

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

**Jeremy Kargon**, Architect

Morgan State University, School of Architecture and Planning

### **Mapping a City's Architecture**

Written histories of Baltimore often refer to a document, “Plan of the City of Baltimore,” published originally in 1823 [*Figure 1*]. Typically credited to Thomas Poppleton, this map illustrated the city plan produced by Poppleton between 1816 and 1822. A survey had been commissioned by city politicians just before the War of 1812, but only in the years afterwards was a new plan created and implemented<sup>1</sup>. Poppleton’s plan determined the direction of Baltimore’s growth until well after the Civil War in the 1860’s<sup>2</sup>.

But although Poppleton’s street layout was highly significant for Baltimore’s 19th century development, another feature of this document has also attracted historians of the city’s architecture. Around the border of the map were arranged thirty-five small engravings, illustrating public buildings dating to the map’s original publication. Each illustration was simply titled and gave additional descriptive information about the building, including the architect’s name, the building’s date of completion, and the building’s cost. (See examples, *Figures 4 through 38*.) Especially for those buildings demolished before the advent of photography, these pictures are a useful record of Baltimore’s earliest significant architecture.

Historians’ treatments of these images — and of Poppleton’s map itself — have typically looked at these illustrations individually<sup>3</sup>. Consideration of their ensemble, on the other hand, provides evidence for discussion of two broader themes: The public’s perception of architecture — as a profession and as a source of shared material culture — and the development of that same public’s civic identity as embodied in those buildings. What was significant about the buildings chosen for representation? What did later views of Baltimore derive from this selection? Two centuries after Poppleton’s proposal for Baltimore’s expansion, a closer look at this historical map suggests ways in which the city’s citizens may have chosen to build a civic self-narrative unique to their circumstances and their times.

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

#### **Poppleton's Survey: Background and Context**

The city plan depicted on the 1823 map has been widely cited but scarcely documented. Of the plan's surveyor, Poppleton himself, little is known. Some sources refer to him as English-born<sup>4</sup>, but the date at which he arrived in the United States has not been determined. One writer has suggested that "Poppleton ... was chosen for the city-paid assignment over better-known local talent, not because he was the most technically qualified but because he had a penchant for making his work attractive."<sup>5</sup>

Besides his work for Baltimore, Poppleton is known to have prepared a survey for the "greater part of New York City," published in 1817 [*Figure 2*]. This plan, too, includes a key to places of interest, as well as ferry lines, house numbers, and even the family names of houses beyond the dense areas of the city. No illustrations supplement its city plan; otherwise, its graphic character anticipates the later Baltimore map, although the New York map's inclusion of limited topographical data is an important difference. But of greatest significance is the very example of New York's famous Commissioners' Plan, first proposed for that city in 1807 and formally adopted four years later, in 1811. New York's simple grid-iron street extension, applied with little care for either the land's natural contours or the irregularity of the river's edge, would have surely been the foremost example for other American cities also considering expansion.

It is known that Poppleton had been contracted by Baltimore City, as early as 1811, for a survey of the existing roads and plots of Baltimore<sup>6</sup>. A sketch entitled *An Eye Sketch of Part of the Town and Environs of Baltimore taken without regard to accuracy,* over Poppleton's own name, dates to 1812<sup>7</sup>. But the War of 1812 and the attempted invasion of the city in 1814 quite naturally discouraged continuous work on the project.

The immediate impetus for renewed work on the survey came in 1817, when the Maryland Legislature approved Baltimore's annexation of more than 13 square miles from the surrounding County<sup>8</sup>. The boundaries of the city now reached far beyond the area of urban settlement. To facilitate the integration of this area into the city proper, the Legislature passed an act, which, in the words of one writer, "was neither more nor less than a new charter for the city."<sup>9</sup> The 12th

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

section of this act established a Board of Commissioners, to which was designated the power to survey (that is, to lay out) “all such streets, lanes, and alleys as they shall deem proper and convenient”<sup>10</sup>. The Commissioners, who included prominent Baltimoreans such as John Eager Howard, John Hillen, William McMechen and others, were autonomous from Baltimore's Mayor and its City Council. In their own view, the Commissioners would need exercise their “wisdom and discretion and judgment” alone in fulfillment of their role<sup>11</sup>.

It was to Poppleton to whom the Board of Commissioners turned to complete the survey, and it was Poppleton who in 1822 submitted the survey, which was documented in two plats tendered to both City Register and County Clerk. There appears to have been some public disagreement about the technical quality of the survey and about the City's own responsibility for the expenses incurred by Poppleton and the Board of Commissioners. Poppleton himself wrote to the *Federal Gazette* to account for apparent discrepancies among dimensions given on the plat. Referring to a technical matter still familiar to architects and engineers today, Poppleton explained that “dimensions *in figures* are always preferable to reference to a scale. Figures give the truth, the same to all enquiries at all times.”<sup>12</sup>

The map “Plan of the City of Baltimore,” including its accompanying illustrations, was published the very next year. So although the immediate circumstances of the map's publication are undocumented, what is clear is that the Board of Commissioners were eager to defend their work against criticism in the “court” of public opinion. To do so, it would be necessary to promote Poppleton's plan more widely than would be possible merely by a surveyors plat alone.

### **Poppleton's Map: “Plan of the City of Baltimore,” 1823**

Extant copies of the map are sized approximately 112 x 125 cm; some copies are mounted on linen. Printed by the technique of steel-plate engraving, the map included three significant features. The most obvious was the plan of the city, which encompassed without change the then-existing street layout at the city's core as well as Poppleton's projected grid of streets, extending to the boundaries of the annexed “Precincts.” (No topographic data was included on

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

the plan.<sup>13</sup>) The second feature was indication of the location of existing buildings, many of which were keyed to a numerical legend situated to the left of the map. Eighty-three entries populated this list, which included Churches (entries 1-23), Banks (24-30), Offices (31-42), and Schools, Hotels, Markets, Factories, &c. Even a "Fish Inspection House" (entry 73) was listed in the legend and, consequently, located by number on the City Plan [*Figure 3*].

The third feature, surrounding all these elements, was unique for its time. Below the location legend was the following note: "The views which embellish this Work form a distinct *Alphabetical Reference* the letter over each subject referring to its location on the Plan." These views are the engraved vignettes of Baltimore's "public" buildings, each of which was set in a rosette of textual information, separated by a repeating floral flourish. In addition to these sketches were views, located at the bottom of the sheet, depicting Baltimore's two landmarks: the Washington Monument and the Battle Monument [*Figures 39 & 40*]. Two other aerial views of the city, as seen from the top of what is now Federal Hill, were provided. On the left a contemporary view (circa 1822) was given [*Figure 41*], and on the right was included a redrawing of Moale's famous view of Baltimore circa 1752. A final graphic in the middle, at the bottom of the page, illustrated Baltimore Town's original subdivision dating to its founding circa 1729. These images were printed on narrow strips, joined to the perimeter of a central sheet which itself bore the city plan.

A precedent for the inclusion of such subject matter on a map did exist in Baltimore. The "Warner and Hanna" map, dated 1801, included three insets showing similar information<sup>14</sup>. On this map, one inset framed a legend titled "References," and two others framed pictures of Baltimore's waterfront Market Place and its new-built Assembly Rooms. But the effect of these additions were hardly more than *non sequitur*, and their graphic quality was much cruder than that of the engravings included on Poppleton's map. Another possible precedent existed among the decorative arts, since Baltimore's unique tradition of painted furniture often depicted houses with much the same graphic character<sup>15</sup> [*Figure 42A*].

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

On the "Plan of the City of Baltimore," title and authorship was given in the lower left hand quadrant of the central sheet:

***THIS PLAN OF  
The City of [<sup>16</sup>] Baltimore  
as enlarged & laid out | under the direction of the  
Commissioners  
Appointed By The General  
Assembly  
OF  
MARY | LAND  
In Feby. 1818.***

***As Respectfully  
Dedicated | to the CITIZENS | thereof  
By their Obt. Servt.  
T. H. Poppleton  
Surveyor to the Board.***

The map's title bears the name of two others besides Poppleton. Below the surveyor's name is written, in small type, "C.P. Harrison Script, Sculpt New York 1823." Charles Peter Harrison (1783-1854) was the actual publisher of the map, the fabrication of which occurred in New York and not Baltimore, after all. English-born like Poppleton, Harrison was the son of William Harrison, Sr., an engraver of fine prints and bank notes. C.P. Harrison combined his father's skills as an engraver with a printing business, which moved to New York from Philadelphia only a few years before the publication of Poppleton's map<sup>17</sup>. Although his work as an engraver included a wide range of subjects, his name is attached to at least one other map, of Philadelphia, dated to 1811 and drawn by William Strickland, at John Paxton's direction<sup>18</sup>.

The other name on the map is set in bold text and centered immediately below the word "CITIZENS," and credits an engraver: "Public Buildings &c. Engd. by J. Cone." This Joseph Cone, and not Thomas Poppleton, was the artist responsible for the map's architectural depictions, those images from which "Poppleton's Map" -- as an artifact -- derives its fame.

Joseph Cone (1792-1831) was an engraver, born in Princeton, NJ, who spent most of his early life in Philadelphia<sup>19</sup>. He had been trained to enter either law or medicine, but "an early passion

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

for art... turned his mind towards engraving as the readiest means of at once satisfying a passion and earning a living."<sup>20</sup> He settled in Baltimore around 1820, where his technical work was supplemented by activity as a publisher as well<sup>21</sup>. Cone's name is associated with several engraving techniques, including both line and stipple<sup>22</sup>. Active in the Baptist Church, Cone was part of a community responsible for commissioning Robert Mills, whose "First Baptist Church," is depicted by Cone's hand on the border of Poppleton's Map [*Figure 17*].

Cone's illustrations for Poppleton's Map appear to make use only of line engraving. Shade and shadow is provided by cross-hatching, and material effects are limited to the suggestion of masonry coursing by fine, horizontal hatching [*Figure 44*]. Cone's pictures demonstrate close attention to detail, but those details can prove to be incorrect upon comparison with extant buildings. A common occurrence is the omission of columns or of other repeated building elements, perhaps in order to simplify the compositions due to the small size of each engraved picture. In Cone's depiction of Godefroy's St. Mary's Chapel, for instance, the niches at the top of the facade number eight [*Figure 43*]; in real life, they number twelve. The direction of shading, too, reflects convention and not the physical orientation of the building. Nevertheless, as these examples attest, Cone's engravings provided a wealth of small-scale information about his architectural subject matter.

### **Baltimore's Landmarks**

In deciding upon these pictures' inclusion on this plan for the City's future, the map's creators sought to announce how far Baltimore had come towards its potential as one of the Union's largest and most industrious cities. In this first edition of Poppleton's map, thirty-five buildings were illustrated in addition to the two monuments. These buildings, and their letter-key, are titled in the following way:

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

#### **Letter Key for Map Images**

A *	Museum	B *	Assembly Rooms	C *	Hospital
D *	Court House	E *	Union Bank	F *	Exchange, Custom House &c.
G *	Commercial & Farmers Bank	H *	University of Maryland	I *	Alms House
K *	Masonic Hall	L *	Theatre		
A	Cathedral	B	St. Paul's	C	First Baptist Church
D	St. John's	E	Christ Church	F	Germn. Luthn. Church
G	St. Mary's Chapel	H	Friends Meeting House	I	Eutaw Meeting
K	Western Fountain	L	Centre Fountain	M	Penitentiary
N	First Independent Church	O	Germn. Reformed Church	P	Evangl. Reformed Church
Q	Associate Refd. Church	R	St. Patrick's	S	Trinity Church
T	First Presbyterian Church	V	Second Presbyterian Church	W	Light Street Meeting
X	Eastern Fountain	Y	Northern Fountain	Z	Jail

Entries A\* through L\* are placed at the top of sheet, in a row from left to right. Entries A through M descend vertically on the left side of the sheet; N through Z descend vertically on the right side of the sheet.

This arrangement is itself worth noting, since the buildings appear to have been grouped thematically. Those buildings placed at the top of the sheet were exclusively secular and were places of culture, society, commerce, and charity. Those buildings illustrated along the sides of the sheet were religious in nature, with the apparent exceptions of two buildings used for incarceration and of four public water fountains. Nevertheless, the overall distribution of the buildings' functions was as follows:

#### **Illustrated Buildings by Function**

<b>Monuments</b>	2	
<b>Churches</b>	18	
<b>Museum</b>	1	
<b>Civic Buildings</b>	2	(Courthouse and Assembly Building)
<b>Hospital</b>	2	(Hospital and Medical Teaching Structure)
<b>Commercial</b>	3	(Banks and the Exchange / Custom House)
<b>Fountain</b>	4	(Public Water Supplies)
<b>Alms House</b>	1	
<b>Social/Entertainment</b>	2	(Masonic Hall and Theater)
<b>Jail</b>	2	
<b><u>Total</u></b>	<b><u>37</u></b>	<i>(Including Monuments)</i>

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

Almost *one-half* of those structures illustrated were, therefore, religious buildings. Examples of these included Latrobe's prominent Cathedral [*Figure 15*] and Mills' First Baptist Church [*Figure 17*], both of which were either just completed or under construction at the time of the map's publication. Maximillian Godefroy's talents were shown in two ecclesiastical projects: St. Mary's Chapel [*Figure 21*] and his later First Independent (Unitarian) Church [*Figure 27*]. Older places of worship were included, too, such as the Evangelical Reformed Church [*Figure 29*] and the Friends Meeting House [*Figure 22*], both dating to the 1780's. Among the churches pre-dating Baltimore's incorporation, the most prominent was undoubtedly Dalrymple's First Presbyterian Church [*Figure 33*], the two domed towers of which announced its distinction among Baltimore's churches at that time.

Other buildings illustrated were distributed evenly among other public functions. The two Monuments [*Figures 39 and 40*] were unique expressions of that time's conception of public display, commemoration and monumentality.<sup>23</sup> And, furthermore, the map's implicit proposition that other secular buildings might perform a similar role marks a change from the expectations of the period preceding the Federal-period<sup>24</sup>.

Consider the Penitentiary and the Jail, both depicted on Poppleton's map [*Figures 26 and 38*]. Although physically located on adjacent plots on a single, large city block to the east of the Jones Falls, their illustrations were separated by the full width of the sheet, with the Jail on the right margin and the Penitentiary on the left. Each of these pictures was placed at the bottom of a vertical array otherwise showing religious buildings; such a placement implied, perhaps, that the instruments of punishment and reform were to have some spiritual kindred with the organized institutions of salvation.

The Jail was completed in 1802 by R. C. Long, Sr., with the aid and advice of Colonel Nicholas Rogers, an amateur architect of considerable wealth and political standing<sup>25</sup>. As illustrated on Poppleton's map, the Jail's design included architectural details apparently thought to be "suitable" for its purpose, such as thin windows and smaller round apertures, which recall defensive structures, as well as crenellation at the building's flanks [*Figure 45*], pointing towards the adoption of Tudor motifs for the jail's reconstruction almost 60 years later. It is



## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

worth comparing these decorative eccentricities to the serious monumentality of Latrobe's prison for Virginia, completed two years before Baltimore's Jail.<sup>26</sup> In fact, Latrobe's design lacks decorative "expressiveness" over most of the area of his facade, and instead allows the Penitentiary gate alone to bear both the decor and proportion of a monumental structure [*Figure 46*]. Obviously, the two buildings could hardly be more different, if only because Long (and Rogers) had neither the training nor experience at that time to match Latrobe's intellectual and professional capacities. But both Long's and Latrobe's designs *did* share the premise that even a prison structure might participate in what Dell Upton has called the "cultural landscape."<sup>27</sup>

On the other hand, the design of Baltimore's Penitentiary, completed almost a decade later, seemed to hearken back to earlier — and lesser — expectations. Its builder, Daniel Conn, has been described as "typical of the group of carpenters... [whose] designs had little or no architectural value."<sup>28</sup> But contemporaries of the Penitentiary's construction were eager to see in its walls "that monument which the State has erected to its humanity and wisdom,"<sup>29</sup> and such comments testify, too, to the reason for its inclusion upon Poppleton's Map. Public architecture was less defined by *architecture*, per se, than by its public *acknowledgement*, which itself might depend on either prominent memories or prominent actions. So soon after the city's incorporation, almost any new institution could have claimed such prominence. So as a visual expression of public morality, Conn's Penitentiary might have "spoken" hardly at all, but the very fact of its commission was more than sufficient to assure its inclusion among Baltimore's most significant buildings.

This "ritualistic" understanding of how a community might construct a kind of civic-mindedness, embodied in its architecture, is underscored by the map's most striking omission: Fort McHenry. To be sure, Fort McHenry appears on the map's plan, but its location is neither listed on the numerical legend nor illustrated as an "embellishment" of the City. A place, in and of itself, simply was of little immediate significance to municipal Baltimore's newly-defined identity. Instead, that identity came to be defined reciprocally by the memory of that place *and by its commemoration*. Not surprisingly, it is a monument to a battle — and not that battle's *location* — which was so prominent among this map's features.

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

The drawing of the Battle Monument [Figure 40] was placed at the lower left side of the sheet, just below the map's dedication. Its illustration included, too, an additional description: "Erected in Commemoration of those, who fell in defense of this City, on the 12th of Sept. 1814 at the Battle of North Point, and on 13th. at the Bombardment of Fort McHenry." Forty-two names, in two columns, flank the picture of the Battle Monument, below which is recalled the act of dedication: "The Corner stone of which was laid at the Solemnity of the 12th. September 1815. / Estimated Cost \$10,000." Although the mention of cost together with a "solemnity" might seem bathetic today, the Monument's design and dedication (and its underwriting and erection) were the galvanizing civic acts of its day — more so, perhaps, than the battle itself. By 1827, only four years after the Monument's inclusion on Poppleton's map, Baltimore City placed the image of the Battle Monument on its municipal insignia, where it remains.

## **The Architecture of Baltimore's Public Buildings**

As conceived and executed by Joseph Cone, the images of Baltimore's public buildings share several characteristics. Almost all the depicted structures are illustrated as stand-alone buildings, set in verdant surroundings. (The single exception, the Centre Fountain, although shown in isolation, is set not upon the earth, or among plantings, but upon a paved surface [Figure 25].) In fact, as their location on the map indicates, many of these buildings were located in densely-settled parts of Baltimore. So although drawing the buildings without their actual context may have served to accentuate each building and its design, doing so also betrayed an implicit assumption that the urban spaces exterior to structures were not, in themselves, desirable or otherwise honorific public spaces.

Most buildings, too, were shown in perspective. Only four structures were shown in elevation. These included the Museum, the Masonic Hall, and the Theatre [Figures 4, 13, & 14], the designs of which favored their street-side facades. The Centre Fountain, mentioned before, was also shown front-on, perhaps due to its small size. On the other hand, Latrobe's Cathedral, although drawn in perspective like most other buildings, was illustrated by a *rear* view, looking towards both east and south sides of a building still unfinished at the time of the map's

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

publication. Indeed, the domed towers and the portico, elements which had been already conceived and drawn by Latrobe but which were added only in 1831 and 1863, respectively, are not shown.

Cone's engravings appear, in retrospect, to have acknowledged a diversity of styles in Baltimore's public architecture. Writers have mentioned the tendency towards classicism in the detailing of those buildings shown on the map,<sup>30</sup> and to be sure the influence of such talented designers such as Latrobe, Mills, and Godefroy would have encouraged that tendency also in others. But the details of that classicism are hardly visually dominant among these images. Instead, taken together, the buildings shown illustrate extensive *contrasts* due to different massing, scales, and formal typologies. At a glance, no two buildings on Poppleton's map look similar; furthermore, upon a second look, only the older churches shown tend to share fundamental architectural features.

Such diversity attests to that period's cultural growth and exploration, typical of provincial cities yet to have developed local institutions able to determine the direction of art and industry. For instance, in European cities with longer histories, such institutions would typically have already included professional communities, from which a legacy of knowledge and practice could have been drawn. Not surprisingly, Poppleton's map also testifies to the difficulties of recognition that trained architects -- lacking both institutional support and popular understanding - might have faced.

### **Matters of Attribution**

The listing of architects' names alongside the map's images is certainly significant. The profession of architecture, as such, was new at that time in the United States, and practitioners such as Latrobe — who brought English professional values to cities such as Baltimore and Philadelphia — and his student Mills bemoaned constantly the poor status of their own position.<sup>31</sup> At the very least, these architects sought credit for the conceptual and intellectual content of their work, distinguished from the technical and even manual aspects of construction.

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

So for Poppleton's Map to use so prominently the term "architect" — and not "builder" or "surveyor" or "constructor" — reflects a measure of the progress towards those professionals' goals but suggests, too, their continued conflation with older and more common ideas about producing buildings.

The "Architects" listed by the Map of Baltimore were, for the most part, those carpenters and masons who may have been primarily responsible for the material construction of the work. Nevertheless, the title even then denoted (and connoted) responsibility for the plans, spaces, and ornament of buildings<sup>32</sup>, whether or not that responsibility also included supervision of construction. What is especially interesting is the intersection of these technical matters with wider responsibilities derived from financial and political activity. In a sense, attribution as "architect" was also social promotion, with the promise of future commissions, political involvement, and financial gain.

Some buildings' attribution to Robert Cary Long, Sr., for instance, may have been particularly sensitive in this regard. The list of buildings to which Long contributed both as builder and designer is perhaps the longest of any of his contemporaries; and his important role among Baltimore's rising "business class" after 1800 included participation upon committees whose charge often included the award of building commissions.<sup>33</sup> Yet city directories listed his professional title as that of a "carpenter" up to 1823. In her chapter on Long's work as one of Baltimore's early architects, Claire Eckles notes that only "(a)fter 1824 he was called an architect or 'architectist', and in 1831 and 1833 engineer was added to his listing."<sup>34</sup>

Poppleton's Map credits to "R.C. Long Archt." eight of the thirty-five illustrated buildings — almost a quarter of Baltimore's most significant structures up to 1823. These buildings include the following:

A *	Museum	B *	Assembly Rooms	E *	Union Bank
H *	University of Maryland	I *	Alms House	L *	Theatre
B	St. Paul's	Z	Jail		

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

Long's participation in the construction of all of these buildings has not been contested, but the extent to which he conceived the *design* of those building attributed to him is unclear. In a sense, whose role was *excluded* may be equally of note. For instance, Sharf, in his *Chronicles of Baltimore*, writes that Long and other built the Assembly Rooms [Figure 5] at Nicholas Rogers' direction<sup>35</sup>. Griffith, in his earlier *Annals of Baltimore*, does the same<sup>36</sup>. As indicated above, Long's relationship to Rogers extended to their work on the Jail. Yet the credit on Poppleton's Map for both structures is to Long alone.

Long's independence as a designer, rather than as a builder, was established first with his Union Bank [Figure 8], built circa 1807. (Atypically, no date is given on Poppleton's map.) Called by one writer "a peerless masterpiece of restrained Federal styling,"<sup>37</sup> Long's work on this bank, and the accolades given to it by its contemporaries, shows how for the first time in Baltimore commercial buildings sought to rise to the level to which only churches and government buildings had risen. Of the other buildings shown on the map, Peale's Museum, the Holliday Street Theater, and St. Paul's Church [Figures 4, 14, and 16] are still today credited to Long alone. But Long's sole responsibility for the design titled "University of Maryland" [Figure 11], known today as Davidge Hall, has been contested based on existing letters by Latrobe to Godefroy, who was originally contacted about the design<sup>38</sup>. The structure listed as the "centre building" of the "Alms House," [Figure 12, left-hand side] which was originally known as Calverton Mansion and which was credited to Long on Poppleton's map, has been credited to the French architect Joseph Jacques Ramée on the basis of the structure's unique plan, its figurative sculpture, and Ramée's extant drawings for the landscaping of the estate<sup>39</sup>. In these buildings, others' contribution to their design -- that is, their *architectural* contribution -- seems to have remained less important for the authors of Poppleton's map than Long's work towards their construction.

Long's projects were not the only ones with incomplete or inaccurate attributions. The story of Maximilian Godefroy's involvement with the Custom House, Exchange, &c., [Figure 9] attributed solely to Latrobe on Poppleton's map, has been well documented<sup>40</sup>. Another building for which Godefroy's contribution was omitted from the map was the Masonic Hall [Figure 13]. J. (Jacob) Small, Jr., is listed as the architect. The commission was originally awarded to

## **A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore**

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

Godefroy. But after the death of Godefroy's father-in-law, who was the Catholic architect's liaison to the anti-papist Masons, and after a lengthy interruption caused by the War of 1812, Small Jr. assumed control of the project and reconceived the facade to include the additional story visible in the map's illustration. Godefroy's original design, to which an extant engraving attests, nevertheless remained intact and visible in the final building<sup>41</sup>. But the credit for the building's design went to Small, Jr.

### **Poppleton's Progeny**

Later maps of Baltimore incorporated, by necessity, Poppleton's plan for future roads as illustrated for the first time in 1823. The influence of Poppleton's map extended as well to the burgeoning market for "birds-eye" depictions of Baltimore. And although the decorative arts may have been one of the original influences upon the map's creators, a reciprocal influence reached all the way to Great Britain, where ceramics manufactured for the American market bore imagery drawn directly from Poppleton's map<sup>42</sup> [*Figure 42B*].

Nevertheless, the types of buildings and the character of the architecture thereby promoted changed considerably over the succeeding years. These changes were already apparent in maps and views of the 1840s, during which more and more commercial structures replaced religious buildings among those depicted. No better example of the declining significance of ecclesiastical buildings is Poppleton's map itself, re-designed and re-published in 1852 by Isaac Simmons<sup>43</sup>. In many ways, the graphic character of the map's first edition was preserved. The vignettes, even when revised to show changes or corrections, were still line etchings set within rosettes of text -- already a kind of nostalgic conceit in the new era of photography and photolithography. To illustrate the Baltimore of 1852, however, eight buildings were removed from the map's perimeter, and six new buildings were added. Those omitted included the Assembly Rooms, Centre and Northern Fountains, Godefroy's Commercial and Farmers Bank, and four churches: 2nd Presbyterian, St. Patrick's, Christ Church, and the Eutaw Meeting House. Revisions to those images retained from the 1823 edition included redrawing the Cathedral to show the towers;

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

redrawing St. Johns church; changing the Museum's designation to reflect its role as Baltimore's City Hall; and changing the attribution for Godefroy's St. Mary's Chapel to none other than Robert Cary Long<sup>44</sup>. Of the six buildings added to the 1852 edition, *not one was a religious building*. The new buildings were titled on the map "Athenaeum," "Aged Women's Home," "House of Refuge," "High School," "Mercantile Institute, and "Sun Iron Building." The inclusion of Bogardus' Sun Iron Building -- a new type of industrial building fabricated by a new kind of construction technique -- reflected the encroachment of speculative commerce upon the high-mindedness Baltimore's famous institutions.

But by the time of the Poppleton map's reissue in 1852, printed views of cities had become extraordinarily popular throughout the United States. Most of these depicted "birds-eye" scenes, as though the view had been drawn from a perspective elevated high above ground level<sup>45</sup>. What is striking is that so many of these publications also included miniature vignettes of city buildings, either drawn or -- already by the 1850's -- derived from photographs. Baltimore-based printers such as E. Sachse and Co. did so even when depicting cities elsewhere in the United States<sup>46</sup>. But, echoing changes already seen in Baltimore, the included buildings typically expressed little, if any, public-oriented ethos. Rather, publishers often sold buildings' inclusion among the vignettes as advertising for commercial interests<sup>47</sup>.

During these years, the city which had adopted Poppleton's plan grew geographically. Railroads had enhanced Baltimore's opportunities for commerce, and other technologies had allowed new urban neighborhoods to grow well beyond the boundaries defined in 1816. Baltimore was poised, once again, for another expansion into the adjacent county. Baltimore's architecture, too, included both new types of buildings and new *scales* of buildings, exemplified by the mills and factories clamoring for the public's attention. Yet even as late as 1872, new maps of Baltimore continued to honor, if only implicitly, the memory of Poppleton's presentation. One example, published in 1872 by F. Klemm and based on a survey by Simon Martenet, proposed to Baltimoreans a different plan for their city's future [*Figure 47*]. Titled "Baltimore and the Proposed Extensions of the City Limits," this map showed the 1817 municipal boundaries, but added considerable area to illustrate the scope of those proposed extensions. Large public parks

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

also appeared on Klemm's map, reflecting the city government's increased commitment to recreation and public welfare. But just as in Poppleton's day, this map was surrounded by a constellation of vignettes.

What, according to Klemm and his collaborators, were Baltimore's prominent buildings in 1872? The Battle Monument remained, along with Washington's, but these two relics of the Federal-period were lost among a miscellaneous host of Victorian-era buildings [*Figure 48*]. The Battle Monument was placed between the Maryland Institute and Joshua Horner's Chemical supply depot; Washington's next to an oyster packing facility. The two memorials and the subjects of their commemoration appear to have been overwhelmed by the vitality of Baltimore's commercial culture.

Fifty years later – and more than a century after the original publication of Poppleton's map – both nostalgia and bathos were joined once more in Letitia Stockett's affectionate, yet satiric, essay about Baltimore's history:

Would you know about Baltimore? Then put deliberately out of your mind the fact that the town makes more straw hats than any other city in the world. Aesthetically speaking, that is a fearsome thought. Forget, too, that Baltimore is the centre of the oyster packing industry. Worse, far worse than a straw hat is a packed oyster; Baltimoreans ought to know better. In truth they do...<sup>48</sup>

Or perhaps, by the time Stockett wrote, they actually didn't.

Looking closely at Poppleton's map has suggested that, for the men who commissioned Washington's monument, the corporate act of memory was unique, determinative, and embodied in both physical monument and its representation. But representation does not ensure *preservation*, whether among actual stones or those stones' own perceived meanings. We depend today upon artifacts like Poppleton's map, over a span of almost two centuries, to attest to those meanings.



## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

#### Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Ed Love for his comments and suggestions during the writing of this essay.

#### References

---

<sup>1</sup> Papenfuse, E., and Coale, J., *The Maryland State Archives: Atlas of Historical Maps of Maryland 1608-1908*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), p167.

<sup>2</sup> The influence of the Poppleton Plan is mentioned in most histories of Baltimore; for a recent example, see Olson, *Baltimore: The Building of an American City*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), p. 79 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Examples can be found in Hayward and Shivers Jr., eds., *The Architecture of Baltimore: An Illustrated History*,(Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), p. 21, p.75, p.78.

<sup>4</sup> Francus, Joseph, "Notes to 'Survey of Baltimore by Poppleton'," no date, MS 2977, Box 1, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore.

<sup>5</sup> Richard Cox, unpublished manuscript, cited in Papenfuse and Coale, p.167.

<sup>6</sup> Poppleton, T.H., "Contract and explanation of Surveying Methods to be used..." dated May 20th, 1811, MSA SC 5087-1-1-1/7 (Illustrated as Figure 146e in Papenfuse and Coale).

<sup>7</sup> Poppleton, T.H., "An Eye Sketch of Part of the Town and Environs of Baltimore taken without regard to accuracy," (Baltimore : 1812) 171/4x 11 5/8: 1 map; hand drawn on paper; matted. WOP 20x24: 1812 BCLM CA 2417. Box 22.

<sup>8</sup> Arnold, Joseph L., "Suburban Growth and Municipal Annexation in Baltimore, 1745-1918," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 73, No. 2 (June, 1978), pp. 111.

<sup>9</sup> Townsend, J. et al, "A misunderstanding to an unpleasant extent..." *The Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser*, Thursday March 28, 1822, p. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Poppleton, T. H., "Communicated: The public attention having been lately attracted to the Plats..." *The Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Advertiser*, Saturday April 6, 1822, p. 2.

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

---

<sup>13</sup> For perspective on the consequences of excluding topography from Poppleton's plan, see Olson, op. cit., p. 58.

<sup>14</sup> Varle, Charles, *Warner & Hanna's Plan of the City and Environs of Baltimore*, (Baltimore: 1801), 72.5 x 51 cm.

<sup>15</sup> Elder, Willam V., *Baltimore Painted Furniture 1800-1840* (Baltimore: Baltimore Museum of Art, 1972); see examples on pp. 22- 27.

<sup>16</sup> Here is inserted the seal of Baltimore City at that time [*Figure 42*]. *An allegorical figure carries in one hand a wand and Phrygian cap (symbolizing "freedom"); and in the other the scales of justice. Behind this figure, to her left, appears a monstrous figure, of apparently nautical origin.* (The current seal, displaying Godefroy's Battle Monument, was adopted only in 1827.)

<sup>17</sup> Opitz, Glenn, ed., *Mantel Fielding's Dictionary of American Painters, Sculptors, & Engravers* (Poughkeepsie: Apollo Book, 1986), p.378.

<sup>18</sup> Paxton, J. A., and Strickland, W., *To the citizens of Philadelphia, this new plan of the city and its environs, taken from actual survey is respectfully dedicated by their humble servt.* (Philadelphia: Charles Peter Harrison, 1811); map held by the New York Public Library.

<sup>19</sup> "Rev. Joseph Cone," *The Christian Index*, Saturday 12 February 1831; collected in Brantly, W.T., ed., *The Columbian Star and Christian Index*, (Philadelphia: Martin & Boden, 1831) Vol. 4, No. 7, p.112.

<sup>20</sup> Joseph Cone is mentioned in the biography of his brother, Spencer: Cone, E. W., *The Life of Spencer H. Cone*, (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 1857), p.243.

<sup>21</sup> Weitenkampf, F. *American Graphic Art*, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1912), p.103.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*, p. 77.

<sup>23</sup> See Miller, J. J., "The Designs for the Washington Monument in Baltimore," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Mar., 1964), pp. 19-28; and Alexander, Robert, "The Public Memorial and Godefroy's Battle Monument," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Mar., 1958), pp. 19-24.

<sup>24</sup> Burchard, J., and Bush-Brown, A., *The Architecture of America: A Social and Cultural History*, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1966), p.22.

<sup>25</sup> Alexander, R. "Nicholas Rogers, Gentleman-Architect of Baltimore," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 78, No. 2, 1983, pp. 85-105.

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

---

<sup>26</sup> Cohen, J., and Brownell, C., eds., *The Architectural Drawings of Benjamin Henry Latrobe*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994) Vol. 2: Part 1, pp. 98-112.

<sup>27</sup> Upton, D., "Architectural History or Landscape History?" *Journal of Architectural Education*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Aug., 1991), p. 198.

<sup>28</sup> Eckels, Claire Wittler, *Baltimore's Earliest Architects 1785-1820*, (Unpublished Dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, 1950), p. 32.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, p. 33.

<sup>30</sup> Rogers, C., "Classicism and Culture in Maryland, 1815-1845," in Weidman, G., and Goldsborough, J., eds., *Classical Maryland 1815-1845: Fine and Decorative Arts from the Golden Age*, (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1993), p. 14.

<sup>31</sup> One of many examples is contained in Latrobe's letter to Robert Mills, dated 12 July 1806, in which Latrobe offers advice concerning the professional conduct of an architect: Latrobe, in Van Horne, ed., *The Correspondence and Miscellaneous Papers of Benjamin Henry Latrobe, Vol. 2 1805-1810*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), p.239-244.

<sup>32</sup> Woods, M., *From Craft to Profession: The Craft of Architecture in 19th-Century America*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), p. \*\*.

<sup>33</sup> Eckels, op. cit., pp. 48-52.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid, p. 50.

<sup>35</sup> Scharf, J. T., *Chronicles of Baltimore*, (Baltimore: Turnbull Brothers, 1874), p. 283.

<sup>36</sup> Griffith, Thomas, *Annals of Baltimore*, (Baltimore: Woody, 1833), p. 160.

<sup>37</sup> Jones, Carleton, *Lost Baltimore: A Portfolio of Vanished Buildings*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), p. 59.

<sup>38</sup> Waite, D., "The Historical Portrait: An architectural study blurs the picture of who designed Davidge Hall," *The Bulletin* (University of Maryland Medical School), Volume 81, No. 3, Winter 1996-1997.

<sup>39</sup> Norton, P., "The Architect of Calverton," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, Vol. 76, No. \*, 1981, pp. 113-123.

<sup>40</sup> Cohen, J., and Brownell, C., eds., *The Architectural Drawings of Benjamin Henry Latrobe*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994) Vol. 2: Part 2, pp. 637-661 ; see also Reinberger, M., *The Baltimore Exchange and its Place in the Career of Benjamin Henry Latrobe*, (Unpublished

## A Closer Look at Poppleton's Map of Baltimore

### *Thirty-Seven Vignettes of a City's Self-Image*

---

Dissertation, Cornell University, 1988), pp. 15-41.

<sup>41</sup> Alexander, Robert L., *The Architecture of Maximillian Godefroy*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), pp. 82-84.

<sup>42</sup> McCauley, Lois, *Maryland Historical Prints 1752-1889*, (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1975), p. 15.

<sup>43</sup> "This Plan of the City of Baltimore as enlarged & laid out by T.H. Poppleton...corrected to 1851 with a survey of its Environs and Canton," (Baltimore: Isaac Simmons, 1851).

<sup>44</sup> The change reflects another complication in attribution on Poppleton's Map: Similar names across generations. Although Godefroy was the Chapel's original architect in 1806, and although images on both 1823 and 1852 editions of the map show the building as originally constructed, Robert Cary Long *Junior* did complete Godefroy's design (slightly modified) for a tower around 1840.

<sup>45</sup> Reps, John, *Views and Viewmakers of Urban America* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1984), p. 3.

<sup>46</sup> See "Indianapolis, Indiana, 1854," illustrated in Reps, p. 106.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 53-54.

<sup>48</sup> Stockett, Letitia, *Baltimore: A Not Too Serious History*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), p. 3.