Delaware side; I repent that Such a Progress hath been made there as is already, whereof we have but helpt our Neighbors & hurt ourselves. I am resolved to make Skoolkill the place, and upon this Hill will have a House built whereon I resolve to Dwell which will Draw Business hither, and when I come back will Accomodate thee here with Lotts in Lieu of those at Delaware to thy Satisfaction, for I am resolved to settle at Skoolkill, and by that means will turn your Land into Silver, and your Silver into Gold.

If any of these thoughts were bruited about town, they were forgotten in the excitement of the arrival of a ship from home, the Duke of York, with supplies and letters. Only eight lots, in addition to Carpenter’s bank lot, were laid out in April. Three of them were

69 Penn’s concept of a manor house at Fairmount appears to be implicit in his establishment of the Manor of Springettsberry as the tenure under which purchasers held Philadelphia city and county land. It is further implied by Pastorious who, in March, 1684, noted that Penn expected “to build a house and to set up for himself a little dominion” on the Schuylkill. Pennypacker, Settlement of Germantown, 95. After Penn realized he couldn’t afford to develop both Fairmount and Pennsbury, originally planned as a farm to supply his official residence, he tried for years to get the Province to build him a house on “any of his lots or liberty land” with the money the Province owed him. Colonial Records, I, 328; Penn MSS, Letters of the Penn Family, I, 9, 46, 55. The Manor descended, not to Springett Penn who died in 1696, but to Thomas Penn, the Proprietor’s son by his second wife, Hannah Callowhill. Thomas Penn improved what was then left of the Manor grounds. See Richard Hockley to Thomas Penn, June 27, 1742, quoted in PMHB, XXVII (1903), 435, and Thomas Penn to Richard Hockley, Sept. 18, 1746, quoted in ibid., XL (1916), 224.

70 Joseph Willcox to Penn, Aug. 1, 1701, Penn-Physick MSS, cited in Note 52.
for renters on Schuylkill Third Street at the north end of town. A fourth was laid out for John Gardner across the Schuylkill between the recently established Front and Second Streets on that side. Two of the four lots on Delaware side were also for renters, men whose positions in government required a place for them to stay when business called them to town from their homes in the country. Robert Wade, a member of the Assembly from Chester County, was granted a lot on unassigned ground on Wynne Street between Third and Fourth, and William Clarke, a member of Penn’s Council from the lower counties, a lot on Second Street north of High, near the town prison. In May while Penn and Holme were both in New Castle during the Assembly’s session no lots were surveyed. In the entire month, none were laid out on Schuylkill side, and only four on Delaware side.

The Disenchantment

Penn’s impending departure accelerated the fusion of heretofore individual discontents into a list of grievances, fruit of the seed he planted when he first granted liberties, franchises, and property to his purchasers and adventurers. To the largest investors, the limitations of Penn’s feudal land policy which affected them most heavily had ceased to appear appropriate in the new environment. Their complaints, magnified and repeated periodically in succeeding years, were the first concerted attempt to abrogate or limit the application of his land policy and the powers under which it operated. Such outrages served only to deepen the Proprietor’s disappointment and chagrin that the virgin settlement he had so hopefully initiated had not flowered into the virtuous community he had envisioned.

The legislative session at New Castle in May provided fresh evidence of the colonists’ growing independence and disregard of Proprietary interests. Attempts were made to repeal, in whole or in part, “fundamental” laws passed the previous year. To the proposed bill for establishing provincial judges appointed by the
Proprietor, the Assembly sought to append an amendment limiting the privilege of appointment to Penn's lifetime only. He declared such a proviso was a "Breach of Privilege"; under his grant from the King, both he and his heirs had the right of appointment. Protracted debate over the excise bill, so important to his plans, exasperated him further. After the Assembly had spent an entire week on its wording and provisions, he finally sent two of his Council to inform the members that they "have been soe long un-Dispatcht of the Business proposed, that the Gov Takes it very ill." Once the bill was at last passed on the final day of the session Penn proposed that Samuel Carpenter "farm" the revenue arising from it, advancing funds on the collateral of the duties received. When Carpenter declined, he was asked to join with Claypoole, Songhurst, Wynne, and John Jones, a prosperous Barbados merchant settled in town since the previous fall, "to get in the moneys" Penn needed. After much thought, these men concluded they might be able, by subscriptions, to "raise three hundred pounds or more amongst friends" for Penn's use, provided it would "be in Lew of the other In-gagemts"—payment of the excise duties. With this Penn had to be content.

Returning to Philadelphia Penn was still faced with official business to be settled, decisions to be reached. One decision at this time clearly reflected Penn's growing disappointment with those on whom he had most counted. Henceforth the streets in his new town would not commemorate men who had displayed varying degrees of self-service in the past months; instead, the streets would be named after "the things that Spontaneously grow in the country." Hereafter, Valley Street would be Vine, Songhurst would be Sassafras, Holme Street should be called Mulberry, Wynne changed to Chestnut, and Pool Street to Walnut. Dock Street, south of the Swamp, would be Spruce, and the two most southern ones by the Society's land, until now unnamed, would be Pine and Cedar Streets.

72 Votes of Assembly, I, 50-58; Colonial Records, I, 105, 107-112.
73 The precise date when the street names were altered is unknown, but returns of warrants establish it in the spring of 1684, and in general effect by the end of May. See, for example, the returns of surveys for lots for Roger Hughes on "Chestnut, formerly Wynne," and for John Harding, between "Mulberry formerly Holme" and "Saxafrax formerly Songhurst," both returned May 29, 1684; also for John Moore, between "Walnut formerly Pool" and "Spruce formerly Dock Street," returned June 11, 1684. Warrants and Surveys, II, 55, 82.
Needing his immediate attention were more warrants for liberty land and for city lots. One of the latter which he signed in June was for John Gooding, a carpenter who had taken up as a renter a lot on Schuylkill side the previous October. Since then, Gooding had purchased a hundred acres and wanted "a piece of Ground upon the Bank of Delaware, over against the Shead where the Meeting is now and Thomas Hooten’s, to build on." Penn ordered thirty feet laid out for him on the bank, but not down into the river. John Hughes, "Purchaser of a small spot of ground" on the north side of Walnut "on the other side of the Swamp," where "he hath built a work shop upon," wanted a warrant for survey so he could obtain a patent. William Haig’s original warrant, issued in February, 1683, was for a lot at the south end of town “next to Philip Ford on the hill” beyond the Society’s land. Toward the end of June he was issued a new warrant for “a Lot in Lieu of an Equal front lot on the other side of the Dock.” It was surveyed the same day the warrant was issued, immediately south of Enoch Flower’s lot.\(^74\)

Griffith Jones’ Blue Anchor tavern still obstructed traffic along Front Street. Ten months before, Penn had given him a warrant for a sixteen-foot lot on which to remove the building, but Jones had delayed doing anything about it until his town house at the corner of Walnut Street was finished. In June the little tavern lot, running back about forty feet to the Dock, was at last laid out some one hundred feet south of Haig’s new lot.\(^75\)

A few large tracts in the liberties were also laid out: the Swansons’ 600 acres fronting on the Schuylkill, and two eighty-acre tracts. That for Christopher Taylor was located on Tumanaromaning Creek flowing through the Shackamaxon land. Thomas Rudyard’s eighty acres, due north of Taylor’s, was laid out on a branch of the same stream. Rochford’s 100 acres were divided into two parcels—sixty acres near the German Company’s township adjoining the liberties and forty acres next to the land where Rochford lived.\(^76\)

\(^74\) The Gooding survey and warrant are in *ibid.*, III, 226, 388; Hughes’ in *ibid.*, I, 429; Haig’s in *ibid.*, II, 57–58, 66.

\(^75\) For the survey of the tavern lot, see *ibid.*, II, 66.

\(^76\) The Swanson, Rochford, and Taylor liberty lots were surveyed in May, Rudyard’s in June. *Ibid.*, III, 164, 196, 230.
Others besides the Proprietor had been busier than usual. At the end of December, 1683, Penn appointed Thomas Lloyd the first Master of Rolls and Records. According to the terms of his commission, Lloyd opened the office for business a month later. The conveyances Penn made to his purchasers called for enrollment of the deeds in the Rolls office within six months of its establishment. That time was drawing near, but up to May less than fifty purchasers had troubled to bring in their deeds for recording. Even fewer had thought it necessary to obtain from Penn any further confirmation in the way of patents for the land laid out to them, inasmuch as they held the original deeds of purchase and the surveys showing metes and bounds. As for land transactions between individuals, these were acknowledged in open courts of record at a charge of two shillings each, according to law. There had seemed to be no urgent need for such sales to be enrolled elsewhere, especially since any enrollment would be an additional expense.  

The imminence of Penn's departure and the continuing reports of unrest stirred up by Baltimore's agents in the lower counties altered matters. The security of property titles assumed major importance to men who heretofore had held land only as undertenants. During May and June, the surveys of more than one hundred properties, the majority laid out the year before, were returned for entry in the surveyor general's office. Penn signed patents for more than a third of them in June, more than a dozen of them on June 27 alone.

Scrutiny of these confirming patents, when compared with the original deeds of purchase from Penn, revealed a number of inconsistencies. All but one of them described the patented property as being held "as of our manor of Springettsberry in our county [of

---

77 Basically the system of record keeping apparently set up by Lloyd was simple. Patents were entered in a book designated "A," his own commission being the first entry; original deeds of lease and release from Penn in "B" books; sales of land by original purchasers to underpurchasers in "C" books; miscellaneous records, such as bills, bonds, and releases in "D" books; and ordinary real estate conveyances in "E" books. An examination of such of these books as were exemplified when the original A, B and D books were removed to Harrisburg shows that no Penn grants were recorded until the end of January, 1684, when eleven were entered, and no patents or sales to underpurchasers until February. Up to July, the total number of patents recorded was two, probably because Penn issued a proclamation May 12, allowing a longer time for their recording. Colonial Records, I, 105. It does not appear to have affected original Penn deeds, however; at the end of June, twenty-three Penn sales and eighteen sales to underpurchasers had been recorded.
The exception was William Haig’s patent for his Front lot, surveyed and entered of record the day before it was patented. His patent included the additional and familiar phrase “and as holding of Windsor.” Then there was Griffith Jones’ patent for his Bristol Township land, surveyed early in 1683; it was the only patent which included any mention of or reference to an original purchase made in England. In none of the patents was the phrase which, in their original deeds, declared the land was to be laid out “as are by certain Conditions or Concessions agreed upon.” Moreover, in all of the patents for city lots, quitrents were called for.

In a time and society when each man was his own lawyer, distrustful of the profession as a whole, such variances were viewed with alarm and suspicion. Holding land under Penn’s tenure of the Manor of Windsor was understandable; this was in their original deeds. But the Manor of Springettsberry was something new, implying unknown obligations, unforeseen restrictions. The Free Society’s Manor of Frank privileges and licenses had been disallowed by the Assembly as being too extensive. Proprietary caprice, however, could impose objectionable restrictions just as extensive by virtue of the royal charter. The imposition of quitrents on town lots was equally alarming, threatening as it did a further drain on purses. The bargain made in London with Penn for quitrents at a shilling per hundred acres included no provision for further rents to be laid on town lots which, as far as the original purchasers were concerned, were just as much a part of their purchased land as their liberty land allotments. Such inconsistencies, coming on top of personal disappointments or dissatisfactions, served to unlock stored-up complaints. When Penn heard of them, he agreed to consider the grievances as a whole if they were properly drawn up and presented in an appropriate manner. Until then, business in town went on more or less as usual.

About fifty more surveys of town lots were entered in the surveyor general’s records during July. By the end of the month, a total of about sixty original deeds of purchase had been recorded in the Rolls office since its opening, but only a dozen patents in all had been brought in. Surveying of town lots continued to be light. Plots for only seven persons were laid out during the month, three on Schuylkill side, four on Delaware. Because Francis Fincher had
been "the first that built upon the Schuylkill in the Front," Penn ordered an additional ten feet laid out for him when his Front lot, at the north corner of Mulberry, was surveyed late in June. On Delaware side, part of the corner lot at Second and High, originally claimed by Barnabas Willcox, was laid out for Arthur Cooke.78

Dr. Nicholas More's town lots were surveyed on both river fronts along the south side of Spruce, formerly Dock Street. However, by the digging of "a new cutt" to regulate the course of the stream entering the Dock, his Front lot on Delaware side, at the southeast corner of Second and Spruce, had been reduced to a small triangular plot. Further south, the three back-to-back lots granted the Germans on Delaware side were also surveyed. In the liberties, the Mifflins' land was resurveyed, and across the Schuylkill, two hundred acres adjoining Willcox's ropewalk were laid out for old Peter Cock in exchange for the ground he had surrendered to Penn "where the City now stands."79

As the Council, recessed since June 20, was not scheduled to meet again until July 25, Penn was in town only occasionally. He found time, nevertheless, to issue warrants for renters to take up lots at the Center, and up to July 21 had signed sixteen more patents. By then the original three or four complaints of purchasers and patentees had grown to almost a dozen. The points of contention of "Persons considerate in the city" had been drawn up and digested by Thomas Rudyard, currently embroiled in a controversy with Thomas Holme over improperly surveyed country land. Rudyard's draft of the grievances, arranged in the form of a remonstrance, was to be signed by the "Inhabitants of ye front lots" and then turned over to Claypoole

78 Fincher, a glover from Worcestershire who did not arrive until 1683, had sent his sons over the year before to take up his land. Assigned the Front lot on Schuylkill side, they had improved it without waiting for a survey. Warrants and Surveys, I, 338, and II, 49. Cooke's survey is in ibid., II, 26.

79 More had four lots on Delaware side, three on Schuylkill side. Warrants and Surveys, III, 281. The German Company's lots were laid out in the name of Jacob Vanderwall and Company. Ibid., II, 131. The Mifflin resurvey is in ibid., VI, 64. Cock's is recited in Pennsylvania Archives, Second Series, XIX, 427. He had recently signed two depositions establishing that, during Swedish and Dutch possession of the Delaware valley, Baltimore had never made any claim to it. The first deposition Penn had gotten in January, the second in June, 1684. These, with similar ones from New York, Penn intended to take with him to England to bolster his own claim. Nicholas B. Wainwright, "The Missing Evidence: Penn v. Baltimore," PMHB LXXX (1956), 227-235; ibid., XCI (1967), 35-40, cited in Note 40, Part I.
for presentation to Penn. It may have reached Penn’s hands before the signatures were added.\textsuperscript{80}

To the purchasers’ worry about the “new erected Mannors here whose Privilege of Power” were unknown, and to the absence of any reference in their patents to the \textit{Conditions or Concessions}, was added the further omission of the rights of “Fishing, Fowling, Hunting, Mines, Minerals etc” granted in their original deeds. It was an omission they feared “may & will be a sure grievance to us & our Heirs for ever.” They resented Penn’s present directive that no purchaser could take up more than 500 acres in one parcel, and that this had to be settled “within six or twelve months.” Such a limitation made a purchaser of 500 acres who had paid ten pounds equal to “a Purchaser of 5000 acres for one hundred pounds.” It was “contrary to all Proposals in England” and a “great Injury to the most considerable Purchasers,” preventing them from having land laid out which they had paid for in England.

Dissatisfaction with the size of liberty lots was also aired. At the time of their purchase, they claimed, “the then Purchasers were not so numerous but that every [one] of us might have had an hundred acres that were a Purchaser of 5000 Acres & other Purchasers according to that Rate proportionally; but by Reason of after Purchasers & Persons admitted into this City of Favour—the first adventurers & Purchasers are wronged in their Rights & abridged of their due—Viz, smaller lots in the City & 20 Acres abated in the Town Bounds.” Furthermore, having trusted Penn in the reapplotment of the city to ascertain “the Town Lots to each Purchase,” so that “no Persons should be wronged of his just lots,” they were now being told they had surrendered all their “Right in the City to the Governour & his Heirs.” They were told that city lots were no part of their purchase but the Proprietor’s gift, and subject to a quitrent of five shillings yearly per acre of town lot. On top of that imposition, the obligation to take out a patent “for every respective Parcel & Lot of Land” was “a great Charge & needless Expense,”

\textsuperscript{80} It is possible the signatures were on a separate sheet, and destroyed after the remonstrance was returned to Rudyard. The original, with Penn’s answers, is in Proud Papers Miscellaneous, Box 2, cited in Note 46, Part I. Rudyard’s controversy with Holme is recited in Warrants and Surveys, I, 859-860.
since they had their deeds of purchase and had entered their surveys on record.

The river bank opposite front lots was another sore point. Each lot-holder had always accounted that he “should have the Privilege to build Vaults or stores in the Bank against [opposite] his Lot” especially where the bank was too high for common wharfage. No mention of this right was in the patents, and now they were told it was “not theirs, nor the Peoples in general,” which was “a great Discouragement to the Builders & Adventurers.” They had “not been wanting in laying out their Estates in Building” in the town, and by their industry had brought the place, in only two years’ time, to a greater state than any other town in the neighboring colonies had attained in a greater time; “Yet to this Day they were only a nomenall citie haveing no Charter to incorporate them or [had the] grant of the least privilege of a Corporation.”

Penn had also promised that land would be free of Indian titles and incumbrances, but in their opinion there had been no regular purchase of such lands—only gifts and Indian promises allowing them “to sit down thereon . . . so long as the Proprietarys reciprocal Kindness continue to them in his daily gifts & Presents.” This was neither right nor proper. Persons should be commissioned to mark out the land regularly, pay the purchase price, receive the deeds of sale and “livery of seisin” by turf and twig. That was the only way to prevent future quarrels and preserve the peace.

Presented as the “Humble Remonstrance & address of several, the Adventurers, Free holders & Inhabitants and others therein concerned,” the tenor and scope of the grievances plainly showed that it was the large investors, purchasers of whole shares, who were the most resentful, and how far they had moved from their initial enthusiasm for Penn’s policies. Penn’s disillusionment stands out just as clearly in the brusque answers he scrawled on the back of the remonstrance. The purchasers’ attack was not only against his personal integrity, but against the dignity of his office as Proprietor. After the travail and hazard he had endured in their interests, it was a bitter blow to see how far these people had strayed from guidance by the Inner Light which had led them to the Delaware.
“I impose no Patents,” he wrote, and “have told all they may have them if they will, or stand on their Survey recorded. One Man that proves he was compelled shall have all for nothing.” His patent he held of Windsor, and the purchasers held of him through their deeds of purchase. If their “Patent refers to the Deed, tis enough & that I long since ordered.” The privileges of fishing, fowling, etc., were in their deeds and granted in his royal charter; certainly he would never refuse them.

His limitations on settlements “I say I answer, no self end, but preserve the Country from a Desolation.” “This has been done by Perswasion not Injunction”; nothing in the Concessions or the deeds obliged him to the contrary. Copies of the Conditions were in the hands of his commissioners for all to see. If he had followed them exactly, it would “pinch the people more than me [by] far.” Neither had he cheated them, “for the 100 acres to 5000 acres is if the place allows of it.” It was a mistake “to think that any besides the first 100 shares have a Foot” in the liberties “but what they buy of the First Purchasers.”

As for his right to impose quitrents on city lots, he wrote with asperity: “Let them give me back the Land I bought & added to the City and they shall have the City as of Right of Purchase.” Regarding bank lots, he wrote with equal emphasis: “The Bank is a Top Common from End to End; the rest next the Water belongs to Front Lot men no more than Back Lot men; the Way bounds them; they may build stairs & [along] the Top of the Bank a Common Exchange or Walk, & against the [end of the] Streets common Wharfs may be built freely, but into the Water & the Shore is no [First] Purchasers.”

“Tis the People’s Fault, not mine,” he went on, that there was no town charter. “I was not to wait on them with Draughts; I am still ready, if Time permitts, & shall leave a security by a Promise under my Hand & a charge on my Heirs to do it.” Concerning Indian titles, he was particularly bitter. “I say it is disingenuous, for I have made the most Purchases & have been at the greatest charge of any Prop’r & Govr in America: This is not thought enough, but I must

81 Although Proud knew of the entire remonstrance, he excerpted only this one answer. Proud, I, 244n.
let others have the buying & paying with my Estate for greater Security; this is beyond Modesty & Justice. . . ."

What else Penn may have said in public rebuttal remains unknown. Perhaps he considered it useless to say more. There were many front and back lot men in town who had been present in November, 1682, when the agreement was reached to settle an urban instead of a rural community. He had only accepted their lead and used his best efforts to make that urban center a town of value. "What is altered," he later wrote privately, "and that is very little, was by the peoples desire, no end of myn. I have given to them what I bought of old inhabitants that might have been worth me more than ye income of ye whole for many years, & added it to ye citty, 800 Acres & a mile on a navigable river, but I hope not to please all," 82

It was too late to alter most matters now, but there was one thing he could do to ease their minds. On July 26, he appointed Thomas Lloyd, Thomas Holme, and William Haig a committee "to draw up a Charter for Philadelphia to be made a Burrough, Consisting of a Mayr and six Aldermen, and to Call to their Assistance any of ye Councill." 83

On August 3, 1684, Thomas Rudyard wrote at the bottom of the remonstrance that the colonists, having aired their grievances and "so eased themselves, they were quiet." 84 Business went on as usual. Surveys continued to be enrolled in the surveyor general's records, and by the end of that first week in August a dozen new patents were recorded in the Rolls office. Penn was kept busy signing additional patents, issuing more warrants for liberty land, for lots at the Center, and for other town lots. These included warrants for Philip Ford's and Joseph Growden's lots at the south end of town, which were surveyed the first of August. Another warrant was for George Bartholomew, the landlord of Griffith Jones' Blue Anchor tavern. A twenty-foot Front lot, next to the tavern lot, was surveyed

82 Penn to Stephen Crisp, Dec. 1, 1684, Albert Cook Myers Collection, Box 1, No. 7, Chester County Historical Society. I am indebted to Dr. Gary B. Nash for bringing this letter to my attention.
83 Colonial Records, I, 117.
84 Inasmuch as Penn had appointed a committee to draw up a charter a week before, Rudyard must have added the date when the remonstrance was returned to him.
for him on the first.\textsuperscript{85} On Schuylkill side, two of the warrants were also executed promptly. One lot was at the Center on the north side of Market Alley for a plasterer, Anthony Burges. The other was for William Southeby, a shoemaker, at the north end of Schuylkill Third Street.\textsuperscript{86}

Penn also took time to negotiate with several merchants who, since he had clarified his stand, wanted to lease bank lots. William Frampton, having bought Silas Crispin’s Front lot in June for £24, wanted “the convenience of Wharfing and building storehouses” opposite the lot. He was the first of the merchants to reach an agreement with Penn since the remonstrance. On August 2, he obtained a warrant for a forty-two-foot bank lot “to be known by the name of Town Wharf.” The patent for the lot, signed by Penn on August 5, four days before the lot was surveyed, established conditions similar to those in Carpenter’s patent, but Frampton’s lease was to run for only forty-one years, and his yearly rent was set at four shillings current money.\textsuperscript{87}

The next merchant to conclude an agreement with Penn was the New Engander, John Wheeler. Thirty feet of the bank opposite Enoch Flower’s lot was surveyed for Wheeler on August 4 under a warrant issued the same day. On August 5, a thirty-foot Front lot, assigned to one Robert Knight, a purchaser of 2,500 acres who had relinquished his right to the lot, was laid out for Wheeler immediately south of William Haig’s front lot. Penn signed patents for both of Wheeler’s lots the same day. Rent for his bank lot was set at three

\textsuperscript{85} Both Ford’s and Growden’s warrants were issued July 25, 1684. Warrants and Surveys, I, 365, 410. The survey dates are from Pennsylvania Archives, Third Series, III, 387, 389. Bartholomew, who had purchased James Boyden’s right to the lot, built a log house on it adjoining the tavern. Warrants and Surveys, II, 17, and III, 526–527. Jones sold the tavern to Bartholomew who mortgaged both properties to Jones in 1686, but died before redeeming them. In 1690, when both houses had been replaced by brick buildings, Jones sold them to Thomas Budd, as recited in Deed Book E-7-8, 263: June 8, 1697, Thomas Budd to Anthony Morris.

\textsuperscript{86} Warrants and Surveys, II, 15, and III, 251. Southeby (Southersby, Southesby, etc.) appears to have been a man of various talents. In 1688, the lot he was living on at the Schuylkill, “being too little to build vessels [on] and drive on the Trade of Bakeing as he intends to,” the commissioners of property granted him additional land “as will make it one acre which he is to rent of the Proprietor.” \textit{Ibid.}, I, 889.

\textsuperscript{87} Exemplification Book 1, 25: Sept. 5, 1684, Patent to William Frampton. A complete transcript of the patent is in \textit{PMHB}, XXXVI (1912), 506. The warrant is in Warrants and Surveys, I, 335, the survey date in Pennsylvania Archives, Third Series, III, 385.
shillings a year in the patent, but before it was enrolled Penn and Wheeler came to a further agreement. On the patent Penn noted that “I have given, granted and confirmed unto the said John Wheeler his Heirs and Assigns forever the said piece of land.”\(^8\)

A fourth patent, which Penn signed on August 5, was for the bank lot he granted Robert Turner opposite his entire front lot at the corner of Mulberry Street, formerly Holme. Turner’s wharf was to be called Mount Wharf; as a special concession he was granted the permission denied Carpenter, “to dige the Bank and make Vaults crossing the highway” and under the roadbed between the two lots. Turner’s lease, like Carpenter’s, was for fifty-one years, but his rent of ten shillings was less than half as much.\(^9\)

Time was running out for Penn. Having engaged the ketch Endeavour for his voyage to England, he planned to leave by the middle of August. Only a few more details remained to be settled. On the fourth he signed commissions for the provincial judges, naming Turner one of them. On the fifth, at Friends’ Monthly Meeting for business, he concurred in the decision to have the Center Meeting House built of brick, sixty feet long by forty feet wide, having offered earlier to contribute to it “2000 feet of board, 3000 Cedar shingles, as also the Stone already dug up at the Quarry.” He also received a certificate from the Meeting to Friends in England “touching his demeanour amongst the people” of his province.\(^10\)

On the sixth he settled the administration of his government during his absence. “To ye end that ye People may be sensible of ye Intire Confidence I have in them wch I hope will begett the like in them to me and mine,” he appointed “their chosen Provincial Councill” to act in his stead. He named Thomas Lloyd president of

\(^8\) A recital of title to Wheeler’s front lot, in \emph{ibid.}, Second Series, XIX, 488, gives the first purchaser’s name incorrectly as Robert “King.” In that recital the statement is made that on “King’s” relinquishing the lot, Penn “sold or gave” thirty feet of the lot to Wheeler. It is most likely that Penn, in need of all the funds he could raise, sold Wheeler the lot for a good sum. See also Wheeler’s patent, Exemplification Book 1, 137; for the survey dates of both lots, see \textit{Pennsylvania Archives}, Third Series, III, 384, 387. The lot with frontage on both sides of the Dock was included in the mortgage to Turner, and eventually became part of Edward Shippen’s holdings, for which see Note 58.


the Council, charging him and its members "to Actt & do all things that by Law & Charter you may doe for ye Good of ye Province & not to ye Detriment of me, my Heirs & Assignes." James Harrison, Holme, Carpenter, Turner, and Penn's secretary, Philip Thomas Lehmann, who was remaining in the Province, he appointed commissioners of his revenue, and Lloyd, Claypoole, and Turner commissioners of property to issue warrants for land and to sign patents. On the seventh, he nominated Lloyd, Harrison, and John Simcock guardians of his heir, Springett Penn. 91

Five days later, having written his will and a covering letter to his wife, he left his capital city on the first leg of his voyage. Holme, Lloyd, and Harrison accompanied him to Sussex in the lower counties where he and the rest of his Council held a last meeting on August 14. The next day at Lewes he offered Harrison the stewardship of his Pennsbury property, and signed one more patent. This patent, for Thomas Holme's land laid out the previous year in Dublin Township, 92 was the only one Penn had signed since the remonstrance in which the patentee was identified as an original purchaser of land in England.

When Penn sailed out of Delaware Bay in mid-August, 1684, a few days less than a year and ten months after his arrival, he left behind a town in which some 270 lots are known to have been surveyed, two-thirds of which were on Delaware side. The number of dwellings, however, had "advanced to Three hundred and fifty-seven Houses." Penn claimed that "divers of them [were] large, well built, with good Cellars, three stories, and some with Balconies." 93 They were, in fact, simple and rustic in appearance, set

92 Photostats of Penn's will are in Penn Papers, William Penn, cited above. Proud, I, 287; Colonial Records, I, 118; Penn to James Harrison, Aug. 15, 1684, William Penn Letters, 7, Joshua Francis Fisher copy. Exemplification Book 1, 74; Aug. 15, 1684, Patent to Thomas Holme.
93 "Further Account . . .," PMHB, IX (1885), 66-67. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge my indebtedness to my husband, F. Spencer Roach. His patience over a period of five years, his careful checking of calculations, his clear evaluation of evidence, and his experience in the basic principles of planning were invaluable in the preparation of this study.
in what, in one sense, was indeed a green country town. But it was not the country town Penn had planned in 1681. That had been conceived as the outward expression of a "holy experiment" so designed in a rural framework as to give each householder an opportunity to "maintain some cattel and produce some corn."

Instead, the force of reason, the impact of geography on people, and their reactions to pressures had conspired to alter the focus. In essence, the "holy experiment" had become an urban real estate development, centered on the broadly conceived plan of Holme's Portraiture. Time and circumstances had shown that plan to be flexible, permitting alterations and revision as the need arose. Within its framework, the familiar urban concomitants of political friction, resentment against taxation, litigation in courts, and property disputes were already in full evidence.

As Pennsylvania's first regional plan, Penn's proposals for colonization had encompassed farm land, the green country town exemplified by the liberty land, and a small commercial center of indeterminate nature. Through the years these elements would remain basic, but their interrelationship would continue to be fluid as the overall plan absorbed modifications incidental to practical execution. At the very start, Penn's previously undefined commercial center was enlarged and urbanized, reducing the "greene country towne" to the status of suburban liberties. These liberties would evolve more slowly and, in the nineteenth century, would merge with the urbanized center, assuming its characteristics. As suburban estates they would gradually reappear in the farm land surrounding the enlarged urban center, generating their own local commercial communities. In the twentieth century, urban redevelopment and a revival of interest in community and regional planning would initiate new solutions to the current problems created by the accelerated pace of modern living, and would continue to demonstrate the viability of Penn's basic proposals.

In the seventeenth century, however, Penn's colonists, as they waxed fat and prosperous under the modified plan of settlement, not only failed to recognize the fluid quality of planning, but chose to forget the part they themselves had played in altering the orientation of Penn's initial plan. Condemning the Proprietor for the deviations in it which they had instigated, the colonists, their
children and grandchildren up to the period of the Revolution used the change of focus as a device to further their own interests. None of them recognized the fact that Philadelphia's amazing growth in the eighteenth century, and the prosperity they enjoyed, were directly related to the maxim expounded by Publius Syrus: "It is a bad plan that admits of no modification."

*Philadelphia*  

*Hannah Benner Roach*