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ABSTRACT

This thesis assesses the ways in which gentility served as a catalyst for the creation of a new masculine identity during the early American republic: the Republican Gentleman. In particular, I utilize taverns in Richmond, Virginia from 1780 to 1820, in which to understand the significance of gentility. This thesis analyzes how Richmond taverns represented the growth of gentility through refined architecture and its male patrons. It discusses how taverns, as predominantly male spaces, allowed for the expression of the Republican Gentleman’s masculine identity. The guiding research question for this thesis is how refined Richmond taverns illustrated the prominence of gentility, and thus provided a stage for the performance of the Republican Gentleman during the early national period. Furthermore, this research is informed by the following secondary research questions: In what ways did gentility and republicanism shape masculine identities? How did evolving ideas of gentility and refinement shape physical tavern space and architecture? The broader significance of this thesis is to offer an avenue in which to further develop scholars’ understanding of the intersection of masculinity, class, and gentility during the early national period.
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Introduction

After becoming Virginia’s capital, in 1779, the city of Richmond grew during the early national period to represent fame and prominence. Richmond’s distinction as an important city was undoubtedly aided by visits from notable men, including George Washington and Frenchman Marquis de Lafayette. The places utilized to accommodate and entertain these elite male patrons, as well as the rest of its citizenry, became increasingly significant. Thus, Richmond taverns held a new, weighted meaning as the primary eating, drinking, lodging, and meeting facilities for these men.

During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, taverns offered essential public spaces within American cities and communities as they housed an arena where personal needs, such as food, drink, and lodging, were satisfied. Additionally, taverns promoted social interactions including the dissemination of news, gambling, political discussion, and business transactions. However, despite classifications as “public” houses, taverns represented the illusion of inclusion, and illuminated a hierarchical world in the early national period largely due to the growth and influence of gentility. Richard Bushman describes gentility as a form of heightened self-awareness in which people became increasingly concerned with how they presented themselves to others. Following the Revolution, gentility embraced the American middle class. Specifically for middle class men, gentility became a critical component to their masculine identity. Since a tavern’s location within a city, its architecture, and the accommodations it provided often alluded to the social and economic status of its male patrons,

---

2 Bushman, xvi.
they afforded middle class men the opportunity to appear genteel. This thesis analyzes how American taverns symbolized gentility and through differences in architecture, location, and class of patrons. Additionally, it assesses how taverns, as predominantly male spaces, may be used to interpret the intersection of class and the performance of masculinity between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

In order to conduct a more critical analysis of tavern culture, this study specifically focuses on taverns throughout Richmond, Virginia between 1780-1820, and their white, male patrons. Due to its physical size and diverse population, Richmond offers a platform to compare taverns throughout multiple communities and across classes. This thesis will assess differences in tavern architecture and accommodation in four communities, including Richmond Hill, Rocket’s Landing, Shockoe Valley, and Shockoe Hill.

Beginning in the colonial period and well into the early nineteenth century, taverns played a pivotal role within communities and men’s lives. To be sure, many taverns existed during the colonial period partly due to the fact that alcohol was one of the most common and safest forms of beverage. Although Americans typically drank milk and water, alcohol was less likely to possess harmful contaminants contained in water and did not spoil as readily as milk. Aside from the role of alcohol, Americans utilized tavern space for a variety of reasons, including courtroom proceedings, club meetings, general entertainment, and lodging.

---

3 Peter Clark, *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200 – 1830* (London: Longham, 1983). Most American taverns particularly adopted this tradition from their British counterparts. As scholars, such as Peter Clark, have observed, American public drinking houses most closely identified with British public houses in their function, prominence, and their suggested sense of hierarchy.

4 Specifically focusing on white men inevitably neglects a large portion of the population in the early national period. However, due to the scope of this study and the feasibility of acquiring primary sources directly addressing other groups, white men are the best option for research subjects. Further, Michael Kimmel asserts, “American men have no history.” As a result, this study seeks to provide a lens in which to understand men’s history in relation to class and masculine identity formation. See Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*, 2nd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 1.

Ultimately, taverns served as social gathering places for male patrons across a wide array of classes. Whether used for official meetings, public celebrations, or a place for military volunteers to meet, taverns held a special importance in Richmond during this time.

The early national period serves as a particularly provocative time to study the development of tavern culture due to emerging ideals associated with refinement and gentility. As discussed, gentility was crucial to how early Americans defined themselves and each other. Increasingly, Americans sought out ways in which to appear genteel. Ultimately, gentility affected the ways in which people dressed, talked, behaved, and their values.

After securing independence, emerging ideals associated with republicanism also influenced society and shaped the identities of white, adult men. Republicanism illustrated the importance of virtue, integrity, financial independence, patriarchal authority, and a commitment to the community and country as a whole. Middle class men sought to balance the incorporation of genteel values in their appearance with their performance of essential republican ideals. The combination of gentility and republican values resulted in a new masculine identity, the Republican Gentleman. As a traditionally masculine space, Richmond taverns provided a stage for the performance of the Republican Gentleman. As a result, activities and the public spaces that housed them became more upscale to meet new gentility standards. As taverns evolved to adhere to growing standards of gentility and refinement, they afforded a variety of both public and private rooms for the Republican Gentleman. Within these rooms, the Republican Gentleman performed his masculinity through heterosocial activities, such as balls and sideshow entertainments, men’s clubs and society meetings, and male sociability activities, such as toasting.

---

6 Bushman, 52.
The guiding research question for this thesis is how refined Richmond taverns illustrated the significance of gentility, and thus provided a stage for the performance of the Republican Gentleman during the early national period. Furthermore, this research is informed by the following secondary research questions: How did particular masculine identities influence which taverns men frequented? In what ways did gentility and republicanism shape masculine identities? How did evolving ideas of gentility and refinement shape physical tavern space and architecture? The broader significance of this project is to demonstrate how taverns provided a space for a new masculine identity of the Republican Gentleman.

**Literature Review**

In order to ground my research in the current scholarship, this thesis will engage with four central historiographical subject areas – drinking culture, gentility, gender, and space. Scholarship regarding drinking and its role in the community has evolved from a broad and often nostalgic narrative about tavern culture to more critical assessments relating to the ritual of drinking, and its role in defining communities and highlighting social hierarchies. Research on taverns and alcohol use from the colonial period to the early national period is undoubtedly extensive, as scholars have sought to understand the intricacies of alcohol use and the importance of taverns over time. Leading the discussion on the importance of taverns to early American social life is Alice Morse Earle’s *Stage Coach and Tavern Days*. In exhaustive detail, Earle positions taverns at the center of community life and emphasizes their development as a crucial setting for shared activities, including auctions, news exchange, and business transactions.\(^7\)

While Earle discusses tavern activities and culture broadly, Elise Lathrop’s encyclopedic *Early*  

---

*American Inns and Taverns* offers an understanding of public house nomenclature as she discusses the differences between ordinaries, taverns, and inns. Discussing multiple taverns in cities stretching across the eastern seaboard, Lathrop explains that terms, such as taverns, inns, and ordinaries were not synonymous but were indicative of their specific geographic location.⁸

Although Lathrop’s geographical distinctions are significant to scholars’ understanding of public drinking houses, her negligence in discussing social distinctions between these different structures cannot be overlooked. As Peter Clark argues in *The English Alehouse: A Social History 1200 – 1830*, English inns, taverns, and alehouses sequentially symbolized a hierarchy of public houses according to social and class differences.⁹ Clark explains, “While the landlord of the inn or tavern looked after the upper and middling class of society, it was the alehouse-keeper who ministered to the needs of the great mass of the populace – small farmers, craftsmen, artisans, laborers, servants, and the indigent.”¹⁰ Clark’s analysis of English public drinking houses lends itself to an interpretation of American public drinking houses as the prevalence of American inns, taverns, and ordinaries reflected English origins and traditions. Additionally, his study offers a framework in which to understand how tavern space exemplified social hierarchies, most specifically class.

Apart from where Americans drank, drinking practices and rituals continue to hold a weighted significance for a large portion of the scholarship relating to taverns. One of the most influential studies of early American drinking practices and behaviors is W. J. Rorabaugh’s *The Alcoholic Republic: An American Tradition*. In this work, Rorabaugh specifically studies

---

⁸ Elise Lathrop, *Early American Inns and Taverns* (New York: Tudor Pub. Co., 1935), viii. Particular to Virginia’s public houses, Lathrop notes that they were primarily referred to as “ordinaries.” However, according to public documentation in local Richmond newspapers and insurance assessments, the majority of Richmond public houses were referred to as “taverns.” As a result, for the purpose of this study, Richmond’s public drinking houses will be referred to as taverns, unless otherwise specified.


¹⁰ Clark, 15.
drinking patterns between 1790 and 1840, highlighting that “Americans between 1790 and 1830 drank more alcoholic beverages per capita then ever before or since.”11 Emphasizing how social scientists informed his study, Rorbaugh argues that “the association of particular patterns in the consumption of alcohol with certain social and psychological traits has led me to conclude that the United States in those years underwent such profound social and psychological change that a new national character emerged.”12 Although the methods and conclusions that Rorbaugh drew from this study have been questioned, his proposition that drinking habits affected the inner workings, ideologies, and character of early American society holds merit.13 Applicable to this study is Rorabaugh’s assertion that alcohol consumption resulted, at least in part, in a new national character. In a similar manner, the taverns that housed alcohol consumption represented a new national image through architectural accommodation and refinement.

The importance of taverns to the early national drinking culture, community, and classes is significant to this study. David W. Conroy assesses public drinking houses and their role within the community in his work, In Public Houses: Drink and the Revolution of Authority in Colonial Massachusetts. Building on other works, Conroy argues that taverns became


12 Rorabaugh, xi.

13 Similar to Rorabaugh and Clark’s work, Mark Lender and James Martin argue previous English traditions and customs shaped early Americans’ views toward alcohol. Although much of their work focuses on the prohibition and temperance movement, Lender and Martin address alcohol’s role in the community and its prominence in various gatherings, including weddings, baptisms, militia musters, and funerals. Additionally, they address the necessity of taverns for patrons’ needs, including food, drink, lodging, and public discourse. For more information, see Mark E. Lender and James Kirby Martin, Drinking in America: A History (New York: Free Press, 1987).
significant meeting places for all social groups prior and during the American Revolution. As a result, Conroy hints at how the tavern created a vital public culture and space where many different people could interact and intermingle with each other. However, while taverns offered a space for men to interact, Conroy fails to fully acknowledge how taverns also acted as a space of social and class stratification. In contrast, Peter Thompson argues in *Rum, Punch, and Revolution: Taverngoing and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia* that class stratification developed within taverns. Thompson suggests that in colonial Philadelphia, men from different classes frequented the same houses. By the later half of the eighteenth century, however, “Philadelphia’s economy produced enduring divisions of wealth that became the basis of a class-based system of social stratification.” This stratification affected which specific classes interacted in taverns together. Thompson’s work is significant to this study, because it emphasizes how taverns were no longer representative of an egalitarian society or community, but were evolving as Americans became more stratified according to class. Building upon Thompson’s work, this thesis highlights how the structure and architecture of taverns by the late eighteenth century helped to accentuate these differences.

Tavern space was related to conceptions of class by the late eighteenth century. In discussing how physical space affected class distinctions, Jessica Kross focuses on elite houses

---


in “Mansions, Men, Women, and the Creation of Multiple Publics in the Eighteenth-Century British North America.” Although her analysis focuses on mansions, she explains that public houses, such as taverns and hotels, can be closely compared to her study. Kross explains that mansions were built to have “separate rooms where specialized social interactions took place and where the public part of the house could be segregated from the private.”

In these private rooms, Kross argues that the absence of both women and lower orders of society allowed for “the spatial construction of masculinity. Here “merry” or serious, men could be men.”

Expanding on Kross’ work, A.K. Sandoval-Strausz discusses the physical transformation of public houses from taverns to hotels in “A Public House for a New Republic: The Architecture of Accommodation of the American State, 1789-1809.” Sandoval-Strausz argues that a “rapid escalation in the architecture of accommodation reflected a transformation not only in the way American communities dealt with travelers but also in the way they organized their own social, economic, and political pursuits.”

As this transformation occurred, a new class of public houses developed in the United States. Further, Sandoval-Strausz argues, “The creation of elegant public spaces became important in an age when refinement in manners and material culture was the most commonly used refinement by which Americans demonstrated their own social standing and evaluated that of others.”

Gentility and refinement were crucial to early nineteenth century American society. During this period, ideas associated with gentility and refinement shaped both public and private

---

17 Kross, 401.
19 Sandoval-Strausz, 59.
20 Sandoval-Strausz, 61.
buildings, and the men who occupied them. As Bushman argues in *Refinement of America: Persons, Cities, Houses*, gentility and refinement were often more important in shaping how you were socially perceived than your wealth. Ultimately, Bushman argues that to be respected in society, one had to look and act the part. Although society sought to become more refined, as illustrated in newspapers that referred to men as “gentlemen,” it is unclear whether men who were not part of the elite were able to successfully make this refined transition. As Hannah Greig argues in ““All Together and All Distinct”: Public Sociability and Social Exclusivity in London’s Pleasure Gardens,” “Although mixed company of different social groups may have shared a space, elite accounts demonstrate that this by no means ensured a comparable experience. Social spaces could be trafficked in distinctive groups acting to confirm and consolidate divisions.” As this suggests, taverns and patrons transformed to accommodate popular ideas of gentility. However, this transformation did not always lend itself to bridging differences between distinctive social and class groups.

---


Due to the fact that taverns represented primarily male spaces, it is imperative to consider the significance of gender to this study. As scholars of gender describe it, including Joan Scott and Michael Kimmel, gender is a central component in men’s self-identification and provides meaning to the world around them. Thus, a man’s gender afforded him an avenue in which to understand tavern space. Particular to the early national period when gentility and image became increasingly important, men sought to emulate respectable classes and masculine identities. Toby Ditz’s “Shipwrecked; or, Masculinity Imperiled: Mercantile Representations of Failure and the Gendered Self in Eighteenth Century Philadelphia,” discusses civil inclusion and exclusion among elite Philadelphian merchants. As Ditz’s argument focuses on the correspondence of Philadelphia’s largest wholesale merchants, he chronicles how wealth allowed these men “albeit with difficulty, to “emulate, if not quite duplicate the lives of the lesser gentry of England.”

This can be compared with how men in the early national period emulated genteel behavior in order to be more highly regarded in society. As David Pugh discusses the formation of male identity in Sons of Liberty: The Masculine Mind in Nineteenth Century America, it was important for men to be able to define their masculinity in the company of other men. Pugh claims, “Today, as a century ago, men still seek to define their masculinity among other men and to vent the anxieties of another age toward women, heterosexuality, marriage, and anything that they believe to be effeminate and, therefore, a threat to manliness.”

---


club meetings within public houses offered men a venue in which to define their masculinity and class. As a result, this thesis articulates how refined tavern space and manners of gentility and refinement helped shape class and masculine identities in the new republic.

In addition to gentility, republicanism shaped masculine identities in the early national period. According to Sylvia Hoffert, the new American society defined the republicanism citizen in terms of white men who valued individualism and supported the idea that each person held the right to pursue any interest he wanted. Hoffert highlights some of the most important characteristics representative of the republican man, which included morality, financial independence, a solid work ethic, and a commitment to the broader community.26

Sources

Newspaper advertisements and Mutual Assurance Society fire insurance plans are two of the most important primary sources for this project. For all three chapters, specific Richmond newspapers utilized for this research include the Richmond and Manchester Advertiser, the Richmond Commercial Compiler, the Richmond Enquirer, the Virginia Argus, and the Virginia Patriot. Throughout these Richmond newspapers from 1780 to 1820, references to taverns are strikingly prevalent. Particular to Chapter Two, Richmond newspaper advertisements highlighted the size of taverns. Often, these advertisements indicated the types of rooms available in a specific tavern and the room dimensions. Specific to Chapter Three, newspaper advertisements included a variety of announcements related to men’s club and society meetings, as well as heterosocial entertainments. Additionally, many advertisements offered descriptions of toasts celebrated at Richmond’s most prominent taverns. As a result, the growth of tavern size and genteel accommodations can be assessed over time. Apart from newspapers, Mutual Assurance

Society fire insurance plans are specifically important to Chapter Two. From 1780 to 1820, these plans indicate the transformation of tavern space. Particularly, the growth of specific taverns can be tracked over time. Furthermore, these plans describe the materials, whether brick or wood, used for the construction of taverns. This is significant because of the weighted importance that came to be associated with using brick over wood for construction.

**Chapter Outline**

The first chapter begins by discussing the establishment of Richmond as Virginia’s new state capital. After becoming the new Virginia capital, Richmond gained greater prominence, which was reflected in its public drinking houses. As a result, the use, function, and importance of Richmond taverns are addressed. Further, taverns within each of Richmond’s four communities, Richmond Hill, Shockoe Valley, Shockoe Hill, and Rocket’s Landing, are discussed. This basic overview of taverns from the late colonial period to the early republic provides a foundation for understanding the importance of taverns to American cities and communities.

Chapter Two specifically illustrates and summarizes the appearance of Richmond taverns. In order to do this, the physical space of specific Richmond taverns is discussed through the aid of Mutual Assurance Society fire insurance plans. Along with addressing how tavern space grew, the materials used for the construction of new additions to previously existing taverns and newly constructed taverns is emphasized. Further the importance of architectural refinement to early nineteenth century America’s national image is a prominent theme woven throughout the chapter.

The final chapter investigates the manner in which the combination of gentility and refinement transformed Richmond taverns, and how these refined taverns provided a space for
the performance of the Republican Gentleman. What is essential to this chapter is explaining how gentility and republicanism produced the distinct masculine identity of the Republican Gentleman. Additionally, it assesses how the presence of public and private rooms in refined tavern space, afforded the Republican Gentleman the opportunity to perform his masculinity through heterosocial activities, like balls and sideshow entertainments, men’s clubs and societies, and male sociability rituals, most specifically toasting. Through evaluating the roles of gentility and republicanism in the creation of the Republican Gentleman’s identity, conclusions can be drawn in reference to the importance of taverns as spaces for the expression of masculine identities.
Chapter 1
Richmond, Alcohol, and Public Houses

“The position of Richmond is truly agreeable. The lower town, which is situated along the bank of James-River, lies between that river and a tolerably high hill; but the greater part of the houses – those indeed of almost every person who is not engaged in trade – are built on the hill, which commands a prospect of the river, and whence the view embraces at once the island formed by its waters, the extensive valley through which it flows, and the numerous falls by which its stream is broken.”

When Virginia’s capital moved to Richmond from Williamsburg in 1779, nothing about the location of the new capital beckoned fame or prominence. During the Revolutionary War, Richmond offered a strategic location for Virginia. As a result, many viewed it with respect, which only further grew through visits from celebrity like visitors, such as George Washington and Marquis de Lafayette. Once Richmond represented a notable and respected destination, it became increasingly important for it to provide public spaces to accommodate its prominent male patrons. Thus, the growth of Richmond’s public houses, commonly referred to as taverns, inns, and ordinaries, was important to the city between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Ultimately, Richmond’s taverns, inns, and ordinaries provided a socially acceptable stage for men to drink and interact with one another.

The New Capital

Decision makers chose to move Virginia’s capital to Richmond due to necessity and safety purposes. Previously, Williamsburg served as the state’s first capital. However, due to its position on the seaboard, the city was constantly exposed to potential enemies. As a result, in May 1779, the General Assembly, acting on the suggestion of Thomas Jefferson, decided to

---

move the capital to Richmond. Summarizing this need for removal, the “Act for the removal of the seat of Government” stated the following:

And it has also been found inconvenient, in the course of the present war, where seats of government have been situated as to be exposed to the insults and injuries of the public enemy, which dangers may be avoided and equal justice done to all the citizens of this Commonwealth by removing the seat of government to the town of Richmond in the County of Henrico, which is more safe & central than any other town situation on navigable water.  

Along with the removal of the capital, the Act called for a State House and Halls of Justice. Once the Assembly appointed a board of directors, including Jefferson as its leader, a group of men met at Hoggs Tavern in August 1779, and planned a temporary capital near the northwest corner of present-day Carey and Fourteenth Streets. The following year, lawmakers passed another act in order to enlarge Richmond.

Upon becoming the new state capital, Richmond’s appearance did not reflect its newfound prominence. Although relatively little is known about the town at this time, its appearance reflected crude and humble origins. In contrast to Williamsburg with its Palace Green, century old mansions, and fine shrubbery, Richmond was still considered a village. Most houses were one or two stories and made of wood, with shutters and chimneys made of wood and clay. A letter by Mrs. Edward Carrington in 1779 offers glimpse of what Richmond looked like during this period. She wrote, “It is indeed a lovely situation, and may at some future period be a great city, but at present it will afford scarce one comfort of life.” Mrs. Carrington’s description affirms the modest appearance of Richmond as she explained how it would provide “scarce one comfort of life.” Despite its appearance, Mrs. Carrington seemed to believe that Richmond had the potential to become a “great city” in the future.

---

Richmond’s appearance did not significantly change in the years immediately following Mrs. Carrington’s observations. Dr. Johann David Schopf (1752-1800), a former Hessian surgeon with the British army, made notes about the city as well. Passing through Richmond in 1783, during a grand tour of the United States, Dr. Schopf noted, “The houses of this town, a short time since of little consequence, are almost wholly of wood and scattered irregularly on two heights, divided by the Shokoes (sic), a small brook; the number of them is not large nor are they in themselves of a handsome appearance.” Like Mrs. Carrington, Dr. Schopf made notice of Richmond’s relatively humble beginnings as the state capital. To him, the most desirable physical feature of the town was its natural surroundings. Both Mrs. Carrington and Dr. Schopf’s observations demonstrate the importance of Richmond’s location, rather than its appearance. Although Richmond would significantly change and develop in appearance in the next decades, the town first needed to fundamentally establish itself as the capital of the nation’s largest state.

After the end of the Revolution, Richmond’s citizens began to move forward in building the city. In May 1782, the city of Richmond was chartered as the sixth in the Commonwealth. Once the charter and the city government were established and organized, Richmond’s importance grew significantly. As a result, city planners began tasks such as determining the street layout and digging public wells, with zeal. However, within the next two years, city planners accomplished little else regarding these tasks, with the exception of planning and

---

31 Johann David Schopf, Dr., ““Of Coaches There Were None”: A German Traveler Visits the Emerging City at the Falls (1783),” quoted in A Richmond Reader, 1733-1983, ed. Maurice Duke and Daniel P. Jordan (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983), 12.
32 Christian, 21.
organizing. Although Richmond was officially a city, it still resembled a village; similar to the way Mrs. Carrington described it in 1779.³³

Despite its initial lackluster appearance, as prominent figures made travels to Richmond, citizens increasingly recognized the importance of the city. For example, Richmond became the home of Jefferson after he succeeded Patrick Henry as governor.³⁴ Additionally, in 1784, Richmond received visits from both George Washington and Marquis de Lafayette, only three days apart. Although many in Richmond struggled following the end of the Revolutionary War, these visits provided a much-needed opportunity for celebration. Festive crowds, including Revolutionary officers and soldiers, the militia, officials of the state and town, and local citizens, escorted both Washington and Lafayette to public dinners at the Bell Tavern.³⁵ While the Legislature was in session during this time, it was decided that a committee of five members would be appointed to wait on each man. Specifically for Washington, the House required that the committee, “express to him the satisfaction they feel in the opportunity afforded by his presence of offering their tribute to his merits…” Further, the House called on the committee to “assure him that as they not only retain the most lasting impressions of the transcendent service rendered in his late public character, but have since his return to private life experienced proofs that no change of situation can turn his thoughts from the welfare of his country…”.³⁶ Mayor Robert Mitchell held a special meeting at his house later that same day in order to compose an address to Washington as the late Commander-in-chief of the American Army. The address articulated high regards for the esteemed leader. A small portion of it stated, “On seeing you, sir, in this city, we feel all that men can feel who are indebted to you for every social enjoyment…”

---

³³ Christian, 23.
³⁴ Stanard, 37-38.
³⁵ Christian, 23.
In addition, the address stated, “if the late illustrious leader of the Armies of America had not possessed but exercised every talent and every virtue which dignify the Hero and the Patriot, we might not at this day dared to speak the language of free-born citizens.”37 Although Washington’s speech, in response to this address, was not recorded, it has been noted that he thanked both the Assembly and the city for such generous remarks. Additionally, he wished Richmond a prosperous and grand future.

**Building Richmond**

Over the next decade, officials determined the actual space for the capitol. Shockoe Hill became the site of the permanent capitol. On August 17, 1784, a committee decided specifically what land would be designated for the new seat of government. The committee provided Thomas Newton Jr. and John Woodson one hundred and fifty four pounds apiece for their properties. Although some have contended that William Byrd provided the land for the capital, Byrd ultimately relinquished his Shockoe Hill property via a lottery before the capital was moved from Williamsburg. The Richmond Lodge of Masons, No. 13 laid the cornerstone of the capitol on August 18, 1785. This was a tremendously important event in the city’s history, and everyone in Richmond came to witness it.38

Originally, the directors of public buildings for the Commonwealth asked Jefferson, who was at the time serving as America’s minister to France, if he would assist in creating building plans for the capital and other various state buildings. James Buchanan and William Hay wrote to Jefferson on behalf of the matter, adding, “We have not laid down the ground, it being fully in your power to describe it, when we inform You that the Hill on which Gunns yellow house stands and which you favoured as the best situation…” Along with describing the property,

---

38 Christian, 27.
Buchanan and Hay conveyed the amount of funding that was available for the project to Jefferson. In reference to financial matters, they stated, “The Legislature have not limited us to any sum; nor can we, as yet at least, resolve to limit ourselves to a precise amount. But we wish to unite oeconomy with elegance and dignity. At present the only funds submitted to our order are nearly 10,000 pounds (sic) Virga. Currency.”39 The amount set aside for the construction of new capitol buildings demonstrates planners’ motivations to make Richmond a prominent city.

Recognizing the significance of how the new nation presented itself, Jefferson paved the way for the design of Richmond’s capitol buildings. Given only thirty days to respond, Jefferson ultimately missed his deadline. In turn, Jefferson wrote to James Madison about the matter, citing the deadline and the plans that he had for the architecture of these buildings. Jefferson chose to model the capitol building in particular on the Maison Carree, in Nimes, France. Describing the model to Madison, Jefferson wrote, “We took for our model what is called the Maison quarree of Mismes, one of the most beautiful, if not the most beautiful and precious morsel of architecture left us by antiquity.” Although Jefferson sought to mimic the beauty of France’s buildings, he understood the necessity for simplicity in presenting a national image. Jefferson further stated, “It is very simple, but it is noble beyond expression, and would have done honour to our country as presenting to travelers a morsel of taste in our infancy promising much for our maturerage.”40 Jefferson thus viewed Richmond’s capitol as more than a set of buildings. Instead, they offered a lens in which to assess Richmond’s present and future prominence.

As the leading voice calling for the capital to be moved to Richmond, Jefferson recognized the importance of transforming the city’s landscape, and quickly began making architectural suggestions to display Richmond’s prominence. Jefferson would later elaborate on the construction of a prison that would be attached to the capitol, and further articulated classic architectural styles from antiquity that influenced him. In regard to building the capitol, Jefferson wrote, “Thinking it a favorable opportunity to introduce into the State an example of architecture in the classic style of antiquity, and the Maison quarre of Nismes, an ancient Roman temple, being considered the most perfect model existing of what may be called cubic architecture…” Jefferson continued to describe the appearance of France’s buildings and how he believed this particular design of building could be applied to Richmond. In reference to this, he stated, “I applied to M. Clarissault, who had published drawings of the Antiquities of Nismes, to have me a model of the building made in stucco, only changing the order from Corinthian capitals to Ionic on account of the difficulty of the Corinthian capitals.” Along with the exterior appearance of the capitol buildings, Jefferson judged the interior space of these structures to be important as well. Jefferson described the creation of these rooms and stated, “To adapt the exterior to our use, I drew a plan for the interior, with apartments necessary for legislative, executive and judiciary purposes; and accommodated in their size and distribution to the form and dimensions of the building.”\(^{41}\) These specific rooms available for government meetings symbolized important space to the new capital.

When Jefferson finally sent the plans off, he wrote from Paris on January 28, 1786, that he encouraged the importance of Richmond’s image as the capital of one of the most influential states. Along with his plans, Jefferson wrote in an accompanying letter:

…I send by this conveyance designs for the Capitol. They are simple and sublime. More cannot be said. They are not the brat of a whimsical conception never before brought to light, but copied from the most precious the most perfect model of ancient architecture remaining on earth; one which has received the approbation of near 2000 years, and which is sufficiently remarkable to have been visited by all travelers. It will be less expensive too than the one begun.42

The importance that Jefferson, as well as others, placed on the appearance of Richmond’s capitol cannot be overstated. As the capital of the largest and one of the most important states in the union, it was imperative for Richmond to emulate Virginia’s status and position. Apart from depicting only Virginia, however, Richmond, along with other cities of the era, represented the nation as well. As a fledgling nation, lawmakers and government officials viewed the appearance of its cities as essential in communicating the nation’s potential both to its own citizens and abroad.

Once builders completed the construction of the capitol, it quickly became the center of all government activities. As a result, changes regarding its appearance occurred in due haste. The General Assembly met for the first time at the new capital on October 28, 1788. After a petition calling for a convention of the states to consider the defects of the new Constitution, representatives elected Richard Henry Lee and William Grayson as the first United States Senators from Virginia, under the new Constitution. Beverly Randolph became the new Governor, following Edmund Randolph’s resignation. October of this year also marked the first time Richmond was allowed a representative in the House of Delegates.43 Along with these strides in electing officeholders for the local and state governments, the appearance of Richmond changed dramatically from the musings of Mrs. Carrington and Dr. Schopf. By 1789, one who visited the city described the growth of private houses and the appearance of the new capitol
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buildings: “It contains about 300 houses. The new houses are well built. A large and elegant state-house or capitol has lately been erected on the hill. The lower part of the town is divided by a creek, over which there is a bridge, which for Virginia is elegant.” According to the visitor’s observation, Richmond’s citizens sought to construct houses that added to the beauty of the city as well.

While Richmond certainly underwent a transformation during the last decade of the eighteenth century it still bore the marks of a fledgling city. When John Tyler, a Virginia governor, reminisced about Richmond from his childhood, he stated, “I speak of Richmond as I first knew it, when, at the age of eighteen, I joined my venerated father, who was at the time Governor of Virginia. The population of the city did not exceed 5,000 in 1808.” In reference to Richmond’s appearance in 1808, Tyler professed, “The surface on which the city stood was untamed and unbroken. Almost inaccessible heights & deep ravines everywhere prevailed. The Capitol Square was venda indigesta que moles & was but rudely if at all inclosed.” Although the contrast between the anonymous traveler’s and John Tyler’s opinions is quite sharp, they demonstrate that Richmond was not static in the way people viewed it. Instead, it still represented a city in its early stages of growth.

During the next decade, Richmond experienced both growth and catastrophe, primarily brought on by fires and the War of 1812. By the end of this period, the census of 1820, indicated the Richmond boasted a population of 12,046, of which 6,407 were whites, 4,9393 slaves, and 1,266 free blacks. By 1810, Richmond’s population had increased to approximately 9,735 people. December 26, 1811, marked one of the most horrific events of the decade. On this night, a crowd of nearly six hundred people attended a new play entitled “The Father, or Family
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Feuds” at the Richmond Theatre. During the intermission, one of the young stagehands hesitantly raised a chandelier, as he was told, although it still contained a burning oil light. Unfortunately, the chandelier became stuck in the pulley, causing the remaining oil light to set fire to the stage. Within minutes, screaming men, women, and children rushed for the exits or found windows from which to jump. Thomas Jones, a lawyer and public servant of Accomack County recounted the fire to his brother on December 27, 1811. Jones reflected, “About half past ten o’clock several pieces of fire fell from the top of the Theatre down on the stage amongst the Actors and in an instant it was discovered that the whole house was enveloped in flames.” Jones elaborated on the magnitude associated with the terror of the scene and further wrote, “Then menaced a scene of horror and misery, than which one more tragical perhaps never happened.” Unfortunately, seventy-two people succumbed to the fire or were killed as they jumped from the theater’s windows. This event paralyzed the city as citizens were asked to keep businesses closed for the next forty-eight hours and a day of fasting and prayer was held.

Apart from the theater fire, President Madison declared war with Great Britain on June 18, 1812. As a result, Governor Barbour called for Virginia troops to respond, and Richmond’s men did readily. Meeting at the Bell Tavern, young men enlisted, forming the Rifle Volunteers, the Washington and Jefferson Artillery, the Light Infantry Mechanics, and the Riflemen. Holding a strategic position, Richmond offered the rendezvous location for traveling troops coming from the western part of the state to Hampton, Norfolk, and other places. As the war continued and the prices of merchandise continued to climb, Mayor Robert Greenhow issued a proclamation calling on citizens of Richmond to suppress war-induced speculation. As the war came to a close, Richmond rejoiced on February 1, 1815, when a grand federal salute was fired.
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as the mail arrived delivering news of General Andrew Jackson’s victory over Native American and British forces in New Orleans. Mayor Thomas Wilson, the head of Richmond’s government at this time, acted on a proclamation by the governor and called for a grand parade, requesting that all houses in the city be illuminated on March 1, 1815, to celebrate the return of peace.48

**The Importance of Taverns**

Taverns were important fixtures in early Richmond. Throughout the city, they performed a variety of social functions from the late colonial period to the early republic and served as one of the most important social, political, and economic institutions.49 Social historian, Ian Tyrell has noted the importance of public houses and taverns in their “service as a utility institution in a society lacking the complex structure of more specialized institutions.”50 During the colonial period, southern colonies, specifically, often lacked venues for churches, gentry gatherings, and other cultural products synonymous with Great Britain and New England. As a result, the activities, communication, and interaction that taverns offered connected southern localities to metropolitan culture.51

Additionally, taverns represented pivotal spaces of economic exchange and provided a space for business and news distribution.52 Newspapers charted tavern business over time.53 Daniel Beasley, the secretary of the Board of Directors of the Manchester Turnpike Company wrote, “By order of a Board of Directors of the Manchester Turnpike Company, I hereby notify the Share-holders of the said company, that they are requested to meet at Mr. Brooks’s tavern in
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Manchester, the 30th day of August next, to supply a vacancy in the Directory,” in Richmond’s Virginia Argus on July 31, 1802.54 Further, taverns provided space for many other community functions, including polling places, courtrooms, and post offices.55 Indicative of the significance of their predominantly male environment during the Revolution, men used taverns as meeting places for military training activities. Following the Revolution, men continued to meet here for the sociability and fraternization that these drinking houses provided.56

Along with their many functions, society referred to public houses with a multiplicity of different names. Tavern, inn, public house, tippling house, ordinary, and later hotel, are just a few names that these establishments used. Tippling houses were generally unlicensed public houses specializing in the sale of spirits.57 It is important to recognize that names, notably tavern, inn, and ordinary, which were most commonly used, were not interchangeable. Inn and tavern, for instance, distinguished between places that only served drink and those that served both drink and meals. Along with services, geographic location often determined the names of these public houses, as Elise Lathrop highlights in Early American Inns and Taverns. Lathrop notes that taverns were most frequently identified as New England and New York drinking houses. Inns were common in Pennsylvania. Finally, ordinaries were characterized as southern.58

In Virginia, ordinary was the name typically given to public houses, while elsewhere they were referred to as inns or taverns. Ordinaries were usually furnished with billiard tables and bowling alleys, and served as gambling sites. These ordinaries highlighted the centers of social
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and political life in Virginia. Demonstrating their significance, an English traveler by the name of Mrs. Wakefield observed:

“We can scarcely pass ten or twenty miles without seeing an ordinary. They all resemble each other, having a porch in front, the length of the house, almost covered with handbills. They have no sign. These Virginia taverns take their name from the person who keeps the house, who is often a man of consequence.”

Wakefield’s description illustrates the ambiguity of public house names. Within this short note, she defines Virginia public houses as both taverns and ordinaries. As a result, Lathrop’s geographic guide for determining the nomenclature of these public houses remains ambiguous at best. Although scholarship refers to public houses, across geographic regions and in general, as taverns, the definition of these institutions is not concrete. The *Oxford Universal Dictionary* defines taverns from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as “a public house or taproom where wine was retailed; a dram shop.” However, this definition did not begin to reflect the range of activities that occurred in taverns, including eating, drinking, smoking gaming, exchange of news and information, formal meetings, business transactions, banquets, and overnight accommodation of travelers. One of the best descriptions of the tavern era came from William Pope Dabney’s “Old Virginia Taverns,” which appeared in *The Times* of Richmond, Virginia on February 4, 1894. Dabney wrote:

“The tavern or ordinary, generally with a long porch occupying the whole length of the house, and situated on the side of all the main thoroughfares, was the prominent place in every neighborhood. There the country people met to hear the news, to talk politics, and to sell any farm supplies that they wished, for the ordinary had use for them all, and therefore was the home market for the district.”
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Mordecai and Richmond Taverns

Before the tavern, “ordinaries” and “tippling houses” served as the most common public houses of entertainment in early Richmond. However, once city planners selected the permanent site of the capitol on Shockoe Hill, a mad rush ensued to construct public houses, officially referred to as “taverns.” On Main Street, Dr. James Currie’s Eagle Tavern was the first to go up.62 Discussing Richmond’s taverns, Samuel Mordecai, one of the city’s first historians, recounted many of his memories from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in his work entitled Richmond in By-Gone Days. Born in New York City, Mordecai was brought to Richmond by his parents as an infant. Although he was not a professional historian, his writings indicate a sharp eye for detail.63 In this work, Mordecai highlighted a select number of taverns in Richmond. In reference to the Bird-in-the-Hand, Mordecai wrote, “The oldest public house in Richmond was “the Bird in hand” on Main street, at the foot of Church hill, lately a ruinous hovel, but now embellished with a new front of brick-bats.”64 In contrast to the Bird-in-the-Hand, Mordecai found the features of the City Tavern more refined: “A more modern, and a splendid house in its day, was the City Tavern, erected by Mr. Galt, of Williamsburg, and known as Galt’s Tavern.” Although “degraded to a workshop” at the time of his writing, Mordecai reminisced, “The smoke-stack has succeeded the smoke-jack, the table is displaced by the work-bench, and wheels, bands and pullies revolve where minuet, reels and congos were danced at a ball given in honor of George Washington.”65 Mordecai’s descriptions of Richmond’s taverns alluded to differences in size, prominence, location, and appearance. The particular appearance
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and character of a tavern determined in which Richmond district it resided. Richmond’s taverns were divided between four different districts: Richmond Hill, Rockett’s Landing, Shockoe Valley, and Shockoe Hill. Each held a specific history and indicated a unique style of tavern.

Richmond Hill

Proprietors erected Richmond Hill taverns near the James River on 21st Street, 22nd Street, and 23rd Street. Since these streets were not located in close proximity to Capitol Square, the taverns in this district represented simplicity in their appearance and design. (See Figure 1.1) Further, many were still termed ordinaries, rather than taverns. Richard Levins was the first ordinary-keeper in Richmond when he received his license in 1717, from Henrico County.  

One of the most popular taverns in Richmond Hill was Isaiah Isaac’s Bird in Hand. Isaiah Isaacs kept the tavern for most of its existence, although he did maintain a business partnership involving the Bird in Hand with Jacob I. Cohen until October 1792. In 1785, the tavern had all the necessary outbuildings and an enclosed garden. The sign on the door of the tavern illustrated a gentleman dressed in a black frock coat and top hat holding a bird in his upturned hand. The lettering beneath this image read, “A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.” Samuel Mordecai fondly remembered the tavern as well as its tavern-keepers. Referring to the establishment’s keepers, Mordecai wrote “The oldest in my day were old Burgess and his wife, round and rosy, of that ancientest of inns ‘The Bird in Hand,’ at the foot of Church Hill.”

Dr. Thomas P. Atkinson also mentioned the Bird in Hand when he published “Reminiscences” of his trips to Richmond in 1810, 1811, and 1812. In reference to the tavern’s location, Atkinson wrote, “I must not omit the old Bird-in-the-Hand Tavern, which was located on the north side of Main, and near where it corners with the street leading by St. John’s Church,
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on Church Hill.” Although Dr. Atkinson noted that a tavern was once defined as “a place where wine is sold and drinkers are entertained,” he acknowledged that this definition should be modified for the Bird in Hand. Dr. Atkinson stated, “If we were to substitute ‘ardent spirits’ for wine, ‘the Bird-in-the-Hand’ might be deemed to have been more deserving the name of tavern than of hotel or inn, as it was an establishment at whose bar drinkers ‘most did congregate.’”69 In its prime, the Bird in Hand was a highly venerated tavern where Richmond men frequently flocked.

Although Richmond Hill’s taverns primarily represented simplicity, Gabriel Galt’s tavern, known as both Galt’s Tavern as well as the Old City Tavern represented one of the most distinguished public houses in Richmond Hill. Out of all of Richmond Hill’s public houses, Galt’s Tavern was located in the closest proximity to Capitol Square. This location undoubtedly affected its appearance since taverns erected near the capitol often provided added conveniences to the distinguished men and political leaders who traveled here for business. Galt’s Tavern opened in 1775, and was known as “a commodious one with good stables, kitchen, smokehouse, dairy, corn-house and an excellent bake oven and bake house.” By the first decade of the nineteenth century, however, it became difficult for the Old City Tavern to compete with new taverns on Shockoe Hill, where the capitol was located.70

70 Gish, 100. Additionally, the construction of Dr. John Adams’ grand Union Hotel just across the street from the Old City Tavern impeded business.
Rockett’s Landing

Taverns in Rockett’s Landing were located even farther away from the capitol than those in Richmond Hill. Rockett’s Landing was known as “the lower landing” – where cargo was brought up from the James River by smaller watercraft.⁷² (See Figure 1.2) Gilly Gromarrin, according to the transcription of a Henrico county clerk, originally owned the land at Rockett’s Landing. Gromarrin was a merchant-seaman, possibly of French origin.⁷³
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Rockett’s Landing’s importance lay in its location as a port on the upper James. Any physical structure built on Rockett’s Landing risked flood damage due to its position on the river. During the great flood of 1771, for instance, nearly everything at Shockoes and Rockett’s Landing was destroyed. Although one writer observed, “There was land sufficiently high to build any kind of house out of danger from water [present Church Hill],” another promptly refuted this claim. The respondent found the first observer to be guilty of “fallacious thinking.” Further, the respondent stated, “The distance of the high land of Rocketts from the wharf, never yet could be made to stand.”

The dangers of destructive flooding likely accounts for the fact that only four taverns existed at Rockett’s landing: William Depriest’s Tavern, John Roper’s Tavern, William Pennock’s Tavern, and Lockley’s Tavern.

The earliest tavern at Rockett’s Landing was Roper’s tavern and store. The Hustings Court of the city of Richmond granted ordinary licenses to John Roper and Mary Taylor in 1782. Unfortunately, no other information is known about Mary Taylor other than this. Serving as both a tavern and store, Roper’s Tavern offered more than just alcohol to customers. In a January 1783 a *Virginia Gazette* advertisement, highlighted other items for sale, including “Jamaica and Grenada rum, brown sugar by the barrel, hyson, congo, and bohea tea; and various articles of dry goods; all at reasonable rates.”

By January 1799, David Bradley of Isle of Wright County, had taken ownership of Roper’s Tavern. John Roper died in 1793 from a smallpox epidemic, and ownership of the tavern remains a mystery between Roper’s death and Bradley’s assumption ownership. By 1799, Roper’s Tavern still served as part grocery store, and Bradley promised to sell his merchandise, “as the situation will enable him… on lower terms,
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than they can be purchased in the city.” As a tavern and store, Roper’s Tavern was an establishment of necessity, quite different from a public house of entertainment.

Shockoe Valley and Shockoe Hill

The districts of Shockoe Valley and Shockoe Hill lay in close proximity. Shockoe Hill, nevertheless, was specifically designated as Richmond’s capital. (See Figures 1.3 and 1.4) Originally, Shockoe Hill was referred to as “Indian Hill,” and was bound on the west by Shockoe Creek and on the east by the creek in Sorrel Bottom. The main public road in town ran through this area, past Rockett’s Landing to the Henrico Court House at Varina, and then to Williamsburg. When Thomson Mason elaborated on the area in a Virginia Gazette
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advertisement as he was trying to find a buyer for his tenement, he described Shockoe Hill as “on the north side of the falls of James River, with a number of convenient houses upon it, well adapted for either a merchant, tavern-keeper, or private Gentleman...”\textsuperscript{79}

In Shockoe Valley, the Rising Sun was a prominent tavern. The Rising Sun was the only tavern in Richmond above the falls of the James to enjoy an eastern exposure. Originally, it was known as Rawlings Tavern in honor of its owner, Robert Rawlings, from Portsmouth, Virginia. In 1787, Rawlings began his business in tavern keeping at the corner of what would later be known as Exchange Alley and Fourteenth Street. Although a great fire destroyed the tavern in January 1787, by September of that same year, Rawlings was able to open his tavern once again. Referring to this new construction in a newspaper advertisement, Rawlings described the tavern as “It is fitted to accommodate gentlemen with boarding, lodging, &c. and has accommodations equal to any Tavern in the City.”\textsuperscript{80}

By November 1794, the Rawlings Tavern was under the ownership of Casper Fleisher and was renamed the Rising Sun. Mordecai remembered both the Rising Sun and Fleisher well in his memory of Richmond. Mordecai wrote, “Caspar Fleisher and his wife were host and hostess of the Rising Sun – as round and as red as he, when seen through a fog – against the effect of which Caspar furnished an antidote.” Particularly in reference to the tavern, Mordecai commented, “His sun rose and shone for many years near the old Capitol, and on the spot now occupied by stores on Fourteenth street, north side of Exchange alley.”\textsuperscript{81}

Among the Shockoe Hill taverns, Richmond’s most celebrated house of public entertainment was the Eagle Tavern. Throughout it’s life, a host of tavern keepers operated the
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Eagle Tavern. James Currie, a young physician from Scotland, originally led construction of it. Over the years, the Eagle Tavern grew into a three storied brick building with elegant accommodations, including a ballroom, coffee room, multiple private rooms, stables, and carriage house, for its genteel patrons. Just as Capitol Hill was the commonwealth’s seat of government, the tavern served as the city’s seat of entertainment. During the day, members of the legislature enacted laws on Capitol Hill. At night, however, the Eagle Tavern provided a space for entertainment, amusement, and relaxation. On March 27, 1807, excitement surrounded the Eagle Tavern when former Vice President Aaron Burr lodged here as a state prisoner. Guards brought Burr to Richmond to undergo questioning and examination by Chief Justice Marshall. The tribunal charged Burr with the act of treason, which he likely committed at Blannerhassett’s island, located in the Ohio river and within the current limits of Virginia at this time. As a result, his crime fell within the jurisdiction of the Federal District Court of Virginia.
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Figure 1.3: Shockoe Valley tavern sites based on Richard Young’s *A Plan of the City of Richmond* (1809). Used in accordance with the Fair Use Policy.

---

84 Gish, 144.
Richmond Taverns – Functions and Services

Across Richmond, taverns provided a primary meeting place for most white males. Oftentimes, a trip to the tavern was a common part of many men’s daily routines. Following a long day at court, Landon Carter, a wealthy Virginia planter and justice, ended his day by traveling a short distance to the same public house that he always visited. Additionally, Richmond men often favored a particular tavern because of the traits that they often shared with other male patrons, such as their status or occupation. The Mechanics of Richmond, for
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instance, often met at Washington’s Tavern for both their general and committee meetings. In Richmond’s Agricultural Society, which served to promote the betterment of Richmond agriculture during the early nineteenth century, typically met at the Swan Tavern.

Throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, alcohol was a necessity in Richmond taverns for gambling male patrons. In order to soothe thoughts of their losses, the presence of alcohol was crucial to Richmond taverns. For large urban taverns, like the Eagle Tavern, multiple rooms provided male patrons the option to participate in either cards or billiards. In Virginia, Nicholas Creswell, a well-known traveler during this period, noted that if patrons only wished to drink and converse, they would still find themselves involved with gambling. Popular spectator sports, such as horse races and cockfights only encouraged gambling, as patrons drank in order to celebrate their victories or drown their losses. Although not sports, sideshow entertainment acts also received attention in Richmond’s taverns. Richard Bowler, for instance, consistently published advertisements about the presence of the “Learned Pig” and “Beautiful African Lion” in his tavern throughout the Richmond newspapers.

In contrast to gaming and other sources of entertainment, Richmond taverns provided a meeting place for military volunteers and court proceedings. Often, taverns served as a common meeting space for militia training. Due to its size, the Eagle Tavern was designated as a meeting place for militia members. On December 22, 1812, volunteers, who were called to be “punctual in your attendance,” were ordered to meet at the Eagle Tavern by order of the captain. Along with militia meetings, taverns provided a space for court proceedings. On November 8, 1799,
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the *Virginia Argus* published a notice, written by David Lambert, calling for a “Regimental Court of Inquiry” to be held at Mr. Soloman Raphae’s tavern “in order to assess fines on the Officers of the 19th Regiment.”93 Perhaps one of the most significant trials to be held during the first decade of the nineteenth century was that of former Vice President, Aaron Burr. As discussed previously, this trial was heard at Richmond’s Eagle Tavern before Chief Justice John Marshall.94 Whether used for official meetings, public celebrations, or a place for military volunteers to meet, taverns were central to late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Richmond.

Regardless of the activity, drinking served as an important component in Richmond tavern culture. For many Richmond men, consuming vast quantities of alcohol indicated a symbolic ritual. Specifically, toasting promoted a style of drinking that built upon what a group of men had in common, whether social, economic, or cultural backgrounds.95 As Nora Kilbane highlights, the conditions of the early republic “encouraged drinking in a public and highly social fashion, since it was believed to strengthen community bonds and to assert equality among those sharing a toast, even if in actuality they were from very different levels of society.”96 For Richmond men, taverns offered the ideal space for drinking, toasting, and forming bonds of male camaraderie. At a celebration for the Fourth of July at the Bell Tavern for example, a company of citizens, primarily composed of professional printers, celebrated with rounds of patriotic toasts and songs, while one of the patrons read the Declaration of Independence aloud.97 Despite the number of services and activities that Richmond taverns began to more actively offer, their primary purpose remained to serve alcohol.
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Changes in Tavern Culture

By the early nineteenth century, drinking was not only practical, but was also symbolic of Americans’ personal liberty and national identity. The first few decades of nationhood placed an emphasis on personal liberty, equality, and self-reliance. Thus, the choice a person made either to moderately consume alcohol or to become intoxicated represented an exercise of personal liberty. The uninhibited consumption of alcohol was emblematic of freedom. As Kilbane argues, this freedom offered the ability “to choose to drink, to set one’s own limits and to choose to become drunk – thus excessive consumption became a visible way to assert one’s personal liberty.” Ultimately, alcohol consumption symbolized personal liberty granted to citizens of the new republic, and the physical act of drinking was determined to be part of that freedom. In conjunction with personal liberty, alcohol consumption became a part of the maturing national identity. In large measure aided by the fact that the period between the 1790s and the early 1830s was the nation’s heaviest drinking era, alcohol consumption instilled a sense of national identity and provided a sense of camaraderie and fellowship among drinkers.

Along with personal liberty and national identity, drinking helped develop and aid community bonds as well as a distinct sense of camaraderie among men. Harold Fallding argues that the mutuality of drinking is important and places pressure on male companions to drink in like manners. According to Fallding, drinking is a fundamental component in easing a person’s integration in society. Further, he acknowledges the internal barriers to community participation without the aid of “alcohol anesthesia.” From this, it can be understood that from the colonial
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period to the early republic, men used alcohol as an aid while they sought out ways to integrate themselves into drinking circles. This would likely have proved useful among men of the same class, and particularly helpful while mingling with men a higher social status. By the early national period, economic developments increasingly stratified social classes.

The economy after the American Revolution marked stark changes for both Richmond and its taverns. By the end of the colonial period, the economy became characterized by an expanding export sector, a growing financial infrastructure, and a growing internal market.103 Around the turn of the century, Richmond experienced a growth in urban socialization. The removal of Virginia’s state capital from Williamsburg to Richmond confirmed the shift of the state’s importance from the coast, and influenced the regional economy of the backcountry.104 Peter Clark notes that Richmond held “a greater number of more polished, hospitable and well informed inhabitants” than any other town in the union at the time.105 This was in part due to the growth of Richmond’s voluntary bodies, including library and literary societies, the Sons of St. Tammany, and an anti-slavery society.106 This changing economy sat unsteadily with tavern sociability and signaled the development of more pronounced economic inequality and political factionalism. Further, the disintegration of controls on the maximum retail price of liquor caused changes in patterns of tavern going. The combination of these changes resulted in the
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development of new types of public houses, which sought to create a harmonious and culturally specific form of tavern sociability.107

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the combination of the increase in the number of legislators, government leaders, and visitors to the city, demanded more genteel accommodations from taverns. Thus, the name “tavern” began to give way to “hotel.” This can be seen in regard to the Eagle Tavern. Once Dr. Edward Hallam came into possession of this public house, he enlarged the brick structure to the status of a hotel. The growth in the size and complexity of Richmond’s public houses can also be understood by looking at a 1782 census, along with two early business directors published in 1819 and 1845/6. According to the 1782 Richmond census, there was one inn-holder, two bar-keepers, three tavern-keepers, and for “ordy”-keepers. By 1819, the Richmond Directory, Register and Almanac found that the term “ordinary” was almost never used, and instead listed taverns, oyster houses, porterhouses, and boarding houses. Years later, by 1845 and 1845/6, the term “tavern” was seldom used and in its place principal hotels and boarding houses were listed.108

Conclusion

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Richmond’s appearance underwent significant changes. Chartered as an official city, the presence of Jefferson’s meticulously crafted capitol buildings hinted at Richmond’s rise to prominence. Emblematic of most developed cities during this time, the rise of Richmond’s public houses testified to the city’s growth. In addition to the wants and needs of Richmond’s local residents, more public houses arose in order to quench the thirst of prominent travelers. Providing a space for acceptable alcohol consumption, for the meetings of government officials, and for general public

107 Thompson, 78-79.
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entertainment, taverns were a central feature within the city’s limits. Amateur historian, Samuel Mordecai, pointed to this by identifying a number of distinguished taverns in Richmond during this time, including the Bell Tavern, City Tavern, Union Hotel, and Bowler’s Tavern. However, the growth of Richmond’s public houses was not only measured in sheer number by the start of the nineteenth century. Rather, the development of public houses was also measured by each tavern’s size. In conjunction with changes in the economy in the early republic, shifts in tavern architecture, size, and sociability occurred as well. Reflective of the growth of the city, Richmond’s public houses fittingly followed suit.
Chapter 2
The Growth and Development of Richmond Tavern Space

“There can be no doubt but our style of buildings has, within a few years, very considerably improved: but there yet is open to the taste and good sense of the citizens a very great space, indeed, for their inventions, taste and wealth, to be laudably exerted in. In this country, we are less confused in our ideas of propriety, in general than are the inhabitants of any other country on the globe.”

Beginning in the colonial period, Richmond taverns conveyed simplicity and plainness. Throughout this period and into the Revolution, taverns offered a distinct kind of controlled space for patrons, predominantly white men, to interact among each other. Although taverns served as one of Richmond’s most important public buildings, their size and architecture did little to articulate or capture such prominence. As small, crowded, and wooden structures, Richmond taverns maintained a simple appearance until the end of the Revolution.

Once becoming Virginia’s new capital, Richmond grew in importance, just as its taverns grew in size. During the early national period, the appearance of public buildings became more meaningful as architecture provided a way for the United States to present a national image of itself both domestically and abroad. Buildings that appeared larger and more refined invoked a stronger national image than smaller, less impressive buildings. This, in part, was one reason why such attention was given to the construction of Richmond’s capitol buildings. As one of Richmond’s most important secular, public buildings, taverns similarly underwent architectural changes. Accordingly, the physical dimensions and elevated materials employed to construct Richmond taverns in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries represented a concerted effort to elevate Richmond’s public houses.

Early Taverns in Richmond

---

Prior to the American Revolution, Richmond taverns were architecturally simple structures. In many instances, property owners built taverns only for the purpose of meeting social functions.\textsuperscript{110} Richard Crouch’s Virginia Inn, located in Shockoe Hill, was emblematic of a basic design. Regarding the Virginia Inn, Richmond’s resident historian, Samuel Mordecai, stated, “Crouch’s Virginia Inn, located on the ascent of governor street, had nothing to distinguish it that I remember, except the difficulty of getting to it and the small inducement to do so.”\textsuperscript{111} The building itself was a wooden story-house, measuring 40 x 22 feet, under pinned with brick and covered with shingles, along with a two-story porch covering its front.\textsuperscript{112} (See Figure 2.1) In a similar manner, Mordecai discussed the straightforward design of Richard Bowler’s Tavern, located in the Shockoe Valley, in \textit{Richmond in By-Gone Days}. Mordecai stated, “Bowler’s was a one story wooden house of an L shape, standing on a bank some six feet or more above the street, and reached by a flight of steps, beneath which ran the gutter – sometimes a mill stream in volume.” The actual height of this particular tavern was only elevated due to the propensity of flooding in the area.\textsuperscript{113} Since the primary purpose of taverns during this period was to provide a space for men to drink and interact with one another, there was little need for larger taverns with more specialized private spaces.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{110} Fames Marston Fitch, \textit{American Building – I: The Historical Forces That Shaped It}, 2nd ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975), 44.
\item \textsuperscript{112} \textit{Mutual Assurance Society} Declarations (Accession 31634), Volume 68, policy no. 1129, dated 28 April 1812, Library of Virginia, quoted in Gish, 209.
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Along with outward appearances, eighteenth century taverns interior spaces and assessment values indicated architectural modesty. The Bird in the Hand Tavern, for instance, was certainly not venerated for its architecture. The building was a one-story wood-framed house located on “the south east corner of the street leading to Rockets landing [Main Street] and the Church Road [25th Street].” The *Mutual Assurance Society* insured it for only $500 in 1798. Additionally, the Swan Tavern, located in the Shockoe Hill, was thought to be rather simple in appearance. An author who wrote for the *Virginia Historical Register* under the name of “Howard,” recalled the Swan Tavern as a “plain building, of ordinary and almost rustic appearance.” In regards to the interior, “Howard” stated, “The furniture too, was as plain as possible. There were no gas-lighted chandeliers to blind your eyes, nor costly mirrors to reproach your extravagance by their reflections.”
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from these taverns, men continued to frequent them up until the late eighteenth century and even into the early nineteenth century.

Originally, many Richmond taverns contained the same common features well before even the French and Indian War. During this time, little distinguished early taverns from homes, with their central public rooms and small assortment of private rooms upstairs.\textsuperscript{117} Typical to most taverns was a single bar room where customers could gather together around a central drinking table.\textsuperscript{118} The majority of taverns in British North America remained in small dwelling houses, or other similar structures. In addition, most colonial taverns provided relatively small and unspecialized interior spaces. Even more sophisticated taverns, such as Frances’ Tavern or the Raleigh Tavern in Williamsburg, Virginia, which were distinguished by their multiple meeting rooms and private quarters, only supplied a few public rooms and never contained more than approximately fifteen guest chambers.\textsuperscript{119} In addition to the lack of specialized space, most early tavern rooms contained simple furnishings and minimal decorations. It was only during the later eighteenth century that tavern keepers became more focused on their taverns as their sole business, rather than engaging in other occupations.\textsuperscript{120} This change in focus allowed for a greater attention to customer wants and needs, which resulted in a greater number of offered tavern services. For example, added features, such as stabling, became a fundamental feature of most taverns.\textsuperscript{121}

Contributing to their common appearance, Richmond property owners utilized relatively inexpensive materials to construct taverns prior to the Revolutionary War. Most of Richmond’s

\textsuperscript{120} Brennan, 310.
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aging and smaller taverns were made of wood. Mordecai mentioned the presence of wooden taverns as part of his first recollections of Main Street in Richmond. Mordecai reminisced, “The earliest impression on my mind of the appearance of the Main street, (and it was the only one on which the buildings were not “few and far between,”) is that the houses were of wood, and generally of one or two stories in height.” Particularly, Bowler’s Tavern, the Virginia Inn, the Swan Tavern, and the Bird in the Hand were all primarily made of wood. In sum, by the end of the eighteenth century, most Richmond taverns were small, crowded, and lacking in aesthetic qualities. However, these taverns would no longer suffice for Richmond’s growing social, political, and economic needs as Virginia’s new capital. As a result, larger public houses in convenient locations to the capitol, with larger tables, and more attractive features proved necessary.

Architectural Refinement

During the early national period, many understood the necessity of incorporating more refined architecture to establish the nation’s image. Highlighting the need of the emergence of finer quality in the nation’s public buildings, but also emphasizing the work that still needed to be completed, one anonymous writer stated:

“There can be no doubt but our style of building has, within a few years, very considerably improved: but there yet is open to the taste and good sense of the citizens a very great space, indeed, for their inventions, taste and wealth, to be laudably exerted in. In this country, we are less confused in our ideas of propriety, in general than are the inhabitants of any other country on the globe.”

---
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As this passage illustrates, while the architectural style of the early republic’s buildings had developed, there was still a dire need for substantial renovation. Thus, architects became crucial to establishing the nation’s image to the rest of the globe.

The growth of architecture, as a profession, considerably transformed Richmond’s public houses into more desirable spaces during the early national period. The men who found their profession in architecture differed from their predecessors. Instead of amateurs, many were full-time technically trained professionals, primarily the product of European universities. Following the American Revolution, as economic equilibrium returned to seaports and cities, private building construction revived.126 As a result, amateur designers and builders began to yield to professional architects who began to travel to the United States by the end of the eighteenth century.127

Within the quickly materializing professional field of architecture, Benjamin Henry Latrobe served as one of its most prominent members. Latrobe, who would later come to be identified as one of the most well known architects of the early republic, arrived from England in 1796. Upon his arrival in Norfolk, Virginia, Latrobe had little money. Previously, he earned an engineering degree from a German university and held an apprenticeship under the English architect, Samuel Pepys Cockerell, one of the pioneers of the Greek revival. This apprenticeship would greatly influence Latrobe’s work as he continually highlighted Greek architecture in most of his designs.128 Latrobe received his first employment in Richmond, where he conducted
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navigation work on the James River. After a year later, in 1797, Latrobe completed a plan of an ornate hotel and theater complex for the city. Although this structure was never built in Richmond, it does hint at the development of a new generation of taverns that represented more space, decoration, and complexity.

As a driving force behind the architectural movement and a supporter of Latrobe’s work, Thomas Jefferson was an advocate of employing buildings as a way to present the United States’ national image. In many ways, architecture provided a means in which to measure the United States’ character, strength, and status to the rest of the world. Viewed as the guiding spirit of American building, he often asserted direct and indirect influence over buildings, specifically in Virginia, including both his private home and the University of Virginia. As Jefferson’s knowledge of architecture and building structure deepened, he grew to have a thorough grasp of the theoretical and practical applications of the field. Following his stay in France, for instance, he became transfixed with Greco-Roman “columnar” style. Additionally, he was greatly influenced by the painters, sculptors, writers, and architects of the French Revolution. Stemming from a long sponsorship with Latrobe, Jefferson was responsible for directing the attention of the American people directly upon the cultures of Rome and Greece. Although Jefferson primarily identified with Roman architecture and Latrobe with Greek, this did not seem to create rift between the two. Ultimately, Jefferson was able to sell his idea of duplicating a Roman temple in Nimes for Virginia’s new state capitol house. For Jefferson, the Roman orders
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represented the first principles of architecture and symbolized a republican form of
government.\textsuperscript{136}

In many ways, Jefferson understood architecture as a form of ideological persuasion, in
which a message to the rest of the world could be sent indicating the nation’s potential for future
growth and prosperity. Jefferson particularly had this in mind when he created plans for
Richmond’s capitol buildings. In a letter to James Madison in reference to his vision of the
capitol buildings, Jefferson stated, “We took our model what is called the Maison quarree of
Nismes, one of the most beautiful, if not the most beautiful and precious morsel of architecture
left to us by antiquity.” Jefferson went on to address the use of Roman architectural style in
relation to American buildings by stating, “It is very simple, but it is noble beyond expression,
and would have done honour to our country as presenting to travelers a morsel of taste in our
infancy promising much for our maturer age.”\textsuperscript{137} Jefferson utilized Rome as a model for most of
his architectural designs in order to tastefully embody emerging American ideals, including
democracy. The first national building projects to follow this philosophy were primarily
governmental.\textsuperscript{138} For buildings particularly, it was believed that a “tasteful” dinner party in well-
designed and finely furnished rooms would help conceal needed improvements in the new
nation. A fine dinner could help camouflage the absence of a proper naval fleet, a table with an
assortment of wines available for guests would counter rumors of bankruptcy, and elaborate
public buildings, like the classic state house in Richmond would correct simplistic images of log
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Jefferson’s concern for the appearance of the nation’s social wealth was a significant part of his attitude toward architecture in the early republic. Following the Revolution, Americans utilized architecture as a means to accentuate and represent their national identity and presence. An anonymous author writing about the arts in the United States sought to remind his readers of the importance of grand public buildings in the early republic as a way to present the nation to the rest of the world. The author stated, “There is scarcely any single circumstance which contributes more powerfully towards elevating the reputation of any people, than the grandeur of public edifices; nor is there any way in which a republican government can with so much propriety display its munificence.” This author goes on to describe the subsequent patriotism that accompanied these public buildings as well by stating:

“But a noble hall for the purposes of legislation or of justice is the immediate property of the people, and forms a portion of the patrimony of every citizen. Love of country should indeed rest upon a far broader ground, yet it is well to have local pride and attachments come in to the aid of patriotism...Nor will a benevolent mind be inclined to overlook the effect which these displays of public magnificence may have in imparting “an hour’s importance to the poor man’s heart,” and enabling him for a time to forget the inferiority of his condition, and feel a community of interest with his wealthy neighbor.”

As this passage illustrates, the appearance of state and federal buildings indicated a concerted attempt to display a national image. Throughout the Revolution, building construction was at a standstill. Upon achieving independence, the new republic desperately needed to assert a new political and economic status in order to transition from a second rate colony to a first rate power. Building provided one avenue in which to accomplish this. There was a distinct desire
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to employ architecture as a means to express the overwhelming spirit of nationalism of the
time.\textsuperscript{144} Jefferson, particularly, was determined for new buildings to be sound, as the social
wealth of the nation relied on their appearance. Ever cognizant of how the rest of the world
viewed and judged the United States, Jefferson called for buildings to be aesthetically
pleasing.\textsuperscript{145} Apart from state and federal buildings, however, typical public buildings and private
residences sought to become a part of this trend.

\textbf{Evolution of Tavern Space}

Apart from Virginia’s new capitol buildings, Richmond taverns, as public spaces,
provided a way to elevate the nation’s cultural taste and national character. In conjunction with
national identity, the appearance and the presence of refinement in public spaces was important
to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. During the early national period, Americans
used refinement in manners and material culture as a mechanism to demonstrate social
standing.\textsuperscript{146} Following the Revolution, it became important for Richmond proprietors to endorse
a certain respectability in the taverns they operated. Part of this respectability was created
through tavern lodging, which included private and clean rooms, along with “good bedding.”\textsuperscript{147}
As the importance of refinement grew, more of the city’s taverns began to offer greater
conveniences for their customers.\textsuperscript{148} Even the demand for more harmonious sociability increased
the number of houses that sought to provide refined services that were essentially non-existent in
other similar city inns and taverns.\textsuperscript{149} The escalation in tavern accommodations reflected the
importance of architectural and building refinement.
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Between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, taverns flaunted refinement through physical size. Across Richmond, taverns cultivated a new image that appropriately adhered to growing trends of development and expansion. Jacob I. Cohen’s Cross Keys Tavern, located in Richmond Hill, was representative of this growth. When Cohen’s wooden tavern was insured as a “tippling house” in 1796, it valued at $250 and measured 26 x 16 feet. (See Figure 2.2) When the property was insured a second time in May 1802, it was insured for $900. Now, a wooden porch covered both the tavern and an adjoining shop, which measured at 20 x 16 feet. Additionally, a wood kitchen with a brick chimney was added on to the back of the tavern that was valued for $100. (See Figure 2.3) Thus, the total insurance value for the structure was $1,000.\(^{150}\)

---


\(^{151}\) *Mutual Assurance Society* sketch, Vol. 12, policy no. 35, dated 17 February 1796. Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.
The physical size, height, and grandeur of taverns became significantly important to demonstrating architectural refinement and the nation’s prominence to other countries. When Gabriel Galt sought to sell his tavern, known as Galt’s Tavern and the Old City Tavern in January 1788, he highlighted the size and features of it in a *Virginia Gazette* newspaper advertisement. Describing his establishment, Galt stated, “it stands, with all the improvements, also two lots on the back street, on which are good stables, with 28 double stalls. Adjoining the said lot is a genteel dwelling house 44 by 24, with two rooms, and a 12 foot passage below, and 4 rooms above, at present occupied by Col. JAMES INNES.”

By April 1801, the new leaseholder of the Old City Tavern, Solomon Raphael, described the tavern in Richmond’s *Examiner* as “a commodious one with good stables, kitchen, smokehouse, dairy, corn-house and an excellent bake oven and bake house. Also, a very extensive Garden.” Given its size and aesthetic qualities, Mordecai described the Old City Tavern in *Richmond in By-Gone Days* as,
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“A more modern, and a splendid house in its day, was the City Tavern, erected by Mr. Galt, of Williamsburg, and known as Galt’s Tavern.”¹⁵⁵ In much the same way as the Old City Tavern acquainted readers with its size, words, such as “commodious” and “excellent,” proclaimed its more attractive qualities.

Along with added space, Richmond taverns grew in height as well. Following the Revolution, most public houses were either two or three stories. In cities, such as Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, four stories was not uncommon after 1800.¹⁵⁶ In Richmond, larger taverns were typically characterized as having up to three stories, with long wooden porches wrapping around the entire length of the house. Following the initial stages of construction for Richmond’s capitol buildings, James Currie, a young physician, began laying the ground work for one of Richmond’s most notorious public houses: the Eagle Tavern, a three story tavern. The only known description of Dr. Currie’s original building appeared in the *Virginia Gazette or the American Advertiser* on Saturday, 7 January 1786. The advertisement drew notice to each of the three floors and gave detailed attention to the specifications of each room. Highlighting the dimensions of the first floor, the advertisement stated:

“TO BE RENTED, for one year, or LEASED for a term of years, A LARGE commodious three story Brick House, conveniently situated in the City of Richmond, with the following apartments: - A cellar, 27 x 36 feet. Upon the first floor, two rooms 17 feet 10, by 12 feet 4. Two rooms, 13 feet 4, by 9 feet 4. One room, 25 feet 8, by 17 feet 6. One room, 17 feet 6, by 11 feet 8; with the necessary passages, and four fire places.”

The advertisement proceeded to describe the parameters of each room on the other two floors of the tavern in a similar fashion.¹⁵⁷
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In accordance with growing physical dimensions, the materials used to construct Richmond taverns changed during this era as well. Richmond City planners and tavern builders endeavored to use materials that would invoke strength and durability. As a result, the use of inferior materials like wood to construct the city’s as well as the nation’s taverns was met with disdain. An anonymous writer made the following statement about the use of wood in constructing new buildings:

“The evil in architecture lies principally in this – that we build of wood. From this custom much immediate, as well as remote inconvenience, is to be expected: and certainly, however suddenly felt may be the comfort arising from celerity and dispatch, the numerous considerations of perishableness, and want of safety, and call for repairs, added to the reflection, that the public [ ] is for the first time deprived of one great field of exertion, will very much weigh with an enlightened people, when once they become awakened to their advantages, and proud of the singular novelty of the physical and moral opportunities of the situation.”

Due to the aversion of using wood in construction, brick quickly became an esteemed building material for Richmond taverns. In relation to the use of brick, Jefferson contended, “when buildings are of durable materials, every new edifice is an actual and permanent acquisition to the state, adding to its value as well as to its ornament.” Of brickwork, the same anonymous author who lamented the use of wood affirmed:

“Bachelors only ought to build of wood – men who have but a life estate in this world, and who care little for those who come after them. Those who have either children or a wife to leave behind them will build of brick, if they wish to leave monuments of kindness, rather than a rent-charge, behind them…”

To many, in relation to building construction, wood represented an inferior material, while brick conjured feelings of endurance and imperishability over time.

---

Throughout Richmond, the utilization of brick swept the city. In 1805, Mordecai referenced the incorporation of brick in the Bird in the Hand tavern, previously a wooden tavern and stated, “The oldest public house in Richmond was “the Bird in hand,” on Main street, at the foot of Church hill, lately a ruinous hovel, but now embellished with a new front of brick-bats.”\textsuperscript{160} Thomas Pulling’s Court House Tavern in Richmond Hill perhaps more noticeably represents the shift to brick taverns. The Court House Tavern began as a one-story, thirty-two foot square wooden dwelling house in 1798 and was insured for $1,000. By 1805, the building was a two-story tavern measuring 51 x 33 feet and was valued at $3,200.\textsuperscript{161} The first floor of the tavern was constructed of brick, while the second floor was made of wood. (See Figure 2.4) By 1820, Pulling lost the tavern to Joseph Marx in an auction. When Marx bought the property at auction for $5,560, it consisted of a two-story brick and frame tavern connected to a brick two-story dwelling. By itself, the tavern was insured for $2,200, which did not include the 80 x 26 foot brick stable also included on the property.\textsuperscript{162} (See Figure 2.5)
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Figure 2.4: A Mutual Assurance Society sketch of the Court House Tavern, 1811. Courtesy of the Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.163
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163 Mutual Assurance Society sketch, Vol. 67, policy no. 1072, dated 29 May 1811. Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.
The Bell Tavern in Shockoe Valley serves as another example of the use of brick. On July 11, 1801, Nathan Bell and George Winston of Hanover County purchased a three-acre parcel of land on the north side of Main Street from Gervas Storrs. Winston, a builder specializing in brick masonry, replaced the former wooden structures of the tavern, located on this parcel of land, entirely of brick. Bell and Winston advertised their new tavern for rent on October 6, 1802. They described it as a new three-story brick house with thirty-seven rooms,
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along with a front and back platform. Nearby was a two-story brick family house with six rooms, including a fireplace in each one. Additional brick buildings on the property included a brick dairy and a 73 x 37 feet brick stable with forty-two stalls, which accommodated eighty-two horses. (See Figure 2.6) With the development of dairies and more extensive stables on tavern properties, such as the Bell Tavern, public houses became more than just places to drink in Richmond.

165 “New Brick House to Let. For terms apply to George Winston, near Richmond, or the subscriber near the Meadow Bridge in Hanover County. NATHAN BELL.” Virginia Gazette & General Advertiser, Wednesday, 6 October 1802, p. 3, col. 5, quoted in Gish, 151. By 1805, Bell added an additional story to the tavern as well as the family dwelling house. This increased the tavern’s insurance value to $12,000, the dwelling house to $2,500, and the two brick stables to $1,100 each, with one remaining at $900. The total insurance value for this property was $18,000. For more descriptions of brick taverns and similar structures in Richmond during this time see, Virginia Gazette & Central Advertiser, Friday, 7 February 1800, p. 4, col. 4; Virginia Gazette & General Advertiser, Wednesday, 5 January 1802, p. 3, col. 5 in reference to Robert Gamble’s Brick House.
Along with the use of brick, the increasing employment of stucco to buildings aided aesthetic appearances. By 1800, stucco’s use in the physical construction and decoration of buildings was greatly augmented. This was in part due to Latrobe’s influence.\(^{167}\) However, as Mordecai notes, Richmond’s capitol buildings remained noticeably absent of stucco following their construction. In relation to the appearance of these buildings, Mordecai stated, “The Capitol itself, not then stuccoed, exposed its bare brick walls between the columns or pilasters.”\(^{168}\) The use of materials, such as stucco, displayed a distinct effort to construct taverns that would appear different from the colonial period.

\(^{166}\) *Mutual Assurance Society* sketch, Vol. 17, policy no. 885, dated 15 November 1802. Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.
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The location of taverns throughout Richmond was especially important. Once Richmond became Virginia’s new capital, the setting of public houses acquired a heightened significance. Richmond, like other cities at the time, was organized according to urbane city-planning principles, which supported polite society. As a result, the placement of taverns became situated farther and farther from local harbors. The Eagle Tavern, for instance was centrally located in Richmond. An advertisement in the Richmond Enquirer noted:

“Situated in a central part of the City of Richmond, and equally convenient for professional characters, and others from the country, who have business in the Capitol, and whose who wish to take lodgeings in a part of the town contiguous to mercantile transactions, the Eagle Tavern cannot but offer to the traveler and the temporary accommodations and conveniences, at least equal to any in the city.”

Similarly, the Washington Tavern was located adjacent to the Capitol when it opened on Monday, August 25, 1814.

The more spacious and accommodating taverns, sometimes referred to as hotels in the press, were located near Richmond’s capitol buildings and important traveling routes. Because American capitals, like Richmond, positioned county seats and governmental powers in public squares, the construction of taverns in such areas suggested their prominence to the community. Ultimately, these taverns, in relation to those located farther away from the capitol, offered better cuisine, private bedrooms, and private sitting rooms for Richmond’s elite.

**Refined Accommodation**

---
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More refined accommodations led to the emergence of taverns that came to be known as hotels. In newspaper advertisements, the term “tavern” and “hotel” became synonymous. By the 1790s, hotels afforded “respectable” citizens with the space and privacy that other smaller taverns could not provide.\textsuperscript{175} The size, refined appearance, and expense of hotels illustrated an attempt to create a new class of public houses that would stand apart from their predecessors.\textsuperscript{176} Furthermore, hotels arose because a new form of public accommodation was necessary to house politicians and officials in the new federal government. It is no coincidence that George Washington’s presidential tours around the country from 1789-1791 corresponded with the development of hotels.\textsuperscript{177} Washington’s presidential travels marked the importance public accommodation to the political life of the early national period, while highlighting the inadequacies of the nation’s current taverns and inns. Ultimately, Washington’s tours generated widespread community self-consciousness in regards to the sufficiency of local accommodation.\textsuperscript{178}

The construction of the Union Hotel represented the sizeable accommodations that Richmond sought to provide for prominent travelers. Upon tearing down a two story wooden house on the corner of Main and 19\textsuperscript{th} Streets, Dr. John Adams began construction of a new house of public entertainment. Unlike ordinary public houses, Adams sought to build a hotel that was becoming increasingly popular in similar large cities. For the work, he solicited help from architect and builder Otis Manson, originally from Boston, who established his business in Richmond. Based on Adams’s vision, Manson constructed a four-story brick structure
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measuring 50 x 60 feet. Similar to the state capitol building, the entire exterior was made of brick and covered with stucco. Behind the hotel, Manson built a three-story brick wing that measured 100 x 45 feet, with a brick patio facing towards the courtyard. The magnitude of this construction can be illustrated both by its appearance and value. The original wooden house that Dr. Adams tore down was insured at $1,250 in 1808. On February 14, 1817, the only half-finished Union Hotel and an accompanying wing were insured for $18,000. By the time the brick hotel and wing were completed on July 8, the value of these two structures reached $50,000. (See Figure 2.7) A *Virginia Patriot* advertisement from 1817 stated, “The splendid and extensive establishment erected by Dr. John Adams, at the corner of E and 19th Streets, we are happy to inform the public will be in full operation, under the name of the UNION HOTEL, before the 1st day of October next.” The *Virginia Patriot* went on to say, “The front of the building affords in its present stage of finishing, the promise of uncommon beauty and correctness of proportion. The house will afford comfortable Lodging go an hundred persons; and the stable is calculated to receive 120 horses.”  The emergence of the Union Hotel highlights the expenses that tavern property owners were willing to pay in order to benefit from this new architecture of accommodation.
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Figure 2.7: A Mutual Assurance Society sketch of the Union Tavern Hotel, Lot 16, 1817. Courtesy of Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.\textsuperscript{181}

\textsuperscript{181} Mutual Assurance Society sketch, Vol. 73, policy no. 258, dated 1817. Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.
The evolution of the Eagle Hotel offers another prime example of the development of tavern space and architecture of accommodation in the early national period. Following Dr. Currie’s death in 1807, Edward Hallam purchased the Eagle Tavern in 1813 with the intention of enlarging it into a hotel. In 1813, the tavern itself appraised for $15,000. By 1822, the value of Hallam’s hotel reached $75,000. The value of the four-story brick hotel itself was valued at $28,000. A separate wing, also made of brick and four stories in height, measured at 100 x 28 ½ feet and was valued at $20,000. Additionally, outdoor toilets made of brick valued at $1,500, a three-story brick back building valued at $10,000, and a three-story brick carriage house and granary assessed at $1,500 were included in this assessment.\(^{182}\) The expansion of the Eagle Tavern is illustrated in sketches made by the *Mutual Assurance Society*. (See Figures 2.8 and 2.9)

Figure 2.8: A Mutual Assurance Society sketch of Dr. James Currie’s buildings “known by Ye Name of Ye Eagle Tavern,” 1796. Courtesy of the Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.\textsuperscript{183}

\textsuperscript{183} Mutual Assurance Society sketch, Vol. 12, policy no. 30, dated 15 February 1796. Library of Virginia, Richmond, VA.
Conclusion

Similar to private houses, at the start of the nineteenth century, tavern space increasingly housed private rooms for specialized social interaction. The differentiation in the functions of these various rooms, and consequently the adaptation to individual rooms for a specific use was typical for this era. The interior spaces of these taverns were a sharp contrast from previously existing public houses due to their more elaborate internal arrangement devoted to substantial public rooms and a greater number of private rooms.

The increased size of taverns in conjunction with the creation of more specialized private spaces resulted in a new appearance of public houses. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, taverns still maintained orderly material settings that supported public life. However, concepts related to refinement and gentility shifted the requirements of these structures. The size
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and architecture of the nation’s first hotels embodied a distinct departure from long-established standards of public accommodation. As a result, a new paradigm of public houses, public space, and public life in America was created in which patrons came to expect more from taverns. Since men still remained taverns’ primary patrons, they came to expect more from tavern space including gaming tables and private rooms for club meetings. Increasingly, men frequented taverns with accommodations that allowed them to display their class identities and masculinity.
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Chapter 3

Richmond Taverns: A Stage for the Performance of the Republican Gentleman

The definition of a gentleman according to Lord Chesterfield: “a man of good behavior, well bred, amiable, high-minded, who knows how to act in any society, in the company of any man.”

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate the manner in which gentility and refinement transformed tavern spaces in Richmond, Virginia from 1780 to 1820, and how these spaces provided a stage for the performance of the Republican Gentleman. During this period, the combination of the emergence of republican ideals and the growth of gentility produced a new masculine identity, the Republican Gentleman. What is pivotal to this study is assessing how men sought to demonstrate their masculinity primarily in the presence of other men. By identifying the activities that men took part in within taverns greater understanding can be garnered of how ordinary men utilized this arena to be considered a Republican Gentleman.

Throughout this chapter I will analyze how taverns, as increasingly refined spaces, acted as a stage for the performance of the Republican Gentleman. As discussed in chapter two, taverns underwent dramatic physical changes following the American Revolution. New architectural features, including private rooms and ballrooms, represented the presence of refined space. Just as important, newly constructed and renovated taverns reflected genteel values and influenced men’s performances within these spaces. Specifically, I will assess how three separate activities within these refined taverns provided a stage for Republican Gentlemen. These activities included heterosocial entertainments, men’s clubs and society meetings, and drinking rituals, most specifically toasts. By evaluating the roles that gentility, refinement, and
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republicanism played in the construction of Republican Gentlemen, conclusions can be drawn in reference to the importance of taverns as stages for expressions of class and masculine identities.

The Meaning of Men: Defining Manhood and Masculinity

Gender is one of the foundational components in men’s self-identification and how they assess others. Simply, gender is defined and understood as the cultural meanings that societies attach to one’s biological sex. Intricately tied to our personal experiences, gender helps to give meaning to and explain the world around us. According to gender historians, early America was constructed as a gendered polity in which the formation of the male citizen relied on his relationship to women. As Toby Ditz argues, gender, whether manhood or womanhood, is a historical and ideological process in which individuals are identified and identify themselves as men or as women. In relation to how men and women are identified, Joan Scott highlights that gender is a cultural construction, created by a particular societies’ ideas about the suitable roles for women and men. Further, Scott defines gender as having two primary components. First, it is an integral component of social relationships based on perceived differences between men and women. Secondly, gender can be understood as the primary way of indicating relationships of power. The construction of these relationships, Scott emphasizes, is legitimized as masculine. As a result, the interpretation of power as masculine too often influenced the natural relationship between men and women. Further the generalization of masculine power
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oversimplified a man’s identity and his relationship with other men. Thus, it is imperative to deconstruct what this power means in relation to a man’s gendered identity.

Although men’s gendered identity is in part determined by their relationship to women, the manner in which men define themselves in relation to other men is a central component to determining manhood and masculine identity. When considering men’s history, Ditz contends that there are two central premises that must be noted. First, both manliness and masculinity are pieces of a larger gender order that subordinates women and protects the patriarch. Second, the larger gender order pertains to differentiating between men. Masculinity and manhood, in other words, are relations of domination, subordination, competition, and affiliation among men, as they are about women.196 Thus, the way in which define men themselves in relation to other men is a crucial part of their identity. Similarly, Joe Dubbert argues that identity is the process of living up to what a person thinks he should be as well as what others think he should be.197 From this, identity formation can be understood as a process of reflection as individuals strive to live up to approved, socially constructed definitions of what it is to be manly or masculine.198 Although unquestionable proof of a specific masculine identity simply does not exist, as men did not readily reveal their feelings, scholars have offered definitions of manhood and masculinity.

Manhood is a socially constructed term that is inextricably tied to how men define masculinity. Michael Kimmel argues, “the quest for manhood – the effort to achieve, to demonstrate, to prove our masculinity – has been one of the formative and persistent experiences in men’s lives.”199 This “quest,” as Kimmel defines it, is less about the desire for domination and more about the fear of others having control over us. Additionally, manhood relies heavily
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on factors such as race, class, religion, ethnicity, age, sexuality, and region of a country. Similar to manhood, the definition of masculinity incorporated a host of variables. The meaning of masculinity has continuously changed over time. Within a culture, however, there will always be one definition of masculinity that members of that culture will be influenced by, and will likely be compelled to follow.

Masculinity, as a concept, is reliant on the values and ideals of a culture during a specific time period. These values create a commanding ideology, known as the cult of masculinity. During the early national period, the cult of masculinity was, in itself, distinctive. By understanding the model of masculinity that existed during this period, we can better comprehend men’s actions within the tavern. The American cult of masculinity evolved during the Revolution when rebels, who felt like children entitled with few rights, were victorious in the war.

**The Ordinary Man vs. The Gentleman**

Before understanding the intricacies of the varieties of manhood in the early republic, it is imperative to make the distinction in regard to how men were classified: common men and gentlemen. Humble, rural origins and limited education characterized ordinary men during the early national period. Society branded farmers, artisans, and other workers who participated in manual labor as ordinary men. While the new republican ideology held that all white men were created equal at birth, they were not equal in their abilities and character. In 1787 Benjamin Rush noted, “The rights of mankind are simple.” Rush explained, “They require no
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learning to unfold them. They are better felt, then explained. Hence in matters that relate to liberty, the mechanic and the philosopher, the farmer and the scholar, are all upon a footing.” Rush further stated, “But the case is widely different with respect to government. It is a complicated science, and requires abilities and knowledge of a variety of other subjects, to understand it.” The ordinary man whose profession involved working with his hands, lacked the proper virtuous character for public leadership. According to Aristotle, “The citizen must not live a mechanical or commercial life. Such a life is not noble, and it militates against virtue.” Aristotle contended that artisans, agricultural workers, and even businessmen could not be considered real citizens, because men “must have leisure to develop their virtue and for the activities of a citizen.” By the late eighteenth century, the ancient prejudices persisted against artisans and other workers, specifically within the realm of government. Prior to the Revolution, William Henry Drayton of South Carolina questioned how “men who never were in a way to study, or to advise upon any points, but knew only rules how to cut up a beast in a market to the best advantage, to cobble an old shoe in the neatest manner, or to build a necessary house,” could possibly hold a position in government. Unlike Drayton, these men were not gentlemen.

In contrast to social subordinates, gentlemen did not have occupations. As one New Yorker described it, these men were “not obliged to use the pains and labour to procure property.” Gentlemen were considered to have professions rather than occupations. Lawyers, physicians, clergymen, and military officers were considered respectable gentlemanly professions. For many learned men, the law represented a desired profession. James Kent, for
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instance, told his Columbia law students in 1794 that law ought to be “usefully known by every Gentleman of Polite Education.” In relation to the value of the law, Thomas Jefferson stated, “It qualifies a man to be useful to himself, to his neighbors, and to the public. It is the most certain stepping stone to preferment in the political line.”209 In addition, a liberal arts education qualified a gentleman to become a political leader. Through education, men better evaluated human affairs, freed themselves of prejudices, and acquired the ability to make non-prejudiced judgments about contending social interests. Noah Webster contended that a liberal arts education, which made a man a gentleman, “disqualifies a man for business.” A businessman could not qualify as a gentleman because his involvement with commercial society and making money would impede him from making judgments in the interest of society as a whole.210

The outward appearances of ordinary men and gentlemen differed starkly. According to Lord Chesterfield, a gentleman was “a man of good behavior, well bred, amiable, high-minded, who knows how to act in any society, in the company of any man.”211 In American society, gentlemen represented five to ten percent of the population. As a group, gentlemen walked, talked, and dressed in distinctly fashionable ways. Unlike ordinary men who wore plain shirts, leather aprons, and buckskin breeches, gentlemen wore lace ruffles, silk stockings, and other fine clothing. Additionally, in contrast to ordinary men whose hair appeared uncovered and natural, gentlemen continued to wear wigs or powdered hair. Further, gentlemen learned how to dance, fence, and play musical instruments, while ordinary men did not.212 Ultimately, gentlemen participated in an assortment of leisure activities that set them apart from the ordinary man.

Republicanism and Manhood
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The birth of the new nation spawned new republican ideals that significantly transformed manhood and the activities used to demonstrate masculinity. Delicate polities that required a society of equal and virtuous citizens characterized republics. Having vanquished the cloak of the English monarchy, Americans became citizens, not subjects. In contrast to subjects, the hereditary rights of their superiors did not shackle citizens. Further, republics required greater morality from their citizens, expecting them to take part in activities that would benefit the whole country, not just their personal self-interest.²¹³ Within republics, social hierarchies were supposed to be solely based off on individual merit rather than hereditary or social connections. Equality of opportunity was thought essential for republicanism.²¹⁴

What it meant to be a republican citizen was usually defined in male terms, and included both ordinary men and gentlemen. Republican citizenry did not include women, because under femme covert, husbands held and managed the legal rights of their wives.²¹⁵ As a result, men constituted the only political citizens who mattered. The white, male citizen valued individualism and supported the idea that each person had the freedom to pursue any interest he wanted. However, the republican man was tasked with balancing personal liberty with establishing a social and political order that would guarantee the success of the new republican government. Thus, success hinged on the republican citizen’s ability to defer to the authority of the government that he helped to create, and devoting himself to its well-being.²¹⁶

The republican man was expected to exhibit certain characteristics. The ideal republican man owned property. Whether a farmer owned his land or an artisan owned his tools, the
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importance of property ownership resided in the degree to which this ownership freed a man from the influence of others and provided the type of economic independence that permitted him to make his own decisions. Personal integrity and honesty designated essential characteristics of any respected businessman in the new republic. If a man did not own his property outright and found himself in debt to creditors, he risked losing a part of his manhood. Further, society viewed business failure as the outcome of personal incompetence rather than the result of economic or social factors. Bankruptcy and financial insecurity undermined one’s manhood as well. The republican man did not wear fine clothing or live beyond that which he could afford. Virtuous and physically strong, he did not squander his money on gaming nor did he threaten the public order by drinking excessively. In addition, this new masculinity exhibited a distinct secular quality, as godliness was no longer idealized.\footnote{Hoffert, 59.}

**Gentility and Genteel Masculinity**

Along with republicanism between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, gentility became a key component in how most Americans identified themselves. Gentility was about making the world an ideal place in which to live beginning with the individual and reaching out to the broader environment.\footnote{Richard Bushman, “The Genteel Republic.” *The Wilson Quarterly* 20, no. 4 (Autumn 1996): 16.} Originally, gentility represented a product of elite culture and provided society a means by which to distinguish ladies and gentlemen from ordinary men and women. Beginning in England with the culture of the court, the spirit of gentility certainly did not mimic the equality and egalitarian characteristics of the American republican society. Following the Revolution, however, most Americans chose to adopt patterns of gentility.\footnote{Bushman, “The Genteel Republic,” 19.}
As the importance of gentility grew, it became significant to the way in which people identified themselves and others. Richard Bushman argues that gentility became identified with the way in which people presented themselves and how they wished to be viewed by society. Ultimately, gentility was defined by the way a person presented themselves to others. Thus, gentility was measured in many ways, including dress, posture, movement, speech, taste, and attitude. Along with the more tangible markers of gentility, including posture, movement, and dress, codes of behavior increasingly became significant to refinement.

For men, in particular, characteristics associated with gentility became entangled with their masculinity, and resulted in a distinct identity representing the two, which I define as genteel masculinity. As previously discussed, a central component to a man’s masculinity was how he defined himself in the presence of other men. The culmination of a man’s masculine identity and gentility resulted in an exceptionally heightened sense of awareness related to public perceptions. As a result, genteel masculinity refers to how a man utilized the appearance and performance of gentility to express his masculinity, specifically in the presence of a male audience. Ultimately, men proved and asserted their genteel masculinity through behavior, performance, and appearance.

By the early nineteenth century, the Genteel Patriarch became a commanding ideal that represented the appearance, character, and behaviors of genteel masculinity. The Genteel Patriarch represented an aristocratic manhood associated with the British upper class code of honor, which considered refined tastes, manners, and sensibilities reflective of a well-rounded

Within the home, property ownership and patriarchal authority defined the Genteel Patriarch. The characteristics that the Genteel Patriarch embodied included kindness, love, duty, compassion through philanthropic work, and a commitment to his family. Considered to be the epitome of what a gentleman should be, many men looked to George Washington as a role model for proper etiquette and demeanor. The following New Jersey funeral sermon for Washington is an illustration of how society viewed him and why it believed men should emulate him:

[To Gentlemen, Officers, and Soldiers]: You have lost the best of officers; perhaps the greatest General that the world hath ever produced. There are none who have fought under his banner, or regaled under the shade of his laurels, but have the highest veneration for his character, and will most sincerely lament his death. He was, as a man—a soldier, and an officer, a complete, and excellent pattern, which each of you should strive to imitate.

In addition to being considered a good leader, Washington was considered a gentleman. During the Revolution, he made a concerted effort to transform his officers into professional soldiers with examples of appropriate, respectable gentry virtues. Washington’s “Rules of Civility” codified a variety of characteristics necessary for genteel men, including personal grooming, dress, and table manners. This work emphasized, “Every Action done in Company, ought to be with Some Sign of Respect, to those that are Present.” Ultimately, the goal of the “Rules of Civility,” was to preserve the social order and to maintain the status quo through modesty, deference, and submission to authority.

Along with the values and manners of the Genteel Patriarch, appearance and performance determine meaningful components to understanding genteel masculinity during the early
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nineteenth century. An illustration entitled, “Grown Gentlemen Taught to Dance,” by English artist, John Collet, presents the ideal characteristics associated with this identity. The focus of this picture is one man, perhaps a dance instructor, teaching another man how to dance. Standing with an erect posture, the instructor appears confident. Although he is not wearing a wig, his long hair is neatly held together with a bow as it flows down his back. To accompany his long, ornately decorated, and regal overcoat, the instructor wears what appears to be a ruffled ascot around his neck. The instructor’s hands are fit with fine gloves. With the right hand, the dance instructor holds his male companion’s hand, and with the left hand he points out where his partner should move his feet. In contrast to the instructor, the male dance student maintains a less erect posture. Unlike the instructor, the student wears a wig. However, the appearance of the student’s real hair, which is left unchecked under the wig, makes the hairstyle seem less refined. Further, the demeanor that resonates from his facial expression is hesitant and unsure. Although the student wears a long overcoat with a few buttons, it is less ornate in appearance than the instructor’s coat. The small rag or handkerchief that is left absentmindedly hanging out of the student’s pocket only adds to his less than polished appearance. Along with his facial expression, the student appears tentative with his footwork as he positions both of his feet awkwardly together in front of himself, in opposition to the instructor’s refined and open stance. As the student makes his right hand available for the instructor to guide him, it is clear that the student is in the submissive position. This submissiveness is only accentuated, as the instructor appears to tell the student what to do with his feet.

The appearance and behavior of the dance instructor in Collet’s illustration demonstrates the essence of genteel masculinity. The instructor’s refined posture, confidence, and dress represent essential genteeel characteristics. As these traits became important factors in how men
assessed each other, standards of gentility became increasingly entangled with masculinity. Refined men, like Washington and Collet’s dance instructor, served as mentors for men seeking to prove their genteel masculinity to others. The dance instructor’s male student exemplifies the common man’s desire to uphold the accepted standards of genteel masculinity. As illustrated through the dance student, however, sometimes this imitation could prove to be an awkward struggle. Thus, men, specifically middle class men, utilized books, illustrations, and other more refined men, like Washington, as guides to create their own version of gentility.

Following the end of the Revolution, middle class men, empowered by republican ideals, increasingly formed their own versions of gentility.228 Despite the fact that a man might have held an occupation, like a businessman or merchant, this no longer impeded him from being considered a gentleman. If an ordinary, middle class man could look and act the part, then he too could be considered a gentleman. Men adopted genteel behaviors and attitudes from courtesy books dispersed throughout the Anglo-Atlantic world. However, this is not to say that middling men were not mocked for their efforts to be perceived as a gentleman. Benjamin Franklin, for instance, poked fun at the new middling gentleman and described him as a “new Gentleman, or rather a half Gentleman, or Mungrel, an unnatural Compound of earth and Brass like the Feet of Nebuchadnezzar’s Image.” Unlike the traditional early American gentleman, the middle class gentleman relied on a host of books and manuals to teach himself manners and politeness.229

The highest character accolade and indicator of a man’s respectability was his display of “gentlemanliness.”230 As middle class men garnered the opportunity to become “gentlemen,” the defining characteristic of the upper social class, they were presented with the opportunity to
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claim a portion of the power formerly held by the ruling class. As a result, middling men held a chance to gain respectability.\textsuperscript{231} By the early nineteenth century, the term, “gentleman,” became less reliant on a man’s class and whether or not he pursued an occupation versus a profession. Instead, it became more dependent on his actions and how he presented himself and how he behaved.

**The Republican Gentleman**

Significant to this study is acknowledging how republicanism and the growth of gentility forged a new masculine identity. This particular masculine identity, which I refer to as the Republican Gentleman, united characteristics of the ordinary republican man and the gentleman. The Republican Gentleman was middle class. Additionally, his role as the patriarch in his family remained significant to his identity. Similar to the colonial period, a symbiotic relationship still existed between the family and the state.\textsuperscript{232} As the patriarch, the Republican Gentleman served as the authority over his family and was equally responsible for its well being. Due to this, the Republican Gentleman worked for a living to sustain the economic viability of both himself and his family, unlike the traditional gentleman. It is important to note, however, that this work did not include hard, manual labor. Prominent businessmen, merchants, clerks, middling farmers, and schoolteachers symbolized professions of the Republican Gentleman.\textsuperscript{233} The wealth that the Republican Gentleman gained through his profession also ensured his ability to remain free of debt as the republican society frowned upon financial instability and incompetence.

The importance of gentility and genteel masculinity greatly affected the Republican Gentleman’s appearance. Despite the meaningfulness of virtue and limiting excess, in terms of material belongings, the Republican Gentleman wore fine clothing to assert and articulate his
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position in society. This appearance did not include the rather ostentatious appearance of powdered wigs. Thus, in many ways, gentility served as an instrument of power for American men. There were certain values of the ordinary republican man that remained important for the Republican Gentleman, including property ownership, virtue, honesty, integrity, and financial freedom. Additionally, the Republican Gentleman sought to balance his individual interests, as well as that of his family’s, with his broader contribution to the community as a whole. As a man, the Republican Gentleman illustrated the culmination of these attributes before a community of his male peers in order to prove and validate his masculine identity.

Heterosocial Activities – From Ball Rooms to Sideshows

Compared to their original structure and purpose, Richmond taverns grew significantly in size and accommodation from the eighteenth to the early nineteenth century. As discussed in chapter one, Richmond’s taverns provided focal points for male sociability. From Richmond Hill to Shockoe Valley, Richmond men flocked to public houses for a host of activities, including drink, food, lodging, business transactions, and socialization. Following the Revolution, the space in which these activities took place significantly changed. Chapter Two illustrated the dramatic changes that these structures underwent as buildings became an avenue in which to display the emerging national identity and accommodate the needs of genteel patrons.

The importance of gentility and refinement to the appearance, size, and structure of early nineteenth century Richmond supported the emergence of a range of heterosocial activities. With the refinement of architecture, Richmond tavern proprietors arranged for their taverns to hold a greater variety of rooms, apart from the simple common room. Given the architectural refinement of taverns, the distinct presence of different forms of spaces, like parlor rooms and

ballrooms indicated new patterns of tavern use. Although society still considered taverns to be a primarily male environment, new spaces allowed for heterosocial activities, like ballroom dances and side show entertainments. Ballroom dances formally invited women, while sideshow entertainments, including performances by the “Learned Pig” and ventriloquists, welcomed both women and children. As the growing presence of these activities in Richmond’s leading public houses, including the Eagle Tavern and the Bell Tavern, became more common, men naturally escorted their wives, and sometimes their children, to these heterosocial activities and attractions.

Ballroom dances and sophisticated entertainment afforded the Republican Gentleman the opportunity to escort women into refined taverns. On February 23, 1814, for instance, men across Richmond escorted ladies to the Bell Tavern for “an elegant Ball.” This particular ball was held in honor of George Washington’s birthday. According to the *Virginia Patriot*, “After the Military had gone through the usual ceremonies, the proceedings of the day were closed with an elegant Ball, given at the Bell Tavern, where ladies and gentlemen united in recalling to recollection the illustrious virtues of him.”

Husbands or grown sons typically escorted married women to balls or other acceptable heterosocial entertainments held in the tavern. On July 2, 1803, the *Virginia Argus* published an advertisement for the Bell Tavern that invited both ladies and gentlemen to a ventriloquist act. The advertisement stated, “See, Compare, & Judge! On Monday evening, July 4th 1803, at the Ball Room in the Bell Tavern, the ladies and gentlemen of Richmond are respectfully informed that they have it in their power for the first time in this city to hear the inimitable powers of the European Ventriloquist.”

By escorting wives and mothers to balls and sophisticated entertainment shows held in Richmond’s leading taverns, the Republican Gentleman exemplified his role as protector. The emergence of heterosocial
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activities and attractions in Richmond taverns provided men the opportunity to perform what it meant to be a Republican Gentleman. As men escorted their wives and children to sideshow entertainments, they demonstrated their position as the dominant head of the household. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the role of family patriarch was significant to how the Republican Gentleman defined his identity. By taking his wife to a ball or his family to some form of sideshow entertainment, the Republican Gentleman asserted his role as the family patriarch.

By escorting his wife and family to public events, such as those in the tavern, the Republican Gentleman was responsible for both his family and their appearance. On February 25, 1812, the *Virginia Patriot* published a bill that held if “any white female of the age of ten years or upwards” appeared in any “public street, lane, alley, highway, church, court-house, tavern, ball-room, theatre, or any other place of public resort with naked elbows, or naked shoulders,” or with “less than three body garments,” the parent or guardian of the girl in violation would be fined. The fine consisted of “not less than one or more than one hundred dollars, to be recovered by action of debt, information, or indictment.”

Advertisements such as this demonstrate the importance that society placed on standards of appearance. If a Republican Gentleman brought his family out in public, he was responsible for protecting his family’s image. The appearance of the Republican Gentleman’s family was a reflection of both him and his abilities as a patriarch, a defining feature of his masculinity. Thus, the tavern provided a public stage in which the Republican Gentleman was able to prove his patriarchy, his authority as head of household, and commitment to his family.

Along with his status as the family patriarch, by taking his family to sideshow entertainments, the Republican Gentleman confirmed his financial ability as many of these
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attractions cost money. On November 5, 1799, Richard Bowler published two advertisements in the *Virginia Argus* highlighting the presence of sideshow entertainments in his tavern. Both of these forms of entertainment invited “Ladies and Gentlemen,” and their children. Further, Bowler publicized the fee for each entertainment. The first advertisement for entertainment stated, “To the Curious. A Beautiful Lion, to be seen every day, (Sundays excepted) at Mr. Bowler’s Tavern in this city. Admittance for Ladies and Gentlemen, One Quarter of a Dollar – Children half price.” Under the advertisement for the “Beautiful Lion,” Bowler announced another entertainment, the “Learned Pig.” The advertisement stated, “A Curiosity in which the public will not be disappointed. The Learned Pig: To be seen at Mr. Richard Bowler’s Tavern, in this city, every day in the week (Sundays excepted.) **Price of admittance 25 cents - Children half price.”

For republicanism, financial independence and ability was especially meaningful to a man’s identity. By paying for these entertainments for his entire family, taverns provided an essential avenue for the Republican Gentleman to illustrate his financial abilities and independence. Since taverns provided a space for primarily male patrons to congregate, the Republican Gentleman was able to prove his position of authority, commitment to his family, and his financial stability in public to a community of male peers.

**Homosocial Activities – Clubs and Societies**

Both before and after the Revolution, drinking served as a fundamental feature of masculine identity. By the end of the eighteenth century, male-drinking cultures developed throughout American cities, including Richmond. Within these drinking circles, men chose to drink with other men. Alone, within these homosocial spaces, men embraced a different range of

---

238 *Virginia Argus*, 5 November 1799, Vol. VII, no. 57, p. 3. Typically, sideshow entertainments, such as these cost twenty-five cents, at most for adults, more sophisticated forms of entertainment, like ventriloquist acts cost one dollar per person. Additionally, newspapers only advertised to “Ladies and Gentlemen” for ventriloquist acts, not children.
behaviors than they did in the presence of women. In a sense, they created a different masculinity without the presence of women. Since drinking was an experience shared with other men, it allowed them to determine their masculine identity within the context of social relationships with other men.

During most of the eighteenth century, before the emergence of the Republican Gentleman, traditional gentlemen often drank with ordinary men whose economic status was less than that of their own. As gentlemen often treated ordinary men to drinks or a bowl of punch following a political election or horse race, gentlemen demonstrated their superior hospitality, wealth, and independence to the men around him. After the Revolution, white men began to conceive of drinking within the context of equality. As a result, drinking with those of equal social and economic status became more acceptable. Since men defined their masculinity in the relation to other men, drinking with men of a similar social and economic background illustrated a man’s individual masculine identity to himself and society.

By the late eighteenth century, ideals associated with gentility and refinement began to significantly transform tavern space as Republican Gentlemen sought out more physically exclusive spaces in order to socialize among men of similar backgrounds. In reference to a Philadelphia tavern, Dr. Alexander Hamilton stated:

I observed several comical, grotesque phizzes in the inn wher[e] I put up wich would have afforded a variety of hints for a painter of Hogarth’s turn. They talked there upon all subjects – politics, religion, and trade – some tolerably well, but most of them ignorantly, I discovered two or three chaps very inquisitive, asking my boy who I was, whence come, and whither bound.

---
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Hamilton’s remark was likely reflective of how well to do men judged tavern company. Esteemed men like Hamilton perceived working class, and perhaps some middling men as uneducated and uninformed. This is reflected in Hamilton’s description of these men as “grotesque phizzes.” As a result, more elite men, including Republican Gentlemen, sought to distance themselves physically from this particular class of men in order to not be identified with them.

Along with ideals related to gentility and refinement, this period typified an age in which social differences were increasingly represented through physical separation as both ambition and poverty were articulated spatially and visually.244 Due to this, esteemed members of Richmond’s mercantile society flocked to the type of taverns that could provide the selective and exclusive space they desired.245 Particularly, officers and gentlemen viewed privacy as essential in tavern accommodation. As these genteel men gradually segregated themselves to more private rooms rather than the general barroom, the spatial differences between these rooms articulated social differences between gentlemen and working class men. In Richmond, taverns, such as the Eagle Tavern, offered a greater degree of privacy as a larger public house rather than smaller taverns, such as the Bowler’s Tavern.246

In order to accommodate the needs of men who wished to socialize and drink with men similar to themselves, private rooms became increasingly prevalent in Richmond’s more refined taverns. The emergence of private rooms provided a space for men’s club and society meetings. Here, men were able to meet in a more closed and exclusive environment. The early nineteenth century typified an age in which social differences were translated through physical separation.
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Club meetings were crucial in expanding the scope of public expression as they provided a level of discourse between men that differed from the dialogue of the common room.\textsuperscript{247} Held within private rooms, the presence of club and society meetings represented spatial exclusivity, in part due to selective membership requirements. The Society of the Friends of the Revolution in Richmond, for instance, required that non-members pay for tickets in order to gain admission into their meetings. An advertisement for a meeting in Richmond’s \textit{Enquirer} stated, “The society of Friends of the Revolution will dine at the Bell Tavern on the 4\textsuperscript{th} of July. Gentlemen (not members) who wish to unite with them, may get tickets of admission by applying to Mr. Wordham.”\textsuperscript{248} This advertisement illustrates the importance of membership to these organizations as well as financial independence since it was a requirement that non-members pay admittance to join the meeting. It is important to note that the purchase of a ticket did not necessarily mean that men were invited to join the group, only the meeting.\textsuperscript{249}

By the early nineteenth century, the presence of clubs and societies in taverns’ private rooms allowed Republican Gentlemen to define themselves among a community of their male peers who held similar social and economic backgrounds. Clubs and societies were private associations, composed of men that met privately on a regular basis in public drinking places.\textsuperscript{250} Along with recreational, political, educational, and philanthropic purposes, clubs provided an avenue for common male sociability.\textsuperscript{251} Without the presence of women, men were able to engage in traditional drunken camaraderie. Particularly, clubs and societies served as places to

\textsuperscript{248} \textit{Enquirer}, 30 June 1812, p. 3. See \textit{Enquirer}, 18 June 1814, p. 3 for additional illustration of meeting admittance for only Master Mechanics.
\textsuperscript{249} Thompson, 85-86.
\textsuperscript{250} Although “club” and “society” were sometimes used interchangeably, societies often were associated with a more formal character. For more information, see Peter Clark, \textit{British Clubs and Societies, 1580-1800: The Origins of an Associational World} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 12.
\textsuperscript{251} Clark, 12.
relax and fraternize with kin, friends, and neighbors without the constraints of female company and obligations representative of the home. Further, these organizations and meetings afforded Republican Gentlemen a platform in which to establish a reputation in the community\textsuperscript{252}. For instance, the Richmond Society, which became known for figures such as John Marshall, who was chosen as president, and James Monroe, the society’s acting vice president in 1811, required that its members be nominated. Advertising an upcoming meeting, the Richmond Society stated in reference to membership:

\begin{quote}
The Richmond Society for promoting Agriculture, begin thus established, the subscription is now closed, and no person can become a member without being previously nominated, and then admitted by vote. – Gentlemen residing in the country, who are disposed to contribute their aid to the promotion of agriculture can be afforded by becoming members of this society, will communicate their wishes to the Secretary.\textsuperscript{253}
\end{quote}

This advertisement’s use of “Gentlemen” and the fact that its members were encouraged to contribute aid to the promotion of agriculture hints at the importance of members’ economic background.

Homosocial clubs and societies provided the Republican Gentleman a platform in which to display his masculine identity. In contrast to heterosocial activities, the Republican Gentleman’s participation in various clubs and societies represented an all-male experience. Due to the fact that masculinity was proved in the presence of other men, homosocial clubs and societies offered an ideal vehicle in which to display masculinity. Further, various organizations served different purposes. Clubs and societies may have represented business pursuits, civic obligations, or patriotic displays. The focus of a group also provided a way for the Republican Gentleman to perform his identity. The Republican Gentleman’s membership in clubs related to business demonstrated his financial abilities and profession. On July 31, 1802, Daniel Beasley,
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the secretary of the Board of the Directors of the Manchester Turnpike Company, advertised a
meeting for the board in the *Virginia Argus*. Beasley wrote, “I hereby notify the Share-holders
of the said company, that they are requested to meet at Mr. Brooks’ tavern in Manchester, the
30\(^{\text{th}}\) day of August next, to supply a vacancy in the Directory.”\(^{254}\) As discussed previously, one
of the Republican Gentleman’s primary professions was business. As a businessman, the
Republican Gentleman was able to make a living without resorting to hard, manual labor. By
making a viable living through business, the Republican Gentleman was able to provide for his
family and he was able to afford the proper refined clothing indicative of the era.

Similarly, business clubs and societies, specifically affiliated with a particular profession,
granted the Republican Gentleman the opportunity to illustrate his exemplary abilities in a
particular profession. Meetings held by the Mechanics of Richmond exemplified this. On May
18, 1814, the *Virginia Patriot* advertised two resolutions, “At a meeting of the committee
(appointed by a general meeting of the Mechanics of Richmond) held at the Washington Tavern
in the City of Richmond, on Thursday evening the 16\(^{\text{th}}\) of June, 1814. Of the two resolutions, the
most important was that the general meeting, which was ordered to meet on Monday at 5 PM,
“be composed of master mechanics only.”\(^{255}\) Since this upcoming meeting was only stipulated
for “master mechanics” it distinguished the abilities between the ordinary mechanic and the more
accomplished mechanic. A Republican Gentleman would have been classified as a “master
mechanic” because it differentiated him from the ordinary man. By participating in meetings for
the “master mechanic,” the Republican Gentleman affirmed his professional abilities to society
and a community of male peers.

---

In the early nineteenth century, the Republican Gentleman maintained a delicate balance between what was best for the individual and what was for the betterment of the community. While individual pursuits were viewed as more acceptable than what they had been in the eighteenth century, one of the persistent concerns of the early national period was that businessmen who were only looking out for their own interests would not look out for the community. As a result, along with organizations associated with business, the Republican Gentleman participated in civic clubs and societies. In Richmond, one of the organizations that served for the betterment of the community was the Agricultural Society. In the Enquirer, members of Richmond’s Agricultural stated the following in relation to their purpose to the community:

> Considering Agriculture as a subject of the deepest interest to this country, and believing that Agricultural Societies, established on order of principles, by affording a stimulus to exertion, and by diffusing information, tend to increase the national stock of knowledge in that most useful science, a number of Gentlemen assembled in the City of Richmond, have determined to associate themselves together, and to form a society for the purpose of promoting Agriculture.

Richmond’s Agricultural Society called a meeting at “the Swan Tavern in this City, when and where the officers of the Agricultural Society” were appointed. The society invited “all who are anxious to promote the best Interests of the Country.” As a member of these particular groups, the Republican Gentleman was visibly seen making a broader contribution to the community. Through his participation in civic organizations, the Republican Gentleman demonstrated his ability to maintain individual business pursuits while still providing a helping hand to the community.

Finally, patriotic clubs and societies afford the Republican Gentleman the ability to illustrate his pride and respect for the new nation. Richmond’s Society of the Friends of the

---
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Revolution represented a popular patriotic organization during the early national period. At a regular meeting of the society on June 11, 1813 at the Washington Tavern, the group resolved to invite “citizens of Richmond, Manchester, and their vicinities, who are friends of the Revolution, [including the military,]” to celebrate “the approaching Anniversary of American Independence,” with the society.257 Similar to his participation in civic groups, patriotic organizations offered an avenue in which to display the Republican Gentleman’s stake in the broader community and country.

**Homosocial Sociability - Toasting**

Drinking and toasting represented fundamental homosocial activities in which men were able to actively participate in this camaraderie and fellowship. During this time, men drank as a testament to their personal liberty. In many ways, drinking was a necessity for masculine culture in the new republic.258 Toasting reinforced the notion that drinking was a man’s activity, and so became a defining feature of manliness.259 As men drank, toasting to the nation and the men who founded it was a common, patriotic activity. In December 1814, Mr. Brooks at the Eagle Tavern held an “excellent dinner” for Captain Reid, of the General Armstrong privateer. During this dinner, it was noted that when the toasts began, “The electric fire of patriotism spread from bosom to bosom; and while the toast and song of sentiment went round, every generous heart caught the inspiration, and every lip gave it utterance.”260

Toasting, itself, consisted of the act of expressing uncontroversial sentiments in a stylized manner. The Society of the Friends of the Revolution often had exceptionally stylized and clearly planned toasts for their meetings and celebrations. According to a group meeting on June
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11, 1813, for instance, a special committee was appointed of the “Hon Charles K. Mallory, Wm Wirt, Thomas Richie, Esq’re s. – whose duty it shall be to prepare Toasts for the 4th of July…” The Friends of the Revolution celebrated this particular Fourth of July at the Bell Tavern. During the celebration, toasts were given in the name of “Thomas Jefferson, to Governor Barbour, to General Taylor, to Major Gawin Chrbin, to the gallant Volunteers of Petersburgh, to the Orator of the Day, &c. &c.” The fact that a special committee was designated to help create and develop these toasts indicates the importance of these accolades.

Promoting a style of drinking that identified and built upon what a group of men had in common, toasting allowed for conversational exchanges between men from a variety of ethnic, cultural, and social backgrounds. This solidified a drinker’s identification with the group in which he drank with, and provided an avenue for strangers to partake of the fellowship. Although toasting bound men together in camaraderie and fellowship, it also included the potential to cause conflict by identifying and isolating men who refused to participate. Men or committees often prepared thirteen to fifteen toasts in advance of an event and would be followed by numerous rounds of more impromptu toasts. The importance of the event often indicated the amount of necessary toasts. At a public dinner held at the Eagle Tavern, Richmond citizens celebrated General William Eaton for his heroic expedition to Derne [Darnah], a seaport on the Mediterranean Sea. As reported in the Richmond Enquirer, the dinner was attended by a “numerous and respectable company graced by the presence of the Chief Justice of the United States, the Judges of the Court of Appeals and the General Court.” In total, “the company drank
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seventeen toasts at the evening’s celebration.” Among the seventeen toasts, men praised Thomas Jefferson, the people of the United States, and the “memory of George Washington.”

For the Republican Gentleman, toasting in taverns provided a space for male sociability. The act of toasting articulated clear descriptions and characteristics that the Republican Gentleman sought to emulate. Through toasting, the Republican Gentleman was able to identify an image of masculinity to emulate as he took part in tavern toasts for everyone from George Washington to Ben Franklin. In these frequent toasts, which were often published in Richmond newspapers, men spent a substantial amount of time articulating the desirable traits of their past Revolutionary heroes. As a result, these tavern toasts offer an indication of the men that other Republican Gentleman looked up to in the early national period. On March 4, 1809, the Bell Tavern celebrated a festival and followed it up with a range of toasts. Among a list of seventeen different toasts, those toasting heroics from the American Revolution received high accolades. Men at the Bell Tavern called for the following toasts:

4. Thomas Jefferson – The bright constellation of principles which guided him thro’ an age of reformation, illuminates with increased splendor his days of retirement. 3 cheers
5. James Madison; the firm, uniform and intrepid supporter of our neutral rights. 6 cheers
6. The memory of Geo. Washington – We tender his Farewell Address to our Eastern Brethren. 3 cheers
7. The memory of Benjamin Franklin who, amidst the venality of Courts and the temptations of power, continued the able and inflexible advocate of the rights of man. 3 cheers
8. The Patriots of 1776 – May their descendents emulate their fame. 6 cheers

These toasts are an indication of the values and men that Republican Gentlemen looked up to during the early national period. As discussed earlier, men like Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Washington, and Ben Franklin were considered to be gentlemen. Since part of
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the Republican Gentleman’s identity was wrapped up in what it meant to be a traditional gentleman, the accolades and toasts that Republican Gentlemen made in honor and memory of these esteemed gentlemen illustrate the importance of these ideals to the Republican Gentleman.

Along with toasting the men that Republican Gentlemen sought to emulate, toasts also highlighted the importance of republicanism. On Saturday, October 21, 1809, the Eagle Tavern held a special dinner in honor of Thomas Jefferson who had come to town “on some Law concerns.”267 “A large and brilliant company” attended the dinner, which included “Mr. Jefferson, the three Judges of the Court of Appeals, Col. Monroe, Judge Cabell, Messrs. Jerman Baker, & A. Thweatt, and Col. Skipwith.” Following dinner, a series of toasts accompanied music from the band of the Rifle Company. The men raised their glasses in the memory of George Washington, describing him as, “The soldier of liberty, the hero of the revolution, and the friend of man.” Apart from Washington, this toast illustrates the importance of liberty to the republican society. Although Washington was their leader, men toasted the everyday patriot of the Revolution and cheered for their fight for independence, their services and sufferings will endear them to their countrymen.” Similar to liberty, freedom and independence represented essential principles to the Republican Gentleman. In the rally of toasts and cheers that persisted throughout the night, men toasted “The republicans throughout the United States – A long pull, a strong pull, & a pull all together.” The meaning of this toast to the fold of republicanism could highlight the significance of community and a shared collective identity. Although republicanism called for individualism, the gentleman still recognized the importance of initiatives for the collective betterment of the community and country. The Republican Gentleman exemplified a delicate balance between the two. Ultimately, as toasts such as these

267 Although the public dinner was held at the Eagle Tavern, Jefferson actually lodged at the Swan Tavern during his stay.
often emphasized the importance of gentlemen, like Washington, and republican ideals, such as independence and liberty, these toasts provided an avenue for the Republican Gentleman to articulate their masculine identity publically before an audience of like-minded men.

By the late eighteenth century, republicanism inspired toasts aptly accompanied republican events and festivities in taverns. At Miller’s Tavern, for instance, a “Republican Beef Roast” took place on Wednesday, November 27, 1799. For this event, a collection of “respectable inhabitants” gathered together for the purpose of celebrating “democratic principles in the United States, and in particular the election of a republican governor in the state of Pennsylvania.” According to the Virginia Argus, a series of “patriotic Toasts were drank and applauded by repeated huzzas on the part of the company,” following the roast. Through toasts that specifically highlighted republican ideals, the Republican Gentleman publically articulated the values that were important to the country as well as his masculine identity. Toasting Thomas Jefferson, guests proclaimed, “may his eminent talents, his well tried integrity, and his republican virtues, secure to him the next presidential appointment.” Jefferson, as a gentleman, already symbolized the epitome of what a Republican Gentleman should emulate. As Jefferson became synonymous with “republican virtues” and “integrity,” these characteristics represented an added importance to the Republican Gentleman. Excess, in consumerism and government, represented a trait that was to be abhorred by republican societies. The third toast of the night highlighted this principle as men cheered for, “The fundamental principles of the constitution – may it be pruned of its exuberances that lead to monarchy or aristocracy.” Apart from Jefferson, the sixth toast of the night celebrated “prominent republican characters of Virginia, Madison, Taylor, Giles, Monroe, J. and W. Nicholas, &c. &c.” The eleventh toast of the night called for “Peace with all the world; but if we are forced into a war, let it be with a monarchy, not a
The prominence of republican ideals throughout this toast, and given the fact that the event was a “Republican Beef Roast,” illustrates the importance of republicanism to the respected Republican Gentleman who attended these events. Through these toasts in the tavern, the Republican Gentleman was able to form bonds of camaraderie with men and perform his masculinity among a group of men with similar social and economic backgrounds.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, republican festivals and toasts became symbolic of tavern activities and representative of the activities of Republican Gentlemen. On February 6, 1801, Richmond’s *Virginia Argus* published an article about a “Republican Festival” that took place in nearby Petersburg, Virginia. Taking place on January 29, 1801, the Republican Festival was described as a “Celebration of the Triumph of Republicanism, over the Aristocracy, manifested in the election of Mr. Jefferson as President, and Mr. Burr as Vice-President of the United States, By the People.” In true patriotic fashion, the festival began with the discharge of sixteen cannons and an ardent display of the American flag. By “4 o’clock nearly two hundred citizens sat down to the Festival, at Mr. Robert Armstead’s Tavern, which was plentifully and splendidly prepared.” Virginia Governor James Monroe, who was “accompanied by several Republican members of the Executive Council of the State,” also attended. Throughout the Festival, “the utmost conviviality and harmony prevailed; every countenance exhibited the most striking appearance of sincere joy and congratulations; and the whole company were warmly animated with that spirit, which the influence of Republicanism never fails to inspire.” The end of the Festival called for a host of patriotic toasts. Similar to other toasts with patriotic sentiments, Petersburg’s Republican Festival ended with toasts that celebrated the typical patriotic leaders and republican ideals. Among the sixteen toasts made that night, the thirteenth
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toast most noticeably exemplified both the man and the ideals that the Republican Gentleman sought to live up to. The thirteenth toast celebrated, “The Memory of George Washington, the Commander in Chief of the Armies of the United States of America during the late revolutionary war – May the virtue, magnanimity, and patriotism which that highly distinguished officer displayed in the cause of Liberty and his Country, be handed down to the latest posterity with undiminished lustre.”

“Washington,” “virtue,” “patriotism,” “distinguished officer,” “Liberty,” and “Country” all represent words that were indicative of the character of the Republican Gentleman.

Ultimately, toasts provided a stage for the performance of Republican Gentlemen as they articulated the connection between the traditional gentleman and the values of republican ideals within the arena of the tavern. Toasts paved a way for Republican Gentlemen to clearly articulate meaningful ideals associated with republicanism. By verbally celebrating these ideals in the presence of similar men, the Republican Gentleman demonstrated faith and belief in these ideals, which included virtue, liberty, integrity, and honesty. Thus, the Republican Gentleman proved his commitment to republicanism in the presence of other men. Along with these republican ideals, the celebration of men, such as Washington and Jefferson, demonstrated the fusion of the gentleman and republican values, which symbolized the Republican Gentleman.

**Conclusion**

During the early national period, the synthesis of gentility and republicanism determined a new masculine identity – the Republican Gentleman. Undoubtedly the transition between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries marked an increase in the proportion of men who sought to become part of the genteel life. Predominantly middle class, these businessmen, small merchants, middling farmers, artisans, teachers, and clerks, embraced gentility as a quality that

---

could be cultivated and nurtured, not something that had to be attained through genetics and family heritage. These ordinary men sought to transform themselves in order to meet the standards of gentility and the growing polite society. Coupled with gentility, the importance of republican ideals to the new American society influenced the masculine identities of middle class men. Virtue, financial independence, integrity, patriotism, honesty, and patriarchy highlight only a small portion of the republican values that middle class men sought to emulate. Throughout the period, middle class men balanced gentility and republicanism as a way to perform the identity of the Republican Gentleman.

Refined Richmond taverns provided a stage for the performance of the Republican Gentleman’s masculine identity. With the rise of gentility, tavern space transformed to meet the growing need for more refined accommodations by the public. As discussed in Chapter Two, Richmond taverns grew in size and architectural complexity by the end of the eighteenth century. As a result, previously existing taverns, as well as those newly constructed at the start of the nineteenth century, increasingly incorporated elements such as private space, gardens, and ballrooms. Ultimately, the development of this tavern space greatly affected its primary patrons, men. In contrast to the past when men often congregated in one primary room of a tavern, these new forms of public houses that stressed the importance of multiple spaces, both private and public. Within these refined spaces, the Republican Gentleman proved his masculine identity among a community of other men through his performance and behavior.

Refined, Richmond taverns offered the appropriate genteel accommodations and theater for the Republican Gentleman. Within taverns, the Republican Gentleman affirmed his masculinity identity through both heterosocial and homosocial activities. These activities included heterosocial entertainments, men’s clubs and society meetings, and drinking rituals,

most specifically toasts. Through heterosocial entertainments, like balls and sideshows, the Republican Gentleman asserted his patriarchal authority as he escorted both his wife and children to these events. The development of more private rooms in taverns provided a space for all male club and society meetings. As members of these organizations, the Republican Gentleman publically identified his involvement with business, civic, and patriotic societies. This was especially significant given the importance of financial independence, contribution to the community, and patriotism to the republican society. Finally, homosocial sociability within the tavern afforded the Republican Gentleman an outlet in which to form camaraderie with similar men through drinking rituals, primarily toasting. These toasts often highlighted the traditional gentlemen, including Washington and Jefferson, and republican ideals that the Republican Gentleman sought to mirror.

Taverns provided the most effective spaces to express the most esteemed values of the Republican Gentleman’s masculine identity. During the early national period, refined taverns still represented a predominantly male space, despite the growth of space to accommodate heterosocial activities. Given the tavern’s history as a male space, Richmond taverns provided a comfortable space for men to perform their masculine identities. Since the Republican Gentleman indicated a new masculine identity, Richmond men flocked to the space where they felt the most comfortable displaying their previous masculine identities to perform this new growing ideal of masculinity. Additionally, since masculinity was proved in the presence of other men, a space predominantly filled with men offered the most effective venue for the Republican Gentleman to perform his masculine identity. This is not to say that Republican Gentlemen were always successful in this performance. Taverns merely offered a stage.
Ultimately, it was up to the Republican Gentleman to successfully express his masculinity, as directed by society’s script.
Conclusion
Gentility, Masculinity, and the Importance of Appearance

Gentility was a fundamental component to early American society. Between the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, appearance proved critical to asserting and assessing identity. In essence, gentility referred to maintaining the appearance of refinement to others. Appearance included a host of characteristics, including dress, manners, posture, etiquette, respectability, and politeness. Particularly meaningful to gentility was the way in which people utilized acceptable appearances in order to present themselves and evaluate each other in society. Ultimately, growing standards of gentility served as a guidebook for Richmond citizens on how they should appear and behave.

Through gentility, Americans took great care in how they presented themselves to others. However, more than a particular style of dress, set of manners, or respectability, gentility became a critical factor in determining early Americans’ identities, particularly middle class Americans. By conforming to a genteel set of practices and behaviors, middle class men and women found ways to distinguish themselves from the lower orders of society. As they dressed and acted the part of the genteel citizenry, middle class Americans embraced gentility as part of their identity.

Particular to middle class men, gentility became intricately tied to how they defined themselves as not only men, but as republican men. Genteel masculinity emerged at the turn of the nineteenth century. This specific masculine identity referred to the way in which men utilized both the appearance and performance of gentility as a means to express their masculinity, particularly within the realm of a male audience. Men proved and asserted this masculinity through behavior, performance, and appearance. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, the emergence of the importance of republican ideology exponentially grew alongside
the growth of gentility. Republicanism supported individualism and granted white, male citizens the freedom pursue any interest they wanted. Expectations of the republican man included financial independence and modesty, personal integrity, a solid work ethic, and patriarchal authority. The combination of republicanism and gentility forced men to strike a balancing act between the two. For men, the appearance of gentility traditionally required fine clothing and powdered wigs. Given the ideals of republicanism, however, extravagancies required moderation. From the men who most successfully maintained the delicate balance of republicanism and gentility emerged the Republican Gentleman.

Richmond’s newly constructed and refined taverns reflected the growth of gentility and significantly influenced the Republican Gentleman’s performances within these spaces. In striking opposition from their small and simplistic colonial appearance, Richmond taverns underwent dramatic transformation by the end of the eighteenth century. Taverns grew through size, architectural sophistication, their amount of specialized rooms, and the accommodations they offered to patrons. Additionally, taverns increasingly demonstrated a shift from using wooden construction materials to investing in brick materials instead. The use of brick materials exhibited the strength and durability of the structure.

As the structure and character of Richmond’s taverns changed to reflect the growing trend of gentility, male tavern patrons reassessed how they presented themselves to a society so attentive to appearance. From the colonial period to the early republic, taverns represented a predominantly male environment. Before the Revolution, a tavern’s single common room afforded a space for men of varying social and economic backgrounds to interact with one another. Drinking in taverns provided a venue for male camaraderie. Since masculinity is proved in the presence of other men, taverns offered an accepted setting and space for men to
perform their masculine identity. Analogous to a theater production, taverns represented a stage for men, or the actors, to perform their masculinity.

With the construction of specific private rooms and ballrooms, the manner in which men utilized tavern space to demonstrate their masculinity changed. Ultimately, Richmond taverns provided a stage for the performance of the Republican Gentleman’s masculine identity through heterosocial entertainments, participation in men’s clubs and societies, and drinking rituals, most specifically toasting. Through the Republican Gentleman’s participation in these specific activities, he asserted his ability to represent and perform the most meaningful characteristics associated with this new masculine identity. Traits related to the Republican Gentleman’s identity included his ability to affirm his patriarchal authority, financial independence, patriotism, and his commitment to the broader community.

Taverns and the Republican Gentlemen who frequented them represented more than just a business and its customers. During the early national period, Richmond taverns and their male patrons provided a window into the world of gentility. More than polite manners, powdered wigs, and refined buildings, gentility shaped national and masculine identities. As discussed, gentility highlighted the significance of appearance. By judging either a building or a person by appearance, a certain set of values and characteristics became inscribed upon people and places. A large and commodious brick tavern represented strength, durability, and citizens’ abilities to afford such accommodations, which thereby offered an indication of the national financial stability. Similarly, the Republican Gentleman illustrated the capabilities of America’s male citizenry through his financial independence, patriarchy, patriotism, and commitment for overall community betterment. Furthermore, for the Republican Gentleman, gentility represented the intersection of class and masculine identities. In order to maintain his identity as a Republican
Gentleman, it was necessary for a man to maintain a middle class income so that he could afford the proper dress and to attend the appropriate social activities, like those offered in the tavern, that became indicative of this particular masculine identity.

The end of the American Revolution emphasized liberty, freedom, and growth. During a time of such dramatic change, the creation of identities served to provide a sense of stability for the young republic and its people. The nation and its citizens, white men, began to establish their identities through appearance. During the early national period, the rise of gentility emphasized the importance of appearance as a critical component to proving identity. Fundamentally, gentility acted as a perpetuating force that shaped people, places, and the nation.
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