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BATTLE OF FONTENOY.

Fontenoy is a village of Belgium, in the Province of Hainaut, five miles southeast of Touraine, the ancient capital of France.

Here on May 11, 1745, the French, about 50,000 strong under Marshal Saxe, defeated nearly an equal number of English, Hanoverians, Dutch and Austrians, under the Duke of Cumberland. In that age France, like Germany in ours, aspired to universal dominion, and was opposed by the combined power of Europe. The battle at Fontenoy was obstinate to the last and was only decided for the French by a smashing charge of the Household troops and the famous Irish brigade. The allies lost 8,000 men and the French 7,000.

This is the battle where the English and French played Alphonse and Gaston. As related by Voltaire in his Précis du Siecle de Louis XV:

"Les officiers Anglais saluèrent les Francais en ôtant leurs chapeaux. Le Compte Chabanes, le duc de Biron, qui setaient avancés, et tous les officiers des gardes-francais leur rendirent le salut. Milord Charles Hai, capitaine aux gardes-anglaises, cria, 'Messieurs des gardes-francaises, tirez.'

Le Comte de Hauteroche, alors lieutenant des grenadiers et depuis capitaine, leur dit à voix haute: 'Messieurs, nous ne tirons jamais les premiers; tirez vous-memes.'

Les Anglais firent feu roulant; c'est-à-dire quils tiraient par divisions, &c.'"

Translated this reads:

"The English officers saluted the French by lifting their hats. Count Chabanes and the duke de Biron, who had advanced in front of the line, and all the officers of the French Guards returned the
salute. Lord Charles Hay, captain of the British Guards, cried, 'Gentlemen of the French Guards, begin the attack.' Count de Hauteroche, then lieutenant of the Grenadiers and since captain, said to them in a loud voice: 'Gentlemen, we, Frenchmen, never are the first to attack, we wait to be attacked.' Then the English made a rolling fire, that is to say they fired by divisions, one after the other, &c.'

HOW NEW ENGLAND LEARNED DEMOCRACY.

Just as there was a Washington family on the southside of the James River, distinct from the Washington family of Westmoreland County, so there was a Lee family on the Southside which appears to have had no connection with the distinguished Lee family of the county on the Potomac.

The Lee family of the Southside laid no pretensions to aristocracy, but they furnished two brothers, Jesse and John Lee, who performed an important part in the life of Virginia and the nation itself. They were both Methodist preachers, sons of a respectable and religious farmer, Nathaniel Lee, of Prince George County. The ministrations of John Lee were confined to the South, but the ministrations of Jesse Lee were almost nation wide, and his great work was chiefly in the New England States, where he was the agent above all others in establishing the Methodist Church.

He was born in Prince George County in 1758, fell under the influence first of Rev. Dexereaux Jarrett, an Episcopal minister with Methodist leanings, and later was received in the folds of the church by Rev. Robert Williams, who was the pioneer of Methodism in Virginia. Methodism, indeed, had its stronghold in this State. In 1779 there were in the United States forty-two ministers and 8,577 members and nearly one-half of this number were in Virginia. It was here the largest labor was employed and here the greatest product was gathered. The situation of things in religion was especially favorable. The church was here, and had
been here from the foundation of the Colony. There were many worthy ministers of the old established church living when Williams came in 1772, but their religion was formal and lifeless, and had little power of opposition.

Mr. Lee moved to North Carolina in 1779, and the following year was drafted into the army. But though he responded to the call, he soon made it known that, though willing to do any other service, his principles forbade him to use a gun. So he was employed as a teamster, and was so successful in mingling religious teachings to the soldiers with attentions to his duties that, when he left the army, he received a highly honorable discharge, and went to his old home in Virginia with credit.

It was in 1783 that, yielding to the earnest entreaties of Bishop Asbury, he consented to go on a circuit, and in 1783 he was admitted into “travelling connection,” and entered on a wide field of usefulness. He spent six years preaching in North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey and New York, winning many to the Methodist Church, and increasing his reputation as one of the ablest preachers in the United States. The revival in 1787 was a noted one, especially in Virginia, and Mr. Lee played a great part.

New England alone remained untouched by the free spirit of the Methodist Church, which alone among the Protestant bodies had no predestination article in its creed. This region, New England, stood out like an iceberg in the cold and stern formalism of its religion. But there the church organization, unlike the Colonial Church of Virginia, had tremendous power. The preachers were entrenched behind special legislation, and in administering religion, they employed it as a great political force to dominate society. This was accomplished by emphasizing those parts of the Calvinistic creed, which dealt in terror and fatalism. Thus the preachers and a group of lawyers and wealthy laymen in each community grasped all power, and the people had either no say, or servilely accepted what was marked out for them by this autocratic establishment.

To assault this rock of bigotry and prejudice required no ordi-
nary courage, but Jesse Lee, of Virginia, was not the man to know fear.

In 1789 he began the almost hopeless undertaking of converting this section of the Union, and for a long time his experiences were discouraging—very discouraging. He received much harsh treatment. Was often denied the use of the meeting houses and often had to preach on the streets. Then the pulpit opened its mouth and soundly belaboured what its ministers called the “damnable principles of Methodism.” Of his reception at Greenwich, Mr. Lee wrote: “The priest and deacon of the place had taken much pains to convince the people of the evil of letting me preach in the parish, and withal they told the people, if the society is broken up, they must bear the blame. Poor priests, they seem like frightened sheep, when I come near them.”

Mr. Lee’s account of the fast days in New England shows that the observance of these days was, like all the other church institutions, entirely devoid of any real devotional feeling. He wrote: “The manner of fasting, in general, is to eat a hearty breakfast as usual, then attend public worship in the forenoon and afternoon, without eating any dinner, and then have supper before night.” It could be no great mortification of the body to fast twelve hours on two hearty meals.

Mr. Lee visited all parts of New England and sometimes found “lewd fellows” in the crowds, disposed to insult the minister, and bring his services into contempt, but with a man of Mr. Lee’s intrepidity and great readiness of speech, these attempts to bring ridicule upon him was never a safe experiment, and there were occasions when he had resort to scathing and withering words of rebuke. The spiritual desolation of large parts of the country through which Mr. Lee passed was as surprising as it was painful. There were hundreds of families and neighborhoods where a minister never came. In Provincetown, where the Pilgrim Fathers first put foot to land, the town meeting refused to allow the Methodists to build a church, and, when the Methodists nevertheless, collected materials to proceed with the work, a company of men assembled in the night and burnt the lumber. Mr. Lee visited the
melancholy scene in the morning, and said sadly, "I feel astonished at the conduct of the people, considering we live in a free country, and no such conduct can be justified."

Mr. Lee spent the greater part of eight years in New England, returning to the South in 1797. But he had accomplished a great work. Not only had he set the Methodist Church on a firm footing in New England, but the doctrines which he taught of perfect freedom went to leaven the whole mass of society. Never again was the Congregational Church the same. Society might have much the same appearance, but it was radically changed at heart. Laws were soon to be passed disestablishing the church and the authority of the autocrats declined. Presdestination became an obsolete dogma in the platforms of all the churches.

One might say that the springs of action set in motion by Lee, the Methodist apostle to New England, were continued by another man who, though born in Massachusetts, had spent his early and active manhood in Virginia. This was John Leland, who had taken a leading part in disestablishing the Episcopal Church in Virginia. He was a Baptist, and by long residence was a Virginian in heart and principle. From a different standpoint, he, like Lee, contended for religious freedom, and found on the national stage a representative in the statesman Jefferson.

So the election of 1804 was especially one where the issue was democracy and freedom, religious and political. The victory that Jefferson won has no equal for principle or thoroughness. Especially was it so in New England. He carried all the New England States except one. For the first time in their history a real democracy began to exert its influence upon the Puritan States.

On a plain marble slab in the old Methodist burying ground in Baltimore appears the following inscription:

In Memory of
The Rev. Jesse Lee
Born in Prince George County, Va., 1758.
Entered the Itinerant Ministry of the M. E. Church, 1783, and Departed this Life September, 1816.
Aged 58 years.
A man of ardent zeal and great ability as a minister of Christ. His labours were abundantly owned by God. Especially in the New England States, in which he was truly the Apostles of American Methodism.

AS OTHERS SAW US.

The Memoirs of General Frederick Adolphus Riedesel, and the Memoirs of his lady, afford interesting reading. They hold up a mirror somewhat different from that in which our ancestors were accustomed to view themselves.

General Riedesel was Commander-in-Chief of the German troops hired by the British to fight the Americans. He came over in 1776, and was soon joined by his wife and three children, who shared his campaign and captivity.

These German troops, generally referred to as "Hessians" from one of the provinces from which they came, were terribly abused by the Americans, who spoke of them as mercenaries accepting blood money. There was no limit of censure of the British government for hiring them. And yet no real difference existed between their case and that of the Germans, who in the Civil War were given large bounties for enlisting, and fighting the South. During the war whole regiments, unable to speak a single word of English, were captured by the Confederates. They were, nevertheless, extolled as patriots and heroes by the Northern press.

Major General Riedesel served in the campaign which had its fatal termination at Saratoga. The British General Burgoyne was a bull headed kind of man, and averse to taking advice. Had he minded Riedesel, he might not have been forced to surrender.

When the surrender took place at Saratoga, October 17, 1777, Riedesel estimated the American army to number 22,350 men, of whom there were in actual service 20,817. The British and German Army numbered only 5,801 men, of whom 327 were camp
servants. Gates' figures reduced the Americans to half the number, and left the enemy at about the number given by Riedesel. But Burgoyne signed the articles after assurance from Gates that the Americans were four times as numerous. However stated, there is not as much glory in the surrender as we have been taught in our school histories. Nevertheless, the importance of the victory cannot be over-estimated, as it decided France to take active steps in our behalf.

Probably the most discreditable feature of the war, on the part of the Americans, was their breach of the article which guaranteed the prompt return of the captured troops to England on parole. Riedesel had advised Burgoyne to make Canada their place of return, which could have been accomplished at once. But Burgoyne, as in other matters where Riedesel showed excellent judgment, declined the advice, and the delay occasioned by waiting for the means of transportation enabled the fault finders in Congress to defeat the terms of the treaty. In this matter, the influence of General La Fayette was decisive. The British were bound by the articles not to fight the Americans, but he argued that they were under no obligations not to fight the French, who were on the point of becoming allies of the Americans.

So the captured army were retained as prisoners of war for many years, during which time they suffered many hardships and many died.

They first went under guard to Boston, and Lady Riedesel writes:

“Boston is quite a fine city, but the inhabitants were outrageously patriotic. There were among them many wicked people, and the persons of my own sex were the worst. They gazed at me with indignation and spat when I passed by them.”

Spitting at people is an abominable breach of good manners, but Lady Riedesel ascribed it to “outrageous patriotism.” Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts, directed his general order No. 28, in the Civil War, at New Orleans, against “any word, gesture or movement, on the part of any female,” expressive of insult or contempt to a Federal officer or soldier. The words for prevention
thereof expressed a presumption so shocking that Prime Minister Lord Palmerston denounced the order in Parliament "as unfit to be written in the English language." Even read at this lapse of time, the language is undoubtedly the most revolting attaching to any order in modern military annals. And yet the patriotism of some people was so "outrageous" that it actually found defenders in the North. Butler in his "Book" prides himself upon the fact that Lincoln and his government approved his administration and never revoked his order, and James Parton, his biographer, claims to find ample vindication of Butler in the public meetings in New York and Boston that greeted him on his return to the North.

But returning to Lady Riedesel, her remarks must not be taken as applying to all the women in Boston but to some* only, and that some Americans of the Revolutionary period, as some of the Civil War, were not very lovable people is shown by the following additional testimony from her:

"I had, during my residence at Bristol in England, made the acquaintance of a Capt. Fenton, whom the Americans claimed, but who remained faithful to his Sovereign. Upon this the infuriated rabble seized his wife, who was a most respectable woman and a daughter of the age of fifteen, who was very beautiful, and stripped them both of their dresses, without regard to their moral worth, their beauty and their delicacy; and, after having besmeared them with tar and covered them with feathers, drove them through the city. What had one not to fear from a people maddened to that degree of hatred?"

It was maddened people of this character, disguised as Indians, that have been glorified in history because they threw the tea overboard in Boston harbor in 1773. Such, too, was the character of the mob in 1770, who attacked the British soldiers in the streets of Boston and had the unfortunate results which they drew

*The German officer, Schlözer, speaks very differently of the women whom he encountered on the way from Boston to New York in the course of their march to their prison camp at Charlottesville, Va.: "So they stood by dozens all along the road, laughed mockingly at us, or, from time to time, dropped a michievous courtesy, and handed us an apple."
upon themselves emblazoned in history as a massacre of the inno-
cent. Between these so-called patriotic incidents, and lynching of
negroes in the South for abominable crimes, there is very little
difference. Mob rule can never be justified, no matter how good
the cause.

November 20, 1777, was a gala day in Boston, when Governor
Hancock attended and hundreds of people dressed in holiday att-
tire were present from the country around. The crowds delighted
to taunt the helpless British by cheering “King Hancock” in
mockery of King George. At this time General Riedesel entered
in his journal the following description of the New Englanders:

“One can see in these men, here assembled, exactly the na-
tional character of the inhabitants of New England. They are
distinguished from the rest by their manner and dress. Thus they
all, under a thick and yellow wig, have the honorable physiognomy
of a magistrate. Their dress is after the old English fashion;
over this, they wear, winter and summer, a blue blouse, with
sleeves, which is fastened around the body with a strap.

One hardly sees any of them without a whip. They are gen-
erally thickset and middling tall, and it is difficult to distinguish
one of them from another.

Not one tenth of them can read writing and still fewer can
write. This art belongs, aside from the literary men, exclusively
to the female sex. The women are well educated, and, therefore,
know better than any other matrons in the world how to govern the
men.

The New Englanders want to be politicians, and love therefore
the taverns and the grog-bowl; behind the latter of which they
transact business, drinking from morning till night.”

This is not a very pleasant picture and was surely overdrawn.
Certainly the men of New England were not so ignorant or
drunken, nor the women so learned and unfeminine, as represented.

In November, 1778, came orders that the prisoners must march
to Virginia. This state and North Carolina had provided the pro-
visions that saved the American Army from starvation at Valley
Forge the winter before. And now again no flour could be had in
the Northern States for the British prisoners, and only in Virginia was there a chance to supply them with food. Hence their removal.

Lady Riedesel went along with the army, and had several unpleasant experiences. They passed through the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. This is what occurred at the home of Col. Howe, to whom she meant to pay a compliment, by asking if he was related to the British General Howe.

"'God forbid,' replied he, in great anger, 'he is not worthy of that honor.' The colonel was a man of very fair reputation and spent in husbandry the time which he was not obliged to devote to military service. He had a daughter, who was about 14 years old, and quite pretty, but very ill-natured. Sitting with her at the fireside, she said, on a sudden, staring at the blaze, 'Oh, if I had here the King of England, with how much pleasure I could roast and eat him.' I looked at her with indignation and told her, 'I am almost ashamed to belong to a sex, which is capable of uttering such fancies;' I shall never forget that detestable girl, and I was impatient to leave her, though we had very good accommodations."

The patriotism of some people of Virginia was hardly less "outrageous" than that of some people of Boston. Lady Riedesel writes:

"After our arrival in Virginia, and when we were in a days journey distant from the place of our destination, we had for our last meal tea and a piece of bread and butter for each. This was the end of our little stock and we could have procured no more either for our present and future wants,—except some fruit, which a peasant gave us for our guineas. At noon we reached a house where we begged for some dinner, but all assistance was denied us, with many imprecations against the royalists. Seeing some maize, I begged our hostess to give me some of it, to make a little bread. She replied that she needed it for her black people; 'they work for us'; she added, 'you come to kill us.' Captain Edmunstone then offered to pay her one or two guineas for a little wheat, but
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she returned, 'You shall not have it, even for hundreds of guineas, and it will be so much the better if you all* die.'"

On their arrival at Charlottesville, Virginia, in the winter of 1779, the soldiers were afforded very poor accommodations. Their sufferings must have been great. The troops were "billeted in block houses, without windows, and poorly defended from the cold." And the snow on the ground was three feet deep.

Fortunately, the weeks that followed were mild and the fruit trees were blooming in the middle of February. The soldiers made haste to put up barracks which were made warm and comfortable. Lady Riedesel secured good quarters and was treated with respect.

The summer following was very hot, and the General had a sun-stroke which came near finishing him. He and his wife were permitted to go to Frederick Springs in Berkeley County (now known as Berkeley Springs), where they met General Washington's family. Unfortunately no printed account is given of their relations to one another. Doubtless, Lady Riedesel saw a good deal of dancing at the springs, for she makes this comment:

"The Virginians are naturally indolent, which may be attributed to their hot climate, but on the least excitement they become animated and dance and whirl about, and as soon as they hear the reel, (an English or Scottish National dance), they look for a partner and jump about with wonderful vivacity; but when the music ceases, they are again like statues."

As her husband had experienced a severe sunstroke, it was natural to refer the indolence of the Virginians to the heat of the climate. Now heat is not wholly local but comes in waves, extending over great areas, and my experience has been that at similar altitudes the temperature from Boston to South Carolina does not differ materially in the summer. A much better explanation is given by Du Roy, the Elder, who was commissary of the

*Notice the use of "you all." Some Northern readers might interpret this to mean a singular as the woman was addressing Lady Riedesel, but of course she meant a plural, referring to the whole British army. No Southerner ever uses "you all" in the singular.
Second Division of the Hessians. He says that the men in Virginia were lazy, because they had negroes to do the work for them.*

The Riedesels left Frederick Springs in August, 1779, and not long after Gen. Riedesel was exchanged. He was given by Sir Henry Clinton, a command on Long Island and later one in Canada. When peace occurred in 1783, he and his family returned to Europe.

While recipients of bad treatment from some Americans, from others they had many kindnesses. Lady Riedesel states that her stay in Cambridge, Mass., was as happy as the conditions could make it, that in New York General Philip Schuyler was especially gentlemanly and considerate, and she makes no complaint of the Virginians except as stated. Maryland receives her especial commendations, not only on account of the courtesies of an opulent lady of that State, but of the people in general; "for in that country," she says, "it would be considered a crime to behave otherwise to strangers."

By his exchange Riedesel was separated from his Germans at Charlottesville. In August, 1780, he estimated their number there at 1,147. In 1781, when Cornwallis came into Virginia, they were marched to Winchester, on the other side of the Blue Ridge, and in January, 1782, they were marched to Fredericktown, Maryland.

*This writer, however, does not include the Virginia women in the lazy catalogue. He writes: "The women are a great deal more industrious. A gentleman's wife considers it highly honorable to do some of the work herself. She sees to it that all the clothes of the family are made at home by the negroes * * * The women here deserve to be highly respected for their industrious tendencies. They are quite the opposite of those in New England, and although not as pretty as those as a rule, they are much more polite and better mannered, also more courteous towards strangers." It is rather amusing to find that Du Roy's description of the New Englanders is just the reverse of the Virginia picture. "The men are very industrious, especially in business, but they are selfish and not sociable. The women are exceedingly proud, negligent and very lazy. The men have to do all the outside work, as milking the cows etc. The woman in New England is the laziest creature I know in the world." Journal of Du Roy, the Elder.
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A letter written at this time to Col. James Wood, the Commandant in charge of the prisoners, by Capt. Joseph Holmes, shows that some of them were practically without clothes. At other times they were practically without food; but it appears that the guards fared little better.

"Winchester, 24th Jan., 1782.

Dear Coll:

In consequence of the appointment with Lieut. Col. North, I have given the necessary orders, and disposition of March for the Guard and British prisurs. They are to move tomorrow morning exactly at the hour of 10 o’clock. The British in one column, the Anspachs,* in another. The extreme coldness of the season has induced me to refer to your consideration the hardships and difficulty both guard and Prisn. must encounter on the March. Many are almost as naked as the hour they were born, & not an ounce of animal food. whether you could not with propriety detain them a few days, or one half of them, then there might be a chance of getting into some sort of shelter at night. It seems to shock the feelings of humanity to drive out of a warm habitation a poor creature stark naked in such a season. I shall be glad to have your opinion with respect to the march.

I am, dr. sir, Yours, &c.

J. Holmes.†

*The German troops.
†Joseph Holmes, of Winchester, was a captain in the army, married Rebecca, a daughter of Capt. David Hunter. They resided at Winchester and from them was descended Hunter Holmes McGuire, the famous surgeon of Gen. Thomas J. Jackson.
REMARKS ON THE CIVIL WAR.

By Dr. A. J. Morrison.

Those who have followed Dr. Tyler in his thoroughgoing defense of the old South, know it to be his opinion that the North and the South were virtually two distinct nations before 1861. Southerners whose memory runs back even thirty years can readily agree with that opinion. I, for one, can so agree. But I am by inheritance a Carolina Whig. If I guess right, I should have stayed with the South in 1861. And I have no desire now to sling mud at my grandparents. A stand up fight is an excellent thing by way of human endeavor. How else settle the matter? The smell of gunpowder may be very wholesome indeed. But there is no peace anyway.

If the Whig party, which made the preservation of the Union the paramount consideration in 1861 could have subsisted, it is conceivable that the war might have been avoided, but as our affairs go, the war could not have been avoided. Slavery bred masters, very masterful men. The industrialism of the North bred masters, very masterful men also. Those groups went to war, and the group that was the more diversely experienced won the war.

It is amazing how many men the South furnished to beat the South. There was Dr. Gatling, for instance. There was Farragut, and there was Winslow, and there was any number of others, especially navy men. There was Abraham Lincoln himself. Those men were somehow convinced that the experience of the North was more to the point in nineteenth century business. Of course there were Pemberton, Quitman, Slidell and any number of others that the North furnished the South. Naturally enough, those men fought for their homes and the country that had been kind to them.

As for Abraham Lincoln, God knows what he was. No man can say. Lincoln seems to have been a human being who could talk like Falstaff and write like Goldsmith. What we call ‘Lincoln’s prose’ is enough to constitute his title to a place in our history. Lincoln’s politics, on the other hand, must be matter of
debate as long as there are investigators into the grounds of men's conduct.

What was the experience of the North in contrast to that of the South? In a political way, it is manifestly misleading to teach that New England or the North was democratic. A very little study of the political history of Boston will show how fierce the struggle was there between the Federalists and the Republicans before 1821. And after 1821 Nathaniel Hawthorne grew up at Salem, where a Jeffersonian Democrat was shunned in good society, and Henry Cabot Lodge grew up in a quarter of Boston, where a Democrat was supposed to be a ruffian. The idea of a League of Nations is not at all more efficient than the idea of a league of peoples in any given community. If New England and other parts of the North could have been made to understand that there was a very considerable democracy at the South, there might have been less trouble. It is remarkable that in this year 1921, the incoming of a Republican administration is held by many people to be a democratic event. Provincialism seems to be one of the primal duties. As things go, it is difficult for any individual or community to exist without incessant self-defence.

Mr. Jefferson knew a thing or two about New England. He said, "I felt the very foundations of the government shaking under me from those New England town meetings." He said also, "Great part of the West has been settled by New Englanders unwilling to put up with the bigotry of New England." Jefferson desired to see a wholesome United States of North America, and spent his last years bothering with an educational programme that he hoped might help. He thought that many men would act differently on beginning business if they had been taught something of books in their youth. Even today, to what are we to ascribe the bungling transportation of the Valley of Virginia? And why have we not branch lines, steam or electric, down all the necks of Tidewater Virginia?

Sheridan harried the Valley of Virginia. The North won and the South suffered. We established our league of commonwealths, first and last, by blood and iron. If proof was wanted, the Civil
War proved that there was resourcefulness, that there was every sort of brains, at the South. But the Whig party was gone, and there was a "solid South" for many years after the war [happy time in very many ways], exhibiting a wonderfully happy democracy. It was striking during those years how like the North and the South were to England and Scotland. The Scotsman regards the intricately organized country to the south of him as cold.

What problems there are before us! How is the world to get together, with organization as it is now almost everywhere? If we cannot solve these problems in America, with all the opportunities we have had and have, the outlook is dismal indeed.

A Southern man, who finds it very difficult to fit into organization as it is, North and South, I have set down these few scattering thoughts suggested by Dr. Tyler's article in the January number of this magazine. I have been compelled to subscribe to a philosophy that looks at the world as an organism capable of endless development at the expense of sore discomfort to individuals, communities, or nations whose processes may be hampering the general plan. As Job might have said, "It is certainly surprising to me that the devil is such a powerful instrument in the divine purpose."

Washington, D. C., April 13, 1921.

Editorial Comments.

Dr. Morrison's paper furnishes food for thought. Was the Civil War inevitable? Men are very prone to regard a past fact as inevitable. Dr. Morrison himself suggests a doubt as to the inevitableness of the War between the States, in favor of the Whig Party, could it have survived. Considered in the light of late events, the war might readily have been avoided if "the masterful men" of the North had recognized the doctrine of self-determination, now so generally admitted. It appears almost an anachronism that eight millions of people, with a thoroughly established government, occupying a territory half the size of Europe, and capable of fighting one of the greatest wars on record, were not
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permitted to set up for themselves. Since the Civil War we have seen Norway and Sweden separate in peace, and much of Europe reconstructed, with general acquiescence, on new national lines.

This is the way Seward in his note of March 15, 1861, to the Confederate Commissioners, put the case of the masterful men of the North: "He (the President, Lincoln), sees in them (the actions of the Southern States) not a rightful and accomplished revolution and an independent nation, with an established government, but rather a perversion of a temporary and partisan excitement to the inconsiderate purposes of an unjustifiable and unconstitutional aggression upon the rights and authority vested in the Federal government, &c."

Will any Northern historian say at this date that the secession of the Southern States was "a temporary and partisan excitement?" or that "they had no established government?" The right of self-determination might be freely questioned in the case of the Philippine Islands or many of the countries under British rule, for they have shown no capacity for self-government, but this could hardly be said of the Southern people.

Dr. Morrison's comments on democracy are well worth considering. If the present United States stand for any well defined principle it is democracy, and this found its first concrete expression in this country in the Assembly at Jamestown in 1619, elected by the free voice of all the people of Virginia. Later three Virginians especially brought the light to New England. In those States the idea of a superior class and an established church continued to prevail long after the American Revolution. The town meetings were little oligarchies, controlled by a bunch of haughty autocrats who held office indefinitely. It was the organization, not the democracy of the towns, which Mr. Jefferson felt as a power. As late as 1793 a newspaper writer complained that in Connecticut the chief magistrates were often chosen by one-twentieth of the legal voters. And in 1798 a writer from Norfolk County, Mass., declared that "the country people this way, in general never prepare their minds previous to a town meeting, and were, therefore, under the influence of their most influential and learned men, particularly the moderator."
Pre-eminent in political influence were the Congregational preachers, who used the doctrine of predestination, in the sense of fatalism, to damn any opponent from a beginning that never began to an ending that never ended.

It was Jesse Lee, of Virginia, the Methodist evangelist, and John Leland, of Virginia, the Baptist missionary, that led the way to better things. Through their fearless and ceaseless ministrations in New England, travelling day and night and visiting every corner of those States, they warmed the icy air of religion and raised the poorer class to a better appreciation of their dignity and rights.

The cause represented by Lee and Leland in religious matters was lifted to a national plane by Jefferson. He was not a doctrinaire like them, but the freedom they demanded as the road to heaven he deemed equally essential to the government which regulated life on earth. The real issue between the Federalists and Republicans at Jefferson's second election in 1804, was no less a one than freedom and democracy extended to both church and State. And the Republicans won the fight.

In many ways this victory was the most complete ever won. Jefferson actually carried all of the New England States, except Connecticut, against the combined wealth and power of all the clergy and aristocrats of that section. And this happened in a region where there had been no limit to the abuse hurled at the heads of Jefferson and his Southern democrats.

Thus in Connecticut, a Southington pastor at Branford, scrupled not to call Jefferson "a debauchee, an infidel and a liar," and in Massachusetts, the chief justice, in a charge to the grand jury, denounced him, in company with "the French system mongers," as an "apostle of atheism and anarchy, bloodshed and plunder." It was usual to refer to all Virginians as "jacobins," a faction in France, somewhat similar in their radicalism to the Russian bolshevist.

After Jefferson's great victory the old laws which maintained the State religion in New England were gradually modified or repealed, and the people were encouraged to come to the polls and
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share in the government. And yet despite this, there are many Northern writers of the present day, who only grudgingly give any merit to their best friend and benefactor, Thomas Jefferson.

Perhaps this has an historic explanation. The aristocracy of Virginia in colonial times had been largely spectacular without much real power, but the aristocracy of New England, without any pretensions to great show, had been essentially an autocracy. It has been harder to get rid of, and to a Southerner, who visits the North to-day, and is thrown in what is known as “best society,” the relics of this narrowness is surprisingly apparent. There is still discerned among these people, descendants of the old autocrats, the old contempt for the poor and the ill-born.

There are signs that this spirit will pass away some day. The fact that in recent years a graduate of Yale College has thought that “Republicanism in New England” is worthy of being seriously treated in book form, is one of these signs. (See “Jeffersonian Democracy in New England,” by William A. Robinson, Ph. D., 1915.)

BLACK BEARD.

Although the name of Blackbeard is variously spelled Thach and Teach in Governor Spotswood’s letter regarding his execution, it appears that, in the subsequent correspondence on the rival claims of Virginia and North Carolina to the captured French vessel and its cargo, the spelling is uniformly Thach. The scene of his activities was the upper coastal region of North Carolina, and there in 1740, in Chowan County, resided a man called John Thach, whose name appears as witness to two wills. See a volume published by the State Department of North Carolina, consisting of abstracts of wills. Then in 1790 the North Carolina census gives three or four persons of the name of Thatch as residing in this region—Chowan and Perquimans. This is only a slight change in the spelling, and the “t” was doubtless introduced to make the spelling more suggestive of the sound.

The case is almost complete that Black Beard’s real name was Capt. Edward Thach.
JOSEPH H. HAWKINS.

By DR. A. J. MORRISON.

Some thirty years ago Senator Lodge drew up an interesting statement of the case regarding "Ability in the United States." Appleton's Dictionary of American Biography was then a new work, and Mr. Lodge took the trouble to glance through all the six volumes of Appleton (about 15,000 names) to determine what the ability of the United States had been and whence it had sprung. The six volumes of Appleton are still the best thing we have, the nearest approach to a critical survey of American biography. But the slightest examination of that faithful piece of work will make it clear that Mr. Lodge's conclusions should be entitled, "Ability in the United States as exhibited by Appleton's Dictionary." General Wilson, the editor, and John Fiske, the assistant editor of Appleton, let in a good many names on very slim evidence of ability, and they left out a great many names that might have been included.

General Wilson has said that the idea of that dictionary occurred to him in 1879. Ten years later the six volumes had been issued. In his essay (as not pertinent) Mr. Lodge did not mention the fact that nearly one-sixth part of Appleton is Latin American. Besides, there is in Appleton a good show of Canadian entries. The plan having been so ambitious, if six volumes was set as the limit, it is at once apparent that the editors were a good deal lumbered up, and with the best intentions had to neglect much of the ability on record in the United States. And then they set down to their task about the year 1880 or 1882. Those editors, both of them fair minded men, of exceptional intelligence, and knowing the United States very well indeed, those really lovable men, James H. Wilson and John Fiske, could not possibly know much about the significant names in Southern achievement. And if they had come South and made special inquiry around the year 1879, they could not have found out. Something had hap-
pened. The region had been stunned. It is hardly going too far to assert that a dictionary of biography, made up of Southern names entirely, and running to six volumes, could be compiled from the facts of Southern achievement during the decade from 1850 to 1860. A full list of important books written by Southerners during those years would make a startling catalogue. Just as in the few years before 1914 English-speaking people were impelled to do certain work (which another century may take stock of curiously) so in the South, during the ten years before the Civil War, there was a mysterious impulse to do—else the thing could not be done. An examination of the list of Southern books from 1850 to 1860 is sufficient proof.

The war knocked winding many of those books. But the printing press recommends itself in some respects. If a book is printed in an edition of a thousand copies, and all but one are lost, that one may reach the public in the end. For instance, who knows anything of William B. Victor's "Life and Events," published at Cincinnati in 1859? It seems rather plain that this book was unknown to General Wilson or to John Fiske around the year 1882, and it very likely that Senator Lodge knew nothing of the book in 1892. The present writer bought a copy for a quarter of a deflation dollar at a beneficent store of old books not long ago. The book should be worth at least $2.50.

William B. Victor has left no trace in the biographical dictionaries. Why he called his book "Life and Events" is something of a guess. He might as well have called it "Pilgrims' Progress," or "A Western Comedy" (after the manner of Dante). The book is really a very interesting, if loosely constructed, account of the Nicholas family of Kentucky, and its connections, in a political way. Joseph H. Hawkins married a daughter of Colonel George Nicholas, of Kentucky, and it is Joseph H. Hawkins that this memorandum is about.

Mr. Hawkins was born in Powhatan County, Virginia. He studied law and went out to Lexington, Kentucky. When barely eligible he was elected to the legislature from Fayette County in 1810. So he was born about 1786, when Powhatan County was
beginning to think fondly of its brief past. Were the facts accessible, you could put together a large biographical dictionary touching the divers business of the old Buckingham road, from tidewater to the West through Powhatan.

Mr. Hawkins took his part ably in the Kentucky legislature. He furthered the plans of the Madison administration in those two years, and was in 1813 elected speaker of the House. After the war, Henry Clay being appointed a peace commissioner, Mr. Hawkins was sent to Congress in the place of Mr. Clay. Mr. Clay, having finished his business abroad, naturally resumed his seat in Congress. Mr. Hawkins returned to the practice of the law at his home and in 1819 removed to New Orleans. As early as 1807 Mr. Hawkins had made the acquaintance of the Austins, father and son. Moses Austin, then living at Mine à Burton in Missouri, brought his son, Stephen, to school at Lexington, Kentucky, in 1807. Stephen Austin lived for a while in Mr. Hawkins’ house at Lexington.

After his removal to New Orleans, Mr. Hawkins was approached by Moses Austin on the subject of the colonization of Texas. The two came to an agreement. Mr. Hawkins, in consideration of capital supplied, was to have a half interest in the Austin grants. Moses Austin dying, his son, Stephen, confirmed these articles of agreement in November, 1821. William B. Victor makes plain statements to this effect, and cites the documents. We suppose that he knew. A great mass of Nicholas papers were in his hands. The account here given does not profess to be critical.

Stephen Austin going to Mexico in 1821 on the business of his grants was detained there until August, 1823. Upon Mr. Hawkins at New Orleans fell the burden of sending down to Texas the three hundred families whose settlement was requisite to the grants. Mr. Hawkins attended to all the difficult business of the transportation and the provisioning of those first three hundred families for the Texas grants. He became involved financially, was worried, his health suffered, and he died at New Orleans early in October, 1823. His estate seems not to have been reim-
bursed. It had been his plan to settle in Texas himself. One of his sons, Norborne B. Hawkins (named for Governor Botetourt) lost his life in a very honorable way in the Fannin expedition, March, 1836. The boy was but sixteen years old. The Mexican officer who captured Colonel Fannin and his party was willing to connive at the escape of young Hawkins. "To this he answered that two cousins had joined the army with him, they were prisoners also, if they could be permitted to escape he would gratefully accept the offer. This the officer refused. Young Hawkins replied, 'I will share the fate of my cousins.' They were marched out and shot with the others."

Benjamin Harrison's Mission to Philadelphia

(From Papers Concerning the Army of the Revolution, Vol. 1, Va. State Archives.)

Benjamin Harrison to the Governor of Virginia:
Philadelphia, Feb. 12, 1781.

Sir:
I arrived at this place late in the evening of yesterday after a most disagreeable journey, which has been considerably lengthened by the great difficulty I found in exchanging State money for Continental, and with all my trouble I fear I have not procured as much as will support me. I am just returned from the board of war who have given me an order for four ton of powder; as you were not particular in the kind that would be wanted, I have taken it one half in musket the other in cannon powder, which I suppose will be about the proportion that will be wanted for the service for which it is intended. I have no doubt of getting it on the way in a day or two, as the board are giving me every assistance in their power. I think you would do well to advise Col. Clarke as soon as possible of its being on the way, that he may send an escort to meet it, as the board informs me there is some
danger of its being destroyed on the way without it, there being a considerable body of disaffected people in that quarter. The expense of transportation I must pay out of the money you entrusted me with, there being not a shilling in the Continental Treasury; the new congress money for this State and the Jerseys pass at seventy-five for one, whilst that of Virginia will only bring thirty-seven and a half, and will not do even that, but from the speculators, a set of men that nothing but necessity shall cause me to deal with, I shall endeavor if possible to exchange the money with the public and have some little expectations of succeeding. The Continental powder at Baltimore amounted only to 2500 wt. I therefore, thought it better to take the whole here. I must fear no great success will attend my Embassy, it appearing to me that Congress can not command men, and if they had them, have they any quantity of necessaries to furnish them for the field; there is great abundance of cloathing in this Town, but it can not be procured without money or tobacco, nor will the latter do, unless the Enemy leave our country, yet would it not be well that Ross should send an agent here if I can not procure them, to try the experiment. Of my success you shall have immediate notice. I am with great esteem and respect.

Your most obedient and most humble servant,

Benj'a Harrison.

[Endorsed on the back]
Speaker Harrison's Letter
Feb. 81.

[Addressed] On Public Service,
His Excellency, the Governor of Virginia

Benjamin Harrison to General Washington.

Philadelphia, February 16, 1781.

My Dear Sir:

I arrived at this place five days ago, sent by our assembly to make application to congress for immediate assistance in men, arms, ammunition and cloathing, and was also directed to wait on you on the same subjects; on Wednesday last I laid before a com-
mittee of that body the businesses I had in charge, as fully as it was in my power to do, without answers to letters I had written to the Governor of N. Carolina and Gen. Green, requesting of the one the situation of his Government as to the necessaries for carrying on the war, and of the other his wants and a return of what regular troops he had fit for duty, & from whence they came; these letters were written in the most respectful terms, and with an assurance that the only motives that actuated me were the General good, however as answers are withheld, I suppose the enquiry was looked on as improper, tho' I cannot yet by any means think so. Our Assembly on taking a full and accurate view of the Southern war, as of our own situation, on whom very much of its success depends, are justly alarmed; they find the Country greatly exhausted in the articles of provisions, arms, and military stores of all kinds, and that there is but little prospect of assistance in these particulars from the adjoining states, except as to provisions from N. Carolina, and even these we have but too much reason to fear will be furnished in but scanty proportion. The greatest part of the ammunition sent to the South went from Virginia, by which means we are left with about 47000 wt. of powder of all kinds, and much of that must be worked over before it can be used; several thousand arms have also gone on, but very few of them have been returned and those in such wretched order that they are useless to us for want of artificers to repair them; from this summary state of the matters you may easily conclude, that our own safety forbids us to disfurnish ourselves any farther, as from the frequency of invasions of late we have abundant reason to conclude that the Enemy mean to overrun us whenever an opportunity shall offer; but our wants and distresses do not end here, we have still a greater which seems to be almost insuperable; what men we have in the field are so naked, that they can render but little service, many of them have been ordered into Quarters, and the remainder must soon follow unless a supply can be had; every method has been tried by the Assembly and executive to furnish them, but with very little success, not more than 300 suits of cloaths and about as many blankets have been obtained, tho' we
have made use of impress where it was necessary. The assembly have passed a bill for raising 3000 men, I think we may expect at least 2500 from the law, but without cloaths, &c., they will also be useless; next to Congress we look up to you for assistance, not doubting but you will do every thing within your line to forward the service.

Since the above, congress have taken into their consideration the subject of the Southern defence, and have agreed on several resolutions which I understand have been forwarded to you; I hope they will not derange any plans that you may have formed, for you may depend on it less will not save the Southern states. If the supplies expected by congress should arrive to the Eastward, we hope you will devise ways to get the proportion assigned us sent on, for without your interposition, but little of them will probably fall to our share. I should most certainly have waited on you at Camp if your journey eastward had not prevented me, where I could have explained our wants and difficulties more fully, than I can by letter, but it being impossible for me to wait your return, I use the only method now left, that of enclosing to you the several papers I have with me which will throw some light on the subject. I wish you every felicity and success, and am with the

Most perfect friendship, &c.,

B. H.

To Gen. Washington.

[Endorsed] Ben Harrison,
Feb. 16, 1781.

Benjamin Harrison to The President of Congress


Sir:

I had it in express charge from the State of Virginia to press your honorable Body in the strongest terms to give immediate orders for the removal of the Saratoga Prisoners out of the State. I took the liberty to lay before the Committee appointed to confer with me, the many cogent reasons that induced the Assembly
to give me such directions, and had my hopes that this business would have been done on the favorable report made, but I am this moment informed that this part of it is postponed. I hope I shall not be thought to intrude on Congress by requesting them to call the subject again into consideration: The members of the Committee will I make no doubt give the many reasons I urged for the measure, from which I am induced to hope Congress will immediately order their removal. The great distress of our officers, Prisoners in New York, has been made known to our Assembly, they wish most earnestly to relieve them, but have it not in their power, without Congress will give a sanction to their sending some of the Commodities of the Country to be sold in New York for that purpose. Specie is so scarce in the State that it is not to be obtained but at such an exorbitant discount that no country on earth can bear it, add to this the certain tendancy that buying it will have in depreciating the new Continental money; I beg leave to request the favor of Congress to take the subject into consideration and enable me to lay their determination before our Assembly which will be sitting when I return,

I have the honor to be

With, &c.

B. Harrison.
CORRESPONDENCE OF COL. JAMES WOOD.

These papers are selected from a number in the State Library, all formerly in the possession of Col. Wood, though all do not seem to be addressed to him. He was son of James Wood, founder of Winchester. He filled many important offices including that of Governor. In 1778 he was appointed to the command of Burgoyne's imprisoned army, and held command at Charlottesville, and at Winchester, when they were removed to that place. In 1782 he was appointed President of the Board of Arrangements of the Virginia Line, created by a resolution of Congress. For an excellent sketch of Col. Wood, see Hayden, Virginia Genealogies, pp. 428-437.

Long Island, Sept. 12, 1779.

Dear Sir:

Your kind favour of the 26th. ultimo which came to hand yesterday, was very consolatory to me at a time when in some measure I despaired of my Friends at camp retaining any remembrance of me. This despondency I think you will determine not to have been ill founded, when I inform that yours are the only lines I have been favoured with from my Virginia acquaintances in the Army since my arrival here the 19th. last March; except a short epistle from L. Smith Esq., received about three days past, and that I can but be the more sensible of the obligation I am under to you, for restoring me to hopes that I am not yet quite forgotten.

I return you my thanks for your pleasing information respecting my family, from whom I have received no letter since last May; I shall be greatly obliged if you will be kind enough to continue your inquiries about them and inform me on that head as often as you conveniently can.

Letters from you to Mr. Thomas Towles will be speedily answered, my last to him and Mrs. Towles was by Col. Matthews, who set out on Parole for Virginia about eight days ago and promised to touch at my house on his way to Williamsburg. Being
then very full it is unnecessary to write them now, if you please when opportunity offers you may inform them I am in such perfect health, that it seems to me as if I had acquired a new leave to secure me a Terrene abode for a considerable number of years yet to come, (accidents excepted) for which I ought to be very Thankful when I reflect that once since my being a Captive, the old one appeared to be somewhat on the point of expiring.

My finances being low at present occasioned in some measure by my having advanced, out of my little stock of solid coin, small sums to sundries which when added together make something considerable at least so to me in my present situation. I am induced from that motive as well as from my knowledge of your readiness to afford me your friendly aid, to take the advantage of your kind offer to serve me by troubling you with the collection of the enclosed amounts. General Woodford I am sure will pay at once. Capt. Kendall may have probably removed to the south, if so it is my desire that you will with paper endeavor to achieve the debt due from him on the best terms you can, as it is not my wish to put him to a farthing of unnecessary expence, although if our destinies had been reversed in this particular, I think he should not have experienced the same neglect from me that I have found from him; with respect to Mr. Mills he has been exchanged near ten months and I was in hopes to have heard something from him ere now, but have not received so much as a scrip although I have frequently written him, he is a native of Connecticut, and when made a prisoner was brought to Philadelphia, badly wounded and appearing to be a worthy young man in distress for want of cash, I was induced to advance the sum of £10.17.0 Pens currency to him, not doubting his replacing it as soon as it might be in his power; if you cant otherwise procure the debt, I must entreat your using the same method as directed for Capt. Kendall, which when they consider it as the only expedient I can use to have my own money replaced, and when without too great injustice to myself I have been as forbearing as was in my power, they can not with reason complain. You'll find enclosed an order for £320
to be used if necessary. Should the paymaster refuse it, apply to General Greene or Col. Rob H. Harrison, who I hope will second your endeavors to obtain it.

Your brother is quite hearty, as also the officers here in general. Those of your acquaintance desire to be kindly remembered to you. I am now to request your tendering my most respectful compliments to the Virginia Officers; I can't pretend to enumerate them if I should begin where should I end; say to (Major) John Pryor, and Capt. John Carter that our friend Capt. Willis is well, and that we are determined in future to tease them with long and frequent miscellaneous epistles, touching on every subject that the whirl of fancy may suggest (except those forbidden by our present situation) They probably may prove as tiresome for them to peruse as this may to you both to read and perform.

Be pleased to forward mine to Capt. Smith and believe always to find from me an equal return of unfeigned respect and esteem with that you express, & have always shown for

Dear sir,

Your affectionate hbl servt.

O. Towles.*

Major Clarke.

[Endorsed on back]

Major Jonathan Clark.

*Oliver Towles was son of John Towles of Middlesex County and Margaret Daniel his wife. Born Sept. 1, 1736, and died 1825. He was a lawyer, became at the opening of the war captain of the 6th Va. Reg., taken prisoner at Germantown and not exchanged till 1780. Commissioned Feb. 12, 1781, Lt. Col. 5th Va. Reg., to rank from Feb. 1, 1778, and retired January 1, 1783. After the war he settled in Lynchburg. He married Mary, widow of John Smith, of "Rickahock," and daughter of Larkin Chew, of Spotsylvania. Thomas Towles mentioned in the letter was first cousin, once removed, of Col. Oliver Towles. He married Mary Smith, daughter of Col. Towles' wife. At the beginning of the Revolution he was Quartermaster to the Caroline Militia. After the Revolution he was major of militia and represented Spotsylvania Co. in the House of Delegates in 1783, 1784, 1785. See Towles Family, Va. Mag., VIII, 320, 428; IX, 198, 324, 433.
This letter was sent by post to Jonathan Clark, Esq., Commissary Gen. Convention Troops by mistake, and by him forwarded to J. W.

Berkeley, 26th. March, 1780.

Dear Sir:

I take the liberty to Recommend to you the bearer Capt. William Cherry, a gentleman who entered the service in the spring of 1776, as second Lieut. in Capt. Isaac Beall's company & served with as much reputation as any officer of his rank, till the army was new modled when he became a supernumerary officer, a captain. He is now called into the state service, in the western Regiment, which are to be embodied at the post where you command he expects to take his proper command in the Regiment & depends much on your seeing justice done him. you probably remember him as he served in the Grand Army at the same time you Did. I w'd have wrote to Col. Crocket, but have not the honour of being acquainted with that gentleman, he will request your interest so far as to obtain him proper justice. I can only say sir that he is an officer, from his former services which I think entitled to the strictest justice, and shall esteem it a particular favour if you'll have him placed in his proper rank in the Regiment.

I have the honour to be sir, your most Obdt.

Hble Servt.

Moses Hunter.*

[Addressed]

Col. James Wood, Comdt.
Fav'd by Capt. Cherry at the Barracks, Albermarle.

*Moses Hunter served as quartermaster during the Revolution and was in the House of Delegates for Berkeley County in 1779 and continuously till 1786. From 1785 to 1795 he was clerk of Berkeley County. He married Anne, daughter of Gen. Adam Stephen and widow of Capt. Alexander Spotswood Dandridge. His daughter, Anne Evelina, married Henry St. George Tucker, President of the Va. Supreme Court of Appeals. Moses Hunter was uncle of Gen. David Hunter, of the U. S. Army. For Hunter Family, see Kennedy, Scildens of Virginia and Allied Families, II, 131-153.
In the House of Delegates,  
the 9th. June, 1780.

Resolved that the Governor and Council be requested to issue peremptory orders immediately to all the officers and soldiers belonging to the Convention Troops who are now absent from the Barracks to reipir thither forthwith, and if the future movements of the Common Enemy indicate a design of rescueing, the said Convention Troops, that he also give orders for their removal to a place of greater security.

Teste,

John Beckley C. H. D.

9 June, 1780,  
Agreed to by the Senate,  
Will Drew C S.

A copy, John Beckley, C. H. D.

In Council, June 9, 1780.

It having been reported that the enemy are advancing through the interior Country of North Carolina, and a doubt arising whether they may not mean to attempt a rescue of the Convention Troops, the Governor is advised to instruct Col. Wood immediately to call in all the said officers and & soldiers to the barracks; that he have everything in readiness to move them over the blue ridge at a moments warning; that he post some of his light horses at proper intervals from the barracks to the neighborhood of the hostile army with orders to convey to him from time to time intelligence of their movements and particularly whether they advance towards his station; that whensoever he shall find it necessary he embody such proportion of the militia of the county of Albemarle and of the counties adjacent thereto as he shall think necessary; that it be submitted to him whether it may not be immediately proper, without further intelligence to embody and draw to the barracks,
so many of the militia of Albemarle as may suffice to guard the prisoners on their march, & embody & draw to Rockfish gap so many of those of Augusta as may secure that pass and that if it should become necessary to remove the said prisoners, the removal be in such direction as Col. Wood in his discretion shall think most likely to withdraw them from danger.

A copy Arch. Blair, C. C.


Lancaster, July 8, 1781.

Hon. Sir:

I this day set out from this place to Connecticut with the British & German officers. I expect it will be the last of August before I return. I have bin to Alexandria since I left home, on Board of a flag ship sent round from Newyork with money & other articles for the British Officers. I find it very expensive traveling nothing is going in this part of the world but hard money, it is so plenty that I have not seen one shilling of paper money since I left Virginia, pray endeavor to get me all the hard money you possible can, as I meane to continue in the service, & have borrowed about eight ginneys that I am obliged to pay when I return. I would advise you to procure all the hard money you possible can for you may depend their will be nothing else going in a short time. I think it would be adviseable for you to purchase & make all the heamp & tobaco you possible can. Bless God, I am in good health, hoping you and the family are hearty, my most particular love & comp'ts to you, Mama, brothers, sisters and all friends and beleave me, Dear Father & Mother, to be your ever dutiful son, 

John Roberts.*

Delkin, five miles of York, 31th. May, 1777.

Dear Sir:

I got to this place in two days from Mr. Gibbs, then I was but seven miles Behind Presley. But alas I went to bed and never has been out of since, not even to get it made and this the

*John Roberts, Major, Culpeper Co.
first time I have attempted to sit up with a Prop to my Back. I believe you never saw a man more Reduced in the time. From a late order of Genral Washington’s it will be requisit for yr. Brother to proceed to camp, for not a Capt. nor any other officer can Draw a farthing of pay for his compy. nor pay them. the pay master is to pay every soldier and officer in the Regt. and our men has now 3 month’s due. They will grumbel if not paid soon. I think it would not be amis to send of[f] the quarter master and adjutent. I am told by some officers from the camp they alwas march with the first division and it is wondered at that yours have not gone and you and myself likewise.

Yr. Humb. Serv.

John Nevill*


Since I wrote the within I heard a fine complement paid you. Majr. Lyne, Mr. Kinkeade & myself, some gentry that meet Presley & his company, was speaking of the Ohio Regiment as they call it, below, and what a fine one it was and what a Pittey Coll. Morgan & his field officers and Adjutant had not had that Regt. What service it might have been to the States; they were in the next room. I made no answer to it. I have at length got a Doctr. who tells me it is the Right Camp fever I have.

New Castle,
6th. August, 1781.

Dr. Sir:

Since my letter to you, through Wm. McHenry, enclosing Commodore Barron’s report, the last spoken of entered York River and landed their Troops. They are fortifying on the Glocester Side, and have made a place of armes of York. Lord Cornwallis is present with his whole army. The Garrison of Portsmouth Excepted— It appears that a part of this fleet was originally intended for New York; but a dispatch arriving from General Clinton produced the present arrangement; It is very essential to your safety that we should be in force here, for this

*John Nevill, Colonel, Berkeley Co.
purpose I have ordered on all the lines with the utmost expedition. But I would beg leave to observe that Maryland might make some disposition for her own defense. The enemy do not lose sight of Baltimore; and they may only wait for a more favorable moment. You are on the spot and acquainted with its strength, and of course know best what measures should be taken. In all cases, you will take care of the Publick Stores.

I am, Dr. Sr,

Your Obdt.,

Layfayette.

Brig. Genl. Gist.

[Endorsed] Copy

Feildenea (?), July 30th, 1783.

Dear Sir:

Since I parted with you last afternoon a matter has occurred to me which may not be amiss to mention; If it be the design of those which have the direction of British prisoners, within this State to confine them, I will provide land for that purpose, within five miles of F. Town, paying me only for the timber necessary for stockade, &c. and deliver them cord word at 7/6 per cd.; the value of building timber I will leave to yourself and make no charge for the land during the war.

Soon after the prisoners now at Frederick arrived there, Dr. Thomas informed me that he received orders from our Governor to stockade the Barracks, but found a difficulty in providing timber as he was not supplyed with money for that purpose; on my telling him that he might be supplyed from my land a number of wood cutters went to worke, untill their superintendent thought they had what was sufficient, some of which has been taken away and a considerabl part yet remains.

At your return to Virginia I flatter myself with the pleasure of seeing you here. I wish you a good journey and remain,

Your respectful hum. Sert.

F. Gaunt.

[Endorsed]
Orange, July 26, 1782.

Dear Sir:

I am making my account for depreciation of pay while I served in the Regiment guarding the convention prisoners, and as it may be required by the Auditor of Public accounts to have it certified by you when that service ended, I will thank you to certify the same & enclose to me which my brother Edmund Taylor will convey to me.

On the 8 June, 1781, the Convention Prisoners arrived at Watkins's ferry, and the Officers of the Regiment Guards were permitted to return, but being on foot and living at great distances from that place, I told them to make their pay to the 15th. The 9th. June, I delivered the troops at Hagars Town in Maryland and waited on my return at Winchester for your arrival, which was the 15 of June, when you informed me I might depart & the next day I left Winchester. I have charged my pay to 15 June, 1781, to which date please certify my being in the Regiment. Please present my compliments to Mrs. Wood, and believe me to be, Dr, Sr,

Your most Hble servant,

Fra. Taylor.

[Endorsed on Back] Col. James Wood,
Frederick County.

Favour of Mr. Taylor.

Camp Ashley-hill, So. Carolina,
Novem. 7th. 1782.

Sir:

Lest the gentlemen I have wrote to may not be at the arrangement, and you being commanding officer in Virginia, I have taken the Liberty to address a line to you.

My secular affairs is such that with the wretched provision our country makes for us, I find that my continuing in service
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disables me from making that provision for my family, which duty requires, and would therefore wish to avail myself the privilege of retiring from service as of necessity many of my rank must, for want of commands.

To enter into a detail of my circumstances would not be entertaining to you, and must be painful to myself,—I wish therefore to bespeak your attention to this my request, & hope it will be in the power of you & the Board to grant me a respite that will put it in my power to endeavor to make some provision for the support of myself & family.

I also hope the officers in general will be actuated by principles more generous than that of the thirst of the junior officers for promotion should oblige those whose circumstances makes it necessary, they should embrace the opportunity of retiring either to resign or serve to their utter ruin, and that the consideration of an officer persevering to continue in the army, from the commencement of the war to this date, will also have its due weight.

I flatter myself you will not think this letter an intrusion. And that all the attention consistant with the good of the service will be paid to my requisition.

With perfect respect, esteem & regard, I am Dear General, your most Hum. Servt.

Ro. Gamble, Capt. 8 Va. R.

Genl. Muhlenberg.
[Endorsed on back]
Fav'd by Capt. Shelton.

Capt. Gamble's letter.

Dear Coll:

I received your letter with the Governor's Warrant the 23rd. of last month, since which time I have done every thing in my power to answer the trust you was pleased to repose in me. I have collected a good quantity of hay, corn in plenty, flour in abundance, Beef & Pork scarce. I have got about 30 head of cattle and have about 6,000 wt. of beef yet. Shall provide as much more as possible, but I had sent a small drove to the com-
missary general just before I recd. your letter. The expectation of the Convention Troops staying here prevented us from sending down the flour we had on hand. Pray let me know if you please, whether I am to expect any troops stationed here this winter, or whether I had better send what flour is on hand to Alexandria. I have stabling & forrage for 20 or 30 horses. (turn)

I will be exceeding glad to see you here, and if you can make it convenient should be glad to hear by a letter before, that I might be at home; but should it not be in your way, be so kind as write on the above to

Dear Coll.
Your most obedt. and most hum'l Servt,
James McCalister.

Martinsburg,
the 15 Decm. 1780;
Coll. Wood at Frederick Town.

N. B. Please to let me know how much I am to give the wagons pr day that is in the service.

J. Mc.

[Addressed] Col. James Wood,
Commanding at
Frederick Town.

Gentlemen:
I conceive myself much injured in Rank by the arrangements that have formerly been made in the Virginia Line, but have not hitherto had it in my power to represent the claim I am entitled to. For I was ordered on command to Tarry-Town the day the Board of Field Officers began to arrange the line in 1778 at White Plains, and was not relieved until the Army marched from thence; which excluded me the opportunity other officers had to state their claim. A Board I have been informed sat at Middle-Brook the winter following. Then it was my fate to be in Virginia.

At Chesterfield in Feb. 1781, I was in command with the Militia near Portsmouth and was unavoidably detained so long,
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that before I got back, a preliminary article was made to govern that arrangement—That the Board would hear no claim respecting rank, but that the former arrangements would be their guide, to that purpose.

The opportunity which now offers of having justice done gives me pleasure, and wish it were in my power to wait on you personally, as perhaps some explanations may be necessary, that being impracticable, I beg the Honbl. Gentlemen will bear with me whilst I give them the following representations.

The assembly of Virginia in the fall session of 1776, when the six additional Regiments were ordered to be raised, Resolved that the five companies then in service on the Western waters, should compose part of the twelfth regiment, viz: Captn. Waggoners, Ashby's, M. Bowyers, Arbuckles & McKee's companies, and that five more Captains should be appointed to compleat the Regiment, which was done, viz, Capt. Mitchell, Vause, Langdon, Madison and Thos. Bowyer. Wallace, Zane, Casey & myself were the senior Lieutenants. Capt. Arbuckle & McKee, refused to join the army, this of course made two vacancies for promotion of Lieuts. And Lieut. Wallace who joined the army in Octo. 1777, with a detachment of men that he & the officers with him, prevailed on to go with them, got his commission, I have understood dated in the Month of March, on the day the two mentioned captains refused marching; this was filling up one vacancy. From the same principle, Lieut. Zane ought to have succeeded to the other, but he resigned about the first of August, 1777, which is the date Lieut. Casey's commission ought to have been, but he had been sent on command to Virginia in June 1778, and did not return till the winter. And during the stay of the Army at Middle-Brook, he died. As he and myself were the persons principally concerned, and neither being at the first Arrangement to state these circumstances, The Board for want of information, or inattention (I must suppose), promoted Casey to the rank of Captain only, at the resignation of Mitchell on the first day of September, 1777, which most undoubtedly is the date that my commission ought to be of.
Thus I have endeavored to state facts, which I presume will give you Gentlemen, such information, (with what can be learned from the officers of that Regiment) as will enable you to judge clearly.

I have the firmest reliance on the justice & candour which influences the Board and believe the gentlemen will give the feelings of a soldier injured in rank its proper weight, as they are susceptible of those delicate sensations. And if they think with me that my commission ought to be dated the 1st day of September, 1777. The argument that this matter will introduce other claims that may give them trouble, will not have weight enough to prevent them doing justice, but I believe there is not a case similar to mine, all vacancies in other Regiments having been duly attended to.

Neither can the plea that Capt. Casey would have had no command be admitted. As the Regiment was the nearest being complete in numbers of any of the Six, and Captain Waggoners Company alone consisted of a number nearly sufficient for two companies.

I have the honor to be Gentlemen with the highest sentiment of esteem & respect.

Your most humb. Servt.

Ro. Gamble, Capt. 8th. Virg Reg.
Camp Ashly-Hill, S. Carolina,
7th. Novemr. 1782.

[Endorsed on back]
Captain Gamble's letter.
[Addressed] The Honbl. The President, and Board of Officers, for Arrangeing the Virginia Line.

Dr. General:

I have the pleasure to inform you, that your friends in Philadelphia were all well a few days ago. I called on your brother but he was out, and had not the pleasure of seeing him to get his comands to you. Constable desired me to give his particular respects to you and begs you'll write him. General Weedon shewed me your orders directing all the officers of the Va. line to appear
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at Winchester; as I have publick business to settle, for the transaction as Q master to the marquis' Army, it will not be in my power to attend, therefore must entreat your friendship to act for me as you think most advisable. My claim is from the resolution of congress when they determined that every regiment commanded by Lieut. Col. commandant should have two majors; as being the eldest captain of Dragoons belonging to the State Virginia, I claimed a majority which the Baron Steuben gave me the command as such in the First Regt. Dragoon, which I believe you were made acquainted with, some dispute arose respecting the rank of officers of the Cavalry, which has never been settled to this day; as the matter was unsettled & Col. Washington insisted on my joining his regt. as Capt., or to relinquish my claim as such in his regiment; being sensible of the propriety of my claim as Major, I gave him from under my hand, that unless I had the rank of a Major which I knew myself to be entitled to, given me, that I would no longer claim the rank of an officer in his regt., and that he might conceive it as a resignation from that date, which was some time in March/81. Just before I joined the Marquis, who drew me into the scrape of Q. Master, which I have been eternally pestered with ever since, by application to the Commander in chief, and congress, who at last have determined that I should deliver the whole transaction over to Col. Carrington. I must beg your pardon for pesterung you with a detail of my affairs, but as I have so often experienced your friendship, it has induced me to take this liberty. I shall remain at Petersburg for some time in order to get all my publick accounts adjusted, should you have any comands in that quarter, I shall be very happy to execute them, pray write me by the first oppty.

I am dear sir,

Yours affecty.,

Cad Jones.

Fredksburg, December 9, 1782.

P. S. My appointment by the Baron was in Dec. 80 and I believe the resolution of congress which entitled me to a Majority was in October or November/80.
Dear Sir:

I have been advised by many gents, & partly by Doctor Walker, to apply to you for two Hessian Stone masons, and which I now do by Mr. Paul Woolfolk, & have sent by him One Hundred & eighty dollars, the price as I am informed of two. However, should it not be quite sufficient, if he wishes to take another tradesman, or two, I will confirm it, & pay any further moneys into the treasury immediately, or in any manner you choose. I Doubt not your shewing Mr. Woolfolk all the countenances you can, & being of any assistance consistent with your office; being with much Esteem,

Dear Sir,  
Your Mo. obedt. Servt.  
J. Syme.*

Dear Cousin:

I am sorry I did not know that you were at the Springs before Mr. Blackburn went up, if I had you certainly would have had a scroll from me. I heard that you could not go on account of Mrs. Kincades illness at your house. I heard she had lost a little one and was very ill, pray let me know [how] she does by this

---

*This was Col. John Syme, half brother of Patrick Henry. He served for many years in the House of Delegates and the Senate. He married Mildred Meriwether, dau. Nicholas Meriwether, Jr. He had issue John Syme, Jr., Nicholas Syme and Sarah Syme, who married Col. Samuel Jordan Cabell. For Syme Family, see Wm. and Mary Coll. Quarterly, XI, 77, 78.
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opportunity. I write this by the hession doctor whom I recommend to you as a good physician, and a sensible man, he has practiced in our family with great success. I'm sorry to hear that you and your poor little girl stand so much in need of a Doctor, but hope to hear of Cols. safe return, which I am sure will cure you. The sattin I told you of was sold before I got down but sould (should) there any thing else in this part of the world that I could lay the money out in for you, please let me know, if not I will send the money up by the first safe hand, let me know how you liked Mrs. Redeout and the rest of the strangers at the springs this season. Please remember me affly to Mrs. Wood and White and Mrs. Kincade, Mr. Brent goes up with the hession, write by him and believe me your ever afft. cousin and 

Humble Servant,

C. Blackburne.*


Winchester, Decembr. 29th, 1782.

Gentn.

As my rank is not settled as I think is my right, or at least as it was settled by the board of warr at Philadelphia, I shall be glad to retire. I have served my country under this hardship this three years past and I believe it is well known as faithfully as any officer in the line to this day. Circumstances being so, never could have a hearing before now, indeed I thought my right so just that it would have bore no dispute, however if this reason is not sufficient for my retirement I shall expect all the older officers of our line, I mean the Capts., will not be at liberty to retire

*C. Blackburn was, before her marriage with Lt. Col. Thomas Blackburn, Christian Scott, daughter of Rev. James Scott. Mrs. Wood was Jean Moncure, daughter of Rev. John Moncure and wife of Col. James Wood. For notice of these interesting ladies, see Hayden, Virginia Genealogies.
as very few of them who are of a senior rank to me have done but very little duty for a long time past.

I am gentn. your obed’t. Hble Servt.  
Thos. Bowyer, Capt.

Colo. Wood, presid’t. of the Board of arangement.

[Endorsed]

Capt. Bowyer’s letter.

Capt. Jas. Wood, Presidt. of the Board of Arangement.

BERKELEY COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA.

By an act of the Virginia Legislature, February, 1772, the counties of Berkeley and Dunmore were separated from Frederick County, and given a separate organization. In 1777 Dunmore County received the name of Shenandoah.

Berkeley County bordered on the Potomac River in the most beautiful part of the Valley of Virginia.

The first court was held May 19, 1772, at the house of Edward Beeson, and the justices commissioned by his excellency Lord Dunmore, were Ralph Wormeley, Jacob Hite, Van Swearingen, Thomas Rutherford, Adam Stephen, John Neavill, Thomas Swearingen, Samuel Washington, James Nourse, William Little, Robert Stephen, John Briscoe, Hugh Lyle, James Strode, William Morgan, Robert Stogden, James Seaton, Robert Carter Willis and Thomas Robinson.

Ralph Wormeley, John Nevill, Samuel Washington, James Nourse, William Little, John Briscoe, James Strode, James Seaton, Robert Carter Willis, and perhaps Thomas Robinson, came from the country east of the Blue Ridge mountains, and if they are to be taken as an index they show the presence in the Valley of a large emigration from the eastward.

In 1801 the County of Jefferson was formed from Berkeley.
It contained three towns well known to history, Shepherdstown, Charlestown and Harpers Ferry.

At this first court held for Berkeley County, William Drew, having produced a commission from Thomas Nelson, Esq., the Secretary of State, was sworn clerk. Adam Stephen was sworn sheriff and Samuel Oldham under sheriff. James Keith, John Magill, George Brent, George Johnston, Philip Pendleton and Alexander White produced licenses to practise law.

Alexander White, having produced a commission, was sworn King's deputy attorney, he having first taken the usual oaths to his majesty's person, the abjuration oath and repeated and subscribed the test.

In the clerk's office of Berkeley County, at Martinsburg, are recorded the wills and deeds of many distinguished persons, who at different times resided in the county.

1. Will of James Rumsey, Inventor of the Steamboat.

Being in sound health, boath of body and mind, I make and ordain this my last will and testament. Item, it is my will that all my estate, both real and personal, shall be devised as followeth, towit: One third to my affectionate wife and the remainder to be divided into equal shares, two of which to be given to my son James, as soon as he shall be of the age of Twenty-one years, one Do to be given to my daughter Susanna, as soon as she arrives at the age of eighteen, or gets married, to the satisfaction and with the approbation of Mary Rumsey, Edward Rumsey, Mary Morrow and Joseph Barnes; one other share to be given to my daughter Clarissa, at the same age, and under the same restrictions of Susannah, and the last share or fourth to come to Edward Rumsey, Junr, at my death. I also ordain him my executor of this my will, The children to be Educated in as ample a manner as the income of their estates will allow. In Testimony of this my will I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this fifteenth day of May in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty eight.

James Rumsey.

Witnessed in the presents of
Benjamin Wynkoop
Joseph Wynkoop.

Proved and recorded in the office of George Campbell, Esq., Register of the probate of wills in the City and County of Philadelphia

This will duly authenticated by the Register of the City of Philadelphia was presented to the Court of Berkeley Co. "by Edward Rumsey, the exor therein named, who made oath thereto, according to law, and ordered to be recorded; certificate is granted him for obtaining a probate thereof in due form, Given security with Nicholas Orcutt and Smith Slaughter, who entered into and acknowledged bond in the penalty of 2000 pounds, conditioned for his true and faithful admn. of said Decedent's Estate."

2. Will of Major General Charles Lee:

I, Major-General Charles Lee, of the County of Berkeley, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, being in perfect health and of sound mind considering the certainty of death and the uncertainty of time it may happen, have determined to make this my last will and testament in manner following, that is to say, I give and bequeath to Alexander White, Esq. one hundred guineas, in consideration of the zeal and integrity he has displayed in the administration of my affairs; also the choice of any two of my colts or fillies under four years of age.

Item—I give and bequeath to Charles M. Thruston Esq., fifty guineas in consideration of his good qualities and the friendship he has manifested for me; and to Buckner Thruston, his son I leave all my books as I know he will make good use of them. To my friend John Mercer Esq., of Marlborough, in Virginia, I give and bequeath the choice of two brood mares, of all my swords and pistols and ten guineas to buy a ring. I would give him more, but, as he has a good estate and a better genius, he has sufficient, if he knows how to make good use of them.

I give and bequeath to my former Aid-de-Camp, Otway Bird, the choice of another brood mare and ten guineas for the same purpose of a remembrance ring. I give and bequeath to my worthy friend, Colonel William Grayson, of Dumfries, the second choice of two colts and to my excellent friend Wm. Steptoe, of Va., I would leave a great deal, but as he is so rich, it would be no less than robbing my other friends who are poor. I, therefore, entreat that he will accept of five guineas which I bequeath to him to purchase a ring of affection.

I bequeath to my old and faithful servant, or rather humble friend, Guiseppi Minghini, three hundred guineas, with all my horses, mares and colts of every kind, those above mentioned excepted. Likewise, all my wearing apparel and plate, my wagons and tools of agriculture, and his choice of four milch cows.

I bequeath to Elizabeth Dunn, my housekeeper, one hundred
guineas and my whole stock of cattle, the four milch cows above mentioned only excepted. I had almost forgot my old friends (and I ought to be ashamed of it) Mrs. Shippen, her son Thomas Shippen, and Thomas Lee, Esq., of Bellview, I beg they will except ten guineas each to buy rings of affection.

My Landed Estate of Berkeley I devise may be divided into three equal parts according to quality and quantity. One-third part I devise to my dear friend Jacob Morres of Philadelphia, one-third part to Evan Edwards, both my former Aids-de-camp, and to their heirs and assigns; and the other third part I devise to Eleazor Oswald, at present at Philadelphia, and William Goddard, of Baltimore, to whom I am under obligations, and to their heirs or assigns, to be equally divided between them. But these devises are not to enter until they have paid off the several legacies above mentioned, with interest from the time of my death, and all taxes which may be due on my estate.

In case I should sell my said landed estate, I bequeath the price thereof, after paying the above said legacies, to the said Jacob Morres, Evan Edwards, Eleazor Oswald and William Goddard, in the proportion above mentioned.

All the slaves, which I may be possessed of at the time of my decease, I bequeath to Guiseppi Minghini, and Dunn, to be equally divided between them.

All my other property of every kind and in every part of the world after my decease, (funeral charges and necessary expenses of administration are paid) I give, devise and bequeath to my sister Sidney Lee, her heirs and assigns forever.

I desire most earnestly that I may not be buried in any church or churchyard, or within a mile of any Presbyterian or any Baptist Meeting house. For since I have resided in this country I have kept so much bad company when living that I do not choose to continue it when dead. I recommend my soul to the Creator of all worlds and of all creatures, who must from his visible attributes be indifferent to their modes of worship or creeds, whether Christians, Mohammedans or Jews, whether justified by education or taken up by reflection, whether more or less absurd; as a weak mortal can no more be answerable for his persuasions or notions or even skepticism in religion than for the color of his skin.

And I do appoint the above mentioned Alexander White and Charles Minn Thruston, executors of my last will and testament, and do revoke all other wills by me heretofore made.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and seal this
day of ———— in the year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-two (1782)

CHAS. LEE (SEAL)

Signed, sealed, published and declared by the said Major-General Chas. Lee as for his last will and testament, in the presence of Jas. Smith, Samuel Swearington, Wm. Goddard.

At a Court held for Berkeley County this 15th day of April 1783. This last will and testament of Charles Lee, deceased was presented in Court by Alexander White one of the Executors herein named who made oath thereto according to law and the same being proved to be executed on the fourth day of September 1782 by the oath of James Smith and Samuel Swearington, two of the witnesses thereto, and ordered to be recorded. And on the motion of the said Executor who entered into Bond with Adam Stephen, Esquire, his security, in the Penalty of twenty Thousand pounds conditioned for his true and faithful administration of the said Estate, certificate is granted him for obtaining a probate thereof, in due form of law.

Teste:—

Will Drew, Clk.

I, Paul H. Martin, Clerk of the County Court of Berkeley County, W. Va., do certify that the above is a true, correct and accurate copy of the will of Major-General Charles Lee, as it appears in Will Book No. 1, page 308, a record Book of my office.

Given under my hand and seal his 3rd day of Feb. 1921.

Paul H. Martin.


General Gates lived at “Travellers Rest,” purchased from Joseph Crabb and Mary his wife by deeds of lease and release dated the 15th and 16th March 1773. The estate lays in that part of Berkeley County which was later Jefferson County. It contained about 720 acres, and was sold on his leaving the county for New York to John Mark of Shepherdstown, Sept. 14, 1790. On August 26 of that year he sold to Mark, for 800 lbs current money, six negroes to be free March 1, 1795, 11 negroes to serve until 28 years of age, and a mulatto named Titura, to be free at 21, and also six horses and four colts, one bull, 17 cows and calves, 45 hogs, 16 shoats and a number of pigs, 19 sheep, and ten lambs, besides sundry household and farming utensils. Gates was a great friend of John Mark, who came from Ulster in Ireland to the Valley, first taught school, and later prospered as a merchant. They were in the habit of familiar correspondence, and several of Gates’ letters to Mark, on domestic and general subjects were published many years ago in early issues of the New York Home Journal.
About 1800 John Mark moved to Fredericksburg, and there took the leading part in the establishment of the first Presbyterian Church in that City. Chiefly through him Samuel B. Wilson, a native of Ulster, like himself, was induced to come from North Carolina in 1806 to be the minister. In a letter, dated January-18, 1812, Mark speaks of our just getting into our "New Church," which was "well finished and situated." John Mark's daughter Anne married Hon. John Baker, a distinguished lawyer of Shepherdstown, and a Federalist member of Congress from 1811 to 1813. In 1786, Anne Baker was a passenger with Gen Horatio Gates, and others on James Rumsey's boat, when he demonstrated the possibility on the Potomac River of propelling a vessel against a current by steam. Her daughter Anne married Gov. Thomas Walker Gillmer and there is a pretty little silver pitcher preserved by one of Anne Mark's descendants, and it has A. M. engraven upon it.]

OTHER WILLS—AND RECORDS—ABSTRACTS.*

John Hite, dated 25 Oct. 1776, proved 18 Mch., 1777. To wife Sarah half of the plantation on which he now lives, the other half to son Jacob O'Bannon, who shall also have all lands in West Augusta. "Inasmuch as my father has been killed by the hand of Violence, & it is probable he left no will behind him, whereby the inheritance of his lands will descend to me, but as brotherly affection will not permit me &c, if my brothers and sisters will be at equal expence in securing the right & title to that tract of land in So. Carolina, lying in the Indian Country within the State of South Carolina, Part whereof being an undivided tract held by my father under a deed granted by the Cherokee Nation to Richard Pearis, the said Pearis' son, and my father, and part whereof being a purchase from John Neville &c;" children Jacob O'Bannon, Mary Catherine and the infant unbaptized; sisters Mary and Elizabeth. Executors: Rev. Daniel Sturgis, Tavana Beale, Thomas Rutherford, William Gibbs, and James Keith.

... Thomas Hite, dated 22 Sept., 1776, proved 17 Augt., 1779, names wife Frances, and mentions children without naming them. Executors: Wife, James Ruth, James Nourse and Dolphin Drew. The appraisement shows the following books: Dictionary of the Arts and Sciences £32; Bailey's Dictionary £8; Ainsworth's Dictionary £15; Cole's Dictionary £6; Josephus, 4 vols. £12; Elements of Navigation, 2 vols., £6; Davidson's Virgil, 2 vols., £5; Smart's Horace 2

*Where it is not otherwise stated, a will is intended.
vols., £4; Pamela, 4 vols., £4; Rambler, 6 vols., £6; Guardian, 2 vols., £3; Pennington's Letters, 2 vols. £1.10; Shenstone's works, 2 vols. £2; Amelia and Sophia, 2 vols. £2; Adventures of a Guinea, 2 vols. £2; Nature Displayed, 7 vols. £10; Browne's works, 4 vols. £4; Beauties of the Spectator, 2 vols. £3; Country Maid, 2 vols. £1.10; Lydia, 2 vols. £1; Hbi. Quality, 3 vols. £1.10; Eaton's Book of Rates, 3 vols. £3; Generous Britain, 10s.; Country Cousins, 10s.; History of Elija, 10s.; Bondes Principal, £1.10. Seneca's Morals, £2; The Art of Speaking, £1.10; Brown on Liberty, 10s.; Farmers Forms of Rent, 10s.; Virtuous Widow, 10s.; The Adopted Daughter, £1.10; Long's Word, 10s.; Correct Junr, 10s.; Extract of the History of England, £1; Intriguing Coxcomb, 10s.; Young Man's Best Companion, £1; Pardan's Arithmetick, £1; Religious Courtship, 10s.; An Introduction for Making Latin, £1; Book of Interest, 10s.; The Words of the Wise, £5; Bible, £2; Church Catechism Explained, 5s.; Flask's Justice bound, £3; Ditto unbound, £2; Sundres Single Plays, £2; Cook on Arithmetick, 10s.; Common Prayer Book, 10s.; Desk and Book Case, £120.


Robert Tabb's Account Current, 1775-1780; Tabbs mentioned:—Susannah Tabb, Elizabeth Tabb, Bailey Tabb, Seaton Tabb, Thomas Tabb, Robert Tabb and Edward Tabb.

Thomas Rutherford, jr., dated 6 July, 1780, proved 25 July, 1790. Names wife Mary, to whom 2 lots in Charlestown &c, one where I now dwell, purchased of Dr. Tiffen, and the other purchased of Richard Montzall; to wife all household furniture; all other estate to be sold and placed at interest till daughter Sarah comes of age; mentions partnership with brother Van Rutherford, and purchase made from John Griffith, eldest son of Robert Griffith, deceased; wife Mary; father Thomas Rutherford & worthy friend William Darke.

Henry Van Mater, Sen., dated March 3, 1790, proved 17 Decr., 1793. Names son Nathaniel, to whom all landed estate in Berkeley County, as well as the plantation on which I now live; other sons, Henry and John, daughter Alice, wife Elizabeth, sons Joseph and Nathaniel; Executors, son Nathaniel and William Garrett. A tract of land, west side of Ohio river in Indian Country, & devolved to me by the death of my son Joseph bequeathed to son Joshua, & another tract in Suffering (?) Valley that also belonged to my son Joseph bequeathed to grandson Joseph, son of son Nathaniel

Accounts current of the estate of Robert Rutherford, dec. by his
widow Elizabeth, examined and reported by Joseph Swearingen. Feb 16, 1795.


Robert Carter Willis, proved 21 Oct. 1783. Directs his land to be equally divided between his sons Lewis Burwell Willis & Robert Carter Willis, who are under age, wife Martha Willis; if both sons should die without heirs, then his estate to go to John McKain, my sister Elizabeth, John McKain's son, and his sons forever. Executrix Martha Willis my wife (For Willis Family, see William and Mary College Quarterly, VI., 27-29, 206-214.)

Susanna Washington, dated December 15, 1782, proved May 20, 1783. Names son John Perrin Washington; first husband George Holding, daus Nancy Holding and Susannah Holding, friend Francis Willis, of Gloucester county, to "breed" him (her son) and educate him at his discretion; sister Willis to take and educate my daughter Susannah Holding and sister Lewis, of Gloucester, to take and educate my daughter Nancy. Exors Friends Francis Willis, & William Reynolds, of York. [Susanna Washington was Susanna Perrin, of Gloucester, daughter of John Perrin. She married (1) George Holden (2) Samuel Washington, brother of George Washington. He, Samuel, married 5 times. William and Mary Quarterly, V., 174, 176.]

Samuel Washington, dated Sept. 9, 1781, proved 18 December, 1781: To wife the land on which I now live containing 230 acres, also a tract called Rutherford's, son Thornton, dau. Harriet, sons Lawrence Augustine, Ferdinand, George Steptoe, and John Perrin Washington. Exors.: Brothers John Augustine Washington, George Washington, and Charles Washington. [Col. Samuel Washington, of "Harewood," Berkeley County, 2nd son of Augustine and Mary (Ball) Washington, of "Wakefield," Westmoreland Co., was a colonel in the Continental Army. He married 1, Jane Champe, d. of Col. John Champe; 2d, Mildred Thornton, daughter of Col. John Thornton; 3d Lucy Chapman, daughter of Nathaniel and Constantia (Pearson) Chapman; 4th, Anne (Steptoe) Allerton, widow of Willoughby Allerton, and daughter of Col. James and Hannah (Ashton) Steptoe, of
"Hominy Hall," Westmoreland County, Va.; and, 5th, Susannah Perrin, daughter of John Perrin, of Gloucester County, and widow of George Holden.]

_Estate of Francis Whiting_, deceased, recorded 15 Sept., 1778.


_Estate of Francis Whiting_, deceased, recorded 15 Sept., 1778.

_Account Current of Matthew Whiting_, 1796.

_Inventory of Robert Rutherford, jr._, taken this 14 June 1785.

_Morgan Morgan_, dated 11 Oct., 1797, proved Dec, 1797. Names wife Mary, Brother Evan Morgan, eldest son Morgan Morgan, and sons Zackwell, and David Morgan, daughters Phebe and Rebecca. Executors, sons Morgan and Zackwell. Refers to Father's deed recorded in Frederick County.


_Thornton Washington_, dated 26 July, 1787, proved 16 Oct., 1787. Names wife Frances Townshend and her son Samuel; other two sons by my former wife Mildred; my three half brothers and sisters; William Berryman, of Frederick County to be guardian of my two sons by my former wife; friends Lawrence Washington, jun., of Chotank, and Warner Washington, of Frederick Co. [Thornton Washington married 1. Mildred Berryman(?) 2. Frances Townshend Washington.]


At a court held for Berkeley County the 20th day of August, 1776. Present:

- Samuel Washington
- Godwin Swift
- Robert Carter Willis
- William Patterson
- John Coke
- Morgan Morgan

Gent. Justices.
An Ordinance of the Honorable Convention of this Commonwealth that the different members named in the former commission of the Peace should continue to act in the said office upon their taking the oaths presented in the said Convention: Whereupon the said Ordinance being read Robert Carter Willis and John Coke administered the said oath to Samuel Washington, who administered the same to the said Godwin Swift, Morgan Morgan and William Patterson, who severally took the same and were sworn Justices of the Commonwealth of Virginia accordingly.

The old Episcopal Church and graveyard at Shepherdstown in Jefferson County, formerly part of Berkeley are deserted, but some tombstones in the graveyard still remain. The following inscriptions appear on two of these:

Sacred to the Remains of
JUDITH BAKER,
Who departed this Life
the 19th day December, 1805,
Aged 71 years.

Sacred to the memory of
MAJOR HENRY BEDINGER,*
Who was born on the 16th day of
October, 1753, and died the 14th day
of May, 1843, aged 89 years,
six months and 28 days.

He served his country on the tented field from the day of the beginning, until the close of the Revolution, which gave his country a place amongst the nations of the Earth, was wounded and taken prisoner at Fort Washington, New York, and continued a short time on board of the Jersey Prison ship, belonging to the British Government, was a prisoner four years. He was an upright magistrate, a kind friend, and an affectionate relative, who discharged the duties of Life(?) He died, as he lived, a firm believer in the divinity and religion of Jesus Christ.

*According to Heitman, he was Captain of the 3d Virginia Regiment—the heroic Third, commanded successively by Weedon, Mercer and Marshall.
ROBERT BAILEY.

Perhaps the most all around sport that ever lived in Virginia was Robert Bailey. He was undoubtedly possessed of talents, which, had they been properly directed, might have ensured him high position. He wrote a biography, which was printed in Richmond by J. & S. Cochran, 1822, in which he gave an account of himself that is as perhaps as near the truth as a man of his loose character could make it. According to this he was born in Chester, Pennsylvania, April 29, 1773. His father was an Irishman, and in the American Revolution was a major of artillery. He was killed at the battle of the Cowpens. His mother was Margaret Hite, a rich Quakeress.

The family lost their money by the Revolution, and after the death of his father they removed to Culpeper Co., Virginia, which he always afterwards claimed as the place of his birth, though it was not.

The incidents of his early youth—his struggles to support his mother and get an education—were much to his credit, and despite every handicap he became a successful merchant of Staunton, and was made captain of the best uniformed infantry company in that city.

Then began his career of a gambler, into which he was seduced by falling into bad company on a visit to Philadelphia. He went the limit with women and cards, travelled all over the United States, and was a constant attendant at the races and faro banks. Sometimes he had thousands of dollars in his possession, and at other times was in absolute penury. At one time, in 1803 he was indicted at Staunton for keeping a faro bank, was convicted and ordered to be hired out under the vagrancy law, a penalty which he managed to evade.

But as he apparently never cheated or resorted to the low tricks of gamblers, he contrived to retain a certain respect, and at one time came within three votes of an election to Congress, in the District represented by the Counties of Rockbridge, Botetourt, Monroe, Greenbrier, Kanawha and Mason. He was owner
of the Sweet Springs, and at another time kept a Boarding house in Washington frequented by members of Congress and other public men.

The value of his book, if it has any at all, consists in the side lights it throws on life in the United States in the early part of the 19th century. It is evident that standards of morality were not high. The spirit of betting was universal, and raged in England and France as well. Charles James Fox was a notorious gambler in England and Henry Clay in America is said to have loved cards passionately. Men would wake up in the morning, and the first thing they thought about was to get up a bet on something, no matter how trivial. Fox bet with a friend on the holes in a cullender and Fox won by taking the precaution quietly beforehand to bore an extra hole.

Some idea of the holdness and resources of Bailey is afforded in the following extract from his extraordinary confessions.

He went to England to sell mountain lands at one dollar an acre, but he did not find the English as easy as he expected and managed to dispose of only a thousand acres. The money thus secured he soon got rid of and this adventure then occurred:

"After loseing and spending the whole of my last thousand dollars, for which I sold the land, I did not know how to raise a new fund. I walked incessantly, trying to sell more land, not a cent in my pocket. I will here introduce the anecdote on myself, which I preceedingly promised, it is one that I have often told in this country. I walked and got all the information I could. I at length discovered where the noblemen played dice; after dining together, they passed about sixty yards, to a house kept for that purpose; they would have a porter at each door, and the house afforded attendants and every refreshment.

"I must confess, I studied on this project; on a very dark night I placed myself at this house, and waited until about twenty of the nobility came rushing out, full of wine; and as they passed me I caught one by the arm, in as familiar a way as if I had been one of the party, as he supposed; we kept locked arms, and we walked these sixty yards; he says to me, my lord, I feel very much like winning tonight, I cant say so, I replied, I am rather dejected;
why so my lord? damn it, you want another glass of Burgundy or Champaign, we mush replenish when we get in; I will, sir, said I; as we entered the first door I lay a little back, let several pass me, and let my companion go in; my heart palpitated as much as when I fought Wigg;* I summoned all by resolution and ventured up; all busily engaged; I seated myself with these nobility.

“My companion addressed himself to this lord, whom he supposed he had been walking with, and said, will you drink Champaign or Burgundy; as your spirits are low, I would recommend Champaign. Why, so, do you suppose my spirits low? Because, you observed, as we came along, that you felt dejected. I, sir, you are mistaken; very well sir, any way, take a glass of Burgundy or Champaign, I want to make ten thousand out of you tonight; they took their wine together.

“I mixed in the crowd, and drank two glasses of Champaign; this encouraged me very much, I felt as if I was socially associated with old friends and pot fellows; they commenced the game most eagerly, I among the rest; no person appeared to notice me; an Irish nobleman, a very liberal gentleman, proposed betting fifty thousand pounds sterling that he was in, when the box came to him.

“Some one observed, that it was too extravagant a bet, without it was guaranteed by some real estate; the Irish nobleman, pulling out his pocket book, and putting down the roll bills on the bank, replied, by Jesus, gentlemen, I will shew you the roll maps themselves to guarantee the bet; and the bet was made, and the Irish nobleman won it.

“The box was coming near me, and by this time they had sipped of the nectar copiously, and those who did notice me supposed I had dined with them; this Irish nobleman who had won the fifty thousand pounds looked at me stedfastly, and observed, sir, dont you bet? Yes sir, said I, but you bet too low for me; this gentleman observed, what do you wish to bet? I observed I would bet fifty thousand pounds, this gentleman to my right

*He refers to a duel he had with a man of this name, in which he broke Wigg's arm with his pistol fire.
throws out, and one hundred thousand pounds I throw in; and laid down an elegant pocket book, without one cent in it. Luckily for me, the gentleman threw out; I let my pocket book remain, and the fifty thousand pounds that I had won; and lifted the dice box and shook them well, to throw for the hundred thousand pounds. I was well acquainted with the game, having played before for thousands. I dashed away, as bold as any of the party, but fortune frowned, and I threw out.

"I was instantly seized with a sensation that disqualified every faculty; I arose from the table in silence; upon reflection I observed, gentlemen, you must act with me as you please, I am an unfortunate young man, I have not one cent, I have imposed myself upon you; I passed the porters without notice, I came in with you all, thinking by good fortune, I might raise some money to take me home; I am from America, bred and born in the State of Virginia; I have lost and spent all I had, and now I have no way to get home; I am honest; seeing and knowing as I did, where you played, and this being a dark night, on your return from your place of dining I took this gentleman by the arm and walked with him as a companion, and ventured in among your lordships to try my fortune; I never was guilty of such impudence before, and I do hope to be treated with lenity by your lordships.

"This Irish gentleman, who had won the fifty thousand pounds, first spoke, saying, he had won fifty thousand pounds, and had lost it with me; and added, young gentleman you stand perfectly excused, and I think you ought to have won, for the large dash you made at us; pray sir, what is your name? and where did your father go from? I told him my name was Robert Bailey, and my father was an Irishman, from the county of Derry, my mother was born and raised in America; he observed, that he knew all my father's family, that they were respectable good people, linnen drapers, and for the respect he had for the name and country, and my bold dash, if I would accept of twenty guineas, it would afford him pleasure to give it to me; and several others contributed, to the amount of fifty guineas; I took two glasses of Champaign, made them a bow and left the room, much elated with
my fortunate escape; but had dame fortune smiled upon me, by bestowing one hundred and fifty thousand, then indeed would my heart have been exulted, and I should have stood excused by my own judgment, for so bold and hazardous an adventure. I have often thought since, that if I had won the one hundred and fifty thousand, I would have relinquished the practice of gaming, but my nature is such, that a sum like that might have plunged me into other excesses, than those to which I had been addicted, upon a larger scale.”

REGISTER OF MARRIAGE BONDS OF GREENSVILLE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1781-1808.
(Continued from Vol. II, p. 256.)
Compiled by Mrs. Dora Hedges Goodwyn, Emporia, Va.

Francis, Cordall & Letitia Hayley, 10 March, 1796. Henry Hayley, father, consents. Willie Clark, Sec.
Freeman, Miles & Margaret Hudson, 12 March, 1804. Wm. Atkinson, Sec.
Freeman, Peter & Sarah Jackson, 25 Feb., 1795. William Edwards, Sec.
Gowing, Benjamin & Catherine Harris, 29 March, 1806. Frances Hill, Sec.
Gowing, James & Rebecca Adams, 24 Nov., 1785. William Brewer, Sec.
Gowing, Mark & Sarah Jones, 29 Sept., 1794. Thomas Jones, father, consents. Robert Brooks Corn, Sec.
Gowing, Thomas & Sarah Jones, 24 July, 1794. William W. Dungell, Sec.
Goodrich, John & Rhoda Goodrich, 9 May, 1798. Benjamin Goodrich, father, consents. Howell Harris, Sec.

Goodrich, Washington & Frances B. Batte, 21 Feb., 1799. Sarah Batte, mother, consents, & is Sec.


Grant, Drewry & Nancy Hines, 30 Dec., 1795. Barham Hines, father, consents. Wm. Andrews certifies that the groom is 23 years of age & the bride 22. Joshua Mayes, Sec.

Graham, George & Sarah Stark, 9 Oct., 1786. Mark Sexton, Sec.

Graves, William & Susanna Randolph, 12 Nov., 1808, Williamson Graves, Sec.


Green, Jesse & Polly Chambliss, 8 June, 1790. Henry Chambliss, Sec.

Green, John & Judith Mabry, 21 Dec., 1796. Abner Hill, Sec.

Green, Miles & Elizabeth Hunt, 15 Oct., 1789. Judkins Hunt, Sec.

Green, Willie & Agnes Chambliss, 29 Jan., 1789. Henry Chambliss, Sec.

Griffin, Richard & Elizabeth Wrenn, 11 Sept., 1807. Abner Lanier, Sec.

Griffin, William & Nancy Sykes, 8 Feb., 1804. Matthews Davis, Sec.

Grigg, Carrol & Martha Blanks, 11 Feb., 1786. Ingram Blanks, Sec.

Grigg, Edmund & Elizabeth Gregory, 23 Aug., 1802. Ingram Blanks, Sec.

Grigg, Jesse & Rebecca Thweatt, 27 May, 1783. Lewis Grigg, Jr., Sec.

Grigg, Lewis & Edith Watson, widow, 22 Nov., 1785. Jones Wrenn, Sec.
Hall, Hugh & Amy G. Tyus, 13 April, 1707. Joshua Lunday, guardian, consents & is Sec.
Hall, John & Elizabeth Jordan, 1 Oct., 1802. Wylie Peeblees, Sec.
Hall, Richard & Martha House, 4 May, 1799. Lucy House, mother, consents. Robert Hall, Sec.
Hammonds, William & Susanna Rawlings, 5 April, 1805. Elizabeth Rawlings, mother, consents. James Adams, Sec.
Hargrove, Dudley & Polly Coalman, 19 Jan., 1791. Capt. Howell Harris, guardian, consents and is Sec.
Harris, Absalom & Clara Jeter, 14 Dec., 1785. John Jeter, Sr., consents. John Jeter, Jr., Sec.
Harris, Charles & Dolly McKendree, 27 July, 1797. William Walker, Sec.
Harris, Reuben & Mary Rawlings, 19 Oct., 1785. Thomas Newsom, Sec.
Harris, Robert & Ann Lancaster, 7 Dec., 1789. Joseph Harris, Sec.
Harris, Simon & Rebecca Davis, 22 March, 1796. Samuel Davis, father, consents. Charles Harris, Sec.
Harris, Sterling & Patsy Woodroof, 8 April, 1790. Samuel Avent, Sec.
Harris, William & Frances Branscomb, 4 Feb., 1793. Thomas Branscomb, Sec.
Harris, William & Amy Going, 19 Dec., 1805. James Gowing, Sec.
Harrison, Charles & Annie Brown, 10 Nov., 1806. John Brown, Jr., Sec.
Harrison, Edward & Frances Wilburn, 10 July, 1787. William Wilburn, Sec.
Harrison, James & Susanna Jones, 4 Dec., 1801. Benjamin Jones, Sec.
Harrison, John & Rebecca Dillehay, 21 Sept., 1793. Charles Dillehay, Sec.
Harrison, Joseph & Elizabeth Ferguson, 31 Aug., 1786. Wm. Allen, Sec.
Harwell, John & Elizabeth Vaughan, 18 Sept., 1804. William Adams, Sec.
Harwell, Hansom & Rebecca Smith, 13 Jan., 1806. Lewis Dupree, Sec.
Harwell, William & Amy Smith, 20 Feb., 1786. Drewry Adams, Sec.
Hay, Archer & Mary Simmons, 21 July, 1806. Abner Lanier, Sec.
Hayley, James & Anne Person, 22 March, 1798. Mary Person, mother, consents. Henry Person, Sec.
Hayley, James & Elizabeth Eppes, 16 April, 1804. Nancy Eppes, mother, consents. Turner Williamson, Sec.
Heath, Nathan & Sarah Collier, 12 March, 1782. Daniel Collier, Sec.
Heath, John & Lucy Vaughan, 13 Feb., 1787. William Griffin, Sec.
Heath, John & Wilmuth Richards, 27 Dec., 1800. Tarpley Young, Sec.
Heathcock, Charles & Lavinia Hicks, 13 Dec., 1794. Chas. Williams, Sec.

Heathcock, Colley & Grief Jeffries, 24 July, 1794. Andrew Jeffries, father, consents. Shadrach Jeffries, Sec.

Heathcock, Howell & Mary Woodall, 30 Jan., 1788. Alley Woodall, father consents. George Collier, Sec.


Heathcock, Meshach & Elizabeth Jones, 26 Dec., 1789. Edward Jones, Sec.

Heathcock, Reuben & Mary Jones, 6 Aug., 1793. Braxton Robinson, Sec.

Hinton, James & Winny Rives, 6 Dec., 1786. Balaam Bertram, Sec.


Hobbs, John & Jane Mabry, 3 March, 1787. Daniel Mabry, Sec.

Hobbs, John, Jr., & Keziah Fennell, 10 Sept., 1804. Isham Fennell, father, consents. James Fennell, Sec.


Howard, Edwin & Nancy Gowyn, 26 Dec., 1794. Benjamin Young, Sec.

Hues, Jacob & Mason Hearin, 12 March, 1804. Freeman Hearin, Sec.


Hunt, John & Agnes Sills, 18 Nov., 1790. Agnes Sills, mother, consents. Jesse Atkins, Sec.

Ingram, Isaac & Martha Ferguson, 6 Aug., 1804. William Ferguson, father, consents. Stephen Jackson, Sec.
Inman, Matthew & Nancy Nichols, 4 Jan., 1804. Henry Evans, Sec.
Israel, Abel & Sarah Whitehorn, 3 March, 1786. John Whitehorn, Sec.
Jarratt, John & Levina Whittington, 8 Jan., 1787. Frederick Whittington, father, consents. Carrol Grigg, Sec.
Jefferson, Lewis & Polly Hill, 10 Jan., 1799. Littleton Jefferson, Sec.
Jeffries, Achilles & Mary Wall, widow, 5 March, 1783. Timothy Rives, Sec.
Jeffries, Drewry & Sylvia Scott, 28 Jan., 1790. Andrew Jeffries, Sec.
Jeffries, Henry & Sarah Shehorn, 18 Feb., 1808. Uriah Cook, Sec.
Jeffries, Nathan & Clara Norton, 23 June, 1791. Refts Stewart, Sec.
Jeter, John, Jr., & Mary Rives, 3 Jan., 1786. Miel Ezell, Sec.
Johnson, Benj., W. & Polly Foster, 16 March, 1802. Thomas Pelham, Sec.
Johnson, David & Winny Sledge, 10 Feb., 1789. Sterling Sledge, Sec.
Johnson, Edward & Elizabeth Burnett, 11 May, 1807, John Burwell, Sec.
Johnson, John & Lucy Sissoms, 30 Dec., 1790. Sterling Sledge, Sec.
Jones, Henry & Sally Saunders, 15 Feb., 1797. Anselm Ivey, Sec.
Jones, Henry & Elizabeth Hardy, 19 Dec., 1801. John Jones, Sec.
Jones, Howell & Priscilla Vaughan, 13 Feb., 1789. Thomas Vaughan, Sec.
Jones, John & Ann Young, 20 Feb., 1804. Edmunds Mason, Sec.
Jones, John & Patsy Dean, 12 Feb., 1801. William Jones, Sec.
Jones, Lattana & Lucretia M. Night, 19 Nov., 1788. Micajah Proctor, Sec.
Jones, Willie & Tempe Ivey, 21 Dec., 1805. Benjamin Jones, Sec.
Jordan, Benjamin & Elizabeth Clark, 27 Aug., 1801. Richard Reese, Sec.
Jordan, James & Sally Young, 3 March, 1808. Nathaniel Peebles, Sec.
Justice, John & Mary Dupree, 30 Nov., 1787. Lewis Dupree, Jr., father, consents and is Sec.

Kerwin, John & Lucretia Galt, 30 Jan., 1804. Burwell Grigg, Jr., Sec.

Lane, John & Sally Jones, 17 Aug., 1799. Henry Jones, father, consents and is Sec.

Lane, Simon & Nelly Jones, 27 May, 1790. Henry Mangum, Sec.

Lanier, Abner & Mary Grigg, 27 Dec., 1808. Burwell Grigg, Sec.


Lawrence, Edmund & Sarah Lanier, 5 Feb., 1794. Devereux Lawrence, Sec.

Lawrence, James & Martha Woodford, 25 Feb., 1805. William B. Collier, Sec.

Lawrence, Jonathan & Mary Hazlewood, 10 May, 1802. Ingram Blanks, Sec.

Lee, James & Mary Collier, 27 April, 1786. Thomas Collier, father, consents. Hubbard Sykes, Sec.


Llwellin, Edmund & Priscilla Grizzard, 18 March, 1790. Frederick Emmery, guardian, consents & is Sec.


Llwellin, Tyson & Sally Hart, 27 May, 1790. Frederick Emmory, Sec.

Lewis, Edward & Elizabeth Porch, 12 Nov., 1807. Ingram Porch, father, consents. Lewis Chambliss, Sec.

Lock, Charles & Mary Batte, 15 July, 1790. John Batte, Sec.

Lockhart, James & Clara Morris, 2 Sept., 1807. James Jeter, Sec.

Love, Thomas & Lucy Allen, widow, 14 April, 1808. John F. Walker, Sec.

Long, Joseph & Annis Lawrence, 8 Sept., 1786. Carrol Grigg, Sec.


(To be continued.)

MUMFORD AND MUNFORD FAMILIES.

It is not positively known whether these two families were distinct or not, but a Munford and a Mumford family lived side by side in Amelia County. The clerks, however, spelt the names of the early members of the Munford family "Mumford."

There was a Thomas Mumford, who went to Virginia in the *First Supply*, and was in two voyages with John Smith that year. He returned to England most probably, where he was one of the adventurers of the second Virginia Company of London in 1609.

February 18, 1664 Thomas Mumpford patented 300 acres of land in Nansemond County. (Land Book, V, p. 58.)

April 20, 1685, Edward Munford patented 148 acres at the head of Poquosin dams in Warwick Co. (Land Book, VIII, p. 461.) He married Mary Watkins, daughter of Joseph Watkins, son of Richard Watkins. This is shown by a land grant to Joseph Mumford, "son and heir apparent of Mary Mumford, widow, late wife of Edward Mumford." This grant is dated 21 April, 1690. (Land Book, VIII, p. 33.

Edward and Mary Mumford, besides Joseph Mumford mentioned in the land grant, had the following children named in the register at Abingdon Parish, Gloucester Co., where they appear to
have lived after removing from Warwick Co.; Edward, bapt. July 15, 1685, and Daniel, baptized Oct. 22, 1687.

It was probably Joseph Mumford named above, who had a son Thomas, of Abingdon Parish, born January 13, 1719-20, who on December 22, 1744, in the same parish, married Sarah Booker, daughter of George Booker, of Gloucester Co.

This Thomas Mumford lived some years in King and Queen County, and later moved to Amelia. The date of this change was doubtless about 1757, for in that year Richard Anderson and Hansford Anderson of the Co. of King and Queen sold to Thomas Mumford, "of the aforesaid County," 520 acres in Raleigh Parish, Amelia County, part of a grant of 1037 acres to Matthew Talbot June 10, 1737.

On November 28, 1760, Thomas Tabb and John Tabb of the Parish of Rawleigh, Amelia Co., for 50£, paid by Thomas Mumford, one of the parties to these presents, made a release to "Rachel Booker, Edward Booker, Richard Marot Booker, exors. of Richard Booker dec'd, Ann Booker and Edward Booker, exors. of Edward Booker, dec'd., George Booker, Thomas Mumford, aforesaid and Sarah his wife, Edward Booker and Hannah, his wife, James Clarke and Samuel Tarry, all of the parish and county aforesaid." George Booker, of Gloucester County, father of Sarah Mumford, was one of eight children of Capt Richard Booker, of Gloucester, Edmund, Judith, Edward, Anne, Richard, John, Frances and George, all of whom but George moved to Amelia Co. (See Booker Family, Va. Mag., VII, 94, et seq.; William and Mary Quarterly, VII, 50.)

Thomas Mumford made his will in Amelia March 5, 1785, and in it names his children 1 Anne, 2 Thomas, 3 Martha Booker, wife of Samuel Booker, 4 Edward, 5 Sarah Wiley. Witnessed by George Booker, John Pride, Richeson Booker.

Thomas Mumford, jr., son of Thomas Mumford and Sarah Booker his wife, made his will in Amelia 4th January, 1786, and it was proved 25 January, 1787. Issue named, Mary Mumford, to whom he gave his whole estate.

Edward Mumford, 2d son of Thomas Mumford was probably the person of that name who served in the Revolution. He ap-
pears to have left a son Marshall Booker Mumford named as "nephew" in Thomas Mumford, jr's, will, and who married Mary Brown in 1808. (Wm. & Mary Quarterly, XVI, p. 274). Edward Mumford had probably also a son Thomas Mumford who married Rebecca Hill.

(To be continued.)

SAMUEL SWANN'S MARRIAGE TO ELIZABETH FENDALL.

From the Records of Perquimons Co., N. C.

This Indenture made eighteenth day of May Anno Domi 1698 between Samuel Swann of the precinct of Perquimons, of the one part, and Henderson Walker, of the precinct of Choan of the other part. Witnezeoth that whereas there is a marriage shortly, by God's grace to be had and solemnized between the said Samuel Swann and Elizabeth Fendall wid; and in consideration that the said marriage takes effect &c &c.

In Witness whereof the parties above said to these Indentures. Interchangably have set their hand and Seals, the day and year first above written.

Sealed and delivered in the presence of
Mary Lillington. Samuel Swann.
Robert R. Harmon, Inr Robert Fendall.

Acknowledged in Court the 10th day of October 1698. Registered the 14th day of October 1698.

John Stepney, Cler.
TOMBSTONES.

Communicated by REV. S. O. SOUTHALL, Dinwiddie, Va.

New Castle, Hanover County

Sacred to the Memory of
Mr. Isaac Brown. He was
a Native of Derby in the
Island of Great Britain
But settled a merchant
in this place.
In the prime of Life,
* * * in the very moment of anxious
expectation,
* * * arrival of a beloved
* * * an infant family,
* * * pleased the Almighty
* * * take him to himself
* * * the Augt, 1785
* * * and Disconsolate widow
* * * token of her affection

On the old Smith Place half a mile east of Dinwiddie C. H.
Capt John Hill,
Son of Col. Larkin Smith
Born May 14, 1783,
Died March 28, 1843

"Old Church," Hanover Co.,
Here lies the corpse of Alexander
Mathy, son of Gabriel Mathy
Mercht in Greenoch who died
of his age.
30 of July, 1752, in the 20th year
JAMES MADISON, SR.

James Madison, Sr., father of the President, was born March 27, 1723. He resided in Orange County and was Lieutenant Colonel of the Orange Militia. He died February 29, 1801. Here are copies of two papers in his handwriting now in possession of W. W. Scott, the Law Librarian of the State.

1779 Majr Thomas Barbour to James Madison in Paper Currency Dr

Novr 26. To 4½ Sheet at 760 Dollars £3

sheet is 3420 $ equal to 1026.0.0.

To 6 Do at Do 4560 " Do 1368.0.0

To Continental Certificate for 709 " Do 212.14.0

1780, Octr, 28 Certificate from Henry Fry, Commissioner of Culper for Beef 650.0.0.

To Do from Johnny Scott, " of Orange for Beef 785.0.0.

To Do from Ditto Do for Bacon 628.16.0.

To Do from Do Do for Brandy 1000.10.0.

1800 April 12. Received at sundry times previous to this the value of thirty-four Pounds two shillings and seven pence towards discharging Augustine Webb his acc. to me: the balance appears now to be due to me is one Pound seventeen shillings and ten pence ¾ d paid to the Sheriff for Taxes & Levies.

James Madison.

HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL NOTES.

Armistead.—Northampton County Records, May 1, 1798: "Account of the sales of the Estate of Capt. Ellyson Armistead, deceased. To cash paid Susannah Armistead, widow of the decedent, and guardian of Elizabeth and Frances Armistead, his orphans, as per receipt." On Dec. 20, 1806, a division was made of his slaves between Mrs. Armistead and Miss Frances Armistead. Capt. Armistead was son of Capt. Ellyson Armistead of York County and Jane, daughter of Rev. Charles Anderson, of Charles City Co.,
Historical and Genealogical Notes


Appomattox Church in Westmoreland County was later called Pope's Creek Church, but nothing of the original building remains. It is said that the register of baptisms, marriages and burials of this church was extant about 1900, and a parishioner had it in his home, where his children cut it up for paper dolls. The will of Dorothy Baldridge, "of Appomattox, widow," dated Nov. 2, 1662, and proved March 11, 1662-63, (recorded at Montross in "Deeds and Wills," No. 1, pages 188-89) contains this provision: "It is my will and minde that a Bowle & Challace be sent for out of England this shipping, & that my executor hereafter named shall pay two thousand pound of Tobacco & Caske for them. Item, I give the said Cup or Bowle & Challace to the Parish Church of Appomattox, to celebrate the Communion forever. Item, It is my will that my name be engraved on the said Bowle & Challace." Lamb's Creek Church, made of brick, appears to be the only one now standing within a few miles of Pope's Creek.—C. A. Hoppin, 102 Waverly Place, New York.

King George Co. Will Book.—During the "War between the States" many of the Record Books of the different counties of Virginia were carried North by the Federal soldiers. Many have been restored, either by purchase or by gift. Many doubtless still remain somewhere in the North. Recently there has been returned one of the will books of King George County, which it is believed completes the colonial records of that historic county.

Queries.

Wimbish-Henderson.—Two brothers, both physicians, of Salisbury, N. C., were married to two sisters of Halifax Co., Va., in 1851—Pleasant Henderson to Fanny Rebecca Wimbish and Alexander Martin Henderson to Melinda Wimbish. I desire information regarding the Wimbish family to which these ladies belonged. Address me: Archibald Henderson, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Poynor-Digges.—John Poynor, of French extraction, said to be of Dinwiddie Co., Va., married ——— Digges (Eliza) probably between 1775-1800. Who were their parents and from what Co.? Three of their children (girls) married and lived in Mecklenburg Co., Va.;
one son, Digges Poynor, lived in Brunswick Co., Va. Wm. Poynor, Capt. in Va. Troops, Cont. Line. Who was he?—M. W. J.

FINCH.—Whose daughter was the wife of Wm. Finch (will 1773) of Charles City Co., Va.? She was probably a Wilson. They had a grandson, Maj. Wilson Walker.—M. W. J.

PALMER.—Who were Capt. Martin Palmer's (York Co.) wife and children?—M. W. J.

WANTED.—Will pay any reasonable sum for No. 2, Vol. XIV (October, 1905) of *William and Mary College Quarterly*.—BENJAMIN L. ANCELL, Mahan School, Yangchow, China.
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IDEALS OF AMERICA.

The celebration of the settlement at Plymouth has given occasion for a joy ride which has borne along all the writers for newspapers and popular magazines. Like a company of boys and girls in a fast going automobile they fill the air with rapturous squeaks and shrieks. The Mayflower compact is the starting point for this maddening historic revel, and even as sedate a paper as the New York Evening Post, in its issue of August 2, has given its great influence to the claim that Plymouth was "the birthplace of democracy."

If all this was only a joy ride of a day, a revel of a night, its violation of historic truth might be passed by without serious questioning. But this is not the case. Hundreds of pens this moment are busy at work trying to make the words which are shouted out on the palpitating air accepted matters of history, and this sort of thing does not exactly go down with those who regard history as a serious matter, and not exactly the thing to be made subject to exploitation and propaganda.

Beginning with democracy, it is not true in any sense that the Mayflower compact warrants the claim that Plymouth was the birthplace of democracy. The Mayflower compact was merely an agreement of the 41 signers to associate together, make laws, and obey the laws when made. In this they did nothing more than other societies had done. The persons interested in the London Company must have first assembled, associated together and agreed to abide by the will of the majority. Had the company (certainly under the charters of 1609 and 1612) come to America, the political authority which they wielded over the Col-
onists sent over would have come into effect over themselves individually as well. The embodiment of their plans in a formal paper voiced by the King did not alter the fundamental facts one way or another. And so as has been well said by a recent writer, the action of the Pilgrim fathers rose from the exigencies of their situation and not from "any preconceived philosophical notions" of any kind. (Adams, The Founding of New England, 98.)

To show that they intended nothing out of the ordinary they made haste the very next year to seek and obtain from the Plymouth Company under whose dominion they found themselves a patent exactly of the same governmental nature as the Compact, and in 1630 they obtained another. During this time they tried their best to get a charter from the King.

It is sometimes said that because these patents did not receive the sanction of the King, the Plymouth Colony existed from the beginning to the end on the Mayflower Compact. But this reasoning is not at all satisfactory. The Plymouth Company had, under their charter of 1630 full powers of government, and until the King signified his dissent to their orders they had actual valid authority. Even if they were illegal, so was the Mayflower Compact, but the Plymouth Company's grants, while giving the same basis for a civil compact between the inhabitants of Plymouth, had the advantage of being the last in time and were asked for and accepted by them, despite the Mayflower Compact.

But what was the society formed by the 41 signers? New England writers represent it as a democracy, but it was no such thing. It was an aristocracy pure and simple. The 41 signers acted from the start as an exclusive body and only cautiously admitted new comers into partnership in power. In 1643 the number of males at Plymouth of military age was 627, but only 230 exercised the suffrage (Plymouth Records VIII, 173-177). As the years rolled by the franchise became more and more restricted, until it finally resembled the system which prevailed in the neighboring colony of Massachusetts Bay (Channing, History of the United States, I, 316). All power was vested in a few favored individuals called "Freemen," in contrast to the poor "inhabitants," who constituted by far the greater part of the population.
While church membership was apparently not required for citizenship at Plymouth and its associated towns, every freeman had in 1671 to be "orthodox in the fundamentals of religion." And Palfrey in his *New England* admits that this law, which was very probably only a legislative recognition of the practice of much earlier times, amounted practically to a requirement of Church membership. (Palfrey, *New England*, II, 8.) In 1691 the Plymouth Colony was incorporated by the King with Massachusetts. In his *Fathers of New England*, Dr. Charles M. Andrews of Yale University, declares that with the single exception of giving to New England the Congregational Church, the Plymouth settlers were "without importance in the world of thought, literature or education." Now it seems that Massachusetts Bay extended its ideals to Plymouth rather than Plymouth to Massachusetts Bay.

And what were these ideals of Massachusetts? Autocracy, persecution and a system of education, directed, as in Germany before the World War, to autocratic ends. Not a suggestion of democracy, freedom of religion, or education, contemplating a real generous purpose or culture of a modern example.

As the charter of this colony vested authority only in those named in it and such as they chose to elect to share the authority, it appears that out of the hundreds that came with Endicott in 1628 and Winthrop in 1630 only about eleven had any voice in the government. These, according to the use of the term, were the only "freemen," and though the number of freemen was shortly increased by the favor of these first, citizenship was construed as a privilege and not a right and made to depend upon membership in the Congregational Church, so that during nearly all the 17th century five-sixths of the people of Massachusetts were deprived of the ballot and taxed without any real representation.

It accordingly follows that as the very limited number of freemen were the only persons permitted to vote in the towns, the towns were oligarchies and not democracies. And this oligarchical character was intensified by the authority of religion, which made a select clique consisting of the minister anddeacons and a few favored laymen of highly orthodox godliness the real rulers
of every town. When a stranger asked Parson Phillips of the South Church at Andover "if he were the parson who serves here," he received this reply, "I am, sir, the parson who rules here." (Charles M. Andrews in Colonial Folk Ways, p. 166). This same clique dictated who should represent the towns in the General Court, which made the laws of the Colony. And the Councillors or assistants, constituting the upper branch of the General Court, were secured a permanent official tenure by reason of the law affording to them "precedency of all others in nomination on the election day." So the Rev. Mr. Stone aptly described Massachusetts in the 17th century as "a speaking aristocracy in face of a silent democracy."

Though the charter of King William in 1691 introduced various salutary political reforms in Massachusetts, chief among which was the abolition of church membership for citizenship, the essential principles of the Massachusetts Government remained the same till long after the American Revolution. The same little cliques maintained their hold on the towns and the ballot continued to be very limited. Dr. J. F. Jameson shows* that just before the American Revolution only half as many people voted in Massachusetts as did in Virginia.† Distinctions in society were as prominent a feature in the life of the Commonwealth as it had been in that of the Colony. To the very end of the colonial days distinctions were observed with such punctilious nicety that the students at Harvard College were arranged according to the dignity of their birth and rank.

The political ideas of Massachusetts were accepted in all the other New England Colonies. The basis of rule in each was a select body of "freemen," vested with the powers of government. This proved true even of Rhode Island, whose towns began their existence as a protest to the tyranny of Massachusetts by the establishment temporarily of real democratic governments. The first authentic form of government established within the present territorial jurisdiction of Rhode Island was the charter obtained

*Dr. Jameson in New York Nation for April 27, 1893.
†William and Mary Quarterly, VI, 7-11.
from Parliament in 1644, which recognized the rule of a majority of the inhabitants. But this government had only a troubled and barely recognized existence, and in 1663 a charter was granted to William Brenton, Roger Williams, and others, investing them with the powers of a close corporation. Only such persons as they selected had any concern in the government. "In short, it abrogated the democratic government established by the charter of 1644 and created an oligarchy in its stead."* The ballot in Rhode Island became very restricted, and it took a rebellion in 1842 to overturn the aristocratic establishment.

The governments of Connecticut, New Haven, New Hampshire and Maine were in the same lines of exclusiveness. Church membership was not expressly required in Connecticut, but as the applicant for the franchise had to be a man of "peaceable and honest conversation," this was very apt to mean church membership in practice. No one but a church member could be elected governor and in choosing the Assistants or Councillors, the same rule of "preference" prevailed here as in Massachusetts. In none of the colonies was the tenure of office more constant or persevering.

In New Haven the aristocratic model was adopted by Rev. John Davenport and his followers, and a strictly church State was erected. The body of free burgesses was very cautiously enlarged from Court to Court.

"By no stretch of the imagination," says Dr. Charles M. Andrews, Professor of History at Yale University, "can the political conditions in any of the New England Colonies be called popular or democratic. Government was in the hands of a very few men."

Neither was there much change with the American Revolution. The towns still continued in the grasp of the autocratic cliques. As late as 1793 a newspaper writer complained that in Connecticut the chief magistrates were often chosen by one-twentieth of the legal voters. And in 1798 a writer from Norfolk County, Massachusetts, declared that "the country people this way in general never prepare their minds previous to a town meeting, and

*"Memorial of the Democratic Members of the Rhode Island Legislature," in Report of Mr. Burke, 28th Congress, 1st Session.
were therefore under the influence of their most influential and learned men, particularly the moderator." (Robinson, *Jeffersonian Democracy in New England.*) This explains why New England became the headquarters of the Federalist party, which had a fear of and contempt for popular rule.

It was not till 1804 that a real democratic spirit began for the first time to exert itself upon the Puritan States. It came with the second election of Jefferson who carried all New England, except Connecticut. And the democratic influence in 1804 did not come from Plymouth, but from Virginia. A brief review of the facts will make this clear.

During the Colonial times in Virginia the chief power was vested in the House of Burgesses, and the basis of this house was remarkably free. Two years before the Pilgrims came to America the London Company, granted to Virginia a charter which authorized "the inhabitants" to elect burgesses to share in the government. By virtue of this authority the first Assembly met at Jamestown July 30, 1619. This was more than a year before the Plymouth Compact.

After the revocation of the charter the right of suffrage was restricted to the "freemen," but this did not mean a selected number as in Massachusetts, but all persons not servants or slaves. It included even free negroes. In 1671 the suffrage was limited to "householders" and "freeholders," but as the act did not designate the amount of the freehold, the status of the suffrage was not materially changed by this law. (Spottswood's *Letters*, II, p. 1.) It was not till 1736, after the House of Burgesses had existed 117 years, that a real limitation ensued. In that year the requirement of a definite amount of land was for the first time declared. But even after that time many more people voted in Virginia than in Massachusetts. (Dr. J. F. Jameson in *New York Nation* April 27, 1893.) Notice too that suffrage rested on a general law, not on selection.

It is not denied that there was a strong aristocratic influence in Colonial Virginia. But it was largely spectacular, and constantly lost power. Negro slaves took the place of the menial whites of New England, and color, and not class, became the real
distinction in society; and as time went on every white man in the 18th century had to be treated as an equal and be accosted in public as “Mister”—a term of respect. Writing of the times immediately anterior to the Revolution, St. George Tucker said that there was no such thing as “dependence of classes” in Virginia, and that “the aristocracy of Virginia was as harmless a set of men as ever existed.”

Edmund Randolph, who was one of the aristocrats, referred to the influence of the aristocracy at the beginning of the Revolution, as “little and feeble and incapable of daring to resist any privilege clashing with the rights of the people at large.” (Henry’s Henry, I, 209.) Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to John Adams as late as 1814, derided the power of the Virginia aristocracy both before and after the Revolution and referred, in contrast, to the “traditional reverence” paid to “certain families in Massachusetts and Connecticut, which had rendered the offices of those governments nearly hereditary in those families.” (William and Mary College Quarterly, XXIII, 227; XXVI, 279.)

Nor were there any rules regarding quality at William and Mary College, nor any election laws affecting the precedence of applicants for office, as in New England.

The ultimate consequences of the social forces in Virginia and New England made themselves felt when for the first time after the American Revolution the two communities had the opportunity of directing, without foreign restraint, the government of their own country. Virginia became the headquarters of the Democratic Republican party—the party of popular ideas—and New England the headquarters, as we have observed, of the Federalist party—the party of aristocratic ideas.

In the literature of the first twenty-five years after Independence nothing is more conspicuous than the hatred displayed by the oligarchies of New England against Jefferson and Virginia. He expounded a doctrine that was particularly hateful to them, and he soon felt the government shake under him by their frantic efforts in the town meetings. But in 1804 came his re-election as President and glorious victory, when he carried all New England except Connecticut. Twelve years later the Federalist party—the
pet of New England—had ceased to exist—and the Jeffersonian principle of the equality of men was adopted by all parties and carried by New England to an excess.

The second principle characteristic of New England was persecution. Massachusetts led in this, as in the autocratic principle, and Episcopalians, Baptists and Quakers successively felt the weight of her iron hand. Plymouth was never as great a sinner as Massachusetts, but as we have seen the basis of its political life was the Congregational Church, and there as elsewhere the other sects were outside the pale. In Plymouth very severe proceedings were adopted against the Quakers, with warm protests from those who sympathized with them, but Connecticut punished any town for permitting them to remain within its jurisdiction, and any ship captain who landed them had to take them out again under heavy penalties. In New Haven a much sharper treatment still was visited upon them. Even in Rhode Island founded on the Puritan persecutions of Massachusetts, and where liberty of conscience was first preached in America, the ideals of Massachusetts blackened the record. Among the first laws enacted in Rhode Island after the charter of 1663 was one denying to Roman Catholics the right to vote or hold office.

Again Dr. Andrews may be quoted concerning religious conditions in Colonial New England, "Of toleration in New England except in Rhode Island there was none." (Andrews, The Fathers of New England, 74.)

Virginia had been by no means free from the persecuting spirit in colonial times, but the courts seldom inflicted severe punishments, and in the Declaration of Rights in 1776 freedom of conscience was put for the first time upon a philosophic footing. The paper of George Mason has this distinctive characteristic and no other paper previous to it has. After the Revolution the constitution of Massachusetts still gave the Congregational Church the preference and New England as a whole was priest ridden. The labors of the Methodist apostle, Jesse Lee, of Virginia (from 1789 to 1797), and the Baptist missionary, John Leland (from 1799-1824), who though born in Massachusetts, was by long residence a Virginian in heart and principle, prepared the way for
the statesman Jefferson, whose success in 1804 was as much one for religious freedom as for political liberty.

We are told in the Memoirs of Rev. Jesse Lee that the old spirit of persecution in New England was still so rampant at the time of his visit that he received much harsh treatment, and was often denied the use of the meeting houses and had to preach on the streets. The spiritual desolation of large parts of the country through which Mr. Lee passed was as surprising as it was painful. There were hundreds of families and neighborhoods where a minister never came. He sometimes found "lewd fellows" in the congregations disposed to insult the minister and bring his services into contempt. In Provincetown, where the Pilgrims first put foot to land, he and his fellow Methodists were refused by the town authorities the right to put up a church, and when the Methodists nevertheless collected materials to proceed with the work a company of men assembled at night and burned the lumber.

Mr. Lee visited the melancholy scene in the morning and said sadly: "I feel astonished at the conduct of the people, considering we live in a free country and no such conduct can be justified."

Jefferson's re-election in 1804 put the stamp of success upon the work of Lee and Leland; and the doctrine of religious freedom, which they all three taught, went to leaven the whole mass of society in New England. Never again was the church the same in that section of the country.

Through the great influences of the light brought from Virginia, laws were gradually passed disestablishing religion, and the authority of the autocrats declined. The Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination upon which the preachers based their political influence became an obsolete dogma.

We now come to the third ideal of Massachusetts, which has been greatly exploited—its school system. No nation laid greater stress on its school system than Germany before the late World War, and yet there were no greater sinners against humanity and the international law than the German professors. It all depends upon the object to which a school system is directed whether it is a good thing or not. In Germany the whole pur-
pose was to strengthen the hands of the autocrats, and in Massachusetts the schools served a similar purpose. The maintenance of the theocracy was the real thing, which is proved by the fact that the law forbade all but members of the Congregational Church from teaching school. "Every grammar master had to be approved by the minister of the town and the ministers of the two next adjoining towns, or any two of them, by certificate under their hands."

When we come to consider the operation of the system, it was singularly defective. The selectmen had to appoint the teachers but the parents had to pay them, so the schools were never free schools in our sense. Nor was there any regularity in the schools. The statutes complain from time to time of the "shameless neglect" of the towns in observing the laws. Many towns preferred to pay the fines than have a school, and in the records there is frequent mention of gross ignorance of the children, which required them to be bound out. The few schools that existed were taught two months in winter and two months in summer, and the education imparted was a bare ability to read and write. Most of the people could do neither.

The autocratic ideal of education, of which Massachusetts was the champion, entered into the life of all the other Colonies of New England. Whatever real output there was went to the maintenance of the church. Sometimes, out of the dense mass of ignorance, there arose a learned minister, who had been through the Harvard Grammar School, but very seldom a learned lawyer or learned anybody else. The people, especially of Rhode Island and Plymouth, were singularly illiterate, and records written by town officers and letters written by even prominent persons in New England are full of bad spelling. Of Plymouth, W. Root Bliss writes in his Old Colony Town: "There were no free schools. 'Every scholler that comes to wright or syfer or to lern Latin shall pay 3 pence per weeke, if to Reade Only then to pay three half pence per weeke,' says the town Record of July 31, 1699." As late as 1793 a project to establish a school for girls at Plymouth was opposed because it might teach wives how to correct their husbands errors in spelling.
The true ideal of Public Education came from a native and resident of Virginia, not from the Massachusetts School System. This colony had many more educated people than New England, and the single County of York (including Williamsburg and Yorktown) had more private libraries than perhaps all New England put together. In making the education of the poor and the establishment and support of William and Mary College a matter of public legislation, it recognized that education was a matter of public concern. Now while it cannot be claimed that this recognition extended to the present educational ideal, it was a Virginian, Thomas Jefferson (taught at William and Mary) that gave to the world the true plan of the public education. The principles of his great bill of 1779 afforded, for the first time, the real basis of the public school system as it exists in the United States to-day. No other person had so complete a grasp of the situation, and his measure was the most luminous conception ever presented to a legislative body. Under his system education was to be free and it was to be a State matter, not a town matter, a unit and not a plurality. More important still its object was to enable the citizen to know his rights and duties as such, which was something totally different from the Massachusetts idea of strengthening and maintaining a theocratic oligarchy.

To what is to be attributed the origination by Virginia or at least by Virginians, of the ideals which now dominate the American people? The answer is to be found in the spread of the free thought and scientific enquiry that characterized the middle of the eighteenth century. The writings of Voltaire, Rousseau and Montesquieu, repudiating the dogmatism of the churches and the authority of rulers, were reinforced by the researchers of the natural philosophers, and found a generous welcome in Virginia. In 1758 Francis Fauquier, a devotee of the sciences and Fellow of the Royal Society, arrived as governor and the same year Dr. William Small, the associate of Erasmus Darwin and James Watt, came to Williamsburg as professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the College of William and Mary. At Williamsburg speculation on all kinds of questions became rife. Fauquier and Small delighted in the society of young men, and at Fau-
quier's table, where Small was a constant attendant, the youth of Virginia learned their lessons in the civil and religious rights of man. Among the students on whom profound impression was made was Thomas Jefferson.

He absorbed the spirit that floated about him and became its noblest expression. And with his marvelous power of impressing others, he created the Americanism of today and is incomparably the greatest vital force in American history.

VIRGINIA, FOUNDER OF THE WORLD'S NAVIES.

Virginians at Jamestown in 1607 laid the Foundation of this great Republic, and in 1619 they laid broad and wide the Foundation of its democracy, at the Assembly that year, elected by the free vote of all the "inhabitants" of Virginia. By Virginians driving away the French in 1613 and 1614 from the New England Coast, and saving the Plymouth Colony from starvation in 1622, as the good Bradford himself narrates, they enabled the Pilgrim Fathers to make their stand on this continent, and thus Virginia was the Founder of New England.

More than any other of the colonies, Virginia, under the leadership of Patrick Henry and George Washington, Founded the Union and secured the independence of the Country. And under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, George Mason, John Marshall and Edmund Randolph they had a chief part in Founding for that Union the government under which we live.

Democracy, whose foundation a century and a half before, had been laid at Jamestown, had admittedly, at the time of the American Revolution and afterwards, its best expression in the Statesman Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the immortal Declaration of Independence; and the Democratic-Republican party, of which he was the head and inspiration, had its headquarters in Virginia, during all the early days of the Republic. The Federalists, who had their headquarters in New England, had little confidence in a strictly popular rule.
Virginia, Founder of the World's Navy.

Through its Presidents, Washington, Jefferson, Monroe and Tyler, the Republic was expanded till, in the place of a fledgling nation stretching along the Atlantic coast about 400 miles inland, there was founded a Continental power reaching 3,000 miles from one ocean to the other.

No State or Nation, of either the old or new world, has furnished to history such a host of ideal men as Virginia, and we can challenge any of them to show two such noble characters as George Washington and Robert Edward Lee. And there were also such men as Jefferson, Madison, Marshall, Monroe, Joseph E. Johnston, Stonewall Jackson, &c.—masterful men—pure of speech, chaste of action and sublime of character.

The North, on the other hand, though it has produced many able men, masterful men, has produced no ideals. We can admire the intellectual power of Benjamin Franklin and Alexander Hamilton, but their private lives were highly immoral and not fit to be cited for the imitation of the youth of the land. We can admire some of the writings of Abraham Lincoln, a distinctly inferior man intellectually to Franklin or Hamilton, but, if there were no other objections to him, and there are not a few, we would hardly care to teach our children to imitate his example of telling filthy stories.

And so in regard to Webster, John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Ulysses S. Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Henry Ward Beecher, &c. In them we recognize plenty of intellectuality but often traits so unlovely as forever to prevent them from being ideals. The best of these morally were the two Adamses, but the childish vanity of the one and the fierce malignity of the other, as shown by his Diary, can not justly give either of them a place among America's ideal heroes.

The simple truth has been that the North, in laying stress upon the commercial values of men, has not been able in any age to produce that ideality which is a combination of supreme patriotism, complete disinterestedness and perfect purity of speech and conduct. The society of Virginia and the South, with all its imperfections, resulted in inspiring a high and scrupulous sense
of honor,* and the Southern citizen, however faulty himself, demanded perfection in his heroes.

This sentimental value attaching to men in the South explains why the favorite songs of the nation have been songs redolent of the South. Each state of the South has its songs, and "Dixie" is the song of a section which never fails, whenever heard, to arouse enthusiasm. The "Sewanee River," "My Old Kentucky Home," "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia," and countless other songs, by authors wherever born, were inspired by the spirit of the South. Indeed, the euphonious names of the Southern States—Virginia, Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, &c., lend themselves to song, but it is well-nigh impossible to associate song with such raucous names as Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York. There is no song like "Dixie" marking off the North as a distinct section. Indeed, history shows that the State and locality appealed more to the Southern man than to the Northern.

There is, in truth, a kind of all embracing meaning attaching to the name of Virginia, which is very suggestive. Virginia was the name given to the whole of North America by the Virgin Queen Elizabeth of England, and Plymouth and New England and New York were only parts of North Virginia. "United States of America" are not a name but mere words of description. The real historic name for the Republic is Virginia, and there could be no sweeter, cleaner or purer designation.

Call this talk "heroics" if you choose, but it is at least satisfactory to the writer, and will suit very well as an introduction to his article. So many FOUNDINGS were accomplished through the agency of Virginia, that it is not surprising that, in addition to what has been mentioned, Virginia may claim to be FOUNDER of the World's Navies.

The publication in this magazine, for the first time, it is believed, of the official report of John L. Worden, captain of the Ericsson Battery, the Monitor, revives the memory of an affair

---

*Hence the "honor system" which prevailed at William and Mary College, the University of Virginia, the University of North Carolina, and other Southern schools and colleges.
which justifies the claim, and it may be set forth briefly as follows:

During the night of April 20, 1861, the United States forces abandoned the Norfolk Navy Yard, after a partial destruction of the ships, stores and cannon at that depot. Among the vessels then at the Navy Yard, out of commission, was the United States frigate *Merrimac*. She belonged to the new class of fifty gun frigates of 3,500 tons, with auxiliary steam power. She was built at Charlestown, Massachusetts, in 1855, and had made several cruises, and upon returning from her last cruise was put out of commission at the Norfolk Navy Yard and was moored alongside of the dock. In her best days, her speed, under steam power, had not exceeded seven miles, and it had run down, at the close of her last service, to four or five miles per hour. At the evacuation of Norfolk, she was set on fire and burnt to the water’s edge, and her machinery and boilers were still further damaged.

The Confederate Government did not lose much time, but raised the hull of the *Merrimac*, which was about 275 feet in length, and put her in the dry dock. Then under the management of those two masterful engineers and constructors, John Mercer Brooke, of Virginia, and John L. Porter, of Virginia, who may be considered as the Fathers of the modern naval warfare, they covered the central part of the hull, about 160 feet long, with a roof of oak and pine wood, 22 inches in thickness, inclined at an angle of 35 degrees.

Upon this structure of wood they caused to be placed 4 inches of iron, consisting of plates about eight inches wide and two inches thick. There were two courses of these plates—one longitudinal and the outer course up and down. The forward and after ends of the roof were rounded, and the apex of the roof was flat, almost eight feet wide, and covered over with permanent gratings of two inch square iron. The gratings were pierced by four hatchways to permit egress from the gun decks to the grating or outside of the ship. That part of the ship’s bow and stern not enclosed in the casemate, about 58 feet at each end, was covered with decking plank and was under water. The vessel, when in fighting trim, had much the appearance of the roof of a house afloat. Her prow was of cast iron, projected four feet from the stem, was under
water two feet, and weighed one thousand five hundred pounds. Her engines and boilers were the old ones still further impaired by the action of fire and sea water.

Her battery consisted of 4 Brooke rifle guns and six nine-inch Dahlgren shell guns. She was capable of a speed not exceeding 3 3/4 miles an hour.

On the 8th of March, 1862, this strange craft, now christened "The Virginia," with Captain Franklin Buchanan in command, Lt. Ro. D. Minor as second in command and Lt. Catesby ap R. Jones as third in command, cut loose from the Navy Yard, and, attended by two small wooden vessels, the Beaufort and Raleigh, mounting one gun each, moved slowly down the Elizabeth River.

As no one aboard knew what her capabilities were, the men of the crew were subjected to some mental anxiety. The boat under its new conditions, being utterly untried, the prevailing doubt, both on the shore and on board, was that, at the first broadside from the enemy, she might experience some sudden disaster, and go headlong to the bottom of the water. She had a crew on board of 320 men, most of whom had never been on a ship before, "land-lubbers" that had little but their courage to recommend them as sailors. Without a trial trip, with workmen on the ship up to the last minute, with a crew and officers strangers to each other and to the ship, with no opportunity to get things into shape or to drill the men at the guns or instruct them in their various duties, the Virginia, went forth to challenge the power of the great Federal Government.

On this day the United States had at anchor in Hampton Roads, off Newport News, the steam frigate Congress (50 guns) and the steam sloop Cumberland (24 guns), and near Fort Monroe were the frigates Minnesota (48 guns), the Roanoke (40 guns), St. Lawrence (50 guns) and Brandywine (50 guns), and there were in addition, twelve gunboats carrying 33 guns, making in all 295 guns afloat. On these ships there were considerably over 3,000 men. In a position to assist this formidable fleet were the batteries at Fort Monroe, the Ripraps and Newport News, which mounted more than an equal number of guns, and were manned by several thousand soldiers.
A formidable collection of fighting materials truly! The sailors on the Federal battleships were trained seamen, brave men, proud of their ships and flag and used to their duties. The men on shore were trained soldiers, officered by experienced superiors. They were confident of their powers and they could not believe that the proud array of which they were a part had anything to fear from one slow-moving iron-clad vessel of ten guns supported by five small wooden steamboats of eleven guns, for, as the Virginia reached the Roads, she was joined from James River by the steamboats, Patrick Henry, Yorktown and Teazer.

The complete victory won by the Virginia on that day is so universally admitted that it is not necessary to go into details. She sank the Cumberland, burnt the Congress, silenced the forts at Newport News, badly crippled the Minnesota, drove the Roanoke, St. Lawrence and Brandywine to the protection of the guns of Fort Monroe, and scared off the gunboats constituting the rest of the fleet like a flock of small birds.

In the course of the fight the Confederate fleet had some 45 men killed and wounded, most of them being on the wooden auxiliaries. The total loss on the Virginia were two men killed and eighteen wounded. Capt. Buchanan and Lieut. Minor were badly wounded, and the command of the Virginia devolved on Lieutenant Catesby ap R Jones. The Federals lost 30 men in prisoners, and had about 400 officers and men on the ships killed and wounded. Gen. Mansfield, who commanded at Newport News, and had part in the fight, wrote: "Our ships were perfectly helpless against the Merrimac, as our broadsides produced no material effect upon her." The Rebellion Records show that the government fell into a perfect panic, and at a cabinet meeting Secretary Stanton said, "the Merrimac will change the whole character of the war."

In this remark of Stanton is read the significance of the victory. It was not a mere defeat of the Federal fleet, but a demonstration that scrapped the navies of the world. By her prowess that day the Virginia changed the character of naval warfare everywhere by showing that a wooden vessel, no matter how gallantly served and manned, had little chance in combat with an
iron clad one, even when of very imperfect make and manned with raw militia.

Then and there Virginia FOUNDED the present navies of the world.

But in the same spirit that places the cart before the horse, makes 1620 an earlier date than 1607, snubs Jamestown out of existence and celebrates the landing of the Pilgrims as the first colony, most Northern writers turn the whole world-wide significance on the subsequent battle of March 9th. The Monitor, which had no share in the battle of the 8th, is lugged in to share with the Virginia, the glory of the new departure in naval construction and warfare, or even to monopolize the glory. And so great adepts at propaganda have been the Northern people as a rule that they have actually persuaded some Southern writers to accept their views in this matter, as they have done in many other unreasonable things.

As a matter of fact, however, the battle of March 9th had no real significance of a worldwide nature. It was a contest between ironclads, and the most that could be decided in such a fight was a question of superior courage or one of superiority of type in the iron ships.†

We have no wish to cast any doubt upon the excuse given by Capt. Worden for his long delay in making his official report,* as in relating the details of the fight, his report is more candid than that of Lieutenant S. Dana Greene, who succeeded him in command. There is overwhelming evidence from both Federal and Confederate sources that the Monitor first retired from the engagement and this was later admitted by Lieutenant Greene, but, in his official report of March 12th, 1862, Greene says nothing about it. Captain Worden, in his official report, is honest enough to state the fact without concealment. After a shell from the Virginia exploded on the outside of the pilot house, damaging it,
and seriously injuring Capt. Worden's eyes, he, thinking that his
ship had received some serious injury, gave the order "to shear
off." The only really objectionable thing about the report is that,
after this admission, he should say that the Virginia was driven
off "crippled and discomfited." A vessel that had "sheered off"
from the fight was in no position to claim that it had driven its
antagonist away, because that antagonist did not choose to await
the pleasure of its return.

How long, indeed, did the Monitor remain away from the fight?
In the official report of Lt. Greene there is, as stated, no mention
of this retirement, but in his article later on he admits that after
Worden was wounded there was great confusion on the Monitor,
which "moved without direction" (whatever that means) for at
least 20 minutes. (S. Dana Greene in Century Magazine for
March, 1885). Capt. Worden in this report seems to say that the
Monitor under Greene only returned to the scene of battle after
the Virginia had left for Norfolk. Lt. Jones, who commanded the
Virginia in the fight, says that "the Monitor did not leave the
shoal to which she had retreated, until we had crossed the bar on
the way to Norfolk." And Midshipman Virginius Newton, later
one of the most prominent citizens of Richmond, goes further and
declares that the Virginia waited for the Monitor to return three-
quarters of an hour, and that "he had a distinct recollection that
at this time when the Virginia had crossed the bar and was well
on her way to Norfolk," the Monitor "while she fired a gun, made
no motion to come out into deep water." (Southern Historical
Society Papers, XX, pp. 1-26. See also account of Dinwiddie
Brazier Phillips, surgeon on the Virginia, in Va. Historical So-
ciety Collections, Vol. VI.)

In strong confirmation of Mr. Newton's statement is the offi-
cial report of C. J. Van Brunt, captain of the Minnesota, which
had been stranded, and was the very ship the Monitor had come
out expressly to protect.

In relating the withdrawal of the Monitor after the injury to
the pilot house, and the wounding of Captain Worden, Van Brunt
says the Monitor "stood down for Fortress Monroe and we thought
it probable that she had exhausted her supply of ammunition, or
sustained some injury," that, when "soon after the Merrimac
headed for his ship," he then "felt to the fullest extent his con-
dition," and characterizing it "as an extreme dilemma" ordered,
on consultation with his officers, "every preparation to be made
to destroy the ship after all hope was gone of saving her."

Certainly, then, Capt. Van Brunt was far from regarding
the action of the Monitor as that of a victorious vessel chasing off
a "discomfited" adversary, or even that of a temporary retirement.
In these words and all that follow in his report, there is not a
syllable about the Monitor's returning to his assistance or any
hint that he owed his salvation to her. On the contrary, if his re-
port of things means anything, it gives positive evidence that the
Monitor retreated to Fort Monroe three miles distant, leaving
the Virginia in possession of the field, and the Minnesota, which
had fought vigorously, unprotected and at her mercy.

Capt. Van Brunt gives a pitiful account of the condition of
his ship. He was hard and immovably aground. During the
time the Virginia fought the Monitor she had also fought the
Minnesota, and put several shells into her which had done much
damage. A shell had blown up the tug boat Oregon which lay
alongside, producing much consternation. And now there was no
friend around to help him, not even a tug boat.

But it seems the Virginia did not drive Capt. Van Brunt to
his last desperate resolves, for he says that when he ascended to
the poop deck, after the council with his officers, he saw that "the
enemy's vessel had changed its course and was heading for Craney
Island."

Then how was his ship saved? Why, by the great draught of
the Virginia which was 23 feet. While engaged with the Monitor
she had fired repeatedly at the Minnesota, which was assisting the
Monitor with her powerful broadsides, but she could not come
close enough to do the work of destruction effectively. This is the
reason that Capt. Van Brunt gives why he was not destroyed the
day before. "Very fortunately the iron battery drew too much
water to come within a mile of us." So that the same reason which
saved him when the Monitor was not around, saved him when she
was.
The inability to reach the *Minneapolis*, while it proved the sole reason that she was saved, was not the sole reason that induced the return of the *Virginia* to Norfolk. She had not come off altogether without injury, in the fight of the previous day. The fact is that so long as the great wooden battleships remained afloat they had proved far more dangerous than the *Monitor*. When the *Cumberland*, the *Congress* and the *Minnesota* discharged their broadsides, there was something doing. So while the *Virginia* had received no injury from the *Monitor* and not one of her officers or men had been hurt by any of the shots from that vessel, she had, according to the report of Lt. Jones, (*Naval War Records*, 7, p. 42), incurred considerable damage in the fight of the first day (March 8). She had lost her prow in ramming the *Cumberland*, and two of the ten guns had their muzzles knocked off. The anchors and all flagstaffs were shot away and the smoke stack and steam pipe were riddled, which made it difficult to keep the fires going in the furnaces. The pilot of the *Virginia* having assured Lt. Jones that he would inevitably run aground, if he attempted to proceed much nearer to the *Minnesota*, the *Monitor* itself being out of reach, the ship needing repairs and the men worn down with two days consecutive fighting, the officers of the *Virginia* determined to avail themselves of the remaining two and a half hours of flood tide and return to her base at Norfolk. There was no more reason to attribute retreat to her for doing this now, than if she had returned to her base for repairs on the day before, as ordinary prudence should have suggested to Lieutenant Jones.

All the honor of the battle, therefore, remains with the *Virginia*. She had won two great victories in two successive days. A similar performance was unknown to Naval Annals. Called upon to fight two battles without hardly an intermission, her untrained crew were necessarily under great mental strain and physical fatigue. There can be little doubt that if the *Virginia* had met the *Monitor* the day before, when the men were fresh and the boat intact, she would have sent the *Monitor* to the bottom of the Roads. And this, despite the fact that the *Monitor* was far more heavily armored than the *Virginia*, scarcely presented any surface above the water, and was exceedingly nimble by the lightness of
her draft which was only eleven fleet. The crew of the Monitor, unlike that of the Virginia were picked seamen and the boat too, according to Capt. Worden, himself, was fully tested before sailing, in nearly every particular.

Without underestimating the competency and courage of the Monitor's crew, or its own remarkable adaptedness to warfare, I am sure that the prow and great weight of the Virginia would have done the business for her, if employed under favorable conditions. Dr. Charles Martin, Surgeon of the Cumberland, was distinctly of this view. (Virginia Historical Collections, Vol. VI. "Career of the Virginia," by Dinwiddie B. Phillips).

That this is not a far-fetched conclusion is shown by the attitude assumed by the respective governments. After the Virginia had been repaired and her formidable prow restored, the Confederate Government and the officers of the Virginia tried very earnestly to force a new engagement in Hampton Roads, but the Federal Government laid the Monitor under strict injunctions not to risk herself in another battle without ample support and opportunity of taking the Virginia at disadvantage.

Twice the Virginia returned to the Roads and challenged the Monitor, April 11, 1862, and May 8, 1862, but in each case the Monitor declined a new encounter.

In the first of these visits, on April 11th, the Virginia cruised around the Roads undisturbed the whole day. The Monitor lay under the guns of Fort Monroe, and though the Virginia by way of challenge, fired three shots at her, (Naval War Records, Vol. 7, p. 222), she never left her station or even made a return fire. One of the wooden gun boats, the Jamestown, that accompanied the Virginia, steamed up under the guns of the Monitor, and at the mouth of Hampton River captured three federal vessels—a schooner and two brigs ladened with supplies. The Monitor did nothing to prevent this insult. For this daring act, the Confederates were cheered by the men of the English corvette Rinaldo, commanded by Captain W. N. Hewitt, later an admiral.

This inertness on the part of the Monitor greatly mortified the Monitor's crew, who on April 25th, addressed a letter to their wounded captain, then off duty, in which, after reciting that the
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Monitor, on April 11th, "fired not one shot," they said: "The Norfolk papers say we are cowards in the Monitor and all we want is a chance to show them where it lies with you as our Captain we can teach them who is cowards." (Naval War Records, Vol. 7, p. 40). The New York Herald, of April 15, commenting on this affair said, "The public are very justly indignant at the conduct of our Navy in Hampton Roads on Friday last."

The Virginia subsequently stationed herself near Craney Island, occasionally going back to Norfolk, for more repairs. Returning from such a trip on May 8th, she found the Monitor, and the Federal fleet, shelling the Confederate batteries at Sewell's Point. The Virginia made straight for them, but the enemy ceased firing and retired with all speed to Fort Monroe.

This kind of conduct was very unlike that of a conqueror confident of his prowess, and its explanation was still less so. It was a desperate manoeuvre, as confessed by Commander Goldsborough, of the United States Navy, to entice the Virginia single-handed to engage Fort Monroe and the Monitor, while the immense wooden steamer Vanderbilt, the Baltimore, San Jacinto, and other merchant vessels, should simultaneously hurl themselves upon her regardless of their own safety. (Naval War Records, Vol. 7, p. 330. See also report of D. C. Constable, Lieut. Commanding U. S. Steamer, E. A. Stevens, otherwise called, "The Naugatuck," ibid. 332.) When in 1884 application was made to congress for $200,000 to be distributed to the men of the Monitor for defeating the Virginia, the committee on Naval Affairs made a strong adverse report: "We assume that the proof shows that the only serious damage sustained by the Merrimac was inflicted by the Cumberland and that the Merrimac went back to Norfolk when her adversaries (the Monitor and the Minnesota) were out of reach, and they being in shoal water and she on account of the great depth of water which she drew unable to attack them, went into dock for repairs and again came out and offered battle which was refused."

Hardly less disingenuous, from an historical standpoint, was the wholly extravagant estimate placed for a long time upon the capabilities of the Virginia by northern writers. The fears of the
Federal government were taken as the measure, not for her own sake but for praising the Monitor, which was credited with preventing the destruction of not only the Minnesota but of all the Northern coastal cities. As a matter of fact, it is very doubtful whether the Virginia could have successfully run by the powerful guns of Fort Monroe and escaped destruction from the Vanderbilt and its fleet of suicidal assistant vessels. And if it had accomplished this feat, she was so crudely constructed that she would have probably foundered at sea in a short time.

The real truth is that the Monitor did not affect the situation to any great degree, if at all. According to Lt. Greene himself, she did not, with her much heavier guns, in her four hours' combat do any damage to the Virginia. She did not save the Minnesota nor any of the other Federal vessels. Their salvation was due to the shoal water and to Fort Monroe, to which they all finally retired.

The result would have been probably the same, if the Monitor had never appeared in the field of action. Fort Monroe was the great factor on the Federal side. Had the Virginia been capable of passing Fort Monroe and riding the ocean successfully, there was no reason why she could not have calmly left the Monitor alone and gone on her mission of destruction. But a perusal of the Confederate documents, published in the Naval War Records, makes it very clear that the danger of what seemed practically suicide was duly appreciated by the Confederates, and her departure would have left Norfolk open to attack of any Federal vessel.

The Virginia effected in her short cruise all that could be reasonably expected of her. Her victories were none the less complete because she did not destroy the Monitor or the Minnesota. She went out to do all the damage she could, and she did it.

After the ineffectual efforts on May 8, made to provoke the Monitor to fight, the Virginia took her station two miles north of the mouth of the Elizabeth river, where it was easy for the enemy's vessels to engage her if they so desired. But the Monitor and all the other Federal ships kept clear of the formidable ironclad.

Two days later, Norfolk was evacuated by Gen. Johnston's army
and Commodore Josiah Tatnall, the Virginia's new commander, announced his determination to force his way past Fort Monroe, if possible, and ascend the York River. From this he was deterred by the pilots who assured him that, if he could reduce the ship's draught four feet they could take him up to Richmond.

The Commodore consented to attempt this, and lightened the ship considerably by throwing everything but the ammunition overboard. Then the pilots came to him and declared that, owing to the unfavorable wind which had been blowing for some time, it would be impossible to cross the bar with even 18 feet of water.

The ship was now in a condition that was perfectly defenseless. The rudder and propeller were entirely unprotected and the wooden hull was everywhere exposed. The fresh water was all gone and not enough provisions had been preserved to last another 24 hours.

The commodore, recognizing the helplessness of the situation, stranded the vessel at Craney Island, disembarked the crew and blew up the ship. This was on May 11, 1862.

Catesby Jones was the last officer to leave the Virginia. He and the rest were hurried to Drewry's Bluff up James River, seven miles from Richmond, and there on May 15, they took part in driving off the Monitor which, with the ironclad Galena and several other vessels, attempted to force a passage to the Confederate Capital.

The hopes of the Southern people concerning the Virginia had been as exaggerated as the fears of the Federal Government. Commodore Tatnall was assailed very severely for his destruction of a vessel in which all the pride and glory of the South were centered. He demanded a court martial, and, after a full hearing, was acquitted on every point.

But there is, nevertheless, something distinctly disappointing, even to a Southern man at this day, about the end of the Virginia. There can be no question of the courage of Tatnall. He is the man who in 1857 had aroused great enthusiasm in this country when, in command of a United States vessel, he had interfered to protect the English at Peiho from the barbarous Chinese, with the declaration: "That blood is thicker than water." But the heroic element makes an appeal to Americans everywhere. It
might, in a practical sense, have been a very unwise thing to attempt, but one cannot but regret that Tatnall did not adhere to his resolve to defy the guns at Fort Monroe and the Ripraps and sail up the York. Had he succeeded in his purpose, he would have added immensely to the discomfiture of the North, and to the prestige of the South. Had his ship gone down in single combat with the Forts, the Monitor and the host of assistant vessels, her career would have closed in a blaze of glory, fit ending for such a ship.

In this connection, one thinks of Sir Richard Grenville, a hero who stands on the threshold of American colonization. He commanded the expedition which Sir Walter Raleigh sent to Roanoke Island in 1585. He was later in 1588 one of the Admirals who helped to defeat the Spanish Armada. He performed other great services, but nothing in naval warfare is more memorable than his death. In an expedition led by Lord Charles Howard in 1591 against the Spanish plate fleet, Grenville was Vice-Admiral, and he opposed his ship single-handed against five great Spanish galleons, supported at intervals by ten others, and he fought them during nearly fifteen hours. Then Grenville's vessel was so battered that it resembled a skeleton rather than a ship, and of the crew few were to be seen but the dead and the dying. Grenville himself was captured mortally wounded, and died uttering these words: "Here die I, Richard Grenville, with a joyful and quiet mind, for that I have ended my life, as a true soldier ought to do, fighting for his country, queen, religion and honor."

OFFICE OF NAVAL RECORDS AND LIBRARY
NAVY DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C., 28 June, 1921

Mr. Lyon G. Tyler, Editor,
Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine,
711 Travelers Building,
Richmond, Virginia.

Dear Sir:

In reply to your letter of May 26th addressed to the Secretary of the Navy in which you requested information concerning the report
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made by Captain John L. Worden of the Monitor in 1868 regarding the action with the Merrimac fought at Hampton Roads on March 9, 1862.

There is enclosed herewith a copy of the report made by Captain Worden. There have been other inquiries concerning this report, but whether or not it has been published in the sense of being printed is not known here.

The officer who succeeded to the command, Lieutenant S. D. Greene, and was consequently the commanding officer, at the end of the engagement, made the official report to the Secretary of the Navy as is customary,—as you have doubtless noted on page 25 of the "Official Records" (volume 7). His very brief account was somewhat amplified by him in "Battles & Leaders of the Civil War."

Trusting that this information may be of some service to you,

Very truly yours,

W. D. MacDougall, Captain, U. S. N.,
Officer in Charge, Office
of Naval Records and Library.

Enclosure.

OFFICE OF
NAVAL RECORDS AND LIBRARY
NAVY DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C., 28 June, 1921.

MEMORANDUM.

To accompany copy of Report by Captain John L. Worden U. S. N., dated January 5, 1868, concerning the Fight between the U. S. S. Monitor and the Merrimac, which occurred 9 March, 1862 at Hampton Roads.

The original manuscript of Captain J. L. Worden, 4th paragraph, leaves the date of commission blank. It would appear that he did not remember the date and intended to fill it in later but did not do so.

The Monitor was launched in New York January 20, 1862, commissioned in February, 25th, and sailed March 6, 1862 from New York.

While it is true that Captain Worden of the Monitor did not make a report immediately subsequent to the fight, it is obvious that this was due to his being disabled by wounds. Lieutenant S. D. Greene, as officer succeeding to the command, made the official report of the action to the Secretary of the Navy, as is the Navy custom.
and this report is found on page 25, volume 7 of "Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion." Reports and letters of other officers on the same subject follow Lieutenant Greene's official report.

Captain Worden's report, while it includes an account of the action, explains in the first paragraph that it is written for the purpose of doing justice to Lt. Greene who "has been annoyed by ungenerous allusions to the fact that no official record existed at the Department in relation to my (Captain Worden's) opinion of his conduct on that occasion."

Captain Worden's letter or report written in 1868 was not included in the "Official Records" as printed for the reason that the compilers of these volumes from the beginning decided to print only contemporary accounts of action.

W. D. MacDougall, Captain, U. S. N.
Officer in Charge, Office of
Naval Records and Library, and
Historical Section.


Brooklyn, N. Y., January 5, 1868.

Sir: Recently learning that Lieutenant-Commander S. D. Greene the executive officer of the Monitor in her conflict with the Merrimack in Hampton Roads, on the 9th of March 1862, has been annoyed by ungenerous allusions to the fact that no official record existed at the Department, in relation to my opinion of his conduct on that occasion, I desire now to remedy a wrong, which I regret should so long have existed, and to do justice to that gallant and excellent officer, as well as to all the officers and crew of the Monitor, who, without exception, did their duty so nobly in that remarkable encounter, by placing on the files of the Department the following report.

In order to do full justice to him and to the others under my command, I beg leave to state narratively the prominent points in the history of that vessel from the date of my orders to her, until the encounter with the Merrimack.

I was ordered to her on the 13th of January 1862, when she was still on stocks. Prior to that date, Lieutenant S. D. Greene had interested himself in her and thoroughly examined her construction and design, and informed himself as to her qualities, and notwithstanding the many gloomy predictions of naval officers and of officers of the
against wind and sea. Between 7 and 8 o'clock however, we got into smoother water and were enabled to so far clear the engine room of gas as to permit the blower bands to be repaired and the blowers to be gotten in motion, and by 8 o'clock were on our course again, with the engines going slowly and a comparatively smooth sea. This lasted until shortly after midnight, when in crossing a shoal the sea suddenly became rough again, broke violently over the deck, causing fears of another disaster to the blowers. The wheel ropes too, became entangled and jammed and for half an hour, until it was cleared, the vessel yewed unmanageably and seriously endangered the towing hawser, which fortunately held and in a short time we were clear of the shoal and in smooth water again. From this time no further serious mishap occurred, and about 4 o'clock p.m. of Saturday, March 8th, we passed Cape Henry light and soon after heard heavy firing in the direction of Fortress Monroe, indicating an engagement, which I rightly concluded to be with the Merrimack. I immediately ordered the vessel stripped of her sea rig, turret keyed up and in every way to be prepared for action. About midway between Cape Henry and Fortress Monroe, a pilot boat came alongside and gave us a pilot, from whom we learned of the advent of the Merrimack, the disaster to the Congress and Cumberland, and the generally gloomy condition of affairs in Hampton Roads.

About 9 o'clock p.m. we anchored near the frigate Roanoke, Captain Marston, the senior officer present, to whom I reported, and who suggested that I should go to the assistance of the frigate Minnesota, then aground off Newport News. Finding difficulty in getting a pilot, I accepted the services of Acting Master Saml. Howard, who earnestly volunteered for that service, and under whose pilotage we reached the Minnesota about 11:30 o'clock p.m., when I reported to Captain Van Brunt, her commanding officer, and anchored near him at about 1 o'clock a.m. of Sunday March 9th. He hoped to get his ship afloat at high water, about 2 o'clock, but failed to do so. At daylight the Merrimack, with several consorts, was discovered at anchor under Sewell's Point. I went at once to see Captain Van Brunt, whose vessel was still aground, a good deal damaged from the attack of the day before and in a helpless condition. After a few minutes conversation with him in relation to the situation of affairs, I left, telling him that I would develop all the qualities, offensive and defensive, possessed by the "Battery" under my command to protect his vessel from the attack of the Merrimack, should she come out again, and that I had great faith in her capabilities. Soon after reaching my vessel and at about 7:30 o'clock a.m. the Merrimack was observed to be underway, accompanied by her consorts, steaming slowly. I
mercantile marine as to the great probability of her sinking at sea, volunteered to go in her, and at my request was ordered. From the date of his orders, he applied himself unremittingly and intelligently to the study of her peculiar qualities and to her fitting and equipment. When she was nearly ready for putting in commission, I was authorized by the Department to select a crew from the receiving ship North Carolina, or any other vessel of war in the harbor of New York. Under that authority I asked for volunteers from the North Carolina and the frigate Sabine; and after stating fully to the crews of those vessels the probable dangers of the passage to Hampton Roads, and the certainty of having important service to perform after arriving there had many more men to volunteer than was required. From them I selected a crew, and a better one no naval commander ever had the honor to command.

She was put in commission on the —— day of February 1862, and from that time until her day of sailing, Lieutenant Greene and all the officers and crew displayed untiring energy and zeal in her fitting and equipment, and in the conduct of the several trials of her engines, turret machinery, etc.

She left the lower bay of New York on the afternoon of the 6th of March, with a moderate wind from the westward and smooth sea, in tow of a small tugboat, and accompanied by the U. S. steamers Currituck and Sachem. About midday of the 7th, the wind had freshened to a strong breeze, causing in our then position off the capes of the Delaware, a rough sea, which broke constantly and violently over her deck and forcing the water in considerable quantities into the vessel through the hawse pipes, under the turret and in various other places. About 4 o'clock p. m. the wind and sea still increasing, the water broke over the smoke and blower pipes, (the former 6 feet and the latter 4 feet high) which wetting the blower bands caused them to slip and finally to break. The blowers being thus stopped, there was no draft for the furnaces and the engine and fire rooms became immediately filled with gas. The senior engineer, Mr. Isaac Newton, and his assistants met the emergency with great determination, but were unable to fight against the gas, which in a very short time prostrated them, apparently lifeless, upon the floor of the engine room, from which they were rescued and carried to the top of the turret, where they finally revived. With motive power thus useless for propulsion or pumping, the water which was entering the vessel in many places, was increasing rapidly. The hand pump was used and men set to work bailing, but with little effect. The tugboat, having us in tow, was ordered to head directly inshore, but being light and of moderate power, she could move us but slowly
got underway as soon as possible and stood directly for her, with
crew at quarters, in order to meet and engage her as far away from
the Minnesota as possible. As I approached the enemy, her wooden
consorts turned and stood back in the direction from which they had
come, and she turned her head up stream, against the tide, remain-
ing nearly stationary, and commenced firing. At this time, about
8 o'clock a. m. I was approaching her on her starboard bow, on a
course nearly at right angles with her line of keel, reserving my fire
until near enough that every shot might take effect. I continued to
so approach until within very short range, when I altered my course
parallel with hers, but with bows in opposite directions, stopped the
engine and commenced firing. In this way I passed slowly by her,
within a few yards, delivering fire as rapidly as possible, and re-
ceiving from her a rapid fire in return, both from her great guns and
musketry, the latter aimed at the pilot house, hoping undoubtedly to
penetrate it through the lookout holes and to disable the command-
ing officer and helmsman. At this period I felt some anxiety about
the turret machinery, it having been predicted by many persons, that
a heavy shot with great initial velocity striking the turret, would
so derange it as to stop its working, but finding that it had been
twice struck and still revolved as freely as ever, I turned back with
renewed confidence and hope and continued the engagement at close
quarters, every shot from our guns taking effect upon the huge sides
of our adversary, stripping off the iron freely. Once, during the en-
gagement, I ran across and close to her stern, hoping to disable her
screw, which I could not have missed by more than 2 feet. Once,
after having passed upon her port side, in crossing her bow to get
between her and the Minnesota again, she steamed up quickly and
finding that she could strike my vessel with her prow or ram, I put
the helm "hard a port" giving a broad sheer, with our bow towards
the enemy's stern, thus avoiding a direct blow and receiving it at a
sharp angle on the starboard quarter, which caused it to glance with-
out inflicting any injury. The contest so continued except for an
interval of about fifteen minutes when I hauled off to remedy some
deficiency in the supply of shot in the turret, until near noon, when
being within 10 yards of the enemy a shell from her struck the pilot
house near the lookout hole, through which I was looking, and ex-
ploded, fracturing one of the "logs" of iron of which it was com-
posed, filling my face and eyes with powder utterly blinding and in
a degree stunning me. The top of the pilot house too, was partially
lifted off by the force of the concussion which let in a flood of light,
so strong as to be apparent to me, blind as I was, and caused me
to believe that the pilot house was seriously disabled. I therefore
gave orders to put the helm to starboard and sheer off and sent for Lieutenant Greene and directed him to take command. I was then taken to my quarters and had been there but a short time when it was reported to me that the Merrimack was retiring in the direction of Norfolk. In the meantime Lieutenant Greene, after taking his place in the pilot house and finding the injuries there less serious than I supposed, had turned the vessel's head again in the direction of the enemy, to continue the engagement, but before he could get at close quarters with her, she retired. He therefore very properly returned to the Minnesota and lay by her until she floated.

The Merrimack having been thus checked in her career of destruction, and driven back crippled and discomfitted, the question arises should she have been followed in her retreat to Norfolk? That such course would commend itself very temptingly to the gallantry of an officer and be difficult to resist, is undeniable, yet I am convinced that under the conditions of affairs then existing at Hampton Roads, and the great interests at stake there, all of which were entirely dependent upon the Monitor, good judgment and sound discretion forbade it. It must be remembered that the pilot house of the Monitor was situated well forward in her bows and that it was quite considerably damaged. In following in the wake of the enemy, it would have been necessary, in order to fire clear of the pilot house, to have made broad "yaws" to starboard or port, involving in the excitement of such a chase, the very serious danger of grounding in the narrower portions of the channel and near some of the enemy's batteries, whence it would have been very difficult to extricate her, possibly involving her loss. Such a danger her commanding officer would not, in my judgment, have been justified in encountering, for her loss would have left the vital interests in all the waters of the Chesapeake at the mercy of future attacks from the Merrimack. Had there been another ironclad in reserve at that point, to guard those interests, the question would have presented a different aspect, which could not only have justified him in following, but perhaps made it his imperative duty to do so.

The fact that the battle with the Merrimack was not more decided and prompt was due to the want of knowledge of the endurance of the XI-inch Dahlgren guns with which the Monitor was armed, and which had not been fully tested. Just before leaving New York, I received a peremptory order from the Bureau of Ordnance to use only the prescribed service charge, viz. 15 pounds, and I did not feel justified in violating those instructions, at the risk of bursting one of the guns, which placed as they were in turret, would almost entirely have disabled the vessel. Had I been able to have used the 30-pound
charges which experience has since shown the guns capable of enduring, there is little doubt in my mind, that the contest would have been shorter and the result more decided. Further the crew had been but a few days on board, the weather bad, mechanics at work on her up to the moment of sailing and sufficient opportunity had not been afforded to practice them properly at the guns, the mode of manipulating which was entirely novel. A few days at Hampton Roads to have drilled them and gotten the gun and turret gear in smooth working order (which from having been constantly wet on the passage was somewhat rusted) would have enabled the guns to have been handled more quickly and effectively and with better results.

And now sir, I desire to express my high appreciation of the zeal, energy and courage displayed by every officer and man under my command during this remarkable combat, as well as during the trying scenes of the passage from New York. I commend one and all most heartily to the favorable consideration of the Department and of the country.

Lieutenant Greene, the executive officer, had charge in the turret, and handled the guns with great courage, coolness and skill and throughout the engagement as in the equipment of the vessel, and on her passage to Hampton Roads, exhibited an earnest devotion to duty, unsurpassed in my experience, and for which I had the honor in person to recommend him to the Department and to the board of admirals (some three years since) for advancement, in accordance with the precedent established in the case of Lieutenant-Commander Thornton, the executive officer of the Kearsarge. I beg leave now, most respectfully and earnestly to reiterate that recommendation.

Acting Master Saml. Howard, who volunteered as pilot, stood by me in the pilot house during the engagement and behaved with courage and coolness. He has since been promoted to acting volunteer lieutenant for his services on that occasion.

Chief Engineer A. C. Stimers, U. S. N. made the passage in the vessel to report upon the performance of the machinery, etc., and performed useful service during the engagement in manipulating the turret.

First Assistant Engineer Isaac Newton, the chief engineer of the vessel and his assistants, managed the machinery with attention and skill and gave prompt and correct attention to all the signals from the pilot house.

Acting Assistant Paymaster W. F. Keeler and Captain's clerk Danl. Toffey, made their services very useful in transmitting my orders to the turret.

Peter Williams, quartermaster, was at the helm by my side and
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merited my admiration by his cool and steady handling of the wheel.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

John L. Worden,  
Captain.

Hon. Gideon Welles,  
Secretary of the Navy,  
Washington, D. C.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO LORD BOTETOURT.

There have recently come into the possession of the State Library some interesting letters and papers relating to the death and estate of Norborne Berkeley, Baron de Botetourt, who was the most beloved and popular of all Virginia’s colonial governors. They constituted at one time a part of the papers of Robert Carter Nicholas, the celebrated treasurer of Virginia, who enjoyed his Lordship’s particular confidence and friendship, and was his executor in Virginia. Lord Botetourt was the son of John Symes Berkeley, Esq., of Stoke Gifford, County Gloucester, England, by his wife Elizabeth, daughter and coheiress of Walter Norborne of Caline, County Wilts. He was born in 1718, and served as colonel of the North Gloucestershire militia and member of Parliament, and afterward in 1767 became constable of the Tower of London.

Since the recall of Sir Edmund Andros in 1698, no governor-in-chief had resided in Virginia, but the emoluments of the office had been shared between a governor-in-chief, who resided in England and a Lt. Governor, who resided in Virginia. Now to appease the growing discontent over the revenue law, the home authorities sent Botetourt over with the full title and authority of Governor General. He was appointed in July, 1768, and arrived in the Colony October 28, 1768.

His reception was enthusiastic, and his affable deportment made him immediately very popular, which was increased shortly after his arrival when he joined with his council in declaring writs of
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assistance illegal. The enforcement of these writs in Massachusetts had stirred up a protest from James Otis in 1761, but his words had had no effect on the Massachusetts Governor, and the writs were enforced in that colony down to the Revolution.

On another question Botetourt was not in harmony with the people of Virginia. Massachusetts had passed some very mild resolutions condemning the Revenue Act, and Parliament had gotten angry and sent over to have the offending parties arrested and brought to England for trial. Massachusetts denied any intention to resist, and allowed British troops to quarter in Boston. All the rest of the colonies were silent. But when the Virginia Assembly convened in May, 1769, not long after Botetourt's arrival, the Burgesses passed stirring resolutions condemning Parliament. They reasserted the ancient right of taxation, maintained the lawfulness of a concert of the colonies and particularly denounced the flagrant tyranny of carrying persons beyond the sea for trial.

The effect of this action was immense and Bancroft says, "Virginia set the example for the continent." Everywhere there was a rhapsody of praise, and soon the Virginia resolves were adopted by every colony on the continent, in many of them, including Massachusetts, word for word as they passed the Virginia Assembly. Parliament felt the pressure and abolished all the taxes except a small one on tea.

Botetourt did not approve the action of the British Government, but he was too loyal to his superiors to countenance the Virginia resolutions, and so he dissolved the Assembly. But he counted upon a speedy repeal of the Revenue Act, and, when only a partial repeal was made, it is said that he contemplated a resignation of his office, and was only prevented from sending it on by his sickness and death, which occurred Oct. 15, 1770.

There are various contemporary notices of his social acts, his dinner companies at the palace, the distinction of his manners and the urbanity of his address. Through his munificence two gold medals were established in the College of William and Mary, to be given annually, one for excellence in classical learning and the other for excellence in philosophy. Eight of these prizes
were bestowed, when the American Revolution put a stop to them. They were said by Wm. J. R. Marvin, Editor of the *American Journal of Numismatics*, to be the earliest of their kind in the United States (*William and Mary Quarterly*, IV, 263).

Lord Botetourt was honored with a splendid funeral and he was buried in a vault underneath the floor of the chapel of William and Mary. About five years later there was deposited in a vault near his own the remains of Peyton Randolph who presided over the Assembly which passed the celebrated protest of May 16, 1769, and was afterwards first President of the Continental Congress.

The nephew and heir of Lord Botetourt was Henry, fifth Duke of Beaufort, son of his sister Elizabeth Berkeley. He inherited his estate and title of Baron de Botetourt, for Lord Botetourt was never married and left no issue. In his letters published below, the Duke refers to a monument, which he intended to erect to his uncle's memory, but it seems the intended monument was never raised. Probably it was prevented by the action of the Virginia Assembly, who on July 20, 1771, voted a statue to his lordship's memory. Both the Council and House of Burgesses were unanimous.

The statue was made in London by the best sculptor in England, Richard Heyward, whose name is inscribed upon it. Its pedestal was decorated with an inscription apparently composed by Richard Bland suggestive of the admiration and gratitude of the people of Virginia (*William and Mary Quarterly*, V, 155). It was taken to Virginia in *The Virginia*, of which Howard Esten was captain, and reached there in May, 1773. The *Va. Gazette* of May 20, 1773, making this announcement, said it cost 700 guineas. (*Ibid.*, XXI, 62.) Afterwards Gov. Benjamin Harrison in a letter to Jefferson, put its cost at £950, inclusive of the cost of shipping, but exclusive of the pay to the men sent over to put it up. (Gov. Benjamin Harrison's Letter Book, p. 369.) It was placed in the hall of the capitol. (*William and Mary Coll. Quarterly* XXVII, p. 241.) It was seen by Mr. Weld much mutilated in that place in 1798. Some time after this it was transferred to the grounds of the College of William and Mary. Here it re-
mained before the College steps until the outbreak of the Civil War, when it was transferred for preservation to the grounds of the Eastern State Hospital for the Insane. After the war was over, it was taken back to the College where it still stands in the pathway before the main College building, rather the worse for wear.

It is one of the few pieces of statuary that survives the colonial period and probably nothing in any of the colonies equalled it in artistic character. The head and one arm was knocked off during the American Revolution, but they were afterwards restored.

There is a cenotaph to Lord Botetourt in the present church of Stoke Gifford, Gloucestershire, doubtless put there by his nephew, the Duke.

The letters below from the Duke are originals. Most of the other papers are copies by Robert Carter Nicholas, who doubtless wrote the originals.

(See for an interesting account of Lord Botetourt William and Mary College Quarterly, V, 165-171.)

Virginia, Octor. 30th. 1770.

My Lord Duke

It is with infinite concern that we acquaint your Grace with the death of his Excellency Lord Botetourt, our late most worthy Governor; which happened on the 15th. inst. after about three weeks Illness. We think we may venture to say that never was a loss more universally lamented; so large a share had his Lordship, by his many endearing Qualities, gained of the affections of all Ranks of people; and we flatter ourselves that your Grace will be persuaded that every human Effort was exerted to preserve a life, in which this whole Colony considered herself so exceedingly interested.

Some embarrassments were occasioned by his Lordship's having omitted, till it was too late, to give directions about his affairs here; these, however, it was endeavored to remedy in such manner, as will be best explained by the enclosed Transcript from the Records of our General Court then sitting. The funeral was attended with some expense, of which particular Accounts shall hereafter be transmitted to your Grace. The managers, &c., we believe, the
whole Country thought themselves called upon by every sentiment of Gratitude & affection to pay the most respectful regard to his Lordship’s memory, and it will afford them no small satisfaction, if the manner in which it was conducted, should meet with the approbation of your Grace, and his Lordship’s other friends in England.

We have made an exact and perfect Inventory of his Lordship’s effects, of which you will receive a copy enclos’d. Thinking it rather indelicate to particularize his Lordship’s wearing apparel in the Inventory, we have there omitted it; but, for your satisfaction, we send you a distinct account of every article. Some few things in the House, of which we inclose a Memorandum, are of so perishable a nature, that we judge it most prudent to dispose of them as soon as possible, and will take care to have it done in the best manner. As to the rest, your Grace will be pleased to give such Order about them, as you may think proper. It occurs to us, as probable that some of the Articles, which you may not chuse to have sent over to England, may suit his Lordship’s successors; many pieces of the Furniture are in the best taste, and we believe most of the liquors are good in their kind. The Slaves are reckon’d orderly & valuable, & perhaps, may be convenient to our next Governor. His Lordsp brought over with him a good many white Servants, and, after a short trial found it convenient and necessary to purchase and hire Negroes to assist in the business of his family, and do the Drudgery without doors. We presume your Grace will have no inclination to transport the Horses to England; and, upon considering that the expense of maintaining them, till your pleasure can be known, must be very considerable, we have thought it advisable to accept an offer made by a Gentleman, by which he agrees to take them all at the same price they cost his Lordship, and keep them at his own expence, Risque, till a new Governor arrives, and, if he chuses it, to let him have them at the same Rates; this proposal was made and accepted, as well to save charges to the Estate, as that the Governor may be accommodated with a Sett of horses immediately on his arrival if he should incline to take these.

We have thought it advisable to retain in the Service of the
Estate, William Marshman, who proved a most valuable and faithful Servant to his Lordship, that the Furniture and other things may be taken care of, and we have also continued, as his assistant, Thomas Fuller another excellent Servant, till we receive your Grace's commands. Permit us, if your Grace should incline to treat with a succeeding Governor for any of the articles contained in the Inventory, to recommend referring the several prices to an appraisement to be made here by some reputable and judicious persons upon Oath.

The exceeding great respect we have to his Lordship's memory will ever incline us to render every acceptable Service, in our power, to your Grace and all others with whom he was connected; if therefore you should think fit to honour us with your Commands, we have only to beg the favour of you to be as particular and explicit as possible in every respect, that we may be able with greater certainty and precision to answer your Grace's expectations and wishes.

We have the honour to be your Grace's most respectful and Obedt. hble. Servts.

By Wm. Nelson,
John Randolph,
Robert Carter Nicholas,
Geo. Wythe,
Jno. Blair.

To the Honble. William Nelson, Esq.,
John Randolph, Robert Carter Nicholas, George Wythe, and
John Blair, Junr., Esquires.

The Monument cannot be conveniently erected over the Grave, Gentleman:

I did not till last night receive your letter of October 30th, being the Duplicate, with the very melancholy account of Lord Botetourt's Death, Or I should sooner have acknowledged it.

I must beg leave, Gentleman, thro You to make my best complimts. to the Council, and to return them many thanks for the great care that they have taken of Lord Botetourt's affairs in Virginia by appointing such Gentlemen as you are, to be at the trouble
of managing them, And at the same time I can not be unmindful how much I and all Lord Botetourt's Friends and Relations are indebted to you, for the great Regard, Respect, and Esteem You have shewn to my late Dear Friend by directing so very handsome a funeral and conducting it with so much Order and Decency; And I shall be most ready to pay any Expence that may be incurred thereby.

I understand by a Letter from Marshman to Ld. Botetourt's agent, Wm. Conway, that his Lordship expressed a desire some time before he died to be bury'd in Virginia, so that I do not intend removing the Body to England, but hope the President, &c. of the College will permit me to erect a monument near the place where he was buried, as the only means I have to show the sincere affection and regard I bore him when alive, and to express in some degree my sorrow and affliction for his Death. At the same time I flatter myself it will not be disagreeable to the Virginians to have this remembrance of a person whom they held in such high estimation and whose loss they so greatly lament.

As I wish as nearly as possible to fulfill Lord Botetourt's intentions, and as I know it was one of them to present at his departure the Pictures of the King and the Queen and the State Coach with the furniture thereto belonging, to the Colony for the use of the succeeding Governor, I must trouble you therefore, Gentlemen, to desire the Council on behalf of the Colony to accept of them, and to receive them of me as a small return for the many distinguished marks of honor and esteem they have shewed my dear friend when alive, the care and attention they bestowed on him when ill, and the Respect and affectionate regard they paid to his memory in his funeral.

For my own part, Gentleman, my most sincere thanks are due to you for the great assiduity and readiness with which You undertook these affairs, and for the trouble you have been at on my acct. by securing the Effects which by the generous Donation of the kind testator devolve to me. It gives me great satisfaction to hear that Marshman and all Lord Botetourt's Servants behaved themselves so well to their late Master, and I approve entirely of your Direction to Marshman to stay there till all the Effects
are disposed of, and that there may be as much trouble as possible taken off your hands, I have by this same opportunity directed Blandford, of whose honesty and fidelity I have the highest opinion, to remain in Virginia and jointly to take your Direction and to execute your commands.

I shall inclosed a list of those things that I would have sent to England, the rest of the things I desire may be disposed of to the best advantage either by public or private sale.

I must desire You to be very careful of all of his public and private Papers and Accounts, And to give Directions that they and all his small things of Value should be put into the Mahogany Desk or Library Table or any other package you shall judge most proper, and sent to England with the rest of the things in the List, by the first opportunity of a ship to Bristol.

I desire that all Lord Botetourt’s wearing apparell & body Linnen may be given to Marshman.

It is unnecessary for me to add that I wish to have the State of his Lordship’s acct. transmitted to me as soon as possible

I am,

Gentlemen
Your most Obed’nt, most oblig. humble Ser’t.

Beaufort.

Badminton.
Jan. 2, 1771.

Virginia 27th May 1771.

My Lord Duke.

We have been honoured with your Grace’s favour of the 2d. of January & are much pleased to find that our Endeavours to pay a proper tribute to the memory of our late worthy Governor, have met with your approbation; We have already discharged the whole expences of his Lordship’s Funeral & every other demand that we know of out of such fees & other Emoluments of the Government as were due to him at the time of his death.

In Complyance with your Grace’s Request, we have had such Things as you were pleased to direct should be sent over to Eng-
land, carefully packt up & now only wait a good opportunity of shipping them. We have not yet been able to prevail with one of the Bristol Captains to take them on tolerable Terms, & are apprehensive that our Difficulties, in this respect, will continue, unless your Grace can procure an order from some of the Merchants of Bristol to one or more of their Captains to receive them; Our last Crop of Tobo. was so exceedingly plentiful that the Captains very readily procured their Freights of that commodity & therefore dont care to run the Risque of incurring the Displeasure of their owners by abridging consignments to them which yield so large a profit. We will, however continue our Endeavours to procure a passage for your goods, & so soon as this can be obtained, we will not fail giving your Grace the earliest Notice of it, that you may insure, or not, as you think fit.

We have sold all the rest of Lord Botetourt's Effects in this Country except a few things still remaining on Hand & we think to good advantage; Tho, from the great scarcity of money here, we judged it most advisable to allow credit for all sums above £10, till the 25th of Oct. next; by this means the prices of most articles were very considerably advanced. We hope in a short time to be able to make your Grace a Remittance & to transmit full & distinct accounts of the sales & of our whole Transactions; & you may rest assured that the Balance shall be sent to you as soon as we are able to collect the money, after it becomes due.

We have communicated to his Majesty's Council that very polite & generous Paragraph of your Grace's letter, in which you are pleased to desire their acceptance of the King's & Queen's pictures & the State Coach for the use of the Colony; they have desired Mr. President Nelson to offer their grateful acknowledgments to your Grace for this obliging Favour, which they esteem the more highly, considering it as a genteel memento of a dear departed friend.

The President & Professors of our College upon being in- formed of yr. Grace's purpose to erect a monument to Lord Bote- tourt's memory near the place of his Interment, have signified to us their unanimous & warmest approbation of it and we are pur- suaded that the Virginians will be much pleased with this & every
other Monument that tends to perpetuate amongst them the Remembrance of a Governor they held in such high estimation. That your Grace may not be at a loss as to the size & Dimensions of a monument which will best suit the Chapel we take the liberty of furnishing you with the enclosed memo. & for yr. farther Information beg leave to refer you to the President of the College himself, Mr. Commissary Horrocks, who will shortly embark for England for the Recovery of his Health & will pay his respects to your Grace in person.

We have the Honor to be Yr; Grace's  
Very respectful & most obt. hble. servts.

(Robert Carter Nicholas' writing)

The Monument cannot be conveniently erected over the Grave, as it would spoil two principal Pews & incommode the Chapel considerably in other respects.

If it is proposed to have it in the form of a Pyramid, it can be placed conveniently in no part, except at the Bottom of the Isle fronting the Pulpit, where it would appear to advantage, if the Dimensions should not be thought too much confined; the Isle itself is about ten feet wide; there must be a Passage left on each side of the monument at least two feet & an half, so that the width of the monument, which will form the Front can be no more than five feet.

A flat monument may be fixt still more commodiously in the side of the wall nearly opposite to the Grave. Between two large windows, there is a strong brick Pier six feet and an half wide; the length of this pier from the ceiling down to the wainscot is twelve feet and an half, & from the Top of the wainscot to the floor eleven feet and an half more; if the Height from the Wainscot to the ceiling should not be thought sufficient, we suppose there would no Inconvenience in leting the monument down into the wainscot as low as the Floor, but then the bottom Part of it would be hid by the Front of the pew.

(Robt. Carter Nicholas' Writing.)
Sir:

I received your letters of Novr. 12th. & Jan. 2d. with Bills to the amount of 1809 10.7 stg. a few Days ago and cannot let pass the earliest opportunity of acknowledging and at the same time thanking you very sincerely for the very great trouble and care you have taken of my affairs in Virginia. I am afraid that the things sent by Capt. Cawsey are lost, as nothing has been heard of his ship since he left Virginia. I cannot help mentioning how extremely assiduous Mr. Norton has been to get the Statue, so nobly voted by the Assembly to the memory of Lord Botetourt, done in a handsome and elegant manner, to answer so generous and so noble an Order. He was with me the other Day and shewed me a Drawing that I believe he means to get completed, and if it is executed properly by the man that undertakes it, I flatter myself it will give satisfaction to those who have expressed so much regard to the Person it represents. I must beg leave again to thank you for the great care you have been at and I should be happy ever to have it in my Power to return your civilities, I am, 

Sir, Your most obdient humble sevt. 

Beaufort.

Grosvenor Square, 
Mar. 6-72.

Virginia 8th. June 1771.

My Lord Duke:

Since our letter of the 27th. ulto we have agreed with Capt. John Cawsey of the Ship Planter belonging to the Messrs. Farel & Jones of Bristol to carry to that part the things you were pleased to order. This opportunity has offered much sooner than we expected, & we believe was chiefly owing to a dreadful & pretty general Calamity which has happened by vast Floods of water issuing down from the mountains and destroying such large quantities of Tobacco in the public warehouses that the Captain could not so readily procure his lading as was expected. We have agreed to allow him 15. stg. for the Freight of the Goods & £25 stg. for his primage & extraordinary care of the Plate, &c. If your grace should think the Freight too high, we have further agreed to refer
it to you & the owners of the Ship to settle the matter in such manner as you & they may think more reasonable. The captain would by no means agree to take the Things unless something certain was fixed here, & we thought it adviseable to come into these terms, the very lowest that could be obtained, rather than they should remain in the Country another year. We are apprehensive that he may be under Difficulties in landing the China & perhaps some of the other articles. We would therefore recommend it to your Grace previous to the arrival of the ship to procure a license from proper authority; this was done when the late Governor Fauquier's china, &c. was sent over to England. We cant with any Precision fix the value of the several articles, but, if you choose to insure them we think you may venture to estimate the whole at about £9000 stg; of this, however your Grace will be the better Judge, as you have a copy of the Inventory & know what things you have directed to be sent. The letter from Lord Botetourt's agent arrived just in time to prevent the sale of 3 pipes of Madeira wine, so that all six will be sent. Mr. Marshman & Thomas Fuller whom we had retained in the service of the estate are very desirous of returning to England & will go with Capt. Cawsey. This we the rather approved, that the things might still continue under Marshman's eye, till they are delivered. We have the Honor to be

Your Grace's

Very respectful & most obt. servts.

(Ro. Carter Nicholas' handwriting.)


My Lord Duke.

The foregoing is the third copy of a letter we had the Honour of writing to your Grace some time ago, to which you'll be pleased to refer to. We since find that Capt. Cawsey will not sail so soon as he expected & have therefore thought it adviseable for Mr. Marshman & Thomas Fuller to go Home with Capt. Samson, as your goods are all delivered safe on Board of Capt. Cawsey's Ship & your Affairs here do not require their further attendance. We were, my lord, such frequent witnesses of Marshman's exceeding
good behavior during Lord Botetourt's life, & of his dutiful & painful attention to his Lordship thro'out his illness, & of his great care & Diligence since his Death that we can not, in Justice but recommend him to your Grace's Favour; we believe Thomas Fuller also was & still continues an excellent and very faithful servant.

You will receive inclosed a particular account of your receipts & disbursements since Lord Botetourt's Death, Bala, in yr. Favour, for which we sent you a Bill of Excha. on Messrs. Nortor & Son Merchts. in London. The expences of the Funeral, &c. you'll observe was pretty high, as we at first supposed; but we hope your Grace will be persuaded that we have observed every kind of Economy which could be decently used upon such an occasion.

We likewise send your Grace accounts of the Sales & of such things as have been used in the Family since his Lordship's Death. Mr. Marshman will be able to explain every article & give you any farther satisfaction that you may desire. You may depend upon having a full remittance as soon as the money becomes due & we can collect it. We have the Honor to be Your grace's very respectful & Mo. Obt. Servts.  
(Endorsed:) Copy of a Ltr. to the Duke of Beaufort by Wm. Marshman.

Gentlemen
I have reed. your letters and beg leave to return you my sincerest thanks for the very great care you have taken of every thing that did belong to Lord Botetourt, and of every thing that has concerned his affairs since his Death, and for the repeated good offices You have done for me, his Relation and Executr. The Accounts shew with how great assiduity and exactness you have managed every particular, but I must be further troublesome to you to order the Vouchers of those Accounts to be copy'd and sent over to me, (for Marshman informs me it is not proper to have the Vouchers themselves sent over) as I think it will have a better appearance for the Vouchers to go along with the Accounts.

The very great Honor the General Assembly does Lord Botetourt by their wishing to preserve to future ages the Esteem they
had for him gives me infinite satisfaction and Pleasure, And I must thro you Gentlemen beg leave to present my sincere thanks for this Testimony of their remembrance of Lord Botetourt, and to assure them that I will give their Agent in England all the assistance in my power to render their wishes effectual that the Statue may be like, tho I fear it must be in some measure imperfect as there is no Portrait of Lord Botetourt that has been taken within the last five and twenty or thirty years, but there is a Medal in Wax that is reckon'd tolerably like, that shall be communicated to the person employ'd by the Assembly.

I have at present nothing further to trouble You with, but to acknowledge the receipt of your Draft on Messrs. Norton & Co. for 545.0.6 and to assure You Gentlemen that I am with the greatest sincerity,

Your most obedient and obliged humble sert.

Beaufort.

Badminton.
13 Octr., 1771.

"Things to be Sent to England"

In my Lords Bedchamber. Gold watch and Walking Cane. Three seal skin Cases of surveyors instruments, one Shagreen case contg. Eight Chas'd silver Tea Spoons and one pair of Tongs, one Pair of Paste buckles, one red Leather case, a pair of stone shoe and knee Buckles, two Morroco asses skin pocket books of Memorandums, one Diamond Stock buckle, one pair of stone shoe & knee buckles, one Diamond Hatt Buckle, two Gold Seals, one Steel Seal, one pair of Good Buttons, two setts of new steel shoe & knee buckles, one pair of cutt steel shoe & knee Buckles, one Handsome Tooth Pick Case.

In Dining Room.

The Public & Private Papers and other things contain'd in the Library Table and Mahogany Desk, to be put in the Most convenient of the Two and be sent carefully to England, the thirteen Wax Portraits. The East India Firelock.

In Chamber over Dining Room.

The Pistols with furniture & five small swords.
In Middle Room.
Two Snuff Boxes, one small Ivory Box.

In Store Room.
One Piece of Fine Damask Napkining.
All the maps and all the books, all the plate in General & knives, forks and spoons. All the China.
All the table and house linen. Three pipes of Madeira to be filled & well cas'd.
None of the Staffordshire ware to come.

"Standing Furniture at the Palace"

In the front Parlour.
34 Scripture prints
2 shades in Frames
2 Brass Branches
7 mahogany chairs
1 Iron grate
Fry & Jefferson's map in the Closet

In the hall and passage.
Arms & Colours 2 looking glasses
6 fire leather buckets
1 step ladder

In the Dining Room.
1 Pr. brass sconces
1 side board with marble slate

In the Ball Room.
19 Leather bottom Mahogany chairs
8 long Stools
8 stockae Brackets
6 brass branches

Supper Room.
2 long walnut dining tables
16 walnut leather bottom chairs
1 glass lustre with 12 bronches
In the Porch.
2 large deal benches

In the Powder Room
2 dressers

In the little middle room.
Chimney & 2 brass sconces
a dresser & monumental piece to Thos Fairfax
an old glass Lanthorne
1 pr. steps

In the pantry.
1 gilt looking glass
3 paintings over the door
Map of New England
4 leather bottom mahogany chairs
1 pr. old money scales

In the Passage up stairs.
3 large Roman Catholick pictures
1 glass Lankorn
1 large looking glass, 1 pair steps
in the closet

Study.
1 looking glass
1 check curtain & rod
1 writing table

Chamber over the dining room.
2 looking glass with black frame & 2 glass sconces
2 outer window frames
10 prints in frames in the closet
1 looking glass with painted frame

Chamber over the Front parlour.
1 looking glass. 15 prints

Middle Room.
2 long looking glasses with red gilded frames
1 large glass on the side of the room with carved gilt frame
glass lustre with six branches
In his Lordship's chamber.
one chimney looking glass
a shade
a stand of shelves

in the 2d. store room.
1 long box with a parcel of broken sconces
3rd—6 spring blinds, 4 billiard tacks, parts of bedstead
1 brass sconce
a parcel of old iron

In passage upstairs.
4 very old black leather chairs

Room over his Lordship's bed chamber.
1 looking glass with gilt frame
stand of shelves

Cellar.
wooden horses 1 rope

Garden.
12 leaden six stone flower potts
1 rotting stone—Tubbs & orange tree & roller for the Tubbs

Out house.
1 Hand mill

In the wine store.
1 step ladder & old chair
3 horses, 2 large shelves."

[Subscription to the Workhouse]

Sir: Please pay to

Mr. Saunders the sum of Sixty Pounds, current money, being the Balance of Lord Botetourt's subscription to the Building of Work house, the whole of which was one hundred pounds, & part, viz, forty pounds, received from his Lordship by myself was formerly paid to Mr. Saunders—

Your most Obedient and very hble servt.

Nov. 13, 1770

J. Horrocks.

To: Robt. Carter Nicholas, Esqr.

Treasurer.
(Endorsed on back:) Mr. Commissary's note to pay Mr. Saunders for bal. of his Ldship's subscription for the Work House £60—


No. of Volumes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Title</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon's History of the Rebellion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlethwayt's Dictionary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson's Dictionary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutes at Large</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson on Commerce</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plinius Harduini</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller's Gardener's Dictionary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Laws</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws of Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralegs History of the World</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conquest of Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs Law Dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacons Works</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockes work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of George the second beginning in the 15 yr. of his Reign ending the 30th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coopers Dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traps Virgil</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansons Voyage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the House of Burgesses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of the Lords from Jany 1765 to May 1768</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Dictionary of the marine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Laws</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlet Military Devotion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron's narrative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode to Shakespear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of H. Burgesses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seat of the late war</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Map North America
1 Kerkead
1 Ignorant Philosopher
a parcel of Pamphlets & old magazines
1 atlas, 3 books of prints & drawings in paste board
1 red Letter Case

6 Hanmers Shakespeare
1 Carters Epictetus
6 Popes Illiad
5 Popes Odyssey, 2 Vols. Goldsmith's Roman History
4 Smollets His. of England
9 Ciceronis opera Oliveti
3 Robert's His. of Charles the 5th
3 Blackstones Commentaries, 2 do, 1 & 3 do lent out and not returned
2 L' Esprit des Loix
6 Humes His. of England (all missing E. R.), do
1 Observations on the Statutes
1 Plays,
1 Prussian Exercise

1 Ainsworth's Dictionary
1 Dictionare de Boyer
1 Caesar Auden dorpia
1 Boyers Dictionary
1 Littleton's do
26 Statutes at Large
20 Universal History
1 Bible & 1 Prayer Book
1 Diseases of the Army

1 Smiths His. of Virginia
1 Essays on Husbandry
1 Coiden's His. of Canada
1 Postlethayt's System
1 Pownal on the Colonies
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4 Sherlocks Sermons,
6 Oeuvres de Voltaire
2 Leland's Demonthenes
9 Popes Works

1 Camp Discipline
1 Stat. Will. & M. Coll
1 Virga. Laws, abridg'd
1 Johnson's Dictionary
2 Knox Historical Journal

2 Smollett's Continuation
4 Atterbury's Sermons
2 Douglass's north America
2 European Settlements
1 Military Essay
1 Bailey's Dictionary
1 Meiges do
1 Boyers do abridged
6 Tom Jones
9 Letters de Maintenon
6 L'Ami de Hommes
Sherlock 3d. volume, not his Lordship's
1 Discourse of trade

16 Treatise on Ventilators
1 Telemanque
3 L'Esprit de La Lique
6 Memoirs de Maintenon
1 Belisaire
2 Adventures of Jos. Andrews, 1 missing, only one,
1 Sprinkes Devotion
8 Swift's works
2 His. of the 5 Indian nations
10 Select plays, T & 1 TC.
9 do C. 2d. Mr. Stark.

Oeuvres de Moliere
THE LANIER FAMILY.

"The Laniers in England are stated in the Dictionary of National Biography, to have been of French origin. John Lanier, who died in 1572 is referred to, in 1577, as having been a musician and a native of Rouen, France. He owned property in Crutched Friars, parish of St. Olave, Hart Street, London. He was probably father of 'John Lanyer, musician to her Matie.' This John Lanyer, or Lanier, married, Oct. 12, 1585, at the Church of the Holy Minories, London, Frances, daughter of Marc Anthony Galliardo, who had served as musician to Henry VIII and his three successors.

"The most distinguished of the family, Nicholas, son of John Lanier just referred to, was baptized at the Holy Minories, London, Sept. 10, 1588. He became a musician in the royal household and in 1604 was 'musician of the flutes.' He held, subsequently, a high position among the royal musicians, both as a composer and performer. Among other music he composed that for Ben Jonson's masques: 'Lovers Made Men' (1617), and 'The Vision of Delights,' as well as painting the scenery for the latter. At the accession of James I he was made Master of the Music, with a pension of £200 a year. He was also a painter and skilled amateur of works of art. In 1625 he was sent abroad by Charles I. to purchase pictures and statues, and is considered to have been the first, with the exception of Thomas, Earl of Arundel, to appreciate the worth of drawings and sketches by the great masters. With the
outbreak of the Civil War the fortunes of the family declined, and Nicholas Lanier followed the Stuarts into exile. At the Restora-
tion he was restored to his office and died Feb. 1665-6.

“Another Nicholas Lanier, probably uncle to the preceding, was musician to Queen Elizabeth in 1581, &c. He owned consid-
erable property in East Greenwich, Blackheath and the neigh-
borhood. He had four daughters and six sons, John, (died 1650), Alphonso (died 1613), Innocent (died 1615), Jerome (died 1657), Clement (died 1661) and Andrea (died 1659). All of these were musicians in the service of the crown and some of their children succeeded to their posts. The will of Nicholas Lanyer, gent., gave his lands &c. to his wife Lucrece, and 12 d. apiece to his sons named. Mrs. Lucretia Lanier was buried at Greenwich, May 31, 1634.

“Another Nicholas Lanier, probably a cousin of the musician
and painter, was born in 1568 and published two volumes of etch-
ings. He was probably the person of the name buried at St. Mar-
tins-in-the-Fields, Nov. 4, 1646.” *Virginia Magazine of History

There are in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*
an abstract of the will of a John Lanier proved in England, August
28, 1650, and an abstract of the will of his widow, Ellinor, proved
22nd. July 1652, and it is probable that they have some connec-
tion with the persons already mentioned. According to these wills
John and Ellinor Lanier had issues, three children, John, Frances,
and Elizabeth.

While it appears impossible to trace all the American Laniers
to one American ancestor, it is not at all improbable that they all
descend from a common English ancestry.

The earliest person of the name connected by the records with
this ancestry was John Lanier, who was resident in Virginia in
1676. He was one of the rebels who took part with Bacon during
the disturbance known as Bacon Rebellion. Sir William Berkeley,
then Governor of Virginia, was slow to act in defending the Colony
of Virginia against the Indians, and the men of the Southside of
James River took the matter in their own hands. They formed a
camp at Jordan's Point, near the present Hopewell in Prince
George County, and selected John Lanier and John Woodlief to go to the Governor and ask him for authority to go against the Indians. But, Berkeley called them "fools and loggerheads," and denied them their request. On their return the camp was visited by Nathaniel Bacon who resided on the other side of the river at Curles Neck, and he assumed the command, and the trouble began by his going against the Indians without a commission from Berkeley. (William and Mary Quarterly, XV, p. 77.)

Two years later Robert Lanier is found residing in the Parish of St. Michael, Barbadoes, and there, on August 21, 1678, was baptized Clement Lanier. As a Clement Lanier is found in Surry County, adjoining Prince George, Virginia, in 1713, as shown by a deed recorded there, and as many persons removed from Barbadoes to Virginia, it is reasonable to suppose that Clement Lanier, born in Barbadoes in 1678, was the same as the Clement Lanier of Surry County. Moreover, as this Clement Lanier had a son Nicholas and John Lanier had also a son Nicholas, it appears very probable that John of Virginia had also come from Barbadoes and was a brother of Robert Lanier.

Many of the descendants of both John Lanier and Clement Lanier went southward into North Carolina, but it does not appear that all of the name in that state had them as their progenitors. As early as 1718 Lemuel Lanier filed a petition with the Council at Sandy Point in Chowan precinct (North Carolina Records, II 308) and Robert Lanier was a juror in the same precinct in 1720 (Ibid., II, 473). A Robert Lanier lived in Tyrrell County, North Carolina, and his will as given in Hathaway, North Carolina Register, is dated 20th. September, 1744. In this will he mentions his wife Sarah and both children and grandchildren.

John Lanier, of Virginia, had a son Robert, but he will be accounted for in his proper place. He had a grandson Lemuel but of course he could not be the Lemuel of North Carolina. It is probable that Robert Lanier and Lemuel Lanier of North Carolina were two sons of Robert Lanier, of Barbadoes, and it is more than probable that they were related to John Lanier of Virginia. This is all that can be said.

The old will books of Beaufort County, N. C., have been de-
stayed and only a few of the ante-Revolutionary wills remain. But among those recorded in a special book is the will of John Lanier, Esq., who represented Beaufort County in the North Carolina Assembly in 1790. In his will dated Jan. 5th., 1794, he names his wife Fanny, brother-in-law Thomas Barrow, Brother William Lanier, and refers to children but does not name them. The will of John Barrow, Esq., dated June 2nd., 1781, shows that John Lanier married his daughter, Fanny.

Pitt County, adjoining Beaufort, has experienced a similar loss. James Lanier was a prominent man in Martinsborough and represented Pitt County in the Provincial Assembly during the Revolution. His eldest son was Nathaniel Lanier, and deeds show that he had also James, Jr., and Isom Lanier.

It would require an exhaustive search in the old records in almost every County in Eastern North Carolina, to fully analyze this branch of the Lanier family. Interest attaches to them, however, because of the fact that J. F. D. Lanier, who was a prominent banker, was born at Washington, Beaufort County. He wrote a family sketch which is valuable as far as his own life and that of his father, and that of his grandfather are concerned, but which illustrates the fallibility of family narratives, when the writer ventures on hearsay to go beyond this limit.

**Clement Lanier and His Descendants.**

It has been noticed that Clement Lanier was living in Surry County, Va., in 1713. In that year by deeds of lease and release Thomas Farmer and Agnes, his wife, sold to Clement Lanier, of Southwarke Parish, in Surry, fifty acres, and the next year fifty acres adjoining was sold to him by William Scoggin. By deed dated August 7, 1758, Nicholas Lanier and Mary, his wife, of the parish of St. Andrew and County of Brunswick, conveyed the hundred acres to Alan Love, a merchant. In the deed which is recorded at Surry Court House, Clement Lanier is described as “father of said Nicholas, to whom as heir at law the said land descended, the said Clement dying without having made any disposition of said land.” Witnesses, H. Nicholson, Robert Hicks, Nicho. Edmunds, Silvanus Stokes, William Betty.
Nicholas Lanier, son of Clement, made his will 5th. April, 1788, which was proved in Brunswick County May 28, 1792. He names his son Clement to whom he gives five shillings current money; his daughter Sarah Bailey, to whom he gives the same amount, and son-in-law Samuel Hudgins to whom "in consideration of his maintaining me during his life," he gives the tract of land on which lived, lying on the east side of the Great Branch, estimated at one hundred and twenty acres, also one negro woman named Pretty and all the residue of his estate. He made his son-in-law, Samuel Hudgins and his friend Sterling Edmunds, executors. Witnesses: Wm. D. Orgain, Wm. M. Johnson, John Turner, William Orgain, and Smart Hawkins.

It is probable that John Lanier, of St. Andrews Parish, Brunswick County, who made his will 13th. February, 1794, which was proved June 23, 1794, was a brother of this Nicholas. He names a wife Selah and children, Clement, Edward and Sinah. The executors were Samuel Hudgins, William Osburn and Selah Lanier.

John Lanier and His Descendants.

As stated, John Lanier was living in that part of Charles City County, afterwards known as Prince George, as early as 1676. In 1683 a land warrant was issued to him and Peter Wycke for 482 acres, located in the Parish of Westover, on the south side of James River. Most of the records of Prince George were lost during the Civil War, but fortunately the volume containing his will has been preserved. He was born about 1655 and died between Jan. 5, 1717-18, when his will was dated, and April 14, 1719 when a little more than a year later his will was probated.

His children as named in his will, were (1) Robert, to whom he gave one shilling; (2) John to whom he gave one shilling; (3) Sampson, to whom he gave twelve shillings; (4) Sarah Brewer, to whom he gave a cow or heiffer of 3 years old; (5) Nicholas, to whom he gave all the land he now lives upon and all his lands on the otterdams, and all his movable and unmovable property. He made his son Nicholas executor, and gave to his grandson John Lanier, "the son of Nicholas, my son," a feather bed and bolster, and blankets, and rug, all new and good and a small gunn well
fixed, two pewter dipers and basin, one chest with lock and key and six spoons, one iron pott and pott-hooks, and frying pann and a small pair of Stillyards, two combs, a young horse of three years old and three sheep.

Robert Lanier, Son of John Lanier.

As his brother Sampson states in a deposition in Surry County that he was about 56 in 1738, Robert, who was probably the oldest son, was born about 1678. It is probable that he married more than once. His wife, at the time of making his will, Sept. 23, 1753, was Priscilla, and and in this will he speaks of “her deceased father, Richard Washington.” As Richard Washington, in his will dated Nov. 9, 1724, and proved in Surry County, May 19, 1725, speaks of his daughter Priscilla Washington and his wife Elizabeth Washington names her, in her will proved May 21, 1735, as Priscilla Lanier, the marriage must have taken place between 1724 and 1735. Robert Lanier spent all his life in Surry County and his will Sept. 23, 1753, was recorded in the Clerk’s Office there May 18, 1756. According to which he left issue, John, Thomas, Robert and Priscilla. John Lanier, the eldest son, died in 1766, when his estate was appraised.

John Lanier, Son of John Lanier.

John Lanier was born about 1680. Of his death, or the number of his children, no record has been found. He appears to have resided in Surry County, for in 1702 John Lanier was taken into custody by the Sheriff of that County for not appearing as a grandjuryman when summoned. He married Elizabeth Bird, daughter of Thomas Bird, whose will was proved in Surry County in 1687. There is a deed recorded in Surry County April 4, 1720, by which George Nicholson and Mary, his wife, tenants during the life of said Mary in certain lands, and John Lanier and Elizabeth, his wife, and John Young and Tabitha, his wife, tenants of the reversion of the fee simple after the death of said Mary, convey the said lands situated at the head of Upper Chippokes Creek in James City County to William Blaikley, merchant of James City Co. Later, on March 1, 1728, Elizabeth Lanier, who is described
as one of the daughters of Thomas Bird, releases to Richard Jones and her sister Tabitha, his wife, all her interest in 300 acres, she and Tabitha being the only surviving children of Thomas Bird.*

Of their children there is no record save this—One Bird Thomas Lanier appears in the records and was probably a son. In 1734 he was appointed by Brunswick Court overseer of the new road to Shining Creek. From this his birth must have been prior to 1713. In 1735 he was appointed Constable and on Jan. 2, 1737 Thomas Bird† Lanier had a land warrant for 312 acres in Brunswick County on the south side of Great Creek. He sold this land in 1739, at which time his wife Mary joined in the deed. It is possible that his wife, Mary, was the Mary Lanier whose will dated April 28, 1798, and proved at September Court in the same year. It names the following children: Edmund, who married Amy Goodrich, daughter of Benjamin Goodrich, Bird, Abner, Tabitha and Sally, wife of Edmund Laurence.

Sampson Lanier, Son of John Lanier.

Sampson Lanier, third son of John Lanier, was born, according to his deposition, about 1682, and he married Elizabeth Washington previous to 1724, the date of the will of Richard Washington, who mentions his daughter Elizabeth Lanier, and son-in-law, Sampson Lanier and his five Lanier grand-children: Arthur, Thomas, Lemuel, Sampson, and Richard. Sampson Lanier later had two other children, Elizabeth, who married George Burch, and James Lanier. His will was proved in Brunswick County, Jan. 8, 1742-3, and he mentions therein his children, Thomas, Sampson, Richard, Elizabeth Burch, Lemuel, and James, which last was under age. Thomas and Sampson were made executors.

Of these children, 1. Arthur, born about 1705, died probably

*Thomas Bird left four children: Thomas, who died without issue; Mary, who married George Nicholson and died without issue; Elizabeth, who married John Lanier and Tabitha who married (1) John Young, (2) Richard Jones.

†He appears to have written his name sometimes as Bird Thomas Lanier and sometimes as Thomas Bird Lanier.
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young and without issue. He is not mentioned in his father's will.

2. Thomas, born about 1707, married Anne Maclin (for Maclin family see William and Mary Quarterly, VII, 108). This marriage took place previous to July 3, 1734, when William Maclin executed a deed of gift "for love and affection to my daughter Anne Lanier and her husband, Thomas Lanier" (Brunswick Co., Va., Records). He made his will August 23, 1745, and mentions his children, Jacob, William, Drury and Benjamin Lanier. Jacob Lanier died in Greenville County in 1788, and as he leaves his property to his "brother Thomas." This Thomas must have been a son of Jacob's father, and born after 1745. He married Tabitha Eves in 1744 (marriage bond at Brunswick C. H.). Benjamin Lanier, another son of Thomas Lanier, removed to Sussex County, where his will dated 11th. June, 1789, and proved 3 Sept. 1789, names his children: (1) Herbert, (2) Augustine, (3) Benjamin, (4) Sterling, (5) Littleton, (6) Patsy. Augustine Claiborne was about this time Clerk of Sussex County and it is possible that Benjamin Lanier married one of his sisters.

It is interesting to notice that one of these sons Sterling Lanier had the same name as the grandfather of the Poet Sydney Lanier, born in Rockingham Co., N. C. But to observe what a charming mangle of facts can be made by a poet, when he lets his imagination run rampant in genealogy, compare his letter in Mr. J. F. D. Lanier's interesting "Sketch" with the account stated here taken from the records. Assuming that he knew his line back to his grandfather Sterling, as the extreme limit allowed by genealogy for mere tradition, his claim of a descent from Buckner Lanier as his great grandfather must be rejected. As will be seen, Buckner Lanier, son of Sampson Lanier, grandson of John Lanier, had no son Sterling.

3. Lemuel Lanier, son of Sampson, was born about 1710 and married Hannah Peters, as is shown by a deed recorded at Sussex C. H. dated April 14, 1755, from Thomas Lanier of North Carolina to Thomas Peters, Jr., of Sussex County, Virginia, for 200 acres of land, expectant upon the determination of the lives of Lemuel Lanier, and Hannah, his wife, the father and Mother of the said Thomas Lanier, which said Thomas Peters, Sr. by deed
of gift transferred to said Lemuel Lanier and Hannah, his wife, the daughter of said Thomas Peters, and then to his grandson the said Thomas Lanier. Lemuel Lanier lived in Albemarle Parish, Sussex County and the parish Register shows that he had the following children by Hannah, his wife, (1) Thomas, born July 6, 1733, (2) Elizabeth, born June 10, 1735, (3) John, born Dec. 28, 1738, (4) Lemuel, born April 12, 1741, (5) Benjamin, born May 3, 1744.

In partnership with his brother, James Lanier, he patented in 1740 350 acres on the south side of Three Creeks in Brunswick County. This land was afterwards divided, and Lemuel Lanier sold his part, 175 acres, to Robert Lanier, 26th. January 1763.

He became one of the sureties on the bond of Elizabeth Lanier, widow of Sampson Lanier, and the guardian for their children.

Hannah, the first wife of Lemuel Lanier, died before 1763, when a second wife, joining him in a deed of that date, had the name of Elizabeth, who by a further deed 25th. Feb., 1765 appears to have been a daughter of John Peebles. This last deed was a deed of gift to his daughters Milly and Sally Lanier, granddaughters of John Peebles. There is no record known to the writer of the will of Lemuel Lanier, but Lemuel Lanier, his son, was very probably Lemuel Lanier, whose will was recorded in Robertson Co., Tenn., in 1817. He had a daughter, Martha, who married John S. Fagan, who served in the battle of King's Mountain. They had a son Robert Lanier Fagan, who served in the war of 1812 and was great grandfather of Mrs. H. H. Neill, widow of Chief Justice Neill of San Antonio, Texas.

4. Sampson Lanier, son of Sampson Lanier, and Elizabeth Washington, was born about 1712. His first land warrant was dated 17 March, 1736, at which time he was doubtless over 21. He appears quite frequently in the records of Brunswick County, as Vestryman of St. Andrews Parish, Justice of the County and Sheriff. He married Elizabeth Chamberlin, daughter of Samuel Chamberlin, as is shown by a bond of Sampson Lanier to Mary Swanson dated Oct. 8, 1752, and recorded, and by the will of Samuel Chamberlin dated Sept. 14, 1752, and recorded. Sampson Lanier left no will and so his widow, Elizabeth, on Sept. 2,
1757 gave bond to the Court of Brunswick Co. to administer on his estate, with Richard Burch and Lemuel Lanier, as two of her securities.

On November 23, 1757, Edward Goodrich, Isaac Rowe Walton and John Maclin, gentlemen, laid off and assigned to Elizabeth Lanier, widow of Sampson Lanier, deceased, her dower of said Sampson’s estate.

A marriage bond, dated 23, July, 1758, on file in Brunswick County, Va., shows that the widow, Elizabeth Lanier, married secondly Cuthbert Smith, and an order of Feb. 27, 1759, appointed Cuthbert Smith guardian of Rebecca Lanier, orphan of Sampson Lanier, and one of Sept. 5, 1759 appointed their Uncle Lemuel as guardian of Burwell Lanier, Buckner Lanier, Winifred Lanier, Martha Lanier and Anne Lanier.

No mention is made in these records of a son named Lewis Lanier, who it is claimed was also a son of this couple, but there is a marriage bond in Sussex County, dated Sept. 21, 1778, between “Lewis Lanier, son of Sampson Lanier and Anne Butler, daughter of Thomas Butler.” In Clarke’s North Carolina State Records, Burwell and Lewis Lanier appear in Anson County, North Carolina, the first as a witness in 1776 against James Perry, a New Light Baptist, and the second (Lewis) as a member of the House of Commons in 1787 and 1788.

Of these children, Rebecca Lanier, married Walton Harris of Brunswick County (Sketch of J. F. D. Lanier); Buckner, married Rebecca Williamson, widow, in 1783 (marriage bond in Sussex). Buckner’s will dated May 18, 1811, was proved in Sussex County, Va., Dec. 5, 1811, and names children, Frederick, Polly and John (under age) to whom he gives the plantation whereon he lives. Winifred Lanier married Col. Drury Ledbetter of Brunswick County, son of Henry Ledbetter, and was ancestor of Mr. Atwood Violet of New York. (See article in New York Genealogical and Biographical Magazine, January number, 1916.) Anne or Nancy is said to have married Major Vaughan, of Roanoke.

4. Richard Lanier, son of Sampson Lanier and Elizabeth Washington, was born about 1715 as seems indicated by his first land transaction. On March 17, 1736, Sampson Lanier and
Richard Lanier, Jr., were granted a patent for 354 acres on the Watery Branch, adjoining the County line. If he was of age at this time, his birth must have been as stated. Being called "Junior" there is an indication that there was another Richard Lanier, perhaps a son of one of the other sons of John Lanier, but of him nothing is known.

He married about April 2, 1759, with Ann Pettway, daughter of Robert Pettway and widow of Isaac Mason (Marriage bond in Sussex, and Sussex records). The Albemarle Parish Register (Sussex County) shows that they had three children. Susanna born Jany. 1766, William, 28 June, 1768, and James, 1st Feb'y. 1771. Anne Pettway Mason, when she married Richard Lanier, had also four children by her former husband, Isaac Mason, John Mason, Mary Ann Mason and Elizabeth Mason.

The late date of his marriage renders it possible that he had a former wife and other children whose names are not handed down to us. On August 18, 1780 at a court held in Sussex county the church wardens were ordered to bind out, according to law, "William and James Lanier, sons of Richard Lanier, it appearing to this Court that the said Richard Lanier neglects their education and proper instruction."

5. Elizabeth Lanier, daughter of Sampson Lanier, is not mentioned in the will of her grandfather Richard Washington and so is presumed to have been born after its date—1724. She married Richard (?) Burch.

6. James Lanier, son of Sampson Lanier, also for a similar reason is presumed to have been born after 1724, and in his case the presumption is rendered certain by the will of his father Sampson Lanier (1743) who refers to him as under 21 years of age. It is reasonably certain that he married Mary Cooke, daughter of Henry Cooke, with whom he had land transactions, and who in his will dated Nov. 30, 1772 names his daughter, Mary Lanier.

While James Lanier, grandfather of J. F. D. Lanier, was born at Washington, Beaufort County, in a section of North Carolina, where lived as seems descendants of the Lanier name having no immediate connection with the Virginia family, the tradition of his descent from Sampson Lanier is so emphatic that in James
Lanier, as Thomas Forsythe Nelson pointed out, may be found the connecting link.

James Lanier, grandfather of J. F. D. Lanier, was born Feb. 2, 1750, and this fits in very well with a son of James Lanier, youngest son of Sampson Lanier.

_Sarah Brewer, Daughter of John Lanier._

Sarah Lanier was born about 1684, and married George Brewer, whose will was proved in Brunswick County, August 2, 1744, and names his children, Oliver, Henry. Nathaniel, Sarah, Lanier, George, John and Howell.

_Nicholas Lanier, Son of John Lanier._

Nicholas Lanier, whom his father made executor and to whom he left the land on which he lived, was evidently from the date of his death, and other particulars, much younger than any of his brothers. He was probably the child of a second wife, and had not like his half brothers, been provided for in his life time. Probably he had not long been married when his father died (1717) and left a legacy to his son John.

He removed to St. Andrews Parish, Brunswick County, and various records show that his wife's name was Mary. In the same parish resided also another Nicholas, son of Clement Lanier, and his wife's name was also Mary, but there is no difficulty in distinguishing between the two. By a deed dated April 2, 1728, and recorded in Prince George County, Nicholas Lanier, described himself as son of John Lanier, and now stated to be of Brunswick County, and Mary, his wife, conveyed the land patented formerly by his father along with Peter Wycke in 1683, and that whereon his deceased father had formerly lived, to Holmes Boisseau, of Prince George County.

He was one of the first Justices of Brunswick County in 1736, was Captain of a company of militia, Sheriff, Church warden of St. Andrews Parish, &c. He lived to a very advanced age, and his will was offered for probate 23d. April, 1779. It was contested by his "heir at law" Nicholas Shepherd Lanier and was never ad-
mitted to record. The original, however, dated 9 June, 1776 was found among the Court files by Mr. Thomas Forsythe Nelson, and it mentions the following devisees: his wife Mary, son William, to whom he gave the land on which he resided, 567 acres, son Nicholas Shepherd Lanier, son Thomas Lanier, son Lewis Lanier, and daughter, Sarah Brown. Mary Lanier, the wife, appears to have been Mary Lanier mentioned as daughter of William Nance in his will dated Nov. 17, 1770 and proved Feb. 25, 1771. John, a son mentioned in the will of his grandfather John Lanier, (1717) is not mentioned in Nicholas’ will, and so was dead without issue, leaving Nicholas Shepherd as “son and heir.”

Nicholas Shepherd Lanier, son of Nicholas Lanier, was born after 1717 and before 1726, which is twenty-one years prior to the date of his first land warrant, Oct. 1, 1847—say about 1720. From a deed conveying this same land in 1750 we learn that the name of his wife was Amy. He died before June 25, 1781, when his own will was probated in Brunswick County. This will dated August 28, 1780 shows that he had issue, (1) Bird, (2) Burwell, (3) Elizabeth, then wife of ——— Edwards, (4) Drury. The will was proved by the oaths of Robert Gee, Jr., Richard Atkins and John Lanier. His wife survived him.

Thomas Lanier, son of Nicholas Lanier, patented land “on both sides of Mitchell’s Creek” in Brunswick County, 12 Jan. 1747. He was born about 1722. From a deed dated 7th. August, 1753, we learn that his wife’s name was Elizabeth, which afterwards a Bible record proves to be Elizabeth Hicks. He was one of the first Justices of Lunenburg County, which was cut from Brunswick in 1743. As furnished me, the Bible record has “Thomas Lanier, married Elizabeth Hicks in 1742-3. Issue, (1) Molly, born April 28, 1744; (2) Robert, born Nov. 12, 1746; (3) Sallie, born, Dec. 12, 1748; (4) Betty Hicks, born Sept. 29, 1750, married Col. Joseph Winston; (5) Caty, born July 31, 1752; (6) Patsy, born Nov. 26, 1754; (7) Rebekah, born January 27, 1757, married Col. Joseph Williams; (8) Thomas, born Dec. 11, 1760; (9) Susanna, born April 13, 1763; (10) Lewis, born Sept. 21, 1765; (11) Fanny, born Nov. 25, 1767; (12) William H., born Aug. 25, 1770. Perhaps Fanny and William were by his second wife.
Frances, who is mentioned in his will dated Dec. 14, 1804, and proved in Granville County, N. C., at August Court, 1805. In this will Thomas Lanier gives a small legacy to the heirs of his son Robert Lanier, "if any there be," and a similar legacy to the heirs of his son Lewis. They were then dead. Mary was living and still single. William was the only living son, and the other surviving children were named as Elizabeth Winston, Sarah Williams, Catharine Allen, Rebecca Williams, Susannah King and Fanny Spraggins. His executors were Robert Burton, James Vaughan, John R. Eaton, Melchisedeck Spraggins, William Hunt and Joseph Williams.


Halifax County, 17 April, 1801.

To Col. John Wimbish, Clerk:

This is to inform you that among many men I have seen have made choice of Mr. John Kerr, the bearer hereof, for my husband and request you to issue license from your office for the completion of the above intention, & oblige,

Yours &c.

Eliza Williams,
John Kerr and Elizabeth Williams were great grandparents of Mrs. C. C. Andrews, wife of Mr. Walter Andrews, now of Newport, Rhode Island.

The marriage bonds at Oxford, Granville County, N. C., show that Martha (or Patsy) Lanier married Mr. William Watson, Rebecca married in 1772 Col. Joseph Williams, Jr., a brother of Robert Williams, Susannah married George King in 1781, and Fanny married Melchisedeck Spraggins in 1780.


That Thomas Lanier of Granville County, N. C., was the same as Thomas Lanier, of Lunenburg Co., Va., is shown by the fact that on Oct. 21, 1761, Thomas Ford and Eleanor, his wife, of Granville County, N. C., sold land in that county to "Thomas Lanier of Lunenburg County, Colony of Virginia," and there is a deed on record in Lunenburg Co., Deed Book 9, page 492, dated 10 Jan. 1764, by which Thomas Lanier and Elizabeth, his wife, of Granville County, North Carolina, conveyed 200 acres of his land in Lunenburg County, Va., to David Christopher. These deeds make it clear that he moved from Virginia some time before October 21, 1761 and January 10, 1764.

He had large possessions, as the Census of 1790 credited him with 1049 acres.

Lewis Lanier, son of Nicholas Lanier. There is a marriage bond at Lawrenceville, the seat of Brunswick County Clerk's Office, dated 25th November, 1752, executed by Lewis Lanier to Martha Speed, and assuming that he was about 25 years old at
the time, it shows that he was born about 1727. He was a resident of Dinwiddie County, and there is recorded at Lawrenceville a deed from Lewis Lanier of Dinwiddie County and Martha, his wife, conveying 200 acres in Brunswick County on both sides of Stony Run to Benjamin Simmons, which he had purchased in 1765, from Isaac and William House. Unfortunately the records of Dinwiddie County have been destroyed except one rather late book and so we have no definite information of his children if he had any. There is on record at Lawrenceville, a deed of gift executed to him by his father, Nicholas Lanier, November 7, 1774, conveying to him four negroes. He may have been the Lewis Lanier who represented Anson County, North Carolina, in the North Carolina Legislature in 1787. But this Lewis may also have been Sampson Lanier's son Lewis.

It is proper to state that work above on the Lanier Family was largely facilitated by a report of Mr. Thomas Forsythe Nelson, late of Washington, D. C., kindly furnished the editor by Mr. Atwood Violett, of New York. A Lenoir family also resided in Brunswick Co., said to be like the Laniers of French ancestry. The family names are similar to those of the Lanier family, but it is hardly possible that Lanier and Lenoir were the same, though they sound much alike. Gen. William Lenoir, of Wilkes County, North Carolina, was very prominent in the American Revolution. He was a captain in Col. Cleaveland's regiment in the battle of King's Mountain. He was born in Brunswick County, Va., May 20, 1751, O. S., and was the youngest of a family of ten children. Wheeler's North Carolina, p. 462.
WASHINGTONS OF SURRY.

There is a numerous family of Washingtons, who descend from a John Washington, living in Surry County in 1658, and doubtless several years previous. He is not to be confounded with John Washington, ancestor of Gen. George Washington, who with his brother Lawrence, came to Westmoreland County, Virginia, in 1657. These last were sons of Rev. Lawrence Washington, rector of Purleigh, who had a brother, Sir John Washington who married (1) Mary, daughter of Philip Curtis, of Northamptonshire, and (2) Dorothy Pargiter, daughter of William Pargiter of Greworth, Esq. By the first marriage he had two sons, John and Mordaunt. Now Theodore Pargiter, brother of Dorothy, writes a letter from London, August 2, 1654, in which he mentions his "cozen John Washington," apparently in Barbadoes. As many people resident in Barbadoes emigrated to Southside Virginia, it is not unlikely that John Washington, of Surry County, was John Washington, of Barbadoes, in which case he and John Washington, of Westmoreland Co., were first cousins. (See New England Historical and Genealogical Magazine, Vol. 38, p. 424, and Vol. 43, p. 405.)

John Washington, of Westmoreland Co., married Anne Pope, but there is a deed in Surry dated November 15, 1656, in which John Washington of Surry contracted marriage with "Mary ford" (Ford), a widow, who had also been the widow Blunt, since the marriage contract makes provision also for "Tho: Blunt sonne of said Mary." Later, on 29 April, 1682, Thomas Blunt and Richard Washington obtained from the land office of Virginia a grant for 330 acres of land, which by deed dated 17th. Sept., 1686 and recorded in Surry, Thomas Blunt conveys to "my brother Richard Washington, all my right, title and interest in the patent and the land therein mentioned, 330 acres in Surry County, Virginia, dated 29 April, 1682." There is no will preserved of John Washington or of Mary, his wife, but the deed just mentioned proves that Richard Washington, of Surry, was the son of John Washington, of Surry, and his wife, Mary Blunt-Ford.

In an "order book" at Surry C. H., under date of 6 July, 1681, it is stated that Richard Washington, "being of full age," appeared in Court and signed a deed for a parcel of land. This shows that Richard was born about 1660, a year and a half after John Washington married Mary Ford.

Richard Washington married Elizabeth Jordan, a niece of Col. George Jordan, attorney general of Virginia, and daughter of Arthur Jordan, who subscribed to a marriage contract with Elizabeth Bavinn in 1654. In his will dated Sept. 24, 1698, Arthur Jordan, of Southwarke Parish, Surry County, mentions "his son and daughter Wash-

According to Clarke's "North Carolina State Records," Richard Washington, at the house of Henry Briggs in 1710, made his affidavit as to the boundary line of Virginia and North Carolina, and the same records show that a Richard Washington in 1720 was constable of Chowan Precinct, 1739. This last was probably Richard, son of Richard Washington, of Surry.


LANIER WILLS.
Will of John Lanier

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN: I, John Lanier, in the County of Prince George, being very weak and ailing in Body but in perfect mind and memory, thanks be given unto God therefore it is appointed for all men once to dye, I do make and ordain this my last will and testament that is to say principally and first of all, I give and bequeath my soul into the hands of God that gave it, and for my body I commend it to the Earth to be buried in a Christian like and Decent manner, to the Discretion of my Executor—nothing Doubting but at the general resurrection, I shall receive the same again, by the mighty power of God, and as touching such Worldly Estate where-with it hath pleased God to bless in this Life, I give Devise and Dispose of the same in the following manner and form—

First, I give to my son Robert Lanier, one Shilling.
Secondly, I give to my son John Lanier, one Shilling.
Thirdly, I give to my son Sampson Lanier twelve Shillings.
Fourthly, I give to Daughter Sarah Brewer one Cow or Heiffer of three years old.

Fifthly, I give to my grandson John Lanier, the son of Nicholas Lanier my son, a feather bed and bolster and blanketts and ruggs all new and good and a small gunn well fixt, and I give to him two pewter Dishes and Bason and One Chest with lock and key and Six Spoons, One Iron pott and potthooks, and frying pan and a small pair of Stillyards and two Combs and a young Horse of three years old, and three sheep.

Lastily, I give to my son Nicholas Lanier, all the land which I now live upon, and all my land on the Otterdams, to him and his
heirs forever, and I give to my son Nicholas all my movables and
immovables. I do make my son, Nicholas Lanier, my whole and sole
Exor. of this my Last Will and Testament, to see that it is performed
As Witness my hand and seal this the 5th. of Jany, of 1717.

John Lanier, Sealed with red wax.

his
William X Peebles
marke
Henry Peebles
his
Thomas X Burrow
marke

At a Court held at Merchantshope for the County of Prince George
on the second Tuesday in April being the fourteenth Day of the said
month Anno. Dom. 1719.

The above written Last Will and Testament of John Lanier, Deced. was exhibitted into Court by Nicholas Lanier his ExeCTR. who
made Oath thereto, and it being Duly proved by William Peebles, Henry Peebles and Thomas Burrow the sevel witnesses thereto is by
order of the Court truly recorded and Certificate is granted the said
Nicholas Lanier for Obtaining a Probate in Due form.

Teste. Wm. Hamlin, Cl. Cur.

A Copy,
Teste: W. D. Temple, Clerk.

Will of Sampson Lanier.
Brunswick Co., Virginia, Will Book 2, Page 52.

IN THE NAME OF GOD AMEN: I Sampson Lanier of the
Parrish of Saint Andrew in the County of Brunswick calling to mind
the mortality of man do make and ordain this to be my last Will
and Testament revoking all former wills by me made and this only
to be my last Will and Restament to wit I give and bequeath unto
my son Thomas Lanier all the tract of land whereon I now live con-
taining one hundred and fifty acres to him and his heirs forever but
it is my desire that my wife should have the use of the Plantation
whereon I now live with the land on the east side of branch during
her natural life makeing no waist on the same I also give unto my
said son Thomas Five pounds cash and all my Coopers tools I give
unto my son Sampson Lanier one Negro man called Mingo my wife
to have the labour of the said negro during her widowhood I give unto my son Richard Lanier two cows and calves two cows and pigs one feather bed bolster a blanket and rugg and a pair of sheets two peuter dishes three peuter plates one good chest one iron pot also one negro woman named Juda my wife having the labour of the said negro woman during her widowhood I give unto my Daughter Eliza Burch one negro girl called Mou the said negro girl and her increase to the use of my said daughter and the heirs of her body forever I give to my son Lemuel Lanier one negro girl called Agge to him and his heirs also one feather bed and bolster a pair of sheets a rugg and a blanket two peuter dishes and three peuter plates two cows and calves one heifer one young mare bridle and saddle and all the huggs that is called his and agang of hoggs that yoused with the same one iron pot and frying pann I give to my son James Lanier two cows and calves two sows and pigs two peuter dishes two peuter plates one iron pot or kettle one young mare one small saddle and bridle one feather bed bolster a pair of sheets a rugg and a blanket and one negro man called Randol to him and his heirs but Lamuel Lanier to have the labour of the said negro till my son James come to the age of twenty one years I give unto my beloved wife Twenty Pounds cash which she hath in her possession to her and her disposial and also let the use of all the remainder part of my Estate to my beloved wife during her natural life or widowhood and after her death or marriage I give all that part of my estate to my five sone to be equally divided among them to them and their heirs my will and desire that my estate may not be brought to an appraisement I also constitute and appoint my two sons Thomas Lanier and Sampson Lanier Exor's of this my last will and testament IN WITNESS whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this Eighth day of January, 1742/3. 

Sampson Lanier (Seal)

Signed sealed and delivered in presence of us as his last will and testament.

James Maclin.

his

Peter Adams

mark

Richard Lanier

At a Court held for Brunswick County May the 5th, 1743.

This will was presented in Court by Thomas Lanier and Sampson Lanier the Exor's therein named who made oath according to law and
the same being proved by the oaths of James Maclin and Richard Lanier two of the witnesses thereto and ordered to be recorded, on the motion of the said Exor's certificate is granted them for obtaining a probate thereof in due form.

TESTE:
Ster. Clack, Clerk Court.

A COPY,
TESTE:
R. H. Turnbull, D. Clerk.

WILL OF NICHOLAS LANIER
Original in the Court Files in Brunswick Co., Va.
(Not recorded)

IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN: I, Nicholas Lanier of the parrish of Saint Andrews and County of Brunswick, being of sound perfect mind and memory blessed be God do this Ninth day of June in the year of our Lord Christ, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-six, make and publish this my last will and testament in manner following Vize: First, I lend unto my beloved wife Mary Lanier four negroes, to-wit:—Harry, Amey, Tom and Bett, also all my House hold and kitchen furniture, also all my stock of all kinds during her life. Also I give and bequeath unto my son William Lanier the land whereon I now live, containing five hundred and sixty seven acres, more or less, and all and singular the appertenances thereunto belonging to him and his heirs and assigns forever. Also I give and bequeath to my son William Lanier, three negro slaves, namely, Tom, Dick and Rachel, to him, his heirs and assigns forever. Also I give and bequeath to my said son William Lanier all my house hold and kitchen furniture of all kinds after his mother's decease, to him and his heirs and assigns forever. Also I give and bequeath to my son Nicholas Shepherd Lanier, one negro slave, namely, Jack, to him his heirs and assigns forever. Also I give and bequeath to my son Thomas Lanier two negro slaves, namely: Jeff and Bet, to him his heirs and assigns forever. Also I give and bequeath to my son Lewis Lanier two negro slaves namely: Mary and Amy, after his mother's decease, to him his heirs and assigns forever. Also I give and bequeath to my daughter Sarah Brown one negro slave namely, Tiny, to her her heirs and assigned forever, and I do bequeath that if there be any of my estate which is not mentioned and herein bequeath to my son William Lanier, to him his heirs and assigned forever.

I do desire there may be no aprasement of my estate and I do leave my son William Lanier my Executor.
BOOK REVIEWS.


Mr. Baskervill, who not long ago favored the public with a book on the Baskervills and their connections, has now, in this publication, tried his hand on the Meades. In addition, he has sketches of the Hardaway, Eggleston, Segar, Pettus and Overton families. It is very disappointing that he has not been able to trace these families back to England, for they are all of acknowledged standing in the chronicles of this State. There is no doubt that they belonged to the gentry of the British Islands, but the proof of their descent is not forthcoming. One of the sons, however, of Andrew Meade, the immigrant, by name David Meade, married Susanna Everard, daughter of Sir Richard Everard, Governor of North Carolina, and with this family the story is different. Through the Everards and their antecedents, Mr. Baskervill's children are descended from kings and dukes without number, representing England, France and Scotland. Notwithstanding all the difficulties, arising from broken records, Mr. Baskervill has published a useful work. The list of authorities given by him shows that he has consulted many sources. The book contains 170 pages and has an excellent index.

History of the University of Virginia, 1819-1919. By Philip Alexander Bruce, LL. B., LL. D.

Since the notice in this magazine of the first two volumes of this valuable publication, two more have appeared. These take the University through the period of 1841-1904. It is a great story, which Dr. Bruce unfolds, and it makes its appeal to the friends of education everywhere. It tells of the influence of Rogers, of George and Henry St. George Tucker, of Basil L. Gildersleeve, of Francis H. Smith, John B. Minor, and many others of its famous professors upon the youth of the South, promoting the development of those ideals which
found expression in the careers of W. Gordon McCabe, Robert L. Dabney, John A. Broadus, and scores of former students who walked in every avenue of life.

Perhaps in describing the "honor system" at William and Mary College and the University, Dr. Bruce gives to its origin too much of a local coloring. I think that this system grew out of the conditions of Southern life and, therefore, naturally found expression at these institutions, as it did at all other Southern institutions, more or less. Henry St. George Tucker, who offered the resolution about examinations in 1842, had been a student of William and Mary College, and grew to manhood in its shadow, and that ancient institution itself was developed from what it first had been—a copy of a college at Oxford—into an institution expressive of the Southern spirit. Neither Washington nor Lee was a graduate of William and Mary College or the University, but they were truly as much products of the honor system as any alumni of those two famous "Schools of Honor."

The Northern States, in laying stress upon the materialistic values of men, have been singularly free from producing ideals of character. Thus Franklin and Hamilton were masterful men, but their private lives were far from being idealistic, and we would hardly care for our children to copy after Lincoln's example of telling filthy stories. Verily, verily human selfishness meets with its punishment in time. The desire of Massachusetts to exploit the South through high tariffs and bounties has driven away the old Puritan population and handed that State over to the mongrels of Europe.


The author who is a Roman Catholic priest was inspired to write this plea by utterances of Pope Benedict XV, wherein that good man announced his faith in the American people as his chief hope of restoring peace and order to the world. Father Semple believes in the good old doctrine that treaties have a moral basis and cannot be treated as scraps of paper. His discussion of the obligation of positive international law is very interesting. No nation can live to itself and is more or less dependent on other nations, and compacts between them should not be violated. How far the conduct of the United States at the present time in withdrawing itself from obligations to insure the peace of other nations may be considered a departure from its true relations to the world, is a question of much doubt. The policy may conduce to the peace of the United States, but America in the robe of self-interest hardly presents the figure of a nation taking much interest in "enlightening the world."
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MORE PROPAGANDA.

In the April number, 1920, and January number, 1921, two articles by the Editor appeared on "Propaganda in History," intended in the nature of a protest against the wholesale misrepresentations of facts in connection with Plymouth and Abraham Lincoln. The protest was continued in the October number, 1921, in an article on "American Ideals," which shows how many Northern writers have completely reversed the truths of history.

Now comes another illustration of this regrettable disregard of historical accuracy.

Fort Wayne, Ind., is the headquarters of a lot of gentlemen who have organized a league ("The American Luther League") apparently to create "one hundred per cent Americans" by flooding the country with a little pamphlet on "Inalienable Rights," by W. H. T. Dau, a copy of which was sent to the editor. Though stating that "One Hundred Per Cent Americanism" must start with the Declaration of Independence, this pamphlet does not once mention the great author of that paper, but proceeds to ascribe it to a lot of "authors," or "framers," leaving the number beautifully undefined.

This ignoring of Thomas Jefferson, a Virginian, the real and only author, is after the impudent manner in which Jamestown has been ignored to make way for Plymouth as "the first colony," and Washington, the Father of his whole country, North and South, removed from his pinnacle as the "First American" to make way for Lincoln, who can never be justly regarded as other than the representative of a section involved in a bloody war with his own countrymen.
“Analyzing somewhat these statements in the Declaration of Independence which glow with the convictions of its authors &c.” (Page 4.)

“But for our present purpose, it is sufficient to nail down this incontrovertible fact that the framers of our Declaration of Independence thought of one kind of rights—which they called inalienable.” (Page 7.)

But not content with dividing out Mr. Jefferson’s work among a number, and not once mentioning his name, the writer proceeds next to make James Otis “the intellectual father” of the Declaration of Independence:

“The thoughts expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and even some of its most expressive terms, had been current in the American colonies for sometime prior to the 4th of July, 1776. The intellectual father of this renowned document was James Otis &c.” (Page 5.)

In support of this the writer proceeds to quote from the speech imputed to James Otis by John Adams fifty-six years after he made it, and from a more authoritative pamphlet published by Otis in 1764 on the “Rights of the British Colonies.”

It is hard to apply the proper name to Mr. Dau’s comments. The most charitable view to take is that he is crassly ignorant of his subject; and has guilelessly accepted everything that New England writers have written in magnifying the reputation of a Massachusetts man.

The ignorance of Mr. Dau does not consist in saying “that the thoughts expressed in the Declaration of Independence, and even some of its most expressive terms, had been current in the American colonies before the 4th of July, 1776,” but in saying that they were prevalent “sometime” prior to that date and in ascribing their origination to one James Otis.

Why, the principles enunciated go back to Magna Carta, and were current among the American people not “sometime prior to the 4th of July, 1776,” but from the time of their settlement on these shores. They were clearly expressed in England by Locke and Sidney in the 17th century, and afterwards in France by Voltaire, Rousseau and Montesquieu. They were expressed by
Richard Bland, who, as a leader in Virginia, held quite as prominent position as James Otis held in Massachusetts. See Bland’s letter in the Pistole Fee in 1753, and “The Colonel Dismounted,” written in 1763 in the dispute of the “Two Penny Act,” some months before Otis published his pamphlet on the “Rights of the British Colonies.” In this last pamphlet Bland used these words:

“Under the English government all men are free born, and only subject to laws made with their own consent and cannot be deprived of the benefit of these laws, without a transgression of them.” And on the burning question soon to press for consideration, Bland, instead of admitting as Otis did in his pamphlet on the “Rights of the British Colonies,” the supremacy of Parliament in all matters, denied that it had any authority whatever in matters purely internal—a position subsequently assumed by the House of Burgesses in its resolutions of November 14, 1764, far in advance of Massachusetts.

Jefferson says that in drafting the Declaration of Independence he “turned to neither book or pamphlet.” He never saw Otis’ pamphlet, and, of course, he could not read his speech on the Writs of Assistance because it did not exist in print. The fact is, it was not necessary to do any of these things; for Jefferson had been brought up in an English colony where the “inalienable rights of man” were preached to him from early boyhood.

The intellectuality of the Declaration of Independence does not consist in its origination of principles, but in the marvelous marshaling of the factors as applied to the American cause. It sets out the inalienable rights of man, and then describes how the king of England had violated these rights, justifying armed resistance and independence. In doing this it employs, in the opinion of a well known New England writer, “a Demosthenic momentum of thought and a fervor of emotional appeal such as Tyrtaeus might have put in his war song.” He well describes the declaration as “a kind of war song;” “a stately, passionate chant of human freedom,”—“the most commanding and most pathetic utterance in any age, in any language, of national grievances and national purposes.” (Moses Coit Tyler, Literary History of the American Revolution.)
Nevertheless, Thomas Jefferson, the author of this unparalleled paper, is to be set aside, and James Otis is to be made the father of its intellectuality!—the one figuring on the national stage for over sixty years as a leader of thought and of men, and the other prominent, indeed, in his own colony, but scarcely known during his lifetime outside of it; the one constantly from his youth defending the rights of the colonies and the other, when the critical period of the Stamp Act arose, declaring resistance treason and later counselling submission to the Revenue Act,—being much of his time in an irresponsible mental condition.

And yet, despite his lack of a sense of justice, which nothing can excuse, I cannot but realize that Mr. Dau has been made a victim to New England misstatements. It begins with John Adams, a man of great ability and sterling qualities it is true, but intellectually disfigured by childish prejudices and vanities. The contemporary opinion of the people of Massachusetts was uttered by himself in 1776 when he gave to Patrick Henry of Virginia, "the credit with posterity of beginning and concluding this great Revolution."

Also in the contemporary opinion of John Adams and the people of Massachusetts, Patrick Henry easily ranked as the greatest of American orators. But John Adams, patriot and statesman—for he was both—underwent a change. He grew jealous of Virginians, and lugged James Otis to the front, manufacturing for him a speech which has the real merits of march and fire, and pronounced him a better orator than Henry. Later he did not hesitate to say that he had heard a hundred speeches from Josiah Quincy, Sr., better than any he ever heard from Patrick Henry.

New England writers took up the cue and ever since the question of the "Writs of Assistance" has figured in their histories as the opening or, at any rate, "the prelude to the American Revolutionary Drama." The truth is, there is nothing in the contemporary accounts calculated to impress us that anything very extraordinary occurred when Otis spoke in 1761.

Hutchinson, the historian of Massachusetts, who was alive to every incident of his times, makes no such allusion. The affair of the Writs of Assistance involved a legal question of search ap-
Moee Propaganda

applicable as much in one part of the British Empire as another. John Adams was present at the trial and took down some notes "in a very careless manner," but there is nothing treasonable in the remarks ascribed in these notes to Otis—nothing that might not have been said in England as well as in America. The Supreme Court of Massachusetts decided against Otis and the Writs were most freely issued down to the Boston Port Bill. There is no evidence whatever that the case attracted any attention in Virginia or other colonies.

As a matter of fact, the question in Virginia of the Pistole Fee in 1753 and the Two Penny Act in 1758, both preceding the question of the Writs of Assistance," and both directly affecting the question of local taxation, had much better claims to being considered "the prelude" of the American Revolution. These questions not only convulsed the colony of Virginia, but were carried to England and produced warm controversy on both sides of the Atlantic. Moreover, both were decided in favor of Virginia. The latter question was one of long continuance and mingled with the Stamp Act and the tax on tea, and powerfully swelled the tide which rolled the colony on to independence. (See William and Mary College Quarterly, XIX, 10-27.) There is contemporary evidence that Patrick Henry used words of treason in the matter of the Two Penny Act, and none whatever that James Otis did in the Writs of Assistance. All after evidence is apt to be affected by after thoughts.

It seems from a letter head that the following appear as names of those who are in command of the affairs of the "American Luther League:"

Dr. H. A. Duemling, President.
Albert Buuck, 1st Vice President.
F. J. Rump, 2nd Vice President.
Hy. J. Doell, Fin. Secretary.
Paul Richter, Treasurer.
W. D. Holterman, Secretary.
John C. Baur, General Secretary.

Members of Executive Board:

W. C. Dickmeyer.
Here is a grouping of names that does not apparently contain a single one of English origin, and the Editor is bound to say that to a person who lives in Virginia, where only about two per cent of the population is foreign born, this array of men of strange cognomens engaged in the cause of making "one hundred per cent Americans" by snubbing a man who was in his day the greatest exponent of the inalienable rights and the founder of Americanism, as we understand it, and is today the greatest living influence on American thought, is one of the most astonishing pieces of propaganda which has come under his notice.

DR. JOHN HAMILTON ROBINSON, 1732-1819.

Communicated by A. J. Morrison.

John Hamilton Robinson, son of David Robinson and Miriam Hamilton, was born in Augusta County, Virginia, Jan. 24, 1782. He was bred a physician and came to St. Louis shortly after the transfer of Louisiana to the United States. In 1806 and 1807 he was attached to Capt. Pike's celebrated party that went to Santa Fé and Chihuahau.

Captain Pike set down plainly what he thought of Dr. Robinson: "He has had the benefit of a liberal education, without having spent his time as too many of our gentlemen do in colleges, in skimming on the surfaces of sciences, without ever endeavoring to make themselves masters of the solid foundations. Robinson studied and reasoned; with these qualifications he possessed a liberality of mind too great even to reject an hypothesis because it was not agreeable to the dogmas of the schools; or adopt it because it had all the éclat of novelty.

"His soul could conceive great actions, and his hand was ready to achieve them,—in short, it may truly be said that nothing
was above his genius, nor anything so minute that he considered it entirely unworthy of consideration. As a gentleman and companion in dangers, difficulties and hardships, I, in particular and the expedition generally owe much to his exertions." That statement was in print before the end of 1810.

Dr. Robinson at Santa Fé and in the Chihuahua neighborhood, temp. 1807, became very much interested in the fortunes of Mexico and in the outlook for a self-determining Mexico. In 1810 he persuaded Secretary Monroe to send him to Chihuahua on State business. Dr. Robinson made his reports during 1810 and 1811. Mr. Monroe was not ready to commit the United States to a militant sort of co-adjutorship in the affairs of the republicans of Mexico, and Dr. Robinson by the year 1813 was quite ready to be a filibuster.

In 1815 he cast in his lot with the revolutionists in Mexico, and ranked as general of brigade in their army as it was constituted from 1815 to 1819. And along with Gutierrez and Toledo, Dr. Robinson had been one of the first accredited representatives in the United States from the republicans of Mexico.

In 1816 William Davis Robinson of Georgetown, District of Columbia, went to Mexico to supply General Mina's army with muskets "at $20 the musket." He fell into the hands of the Spaniards, and was long held a prisoner in Mexico and in Spain. The Spaniards at first thought he was Dr. Robinson, and throughout his troubles William Davis Robinson suffered the more because of his name. Both the Robinsons were men of brains and republican principles, and the Spanish authorities had reason to look out for them.

John Hamilton Robinson was early dissatisfied with the incidence of the Southwestern boundary of the Louisiana Purchase. In 1819 he published at Philadelphia a remarkable "Map of Mexico, Louisiana, and the Missouri Territory, including also the State of Mississippi, Alabama Territory, East and West Florida &c." This was a large-scale map, and Dr. Robinson desired in this way to draw the attention of the United States (and the attention of Secretary Adams) to Texas especially.

_Niles' Register_ (XIV, 359), under the caption _Small Dif-
ference! remarked at the time: “Dr. John H. Robinson’s new map of Louisiana and Mexico is noticed in a Natchez newspaper. The boundary lines of the territorial claims of the United States and Spain are marked on this map.” Niles then figured out the enormous acreage lying between the lines so marked. Niles was no annexationist and was not much interested in the map.

Natchez was the gateway to Texas from much of the United States for some years. Dr. Robinson, during his service in Mexico, had settled his family there. He had married at St. Louis Sophie Marie Michau. Several of their children died of yellow fever at Natchez during 1818, and the next year, Sept. 19, Dr. Robinson died there of the fever. His wife survived him many years. Their son, Antoine Saugrain Robinson, was living in St. Louis in 1888, at the age of seventy-nine. He was for many years cashier of the old Bank of Missouri.

Some day perhaps, Professor Joslin Cox of Northwestern University, will write a Life of Dr. Robinson. These notes have been thrown together because the subject is undoubtedly interesting and to emphasize the importance of gathering up for the biographical dictionary of the Virginia region a good many important western names. John Hamilton Robinson, as a subject for biography, is immensely interesting.

Consider the times, and the plans of Blount, Hamilton, Burr, Miranda, and how many others. It was not logical for the United States to stay fenced off from the Great South Sea. But the logic of the expansion was that America before and with the Revolution had bred the expansionists.

REFERENCES.
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DR. EVANS AND THE WAR (1861-65).

The following letters, the first dated at the beginning of the war for Southern Independence, and the other at the close, were written by Dr. Moses Ford Thomas Evans to his sister Mary, wife of Frank R. Stockton, of Philadelphia, the novelist. Dr. Evans was the son of Thomas F. Evans, and Mary Mansfield Brooks, his wife, and was born in South Carolina in June, 1820. He attended a military school in that state and afterwards studied medicine, with much distinction, at the University of Pennsylvania.

In 1847 he settled in Amelia county, Virginia, where for many years he enjoyed an extensive practice. When the war for Southern Independence broke out in 1861, Dr. Evans entered the service as lieutenant in the Painesville (Amelia County) Rifles, which he did much to organize and drill. This company was mustered into the Fourteenth Regiment. He was made Adjutant and soon afterwards was promoted to Lt. Colonel. He was wounded slightly at the battle of Seven Pines and not long afterwards was rendered unfit for further service by a severe wound received at the battle of Malvern Hill. He retired to Painesville, where he was residing when Gen. Lee evacuated Richmond.

At the time of his death, January 16, 1877, he was superintendent of schools for his county, and a better choice could not have been made. The writer of his obituary says, "I have rarely ever met a man who united so many useful and graceful acquirements. He possessed a strong, quick, incisive intellect, intensified and brightened by culture, research and thought. Not only a physician of the highest professional attainments, he was also a scholar and litterateur. Skilled in occult sciences, he was devoted to their intricacies and beauties, a mathematician, chemist and machinist. Yet, with these solid attainments, he was a lover of the fine arts and polite literature—a rare and singular combination."

His funeral was largely attended, and he was interred in Amelia County, in the graveyard of Capt. John Wiley.

Dr. Evans married twice: (1) Elizabeth Hulens Stockton, of Philadelphia, sister of Frank R. Stockton, and (2) Mary Re-
becca Wiley, of Amelia County, Virginia, by whom he had Sarah, who married Yelverton Evans Booker.

These letters throw some interesting light upon the war. In its destructive tendencies Grant's army held a kind of intermediate relationship to McClellan's and Sherman's. Under McClellan the Federal soldiers respected the persons of non-combatants and protected their private property. No praise can be too great for George B. McClellan. Under Grant, the army, while not cruel to individuals and did not as a rule burn private houses, were wholesale looters of stock and personal property. Nothing was safe—from the chicken sleeping peacefully on his roost, to the Family Bible solemnly revered as containing the family register. Plundering and robbing and looting amounted with them to a kind of disease. Under Sherman, the Federal soldiers equalled the Germans in their indifference to the demands of humanity, and in their barbarous destruction of homes and personal property. The Germans might well have hesitated to drive away the whole population of a French city, but Sherman did not. Witness his conduct at Atlanta.

Hermitage Camp, near Richmond, Va., April 30th, 1861.

My dear Sister Mary

I am about to surprise you with a letter—that is, if Uncle Sam is willing to carry it. A letter from me is a fit attendant upon the times.

How hard it is to realize the strange calamity which has fallen upon our country. War to the death! I have long looked for all this, and yet cannot fully feel that it is a fixed fact now.

What is to be the end of it?

Both sections are actively and fully arming. You see one side—I will tell you of the other.

Virginia has at this moment, of her own force, Seventy-five thousand men in the field—drilling daily—this force is very well armed. The five months preceding the war have been so well spent by the South in purchasing arms and ammunitions of war in Europe and at the North, that the whole South may be regarded as being as well armed as any nation in Europe. What next?

The wish—the universal wish—is to march upon Washington—then upon Philadelphia—another army at the same time upon Cincinnati. But the authorities at the head of affairs may be more pru-
dent than to commit these blunders. Washington is properly ours, and soon will be really—but no further. Maryland belongs to the South, and will be fought for to the last extremity—but no Northern invasion will be thought of by those in power here.

In Richmond we now have 25,000 troops—the other forces of the state are at the various camps in different localities. Alexandria is our depot.

Virginia has officially joined the Southern Confederacy, and one thousand South Carolina troops are now here. 20 thousand more will be on next week. Jeff Davis will be here in a few days. Richmond will probably be the Capital.

Ben, Hood, George Wily, & Miller are here in Camp. All well and in fine spirits.

We hear from home about daily. All well there.

What are you & Frank driving at in these times? Come south. We want Frank to sketch the "Battle of Washington" for us. Wonder if this letter will ever get through to you? doubtful! If it does—dont tell on us.

Orderly Hood looks as savage as a meat axe. Ben don't like the fun particularly—especially his new duties as Corporal of the Guard, George Wily enjoys the whole. Without intending to compliment our little Painville Squad, I may say that the flower of the Southern youths are in the field everywhere.

Our Genl Lee (Late U. S.) thinks the South invincible. So do I. (two great men thus agree)

Oh what armies we are to see! America has yet known nothing like it.

Write what is going on—if you can. Loulu is suffering with neuralgia. Sorry that I cannot be with her. We will take excellent care of her, and return her in good condition when the war is over. It will not last long.

Love to all. Write fully if you can. Your loving brother

M. F. T. Evans.

Enclosed in an Envelope to Meade & Baker Druggists.

Painville, Amelia Co., Va.,
United States of North America,
Western Hemisphere, Earth,
Solar System No. — Nebula No. —
Universe, June 14, 1865.

My dear Sister Mary:

With the above patriotic heading, I suppose that I may safely
write somewhat explicitly. As soon as President Johnson has estab-
lished, at the point of the bayonet, the respective numbers of our
solar system, and Nebula, I will fill the above blanks with pleasure,
and in the true Union spirit.

Your letters, and Loulu's, to Sister Bess, Mary, and Kate, have
just been received, and we poor rebels have derived much pleasure
from them. That you all love us still, is a marvel, considering the
multitude of magnificent lies concerning us, with which your papers
have favored you during the four eventful years which have just
passed. But as obedient, grateful, and well whipped curs, we should
perhaps be careful how we talk of misrepresentations, and only be
thankful if something much worse is not yet in store for us. Mrs.
Stockton's kind letter, though written before yours, came also today.
That you all sympathize with us is very grateful to our feelings, but
thank heaven we have not suffered so much as you very reasonably
expected we would from the rushing of two great armies over our
very bodies, I may almost say. For several days during the recent
transit, Amelia County was alive with the moving hosts of pursued
and pursuers—the whole county filled with Infantry, Cavalry, Artill-
ery, and immense wagon trains; but though many partial battles
occurred in the County, few houses were burnt or destroyed. A large
amount of horses, cattle, and provisions were stolen of course, and
crops in many place much injured.

A brigade of Federal Cavalry charged into Painville on Wednes-
day the 6th. of April, while we were at breakfast. They came at
full speed, with pistols cocked, sabers flashing, and yelling like demons
—about two thousand strong. The village, at the time, was defended
by Lieutenant General Nathan Scay, Major General Thos. I. Horner,
Brigadier Gen'l. Thos. E. Whitworth, Col. Edwin Cosby, and myself.
Our army consisting of women, children, and negroes. After a manifold
defense for two whole seconds, we surrendered. The fight was fully
as fatal as that celebrated battle between the Dutch and Swedes at
Fort Christina, so graphically described by Diederick Knickerbocker.
Our conquerors behaved very well, only stealing all our horses, and
cows, and as much of our provisions as they could manage to get.

After some hours, a body of Fitz Lee's Cavalry came up and a
running fight commenced which continued from Painville to Jeters-
ville—the "Yanks" falling back most heroically. On Thursday the
7th. April, the 5th Army Corps, about fifteen thousand men, passed
through our village. No damage done by them to us, except the usual
stealings, which seem to be an essential part of military tactics.

My own losses may be summed up as follows:—two fine horses;
two excellent milch cows; two barrels of flour; about one hundred
pound of bacon; all my oats; nearly all of my fodder; about twenty gallons of molasses; a hive of honey; a quantity of preserves, and brandy, peaches; many dozen of eggs; about twenty hens; some ducks; and geese, etc., etc.

But they did not get all of my supplies, as I had left six barrels of flour; twenty barrels of corn; three hundred pound of bacon; and other "fixings"—besides twenty one hens, and a good garden. So you see we are not starving.

Upon the whole I will say, that the Yankee Army behaved here almost as well as Genl. Lee's Army did in Pennsylvania, which is saying a good deal. A propensity to steal watches, and jewelry, was the worst form of theft which I heard of, as this could not be based upon any animal necessity. A clergyman who was staying at my house at the time had two watches taken from him. I had given my watch to Lettie for safe keeping, and so saved it.

Beck had hidden hers, with her jewelry, so we lost nothing in this way.

Mary and Kate happened to be away from home.

Our house was not pillaged, but many instances of complete sacking occurred in the county—chiefly with houses deserted by the families through fear.

Of course the panic among the women was great. A Yankee officer, seeing Mrs. Garland Jefferson in great trepidation, exclaimed—"Madam, we do not eat women and children!" This certainly should have reassured her, but she might with truth have retorted, "Sir, you do eat raw bacon, and half hatched eggs." But I cry out from experience, "what will not army folks eat"—it is well for the women and children on both sides that the war did not last a four years longer.

You northern people have had no true idea of the condition of things in the South during the war, as your papers have given you little else than a tissue of enormous and ridiculous lies concerning us. Even your true heart may, in some measure, have been turned from us, by this continued abuse. I can only say here that the Southern authorities and the southern people carried on the war with an honest conviction of right. It was a war of the people—the authorities being only agents—we have had no tyranny—no anarchy—within the Confederate lines, law and order have everywhere prevailed. Our sufferings have been such as were necessarily incident to a war of such tremendous magnitude. The conscription was unavoidable, and was regarded as proper by all thinking men. The opposition here to President Davis was purely a party opposition, in
matters of opinion and policy, but all regarded him, and still regard him, as a Virtuous statesman and Christian.

This sounds strangely to your ears, but if it is not all true, then I shall lose faith in the best evidences of truth. Jefferson Davis had about as much to do with the assassination of Mr. Lincoln, as you had. That horrid deed shocked the whole Southern people quite as much as it shocked the northern people, and it was as sincerely regretted.

Another stupendous lie concerns the wilful starvation of prisoners. It is true that the prisoners did often suffer much from want of food, but only when our own army suffered in like manner, and for the same good reason—never from wilful cruelty. Frequently, however, they fared better than our army, because they were often nearer to the transportation facilities. Concerning battles, too, the lying has been by wholesale. I am now convinced from the teachings of my own experience that there is no such thing as an accurate account of a battle, but independently of this apparently unavoidable difficulty, the wholesale and evidently wilful deceptions about battles, practiced by your papers, are inconceivable.

One example in particular has been a constant source of surprise to me, the battles of Seven Pines and Fair Oaks, fought below Richmond on the 31st May and 1st June, 1862. Your papers and Genl. McClellan's dispatches, represented the last day's fight as resulting in a rout of our army—the troops being hotly pursued to the works near the City. Now I was present, and slept both nights on the battle field. On the morning of the 2d. June, before day, our troops were marched to a new position, in perfect order and quiet—no enemy near us, and not a gun fired. The federals had retired beyond our reach. Now how, think you, will history record these battles?

But why write of all this? We have been weighed in the balance and found wanting—not in courage, or endurance, but in men and now that it has been proved that twenty millions of people, aided by men and supplies from all the earth, can whip five millions, sealed up within their own territory, it follows that further quarrelling had better be dropped. We honestly desired a separate government, but as that can not be had, we accept in good faith the alternative.

The southern people love peace and order as much as any people, and as soon as all reasonable hope failed, the quarrel was dropped. Do any imagine that those states could not have carried on the war for a considerable period, even after Genl. Lee's surrender? If so, they are mistaken. We still had large armies in the field, and in such a country as ours, a guerilla warfare could be indefinitely waged. But it was foreseen that final success was impossible, and so the ques-
tion was settled. We are not Mexicans, nor like them. The failure of a fair trial—an honest trial—at separation, now leaves the south ready and willing to restore the Union in good faith, and as the slavery question, and the question of State Sovereignty, are settled forever all over the Union, the South will have nothing more to do with revolu-
tions—unless some forgetful Yankee state attempts to re-assert the latter of the two above named doctrines, in which case, the South will cheerfully treat her to a dish of cold bayonets.

Nobody here cares three figs about slavery now, except in regard to the little matter of "money out of pocket"—and I hear very little even about that. Very few, in my opinion, would wish to re-establish it. Let it go—and at once.

I hope that Congress will not foolishly pass any "gradual emancipation" laws; and further hope that every state will now ratify "the constitutional amendment" of the last session.

These sentiments, I believe, prevail here generally.

So much for these matters.

What of literature? Have any books been published since the war began? Are England, France, Russia, and Trinnicum still in existence? Are there any great men now? If, so, who are they, and as little Fort says,—"what for."

Sister Bess is at Mr. Peyton's doing well, and looking well. I do not think that she has any idea of going to Philadelphia now—nor have Mary and Kate. The northern people love us so much, and value us so highly that these girls naturally fear that they will be smothered in kindness, or hear too many pleasant things. But the chief object of this letter is to ask you and Frank and Loulie to come here. You see, from previous statements, that we still have something to eat—so you need not fear starvation. We will all be much pleased to see you, and Sister Bess will blow up with joy. Ben—rare Ben—is teaching school at Mr. Whitworth's in Painville. The same cranky, odd fish, as of old. Beck is well and sends love. Mary & Kate ditto, ditto.

Little Fort grows apace. Yesterday was his birthday—four years old. He gave a dinner to his friends, on the occasion, and treated them to sponge cake, custard, raspberries and cream, etc.

Little Sallie Fleming (9 mos.) is a little beauty. She looks wise, but says nothing—a safe example for many of us.

But I am tired of this scrawl.
Come—one and all.

As ever your affectionate brother,

M. F. T. Evans.
WILLIAMSBURG CARICATURED.

C. De La Pena to John Adams Smith.

Williamsburg Novr 3rd 1827.

John A. Smith Esq.
Richmond.

Dear Sir:

According to my promise I write to you from this sad place of solitude and exile, which in former and better times was the Capital of Virginia. As time destroys every thing, nothing remains here that would ascertain its past glories, but an old statue of an old wretched English general who was the first Governor of this State under the British dominion to be seen on the College's yard, and many half ruined wooden houses which afford a tranquil and peaceful asylum to insects of every description. The streets give an idea of the wonderful fertility of this soil, by their being covered with grass, and several cows, pigs, horses, mules and goats are to be seen pasturing undisturbed along them. I thought I was transported to Noah's Ark, when I first came into this town, so prodigious was the quantity of animals I met with, without seeing a single person till I reached the post office which stands in the center of Main St. It is one of the curiosities of this place. I wish I could describe it to you, but such thing is entirely out of my power, and I defy Walter Scott himself to do it, notwithstanding his astonishing imagination, but as to enable you to form an incorrect idea of this superb establishment I will tell you that there is not article whatever in the world which could not be found in it. It is a Book Seller's store in which you will find hams and French brandy; it is an apothecary's shop in which you can provide yourself with black silk stockings and shell oysters; it is a post office in which you may have gisters, chewing tobacco & in a word it is a museum of natural history in which we meet every afternoon to dispute about the Presidential election, and about the quality of Irish potatoes.

I do not recollect who was the blessed soul who told me in Richmond I would be delighted with the society here. I must confess that I am not delighted with it, at least I cannot dislike it, as such thing is by no means to be found in here.

I went some days past to the celebrated York, and scarcely had I been half an hour in that town when I was acquainted with every soul, having visited the famous Cafe in which the Commander of the English Army abode on account of his not being acostomed to smell
the cannon powder, and he was some what afraid of its affects. Judge how much pleased was I with that little bit of a town, that on my returning to Williamsburg I was quite delighted as I thought I entered in a Paradise.

Now I must speak in honest. The few persons I know here have paid me every kind of attention in their power and Doct. Cole's family in which I board is a very agreeable and interesting one. My situation here is a great deal better than I could imagine. I will on Monday next open my french class at the College as I think I will have about 40 students attending to it. I have also several scholars in town & in a few days I will very probably get more than I shall be able to attend.

I intend to pay a visit to my good friends of Richmond about Christmas time, and spend again in their society a few happy days. Has Miss Martha heard from Mr. Thompkinson? Do present my best respects to her, her sister, Mrs. Adams, Mrs. Deuby and Miss Harvey and remember me to the recollection of the Doctor, and the Messrs. D. Timberlake, R. Adams, Ferguson and all the members of our Club partisans of the Administration. Tell Mr. Adams I am very much indebted to him for his letter to Mr. Campbell who I found a very amiable and polite gentleman with whose society I am very much pleased.

Do write to me when you have nothing better to do, as I will always receive a great pleasure in hearing from you.

Farewell my good friend. Do sometimes think of those poor exiled who like me are far from their friends.

Adieu yours

de La Pena.*

---

*C. de La Pena was professor of Modern Languages at William and Mary College for several years. The little that is known of him is furnished by this letter.

Pray excuse my bad english.
SOME DESCENDANTS OF PATIENCE MCKINNE AND JOSEPH LANE, JR., OF HALIFAX, N. C.

(Communicated.)

1. Patience McKinne, daughter of Barnaby McKinne and Mary Exum, his wife, was born about 1715. Her estate, from her father who died 1759, was given her Nov. 18th 1760 and the proceeding recorded in N. C. Colonial and State Records, Vol. 6, pp. 383-384 and 481.

She married in Halifax, N. C., 1730, recorded in N. C. Colonial and State Records Book 2, p. 317 and 519, Joseph Lane Jr. b. 1710 d. 1774, son of Joseph Lane who lived in Jamestown, Va. before moving to N. C. In 1727 Joseph Lane Sr., with Major Barnabas McKinne and others, was elected a vestryman of the N. West Parish of Bertie. N. C. Records Vol. 25, p. 210.

In Vol. 5, p. 982 “The Executors of Joseph Lane,3 former sheriff of Edgecombe County (N. C.) was allowed £16 as his salary for the years 1751 and 1752, he having fully accounted with Mr. Haywood, former treasurer, and paid all taxes for these years, as also 40 shillings for summoning the court for Tryall of a negroe for felony and executing said negroe and as by account lodg’d with your committee £18—Nov. 27th 1758.” Joseph Lane,3 Sr. born 1665 d. 1758, it is supposed was the son of Jo2 Lane b. in England 1631, son of Richard1 b. 1597 and Alice1 b. 1605, sailed for Va. 1635-36.

“License to go beyond the seas April 16th 1635: these parties hereafter expressed are to be transported to the Island Providence, embarked in ye ‘Expectation’ Corneilius Bellinger, master, having taken the oath of Allegience and Supremacie as likewise being conformable to the church of England whereof they brought their testimonie from the minister and justices of Peace of their Abodes: Alice Lane,1 aged 30; Jo Lane,2 age 4; Samuel Lane2 aged 7; Oziel Lane,2 aged 3; Richard Lane,1 aged 38.”

Descendants of Patience McKinne and Joseph Lane


The children of Patience McKinne and Joseph Lane, Jr., were:

(These are mentioned in the records of Gov. David Swain, a descendant.)


II. Jesse Lane, born July 3rd 1733, died Oct. 28-1806 (?) married Dec. 16th, 1755, Winifred Aycock daughter of Wm Aycock, who took out a grant of land in Northumberland Co. N. C. 500 acres Aug. 26-1746 (N. C. Hist and Genealogical Register, 1900) and in Aug. 1779—was one of the grandjurors in the first court held in Wilkes Co., Georgia (G. G. Smith's "Story of Georgia") and his wife, Rebecca Pace, widow of Wm Bradford. Both Wm and Rebecca Pace Bradford Aycock were Welsh. [The Welsh name was Aweek.]

Winifred Aycock Lane was born April 11th 1741, died Dec. 16th, 1794, from pneumonia contracted from exposure when driven from her home by the Indians. She is buried in the "old cemetery" at Athens, Clarke Co., Ga. Her parents belonged to the church of England, of which church she also was a member until converted to Methodism by Rev. Humphries and Mr. Majors.

All of Winifred Aycock and Jesse Lane's children except the youngest, Elizabeth, who was born in Wilkes Co., Ga., were born in Wake Co., N. C.

II. Richard b. Feb. 9th 1759 m. Mary Flint.
III. Henry b. Mar. 28th 1760 died in infancy.
IV. Caroline b. May 26th 1761 m. David Lowry who was killed by the Indians. 2nd George Swain.

V. Rhoda b. May 21st 1763 m. John Rakestraw.

VI. Patience⁶ b. March 28th 1765 m. John Hart.

VII. Jonathan b. April 3rd 1767 m. Patience Rogers 2nd Mary Colley.

VIII. John b. Dec. 25th 1769 m. Elizabeth Street.

IX. Simeon b. March 10th 1771 m. Judith Humphrey.

X. Rebecca b. March 5th 1773 m. James Luckie.

XI. Joseph b. March 8th 1775 m. Elizabeth Hill.

XII. Mary twins b. Jan. 18th 1777 m. Thomas Kirkpatrick

XIII. Sara m. John Kirkpatrick

brothers.


XV. Jesse b. June 13th 1782 m. Rhoda Jolley.

XVI. Elizabeth b. Sept. 6th 1786 m. Wm Montgomery.

Jesse Lane⁵ was a grand old patriarch. He served in the American Revolution, being an officer in the Third N. C. Continentals (Army Accounts, Vol. 13, Section AA, p. 50—1782, also p. 175, 11-6, 1783). He with his son John (father of General Joseph Lane of Oregon) was in the battle of King’s Mountain. He moved to Georgia in 1784 first to Elberton Co., and thence to Oglethorpe County, thence to Jackson Co. (formed of a part of Clarke Co.), where he settled. With his son Jonathan and son in law, David Lowry, he built the first Methodist church in that part of Georgia in 1787, which was dedicated by Rev. Humphries and Majors.

III. Patience Lane,⁶ daughter of Winifred Aycock and Jesse Lane born March 28th 1765 married 1787 John Hart,⁴ son of Benjamin Hart³ and Nancy (Ann) Morgan Hart of N. C. thought to have been the daughter of Thomas and Rebecca Alexander Morgan, and granddaughter of James Morgan of Bucks Co., Penna. Nancy Morgan Hart was a woman of remarkable strength and decision of character. History records many deeds of daring achieved by her during the Rev. War and Georgia is justly proud of her, having recently hung a potrait of her in the Capitol at Atlanta.
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Benjamin^3 Hart was the son of Thos.^2 Hart, b. 1679, d. 1755, of Hanover Co. Va. and his wife Susanna Rice. Benj. was born in 1730 and died in 1798 in Brunswick, Glynn Co. Ga. He was buried in the old cemetery on Wright's Square [which no longer exists]. Deeds for the transfer of his estate are on record in Glynn Co., Vols. A, B, E, F, 1802. His brothers were 1Col. Thos. m. Susanna Rice. 2John died having one daughter who had no issue 3David m. Susanna Munn 4Nathaniel m. Sarah Simpson, and a sister 5Ann m. James Gooch, all of whom left descendants in Kentucky, who have since scattered widely.

John Hart,^4 second son of Benjamin and Ann (Nancy) Morgan Hart with four others founded Watkinsville, the county seat of Clarke Co., Ga., after an act passed Dec. 5-1801 to divide Jackson County. (Clayton's Digest of Laws of Ga. 1801 to 1810, p. 35.) John and Patience lived in Long Creek in 1788, 3 miles from Lexington in Oglethorpe Co. In 1791 they moved to Spark's Fort, near Athens. In 1792 they moved to the Oconee, 3 miles below Athens and in 1802 or 1803 moved to Ky. settling in Union County, what is now Henderson County seven miles south of the town of Henderson on the old Frog Island road. There in the family burying ground on the side of the hill below the old log house he and his wife and mother are buried. At the site of the house there is a pile of bricks which formerly was the chimney and some bits of broken crockery. Three long sunken graves—unmarked—are the resting place of John, Patience, and his mother, Ann (Nancy) Morgan Hart.

Gen. Joseph Lane of Oregon says: "My father, John Lane, and uncle John Hart and uncle Lowery were all good Indian fighters. In pursuit of the Indians who had been robbing outside settlers, they ventured too far, were attacked by warriors and Uncle Lowery was killed. This battle was with the Creek Indians 16 Sept. 1787."


The children of Patience Lane and John Hart were
Wm. Standley 2nd Wiley Suggs 5. Rebecca 5 m. Dr. Thomas Worthington. 6. Susanna m. ———— Floyd 2nd ———— Slack 3rd ———— Dixon 7. Rhoda m. ———— Floyd 2nd Talbot. 8. Mary m. Dr. Alex Bailey.

IV. Rebecca 5 Hart, daughter of Patience Lane and John Hart, born Feb. 28th 1797 in Georgia, died Aug. 15th 1866 in Dallas Co. Texas, married in Henderson Ky, 1817, Dr. Thos. Worthington, eldest son of William Worthington* and his wife, Mary Mason, born May 27th 1786 died in 1852—an eminent doctor and minister in Muhlenberg Co. Ky—where he lived and died, being buried at Island, McLean Co., Ky.

After the death of her husband, Rebecca Hart Worthington moved to Mississippi, but, at the outbreak of the war, moved to Dallas Co., Texas, where she remained until her death. She is buried at the W. W. Corinth Farm north of the city of Dallas.


V. Ann Amanda 6 Worthington, youngest child of Rebecca Hart and Dr. Thomas Worthington. born July 2nd 1841 married March 5th 1865 Captain Walter Anderson 6 Caruth born Feb. 1st 1826 in Allen Co. Ky—died Feb. 3rd 1897 Dallas Co. Texas—Capt. Caruth held large tracts of land in Dallas and Denton Counties. He was quartermaster of the Confederate Army stationed at Tyler, Texas during the Civil War, in Col. N. H. Darnell’s regiment and Col. Stone’s regiment to the close of the War. He was the son of John 5 Caruth born 1800, died Jan. 9th 1869 in Dallas Co., married April 13th 1824 Katherine Anderson, born in Allen Co. Ky. daughter of Wm Anderson thought to have been the son of John

*Note: Wm. Worthington was born in Berkeley Co., Va., 1761. Who were his parents, Also Mary Mason was from Philadelphia. Who were her parents? His Rev. War records is on file in the Bureau of Pensions.
Anderson of Augusta Co. Va., whose will 1787 is given by Boogher in "Gleanings of Va. Hist." Jno. speaks of his son Wm who is to have certain legacies "if he returns from his journey." It is thought Wm. went to Ky. and remained there. It is known that Katherine Anderson Caruth (spelt Carruth interchangeably—sometimes both ways in a single document in the old Ky. and Texas records) had two brothers at least—Samuel and Hiram, the latter moved to Louisiana where he died. If he left descendants they are unknown to the writer.*

The children of Jno. Carruth and Katherine Anderson were:

Jno. Carruth is buried in Dallas Co., Tex., on the W. W. Caruth Farm north of the city of Dallas. He was the second son of Capt. Walter Carruth and Ann (Nancy) Barr, thought to have been a daughter of Capt. James Barr of Mecklenburg Co., N. C. (proof desired). Capt. Walter Carruth was born about 1750 in N. C. presumably Mecklenburg Co., and died about 1820 in Macon Co. Tenn. at Carruth Fort where he was buried with his wife. Their children were.

1. Thomas (eldest child) b. abt. 1898
2. Jno. b. 1800 m. Katharine Anderson 2nd Emily Stark: no issue.
3. Samuel m. Tabitha Manion
4. Mark m. Anderson (perhaps sister or cousin of Katharine).
5. Henry Clay m. Mary Mansfield.
6. Elizabeth m. Austin

Capt. Walter Carruth was Justice of Mecklenburg Co. 1778. Was commissioned Captain of the Cavalry of the N. W. Border from Lincoln Co. 1787. Apt'd wagonmaster and Issuing Commander 1782. (Original documents in the possession of Geo. Wm. Caruth, Little Rock, Ark., son of Henry Clay Caruth.) He was also given a very complimentary letter of introduction by prominent N. C. men when he left N. C. to go West. He was the third son of Adam Carruth and Elizabeth ——. Adam Carruth

*Note: Proof is desired.
was born abt. 1715 in Penna. d. 1782. Will recorded in Lincoln N. C. Mentions “three sons and three sons-in-law.” Witnessed by Major Jno. Carruth of Lincoln, Robert Carruth and Elizabeth Carruth. It is presumed by the disposal of the estate that Elizabeth was his wife. Walter Carruth of Ark., son of Major Jno testifies in a document owned by the writer that the sons were his father, “uncles Walter and Robert Carruth.” It is thought Robert Carruth married Elizabeth, dau. of Robt. Anderson (the Robt. Anderson being mentioned in Adam Carruth’s will). (See Boogher’s "Gleamings of Va. Hist.," page 314.)


In the land grants to Carruths: In 1753 and 1755 Walter Carruth Book 2, p. 128—300 acres in Anson Co. 1705 Book 6, p. 125 302 Acres in Rowan Co. 1753 Book 16, p. 30—1755—Anson Co. 300 acres, and no further issues to a Walter, therefore it may be said Walter lived and died in Anson Co. N. C. though no will or further proof has been obtained to date 1919. In N. C. Colonial and State records, Vol. 4, p. 951. “At a council at New Bern 11th April 1749—the Governor appointed Walter Carruth a Justice of the Peace with the County of Anson and was reappointed 1751, p. 1243.


Book 18, p. 148-381—in 1765 and 1767—100 and 251 acres (resp.) in Mecklenburg Co. N. C.

Book 17—p. 164 April 1765—100 acres in Mecklenburg

" "—" 418 " 1767—261 " " "

" 23—" 305 " 1768—100 " " "

" "—" 80 " 1767—164 " " "
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"55—" 54 Nov. 1784—100 "Lincoln Co.
Which shows how he moved around. Walter² and Adam³ were the first of the name to receive land.


"Thomas McCormick, son of James McCormick, was born about 1702, married in Ireland, Elizabeth Carruth born about 1705, died Jan. 1767, in Cumberland Co. Pa., daughter of Adam Carruth, and sister of Walter Carruth both early settlers of Hanover Township, Lancaster Co. Pa."

Therefore it is thought the above Adam¹ was the father of Walter,² whose son was Adam³ father of Capt. Walter⁴ Carruth, who died in Tenna, and whose grandson was Capt. Walter⁶ Anderson Carruth.

The children of Capt. Walter⁶ Anderson Carruth and Ann Amanda⁶ Worthington were:
1. Minnie Belle b. 1866 died in infancy.
2. Mattie b. 1868 m. N. A. McMillan of St. Louis, Mo.
4. Kistie b. 1874 died in infancy.
5. William b. 1876 m. Sidney Scott of Joplin, Mo.
7. Raymond Percy b. 1885 m. Margaret Scruggs.

VI. Raymond Percy⁷ Carruth, the youngest child, was born Jan. 27th 1885 married June 6th 1912 Margaret Scruggs, daughter of Marion Stuart Price and Gross Robert Scruggs, born Feb. 18th 1892. Their children are:

MUMFORD AND MUNFORD FAMILIES.
(Continued from page 68.)

Quite distinct, at least in later generations, from this Mumford family, was the Munford family which had its habitat in Prince George, Amelia and Mecklenburg Counties. This family apparently begins with James Munford, who patented 50¼ acres of land in "Westopher parish," Charles City Co., 20 April, 1689, in that part of the County on the South side of James River, afterwards Prince George County. In this patent, as recorded, the name is spelt Mumfort, and it may be that he was a brother of Edward Mumford of Warwick and Gloucester Counties, and that Edward and this James were children of Thomas "Mumpford," who patented in Nansemond County in 1664.

A fragment of a Charles City record book shows that in 1684 James Munford was the executor of Robert Wyatt, deceased, probably a son of Capt. Anthony Wyatt, who was born in 1604 and came to Virginia in 1624, and lived at Chaplin's Choice near Jordan's Point. James Munford probably married the daughter of Robert Wyatt, and hence the name of his son Robert Munford, who under the name of Robert Mumford patented in 1704 the 50¼ acres in Westover parish "formerly granted 20 April, 1689, unto James Mountfort."

Robert Munford, spelt more generally "Mumford" in the various patents obtained by him, married in 1701 Martha Kennon, daughter of Col. Richard Kennon, of Conjuror's Neck. (Henrico Co. Records.) He was a vestryman of Bristol Parish, colonel of the Prince George militia, and member of the House of Burgesses. He ceased to be a member of the vestry of Bristol Parish in 1735, and probably died about that time.

He had issue 1 James Munford, to whom calling him "son," he made a deed in 1727 (Prince George Co. records), 2 Robert. There is no direct proof that Col. Robert Munford had a son Robert, but there can be little doubt. After Col. Robert Munford's name drops from the vestry book of Bristol Parish in 1735
“Mr. Robert Munford” is elected a member. 3 Edward, born Nov. 11, 1726. (Bristol Parish Register.)

James Munford, son of Robert Munford, Sr., served in the vestry of Bristol Parish, Prince George Co., from 1728 to 1744, and was major of militia. He is pleasantly mentioned by William Byrd in his Land of Eden. After 1744 he lived in Amelia County. He married Elizabeth Bolling, daughter of Robert Bolling, in 1727-28 (Wm. and Mary Quarterly, V, 276) and had issue named in Bristol parish register 1 Martha born 28 Sept., 1728, 2 James born Sept. 16, 1732, 3 Susanna born March 29, 1734. Besides these children, no one of whom is mentioned in his will, he had, named therein, 4 William, 5 Robert. He had also 6 Thomas Bolling, not named in father’s will, but named as “brother” in 5 Robert’s will, and 7 Edward, named as “brother” in Thomas Bolling Munford’s will.

Major James Munford’s will was dated March 16, 1754, and proved in Amelia County 25 April, 1754. Besides his sons, William and Robert, he names his wife Elizabeth, to whom he gives land on the lower side of the Sweathouse Creek, including the Plantation during her natural life, and after her decease to his son William, together with all the furniture and stock of cattle, hogs, &c., including “one dozen silver spoons,” which have the arms of the Bolling Family.” One of the legacies also to his son Robert was one dozen spoons marked R. M. In the inventory of the personal estate, there is mention of “1 doz. silver spoons to J. Munford.”

Robert Munford, son of Major James Munford, represented Amelia in the House of Burgesses in 1765, 1766-68, 1769, 1770 and 1771. From 1760 to 1773 he was also clerk of Halifax County, succeeding George Currie, who was clerk from 1752 to 1760. He married Anne Brodnax (marriage bond Feb. 11, 1755), probably the daughter of that name of Edward Brodnax, of Charles City County, stated on family tradition not to have married (Wm. & Mary Quarterly, XIV, p. 136). There is a deed recorded in Amelia from Robert Munford and Anne, his wife, William Munford and Prudence, his wife, and William Wilson, Jr., dated March 31, 1773, by which 300 acres on the South side of Sweathouse Creek
were transferred. William Wilson, Jr., had probably married one of the daughters of James Munford.

Robert Munford, calling himself of "Nottoway Parish, Amelia County," made his will Sept. 9, 1771, but it was not proved till 1778. It names his wife Anne, who is to have the land on which he now lives, and mentions children without naming them. Makes "Brother Thomas Bolling Munford" and Vivian Brooking executors. Vivian Brooking married Elizabeth Brodnax, sister of Anne Munford. (See William and Mary Coll. Quarterly, XIV, 136.) In 1773 Robert Munford is called Robert Munford, Sr., to distinguish him doubtless from Col. Robert Munford, of Mecklenburg, who was rather younger.

William Munford, brother of Robert Munford, married Prudence Ward (marriage bond dated Jany 11, 1768). He was a captain in the War of the Revolution, and was living in 1780, when he made a deed for land on both sides of Sweathouse Creek.

Thomas Bolling Munford, another brother, was a member of the House of Delegates from Amelia County in 1777 and 1778. He married Jane Watson (marriage bond, Feb. 1766), and his will, dated 24 April, 1780, is on record in Amelia. The inventory of his personal estate was recorded Jan. 24, 1782. To his wife Jane he devised 400 acres, including the buildings on "my Manor plantation known as Bollingbrook," likewise a single chair, and certain slaves, and after her death "they and their increase to be equally divided among my surviving children by my executors, as they separately come of age." "Brother Edward Munford and worthy friends Richard Jones, Samuel Sherwin, Nathan Fletcher and Samuel Davis" executors. Two of his sons were doubtless Richard Jones Munford, and Thomas Munford, of Nottoway County, who were living in 1800. See Wm. & Mary Quarterly, XXVI, 42, 43.

Edward Munford, brother of Major James Munford, married Elizabeth Hall, widow of Edward Brodnax of Charles City Co., who died in 1748. He moved to North Carolina, and in 1760 Edward Munford of Halifax County, North Carolina, conveyed 620 acres in Amelia on Deep Creek, bounding on the land of Robert Munford,
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(Amelia County records). And on May 1, 1769* Edward Munford and Betty, his wife, of Halifax County, N. C., conveyed land on Tomahun Creek in Charles City County, "devised for life to Betty Brodnax now Munford." (Charles City Co. records.)

We now take up Robert Munford, second son of Robert Munford and Martha Kennon. He was vestryman of Bristol Parish, Prince George Co. from 1735, and represented the county in the General Assembly from 1736 to 1740. The Bland Papers state that he married Anna Bland, born Feb. 25, 1711, 3rd daughter of Richard Bland the Antiquary, and had issue three children: Robert, Theodorick Bland (born Feb. 21, 1742), and Elizabeth (born Sept. 22, 1734).

Of these "Captain" Theodorick Bland Munford attended the grammar school of William and Mary College in 1753-54, and died at Col. John Banister's residence in Dinwiddie County, in October, 1772 (William and Mary Quarterly, IX, p. 240), and Elizabeth Munford married Col. John Banister in 1755 (marriage bond, Ibid., XIX, 274-276). She appears to have been his first wife, and is not noticed in the Banister pedigrees. Col. Banister married 2dly. Martha, daughter of Col. Theodorick Bland, of "Cawsons," and 3rdly. Anna, daughter of John Blair, of Williamsburg.

This Robert Munford, who married Anna Bland, died in December, 1744, whereupon his widow married George Currie, who was first clerk of Halifax County, and had by him two daughters. Robert Munford, eldest son of Robert Munford and Anna Bland, was educated at the Academy in Leeds, Yorkshire, and, on reaching manhood, served as captain in the French and Indian War. Two of his letters written in 1758 from the "camp near Cumberland," are printed in the "Bland Papers," while another appears in the Calendar of State Papers. After the peace, when the County of Mecklenburg was formed in 1765 he was appointed county lieutenant, continuing in that office till his death in 1784.

*By mistake in the punctuation this date is given as the date of the marriage of Edward Brodnax to Elizabeth Hall in William and Mary Coll. Quarterly, XIV, 135.
He was also one of the first two representatives for that county in the House of Burgesses, remaining a member till 1775, and in 1779 and 1780 he was a member of the House of Delegates.

During the American Revolution Robert Munford performed much service in recruiting soldiers for the American army. He was a scholar, and in 1798 his son William Munford published a collection of his "Plays and Poems," a copy of which is in the State Library. The book was printed in Petersburg by William Prentiss, with a Preface written by William Munford. He married Anna Beverley, daughter of William Beverley, and died, as stated in 1784. His will dated Dec. 16, 1783, and proved Feb. 8, 1784, was recorded in Mecklenburg County, and names children (1) Elizabeth B. Kennon, (2) Ursula A. Byrd and (3) William. He names also his sons-in-law Richard Kennon, who succeeded him as county lieutenant and Otway Byrd.

William Munford, only son of Col. Robert Munford and Anna Beverley, his wife, was born in Mecklenburg County August 15, 1775. He was only eight years old when his father died. He studied the ancient languages and literature under George Wythe, who conducted private classes in the classics in Williamsburg, and studied law both under Wythe and Judge Tucker (1790-1794) at the College.* He practiced law in the courts and was member of the House of Delegates for Mecklenburg in 1798-99, 1800-01, and 1801-02. He also represented the county in the Senate 1802-03, 1803-04, and 1805-06. In 1806 he removed to Richmond, where he became one of the foremost lawyers, and on the death of his old friend and preceptor, George Wythe, in that year he made the funeral address. He was appointed to the Privy Council, and served till 1811, when he was appointed clerk of the House of Delegates, holding that office till his death. He also acted as reporter of the Supreme Court of Appeals, and his work is embodied in Hening and Munford's Reports (1808-1812), and in Munford's Reports (1812-1818)—ten volumes in all.

*For extracts from Munford's letters while at College, see William and Mary College Quarterly, VIII, 153-157.
In 1819 he assisted Benjamin Watkins Leigh in the revision of the Statute laws of Virginia.

Mr. Munford was one of the most scholarly men of his day, and inherited the love of poetry from his father. But his tastes and ability in this line were far greater. Of his poetry the earliest published was in 1798—“Poems and Compositions in Prose on several occasions, by William Munford, of the County of Mecklenburg and State of Virginia.” The book was printed in Richmond by Samuel Pleasants, and a copy is in the State Library. He occupied the leisure of his maturer year in making a translation of the “Iliad,” which has been pronounced by competent critics superior to Pope’s famous translation. It was published posthumously in 1848. Mr. Munford died at Richmond, Virginia, June 21, 1825.


For later generations, see Slaughter’s Bristol Parish (194-199).

Charles City Co. Munfords. In Charles City County resided another family of Munfords, but of them the loss of records permits only an imperfect account.

In 1737 the will of Jeffrey Munford was produced in court and proved. He was probably father of William Greene Munford, a prominent citizen of that county. The latter was member of the Charles City County Committee of Safety in 1775, and major of the militia during the Revolution. He served in the House of Delegates from 1781 to 1785, as a colleague of John Tyler. His
will dated February 8, 1786 was proved May 3, 1786, and names issue (1) Robert (2) John, (3) Stanhope, (4) William Greene, (5) Mary, mar. John Lightfoot, of James City Co, (6) Elizabeth.

His son, Robert Munford, was lieutenant in the Revolution and married Margaret W. Harwood, dau. of Major Samuel Harwood of Weyanoke and Margaret Woddrop, his wife. He was clerk of Charles City County Court from 1797 to his death in 1800. His will, dated December 12, 1799, was proved March 24, 1800, and names two sons Samuel and Robert. These two sons removed to Gloucester County, where they died and lie buried. Margaret Ann Munford, a posthumous child, of Robert Munford, the clerk, married Mr. John Sinclair, of "Shabby Hall," Gloucester Co., which was subsequently sold to Robert C. Selden, and is now called "Sherwood." (See for Munford wills and notes thereon, Wm. & Mary College Quarterly, XI, 260-264.)


Mumfords of New England. There is in the yard of Christ Church, Alexandria, Virginia, a tombstone to the memory of Capt. George Mumford, of New London, Connecticut, who died in Georgetown July 17, 1773. His grandfather, Thomas Mumford, is said to have come to Rhode Island from England, and married Sarah Sherman. Capt. Mumford had an elder brother, Thomas Mumford, whose portrait is preserved by his descendant Edward Winston Paige of New York. Wm. & Mary College Quarterly, X, p. 107; XI, 76.
86. Charles Thornton5 (Anthony4, Anthony3, Francis2, William1), of "North Garden," Caroline County, Va., and of Kentucky, commonly called "Captain" Charles Thornton (doubtless from his holding that rank in the Militia) married, 1st, Mary, daughter and heiress of Wm. Jones, of Essex. She had no issue.

He married 2ndly, Sarah, daughter of John Fitzugh, of "Belair," Stafford County, Va. Captain Thornton moved to Oldham County, Ky., about 1812.

Issue: 161, Fitzugh,6 married Caroline Fitzugh, and died in Henry County, Mo., in 1864; all of his children died without issue, except Sarah Ann,7 who married James Todd, of Henry County, Ky.; 162, Alice6 died unmarried; 163, Henrietta,6 married Frank Taliaferro, of Orange County, Va.; 164, Katherine Presley,6 married Cole Fitzugh and had a daughter, Ann, who married Richard F. Taylor and lives near Windsor, Henry County, Mo.; 165, Elizabeth,6 married Richard Merriwether, of Shelby, Ky., and had one son, Richard, who died without issue; 166; Dr. Charles,6 married Mary Taliaferro, and had a large family, and has many descendants; all of his children are dead, except Reuben T.7 Thornton, of Nevada, Vernon County, Mo.; 157, Dr. John Henry Fitzugh,6 married, 1st, Mary Symmes, daughter of President William Henry Harrison, and had issue: (a), Wm. Henry Harrison,7 of Ellettsville, Monroe County, Indiana; unmarried; (b), Charles, surgeon in the United States Army; died unmarried; (c) Anna Harrison,7 died January 17, 1883, married Lee Mason Fitzugh, of "Fern Bank," Ohio; (d), Alice Elizabeth,7 married John C. Lewis, of Chicago; (e), Lucy Harrison,7 died young; (f) John Fitzugh,7 of "Fern Bank," married Lela Morgan West, and had Charles;8

*This number of the Thornton Family, being out of print, is re-published here from Vol. VI. 109-113, William and Mary College Quarterly.
died young. Dr. John Thornton married, 2ndly, Sarah Fitzugh, and had Susan Fitzugh, and George Fitzugh. 168, Daniel McCarty, purser United States Navy, married, 1st, Susan, daughter of Hay Taliaferro; 2ndly, Mary, daughter of Gen. Lawrence T. Dade, and had issue: first marriage: (a) Charles Hay, served in Confederate States Army; married Betty Johnson, and had issue: Charles Hay, Virginia Susan, and Nathaniel; (b), Henry, served in the Richmond Howitzers, C. S. A.; married Betty Conway, and had Henry and Marian; (c), Virginia married Dr. Frederick Roddy, of Richmond; (d), Emma, married first, Nathaniel Norfleet, and secondly, Col. Wm. E. Cutshaw, C. S. A., of Richmond: (second marriage): (e), Lawrence; (f), Baylor, married; (g), Foxhall A. Parker, married; (h), Hay, married; (i), McCarty, married; (j) Arthur Conway, Lucy, married Catlett Conway; (l), Mary, married Catlett Conway; 169, Henry, married a Miss Curry, and left an only son, Charles Henry Thornton, who married twice, leaving by his first marriage, a daughter, Sallie, and by the second (Mrs. Belle Thornton, who survives, and is living at Los Angeles, California), two children; 170, Francis, married Anne Rose Thornton, and died near Jacksonville, Ill., leaving a number of children: 171, William Tucker.

87. GEORGE Thornton (Anthony, Anthony, Francis, William), born in Caroline County, Va., November 18, 1752; died August 30, 1853, aged nearly 101 years; married June 9, 1774, Margaret Stanley. He served in the Revolution as a private in Capt. Wm. Buckner's and other companies of militia, and later received a pension; the papers in regard to it have been preserved. About 1784 he removed to what is now Green County, Va. Issue: 172, Catherine Taliaferro, born August 18, 1775; 173, Ann, born March 5, 1779; lived in Madison County, Va.; 175, Mary P., born September 20, 1781; married Willis Kirtley and removed to Kentucky; 176, Charles, born December 12, 1783; removed to Muhlenberg County, Ky., and had a son, Edward; 177, George born March 3, 1786; 178, Lucy Buckner (twin), born March 3, 1786; married ——— Smoot, Madison county, Va.; 179, Thomas
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S.,6 married Mary Herndon, and had George,7 Varinda,7 and Lucy7; 180, Anthony8; 181, John,9 born October 31, 1792; removed to Muhlenberg county, Ky.

88. Reuben5 Thornton (Anthony,4 Anthony,3 Francis,2 William1), was justice of the peace for Spottsylvania in 1805; married Mildred, daughter of Benjamin and Priscilla (Rootes) Grymes. Mrs. Mildred Thornton married, secondly, Peter Dudley. In her will, dated March 16, 1822 and proved in Spotsylvania in September 1822, she made bequests to her son, Anthony R. Thornton, and his wife, Mildred B., and his daughter, Mildred Ann Grymes Thornton; to Mary H., wife of her son, Benjamin G. Thornton; to Ann, wife of her son, Wm. F. Thornton; to Maria, wife of her son, Reuben Thornton; to Susan, wife of her son, Nicholas C. Thornton; to Lucy B., wife of her son, Charles T. Thornton; and to her nephew John A., son of Wm. Wedderburn.

Lucy Rootes Grymes made a will, dated April 18, 1812, and proved in Spottsylvania November 3, 1817, in which she made bequests to her nephews, Benj. Grymes Thornton, Reuben Thornton, Anthony Thornton, Wm. Fitzugh Thornton and Charles Taliaferro Thornton; and to her sister, Mildred Dudley.

Issue: 182, Anthony R.6 married Mildred B. Walker; 193, Benjamin Grymes, married Mary H. Northa; 184, William Fitzugh6; 185, Reuben, married Maria ———; 186, Anna; 187, Nicholas Cabell,6 married Susan ———; 188, Charles Taliaferro,6 married Lucy B. ———.

89. Presley5 Thornton (Anthony,4 Anthony,3 Francis,2 William1), born 1760; died in Kentucky, November 5th, 1811. He was commissioned Cornet in the Third Continental Dragoons February 21, 1777; was promoted to Lieutenant and captain, and served till 1783. On June 17, 1783, a warrant was issue to him for 4,000 acres of bounty land for three years' service; and on March 30, 1796, a warrant for 666 2/3 acres more for his seventh year's service. When the first warrant was issued the following certificate was filed:

"I do certify that Captain Presley Thornton was appointed a Cornet in the 3d Regiment of Light Dragoons the 17th of March, 1777; he was promoted to the rank of Second Lieutenant the 27th
of May, 1778; also to the rank of First Lieut. the 15th of November 1778; and to a Captaincy the 10th of May, 1780, which commission he resigned the 25th of March, 1781.

George Baylor,
Colo. of the 1st Regiment of Cavalry."

Captain Thornton subsequently reentered the army, and served to the end of the war. He married Alice, daughter of Col. Francis Thornton, of "Society Hill." Issue: 189, Francis Anthony; 190, Sally Fitzugh, died aged eighteen months; 191, McCarty, died in New Orleans, aged twenty-two years; 192, Presley, died aged one year; Elizabeth Presley, married Dr. Avery Gwin of Kentucky.

91. Dr. Henry F. Thornton (Anthony, Anthony, Francis, William), born July 14, 1763; married Ann Rose, daughter of John Fitzugh, of "Bellair." Issue: 194, Anthony; born July 29, 1796; 195, John; 196, Maria, married Edward Fitzugh; 197, Susan, married —— Meriwether; 198, Harriett married John Conway; 199, Ann, married Anthony Thornton; 200, Dr. Henry, Jr., died unmarried; 201, Eliza.

92. Thomas Griffin Thornton (Anthony, Anthony, Francis, William), of Caroline County (he bought "Ormsby" from his brother Anthony), was born June 11, 1775. He was a justice and Sheriff of Caroline, and, while holding that latter office, he was murdered by a man against whom he had a writ. Mr. Thornton was, in his day, noted as a fox hunter; and the American Turf Register and Sporting Magazine contains anecdotes illustrative of the great excellence of his hounds. He married, October 19, 1796, Ann H., daughter of William and Sarah (Digges) Fitzugh, of Fauquier county. Issue: 202, Susan; 203, William; 204, Sarah, married Lewis Battaile; 205; Harriet, married Charles Jesse; 206, Gordon; 207, Thomas Griffin; 208, Mary Digges, married Chas. Jesse (another); 209, Ellen, married —— Catlett.

93. John Thornton (Anthony, Anthony, Francis, William), of "Fairfield," near Guiney's station, Caroline county (the place where General Jackson died), and afterwards of "Ormsby," was born March 4, 1775 (so given in a copy from the
family Bible, but evidently erroneous, as his brother T. G. is given as born on June 11 of the same year); married, first, September 17, 1795, Sarah daughter of George and Mary (Digges) Fitzugh, of Fauquier county; married, secondly, Mildred Washington Dade; married thirdly, October 22, 1812, Jane Laughlin; no issue except by first marriage. Issue: 210, Susan, married Captain Royston; 211, George Fitzugh, John; 212, Mary Ann, married Wm. Royston; 213, Edward Digges; 214, William Fitzugh; 215, Addison F.; 216, Elinor.


104. Francis Thornton (Francis, Francis, Francis, Francis, William), of “Fall Hill,” Spottsylvania County, born 1760, died — ——; was appointed justice of the peace for Spottsylvania county in 1790; married Sally, daughter of Judge Harry Innes, of Kentucky, and niece of James Innes, colonel in the Revolution, and attorney-general of Virginia. Issue: 222, Elizabeth, born December 22, 1793; married J. H. Fitzgerald, of Fredericksburg; 223, Francis; 224 Harry Innes; 225, Sally Innes, born January 11, 1799; married Murray Forbes, of Falmouth, Va. 226, James Innes; 227, Robert Callaway, born 1802; died unmarried; 228, Catherine, born 1804; married Thomas Marshall, of “Happy Crrek,” Fauquier county, Va.; 229, Butler Brayne, born 1806; died 1833.

(To be continued.)
THE CHENOWETH FAMILY.

By Arthur L. Keith, Northfield, Minnesota.

The founder of this family appears to have been John Chinoweth who died in Frederick County, Virginia, in 1746. He probably lived for a time in Baltimore County, Maryland, and in that county part of his children continued to live after John Chinoweth had moved on to Virginia. A descendant of John Chinoweth, Jr., eldest son of John Chenoweth, Sr., gives me the information that John, Jr., was born in 1706.

This agrees well with the following items taken from the records of St. George's Parish, Baltimore County. John Chennerworth (sic) and Mary Smith were married Nov. 26, 1730-31. William Chennerworth, son of the above, was born Jan. 8, 1732. John Watson and Mary Chennerworth, spinster, were married May 24, 1733. A comparison with the will of John Chinoweth, 1746, Frederick Co., Va., given below, shows that these persons belong to his family. These are the earliest records I have found relating to the family of the blacksmith John Chinoweth. Probably he came to this country shortly before 1730 and before 1746 with a part of his family moved to Frederick Co., Va. Arthur Chenworth and Richard Chenworth were land-owners in Baltimore County in 1750.

In Frederick Co., Va., on Apr. 11, 1746, John Chinoweth, blacksmith, made his will, probated May 6, 1746. Witnesses were Joseph Stanley, Mary Stanley, and William Jolliffe. He mentions wife (not by name), children John (eldest), Richard, Arthur, William, Thomas, Mary Watson, Hannah Carter, and Ruth Pettit; grandson John Watson, Jr.; son-in-law John Petit. Son Thomas Chinoweth and James Carter were appointed executors.

Another John Chenowith (sic) made will in Frederick Co., Va., on Nov. 3, 1770, probated Mch. 5, 1771. Witnesses were John Salsberry, William Salsberry, and M. Morgan. He mentions wife Mary, who is appointed executrix; eldest sons William and John, who receive land in Hampshire County on the Cacapon; sons Absalom, Thomas, and Richard, who receive land on which the
testator lives; son Abraham (probably an error for Absalom as he is not heard of again); son Arthur; daughters Elizabeth, Mary, and Rachel; son-in-law James Stuart; granddaughter Mary Chenowith, daughter of eldest son, William, whose legacy is conditioned on her remaining with her grandmother until she becomes of age. Son Richard is to receive testator's smith's tools. This John of 1771 is undoubtedly the son of the John of 1746.

William Chenowith whose will was probated in Frederick County, Va., in 1772 was the son of the John who died in 1771 and identical with the William born in Baltimore County, Jan. 8, 1732. He mentions wife Jane; sons John, Jonathan, and William; and daughter Mary. He refers to Mary's deceased mother, so Jane was not his first wife. From other sources it is known that this William Chenoweth married 1. Ruth Calvert and had John Chenoweth, born 1755; Jonathan Chenoweth, born 1757; Mary Chenoweth, born 1759 (mentioned in the will of John, 1771, see above); and William Chenoweth, born June 18, 1760. This last named William will be given below.

The will of Absolum Chenowith was probated in Berkeley County, Va., Apr. 12, 1773. (Berkeley was formed from Frederick in 1772). This Absolum was born 1745 and was the son of John who died in 1771. The will was witnessed by James Seaton, William Chenoweth, and John Hanna. Wife Ruth and Morgan Morgan are named as executors. Testator mentions brother William's son William who had been bound to him to learn the blacksmith's trade. His children were James (born Dec. 21, 1767, died May 12, 1815); Absolum Chenoweth (who in 1821 was living in Jefferson County, Kentucky, with wife Lydia, and children Stephen, John, Ephraim, Ross, Mary, and Angelina); and Ann Chenoweth (who married James Boggs).

In Berkeley Co., Va., on Mch. 15, 1773, Mary Chenowith, widow of John Chenowith, Absolum Chenowith and Ruth, his wife, Arthur Chenowith and Margaret his wife, all of Berkeley Co., Va.; and Thomas Chenowith and Rachel, his wife, of Baltimore Co., Md., sell to George Scott land on the drains of Mill Creek and branch of Opeckon, granted by patent to the aforesaid John Chenowith,
on Oct. 6, 1764. The Absolum, Arthur, and Thomas of the above deed are undoubtedly sons of the John who died in 1771.

Joseph Chenoweth of Berkeley Co., Va., made will Sept. 23, 1785, probated Oct. 18, 1785. Witnesses were William Chenoweth, Gabriel Hays, and John Hays. Wife Sarah is mentioned and daughter Newly (?). Brother Absolum Chenoweth is appointed executor. This Joseph was the son of the following William Chenoweth.

William Chenoweth of Berkeley County, Va., made will Oct. 10, 1785, probated Dec. 20, 1785. He mentions wife Anne; sons Absolum and William, and heirs of son Joseph, deceased; daughters Mary, Ann, and Hannah. Son William and wife Anne are appointed executors. This William could be no other than the son of the blacksmith John Chinoweth of 1746. He is to be identified with William Chenoweth of Frederick Co., Va., who on Feb. 12, 1743-4 bought land on Mill Creek, a branch of the Opeckon, from John Mills, Sr., of Prince George Co., Md. William Chenoworth of Fredericks Co., Va., in 1752 received grant for 171 acres. In Berkeley County on Oct. 6, 1788, Absolum Chenowith and Anne Chenowith sold to Adam Smith land conveyed by John Mills to William Chenowith.

We turn now to Hampshire County, Va. In 1753 John Chenoth (sic) received grant for 248 acres on the Great Cacapehon. On Nov. 26, 1771, William Chenoweth of Frederick Co., Va., and wife Jane sold to John Chenoweth of Hampshire County 124 acres on Great Cape Capon, which had been bequeathed him by his father John Chenoweth and granted to the said John Chenoweth, dec'd by Rt. Hon. Thomas Lord Fairfax, Mch 3, 1753.

The following heads of households were living in Hampshire County in 1784; John Chenoworth, Sr (probably the son of John who died in Frederick County in 1771), John Chenoworth, Jr (probably son of the preceding), Jonathan Chenoworth (probably son of the William who died in Frederick County in 1772), and Arthur Chenoworth (probably son of the John who died in 1771). In Hampshire County in Apr. 1791, John Chenoweth and Mary, his wife, sold land to John Copsey. On Apr. 19, 1811 John Chenoweth of Hampshire County made will, probated Sept. 14, 1812.
Witnesses were Abraham Cresswell, George Cole, William Nixon, Joseph Nixon, and Thomas Megrow. He mentions wife Eleanor; sons William, Absolum, John, James, and Elias Chenoweth; daughters Elizabeth Monroe, Eleanor Ashbrooke, Rachel Ashbrooke, and Mary Ashbrooke. He refers to land on south side of Cacapon Mountain. Executors are son William and John Monroe. This John Chenoweth is probably the son of the John who died in Frederick County in 1771.

The following did military service in the Revolution from Va.: Jonathan Chenoweth, John Chineworth, Thomas Chinoworth, Richard Chinoweth (captain), and William Chinoweth, the last two names being found in the Illinois papers, indicating that they probably served in Kentucky. On June 28, 1827, Mary Chenoweth, aged 75, widow of John, applied for a pension from Randolph Co., Va. Her maiden name is given as Pugh.

We now take up the records of Baltimore County, Maryland. Notwithstanding published statements to the contrary, I regard Arthur Chenworth and Richard Chenworth, landholders in this county in 1750, as certainly the sons of John Chinoweth, blacksmith, who died in Frederick Co., Va., in 1746. We shall note their wills below. Thomas Chinoworth and Rachel Moore were married Sept. 14, 1766 in St. George's Parish, Baltimore Co., Md. He was undoubtedly the son of the second John of Frederick Co., Va., as shown by the deed of Mch. 15, 1773, given above. Thomas and Rachel Chenoweth had the following children: Elizabeth, born Apr. 8, 1768; Ruxton, born Dec. 12, 1769; and Mary, born Sept. 8, 1772.

In 1766 Nicholas Ruxton Gay of Baltimore Co., Md., made deed of gift to Thomas Chenoweth, Jr and wife Rachel, "she being my niece." From what Sr this Jr after Thomas's name is to distinguish him, I do not know unless it may be the son of Richard or of Arthur, both of whom had sons named Thomas living at this time in Baltimore County. The Thomas who married Rachel Moore seems to have died before Nov. 27, 1783, for on that date his inventory is presented to the Baltimore court by James Moore, his admr and next of kin. Another Thomas Chinoworth and Rachel
Morris were married Jan. 1, 1788, apparently both of Harford Co., Md.


Richard Chenoweth, blacksmith, of Baltimore Co., Md., made will Oct. 1, 1781, probated Dec. 4, 1781 (1785?). He mentions wife Kezia; sons Richard, Arthur, Thomas, Joseph, William; grandson Richard, son of John, dec'd; and daughters Susanna Price, Hannah Ashton, and Kezia Chenoweth, Jr. Executors are wife Kezia and son Joseph. This Richard Chenoweth I regard as certainly the son of John of Frederick Co., Va., 1746.

Arthur Chenoweth of Baltimore County made will Dec. 4, 1800, probated Apr. 7, 1802. He mentions sons Richard, Samuel, Thomas; daughter Ruth Butler; granddaughter Elizabeth, daughter of Richard Chenoweth. Son Richard is appointed executor. I regard this Arthur Chenoweth as identical with the Arthur Chenoweth, Sr of Baltimore County who in 1761 made deed of gift to his son Arthur Chenoweth, Jr. Likewise in 1768 he made gift of land to his son John Chenoweth. Sons Arthur and John are not mentioned in the will of Arthur, given above, probably because they had received their portions by gifts. The date of birth of this Arthur Chenoweth is given as 1716 in a chart of the family prepared in 1893 by Nimrod H. Chenoweth of Dayton, Ohio. It agrees well with the known facts of his life, his death in 1802 and the birth of his son John which is given as 1739. However, the chart above referred to and some published accounts make this Arthur, born in 1716, the son of another Arthur of whom so far as I can ascertain not one contemporary record survives.

Draper in his manuscripts now located at the state historical library at Madison, Wisconsin, had accepted this tradition but offers no records as proof. In my notes on this family published in the William and Mary Quarterly, XX, 113, I offer no objection to this tradition but I now regard it as practically certain that the Arthur
The Chenoweth Family

Chenoweth, born 1716, died 1802, was the son of John Chinoweth, the blacksmith, of Frederick Co., Va., 1746. John Chenoweth and Samuel Chenoweth, sons of the Arthur who died in Baltimore County in 1802, moved to Berkeley County, Va., where John died in 1820, leaving a large progeny.

Draper in the manuscripts above referred to gives data on the large family of one Thomas Chenoweth, whom I regard now as the son of the John of 1746. The exactness of the dates indicates that their ultimate source was the family Bible. The names and dates are as follows: Martha, born Dec. 25, 1744; Sarah, born May 12, 1744; Mary, born July 23, 1749; John, born May 15, 1751; Thomas, born Sept. 10, 1753; Arthur, born Dec. 6, 1755; Richard, born Apr. 1, 1758; William, born May 3, 1760; Elijah, born June 12, 1762; Ann, born May 6, 1765; Hannah, born Aug. 18, 1767; and Abraham, born Jan. 25, 1770.


The following records are from the family Bible of James Chenoweth, son of the Absolum who died in Berkeley Co., Va., in 1773 (see above).

James Chenoweth, born Dec. 21, 1767. Rebecca Bruce, born June 6, 1770. They were married Sept. 21, 1790. They had Rachel B. Chenoweth, born June 21, 1791. Ruth Ann Chenoweth, born Dec. 3, 1792. George L. Chenoweth, born Mch. 17, 1797.
James B. Chenoweth, born June 27, 1800. Edwin G. Chenoweth, born May 5, 1803. Alfred W. Chenoweth, born Sept. 13, 1811. We now follow the Chenoweths to Kentucky. Richard Chenoweth (later called captain) appeared in Ky. as early as 1776. He was almost certainly the son of John Chenoweth of Frederick Co., Va., who died in 1771. Arthur Chenoweth who, like Richard Chenoweth, settled in Jefferson County, Ky., was undoubtedly the son of John of 1771, which gives an added reason for ascribing Richard to the same John. Capt. Richard Chenoweth married Peggy McCarty, probably daughter of Thomas McCarty of Hampshire Co., Va. While living in the eastern part of Jefferson Co., Ky., about 1782 his family was involved in the famous Chenoweth massacre at the hands of the Shawnee Indians. His son Gideon Chenoweth was killed, his wife was scalped but survived and others not of the family were killed.

In 1784 Isaac Cox and Richard Chenoweth were justices in Jefferson Co., Ky. In June, 1803, in same county, the death of Richard Chenoweth was entered on the records and the suit of John Williamson vs Richard Chenoweth in regard to disputed land claims was continued against his heirs, namely, Thomas Chenoweth, James Chenoweth, Mildred Nash, Jane Miller, Naomi Chenoweth, Tabitha Chenoweth, and Ann Chenoweth. Thomas Chenoweth was appointed to defend Naomi, Tabitha, and Ann, being minors. Margaret Chenoweth, widow of Richard, was still living on the disputed land in 1806. In Jefferson Co., Ky., on Aug. 24, 1811, license was granted to Benjamin Irwin to marry Margaret Chenoweth, possibly the widow of Richard. According to the same records license was granted Apr. 9, 1792, to Harnan (?) Nash to marry Mildred Chenoweth and on Apr. 22, 1793, to William Miller to marry Jane Chenoweth. Arthur Chenoweth was a grand juror in Jefferson Co., Ky., in 1795. In 1821 he was still living there with wife and children Absolum, John, and Sarah.

One William Chenoweth appeared on Pottenger's Creek in Ky. in Aug. or Sept., 1779. On Mch. 5, 1782, in Jefferson Co., Ky., he was appointed admr. of estate of David Henton. Later he married the widow Mary Henton, who was the daughter of Jacob Van Meter. This William Chenoweth was the son of the William
who died in Frederick Co., Va., in 1772, and was not the son of
Thomas as I conjectured in the William and Mary Quarterly,
XX, 113. He was born June 18, 1760, and died Aug. 16, 1828.
His wife, Mary Van Meter (Henton) Chenoweth, was born Feb.
11, 1757, and died June 29, 1832. They are buried near Deats-
ville, Nelson County, Ky.

Their son Abraham Chenoweth was born Dec. 27, 1785, died
Mch. 31, 1861, at Perry, Illinois. He married Rachel Chenoweth
who was daughter of Arthur and Elspa Chenoweth. This Arthur
was probably identical with the Arthur, son of the John of 1771.
Rachel Chenoweth was born Jan. 31, 1789, and died Dec. 29, 1864.
Miles Hart Chenoweth, son of William and Mary (Van Meter)
Chenoweth, was born July 7, 1791, died 1846 in Andrew Co., Mis-
souri. He married Rebecca Fairleigh. A fairly complete account
of about 1200 descendants of William Chenoweth and wife Mary
(Van Meter) Chenoweth is ready for publication.

John Henton, son of the above Mary Van Meter by her first
husband David Henton, married Katharine Keith, daughter of
Alexander Keith, who lived until about 1773 in Hampshire Co.,
Va., and then until about 1780 in southwestern Pennsylvania and
later in Nelson and Hardin Counties, Ky.

The La Follette Genealogy represents that the mother of this
Alexander Keith was a Chenoweth but the present writer after
examining the evidence is satisfied that this is an error. The name
Chinoth occurs as a Christian name in an early generation of the
Keith family. There was a close parallelism in the history of the
two families. They both lived in Baltimore County, Md., Hamp-
shire County, Va., and Nelson County, Ky., consecutively.

There are other coincidences, but in spite of them the present
writer does not believe there was any relationship between the two
families, at least until some later generation. Another erroneous
statement in the claim appearing in some published accounts of
the family that one of the early Chenoweths, the original John or
one of his descendants (the accounts do not agree on the particu-
lar Chenoweth) married a member of Lord Baltimore's family.
The claim is supported by no contemporary record.
REGISTER OF MARRIAGE BONDS OF GREENSVILLE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, 1781-1808.

Compiled by Mrs. Dora Hedges Goodwyn, Emporia, Va.

(Continued from p. 66.)

Lundie, Thomas Yates & Elizabeth Maclin, 9 June, 1800. Peter Pelham, Sec.
Lundy, Edwin & Lucy Peterson, 3 Feb., 1789. Chislon Morris, Sec.
Lundy, John & Elizabeth Nelson, 21 Aug., 1786. Frederick Davis, Sec.
Lundy, John & Dorcas Tooke, 6 Feb., 1793, widow of Dempsey Tooke. Isaac Metcalf, Sec.
Lundy, Joshua & Polly Tyus, 8 Sept., 1794. Byrd Lundy, Sec.
Lundy, Peyton & Dorothy Harris, 5 Oct., 1790. Samuel Clifton, Sec.
Lundy, Isham & Dolly Haylay Rives, 29 Jan., 1796. Benjamin Rives, father, consents & is Sec.
Lifsey, John & Hollen Allen, 31 March, 1769. Benjamin Brewer, Sec.
Mabry, Daniel & Mary Smith, widow, 16 June, 1785. John Fenton, Sec.
Mabry, Edward & Ann Turner, widow, 30 Sept., 1806, James B. Lockhart, Sec.
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Mabry, Robert & Rebecca Mason, widow, 22 Sept., 1787. John Mason, Sec.
Maclin, Frederick, Jr., & Mary Spencer, 14 July, 1806. Robert Spencer, father consents. Elliott Spencer, Sec.
Maholland, John & Lucy Smith, 27 Dec., 1785. Benjamin Tarbor, Sec.
Malone, Joseph & Sarah Malone, 21 April, 1795. Thomas Malone, Sec.
Mangum, Henry, Jr., & Nancy Harrison, 9 Feb., 1801. Henry Mangum, Sec.
Mangum, Jeremiah & Nancy Jackson, 20 Dec., 1796. Drewry Walton, Sec.
Mangum, Littlebury & Clara Jordan, 22 Jan., 1807. Sterling Thompson, Sec.
Mason, George & Elizabeth Jones, 7 Feb., 1807. Benjamin Jones, father, consents and is Sec.
Mason, Henry & Rebecca Jeter, 11 Nov., 1796. John Jeter, Sec.
Mason, John & Lucy Cordall, 19 Nov., 1788. John Shearling, Sec.
Mason, Richard & Mary Woodford, widow, 14 Jan., 1799. Henry Wrenn, Sec.
Mason, William & Tabita Wynn Tewell, 11 May, 1799. Hugh Tewell, father, consents, and is Sec.
Mayes, Joshua & Hannah H. Dupree, 28 Jan., 1790. Gardiner Mayes, Sec.
Meacham, Banks & Elizabeth Person, 6 Dec., 1785. William Andrews, Sec.
Medill, Alexander & Martha Wall, 6 Nov., 1792. Sarah Wall, mother, consents. Gresham Watson, Sec.
Mitchell, David & Elizabeth Scott, 22 March, 1794. Philip Jones, Sec.
Mitchell, Drewry, Jr., & Elizabeth Johnson, 12 Sept., 1808. David Johnson, Sec.
Mitchell, James & Sally Llwellin, 7 June, 1789. Robert Mitchell, Sec.
Mitchell, Joseph & Molly B. Emmery, 22 May, 1793. Edmund Llwellin, Sec.
Morris, Henry & Selah Clarke, 21 July, 1789. Peter Clarke, Sec.
Moore, James & Permelia Payne, 10 May, 1802. Randan Wrenn, Sec.
Moore, Joshua & Hannah Dupree, Dec. 8, 1789. Elizabeth Dupree, mother, consents.
Montgomery, Benjamin & Sally Tatum, 13 Dec., 1802. Batte Tatum, Sec.
Moss, Howell & Patsy Clark, 19 Dec., 1806. Sarah Clark, mother, consents. Edwin Clark, Sec.
Moss, William & Elizabeth Collier, 4 Oct., 1785. Joel Prince, Sec.
Morris, Chislon & Tabitha New, 30 Dec., 1794. George Cain, Sec.
Morris, Jabez & Elizabeth Lundy, 19 Aug., 1783. Thomas Morris, Sec.
Murfee, John & Jenny Thompson, 14 April, 1806. Sterling Thompson, Sec.
Nanny, Wyatt & Elizabeth Lanier, 12 Jan., 1801. Randolph Price, Sec.
Newsom, Thomas & Sally Wrenn, 13 Aug., 1789. John Jarratt, Sec.
Newsom, William & Mary Stark, 2 May, 1782. William Fanning, consents. Henry Tazewell, Sec.
Norwood, George & Winifred Rives, 26 June, 1794. Michael Ezell, Sec.
Northington, John & Sally Stewart, 26 Aug., 1784. Wm. Grizzard, Sec.
Owen, Gronow & Elizabeth Simmons, 8 Dec., 1796. Benj. Simmons, Sec.
Owen, Willis & Mary Ford Grigg, 10 Sept., 1804. Frederick Grigg, Sec.
Parks, Henry & Milly Small, 20 Sept., 1794. Solomon Thompson, Sec.
Parks, Joseph & Elizabeth Garris, 24 Nov., 1790. Henry Cox, Sec.
Patrick, Thomas & Cressy Clifton, — ———. Cressy Clifton, mother, consents. John Rogers, Sec.
Payne, Jacob & Susanna Collier, 26 Oct., 1805. Crawley House, Sec.
Peebles, Howell & Rebecca Fox, 9 Sept., 1789. Robert Fox, Sec.
Peebles, Nathaniel & Nancy Walton, 7 Feb., 1804. Isaac R. Walton, Sec.
Peebles, Sterling & Patsy Wilkins, 20 April, 1788. Douglas Wilkins, Sec.
Pelham, Thomas & Isabella Dickson, 4 Oct., 1799. William W. Wilkins, guardian, consents. Peter Pelham, Sec.
Pelham, Thomas & Hannah Burrell, 3 Sept., 1801. Peter Pelham, Sec.
Person, Anthony & Rebecca Person, 5 April, 1790. Mary Person, mother, consents. Burgess Bass, Sec.
Person, Benjamin & Rebecca Parke, 13 May, 1805. James Hayley, Sec.
Pettway, Benjamin & Lucy Sills, 18 Dec., 1795. John Camp, Sec.
Pettway, John & Elizabeth Smith, 12 Feb., 1800. John Smith, father, consents. Williamson Smith, Sec.
Pilkinton, Willis & Mary Pettway, 3 March, 1783. Hinchia Pettway, Sec.
Pollard, George & Rebecca Davis, 8 April, 1805. James Davis, Sec.
Porch, Frederick & Martha James, 4 May, 1801. Bride 21 years of age on Dec. 7, 1800. William Camp, Sec.
Porch, Howell & Elizabeth Atkins, 23 Dec., 1800. Wm. W. Wilkins, Sec.
Powell, Robert & Sarah Malone, widow, 23 Sept., 1785. Peter Wyche, Sec.
Pritchett, John & Martha Mayes, 13 April, 1807. Henry Wyche, Sec.
Purnell, William & Elizabeth Wilkins, 1 Nov., 1799. Douglas Wilkins, father, consents. Peter Pelham, Sec.
Rawlings, John & Letha Smith, 21 Dec., 1799. Jacob Payne, Sec.
Reese, Edward Perry & Jane Watson, 10 Dec., 1788. John Watson, Sec.
Richards, Williams & Willie Young, 10 May, 1787. William Griffin, Sec.
Richardson, William & Edith Vick, 24 June, 1790. William Andrews, Sec.
Richardson, William, Jr., & Sally Mayes, 10 March, 1800. Allen Mayes, Sec.
Riddle, Elisha & Susanna Pepper, 17 Jan., 1792. Anselm Ivey, Sec.
Riddle, Thomas & Mary Dean, 17 Jan., 1792. John Goodrum, Sec.
Rivers, William & Susanna Richardson, 19 Dec., 1789. Thomas Richardson, father, consents. Benjamin Woodroof, Sec.
Robinson, Braxton & Lucy Sims, 28 March, 1795. John Camp, Sec.
Robinson, Braxton & Mary Hicks, widow, 28 Sept., 1799. Kinchin Peterson, Sec.
Robinson, John & Elizabeth Piland, 29 July, 1785. John Berryman, Sec.
Roper, John & Martha Capell, 20 Jan., 1791. Brittan Capell, Sec.
Rosser, George & Ann Brewer, 26 Feb., 1790. John Ingram, Sec.
Rowell, Isaac & Susanna Morris, 9 Jan., 1782. Edmund Jeter, Jr., Sec.
Sexton, Mark, son of Samuel Sexton, & Elizabeth Graham, 28 March, 1786. Samuel Sexton, Sec.
Shehorn, William & Judith Evans, 11 Sept., 1736. William Evans, Sec.
Shelton, James & Winifred Peebles, 28 Sept., 1786. Thomas Shelton, Sec.
Shepard, George & Nancy Wilkins, 14 Nov., 1808. James Watkins, Sec.
Short, Armistead & Elizabeth Ross, 4 Feb., 1808. George Cain, Sec.
Short, John & Susanna Andrews, widow, 1 Nov., 1806. George Cain, Sec.
Shurling, Richard & Delilah Clarke, 5 Aug., 1789. William Bennett, Sec.
Sills, Gray & Sarah Wyche, 24 April, 1783. Henry Wyche, Sec.
Sills, Isham & Patsy Hazlewood, 8 Nov., 1797. Wilkins Goodrich, Sec.
Sills, Richard & Charlotte Clarke, 24 Nov., 1791. Travis Clarke, father, consents. Edward P. Reese, Sec.
Sims, Howell & Mary Nolley, 28 Sept., 1797. Nehemiah Nolley, Sec.
Sledge, Sterling & Rhoda Johnson, 8 Jan., 1789. Moses Johnson, Sec.


Smith, Benjamin & Dolly Mayes, widow, 27 Jan., 1802. Peter Pelham, Sec.

Smith, David R. & Dorothy J. Wilkinson, 14 May, 1808. John Pettway, Sec.


Smith, Lewis & Julia Nolley, 13 May, 1786. Nehemiah Nolley, Sec.


Smith, Williamson & Rebecca Smith, 17 May, 1790. David Smith, father, consents. William Smith, Sec.


Stewart, Benjamin & Phatha Dupree, 7 March, 1798. Joshua Mayes, Sec.

Stewart, Charles & Elizabeth Grigg, 29 Sept., 1803. Frederick Grigg, father, consents. Randolph Grigg, Sec.

Stewart, Dempsey & Lucy Berry, 4 Feb., 1786. Connon Combs, Sec.

Stewart, Munford & Deborah Trunnel, 3 Sept., 1806. Joshua Clark, Sec.

Stewart, Richard & Mourning Charles, widow, 22 June, 1786. Batte Peterson, Sec.

Stewart, William & Mary Artis, 3 Jan., 1792. John Jeter, Sr., Sec.


Span, Willis & Ann Mabry, 8 May, 1786. Robert Mabry, Sec.

Spain, Richard & Rebecca Mabry, 13 Jan., 1790. Ingram Blanks, Sec.
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Spencer, Robert, Jr., & Mary Mabry, 24 Jan., 1793. Evans Mabry, Sec.
Swanson, Frederick & Winny Adkins, 22 June, 1787. Edward Freeman, Sec.
Tarver, Andrew & Ann Young, 10 Oct., 1785. Ann Young, mother, consents. Absalom Harris, Sec.
Thacker, Joel & Rebecca Lanier, 11 Jan., 1792. Collins Lanier, Sec.
Thomas, John & Frances Tyus, 19 April, 1790. Lewis Tyus, Sec.
Thompson, Solomon & Nancy Jordan, 7 May, 1799. B. Spence & Thos. Williford, Sec.
Thornton, William & Frances Goodrich, 12 June, 1804. Wilkins Goodrich, Sec.
Thompson, Lodowick & Delilah Womack, 18 March, 1793. Richard Gilliam, Sec.
Thompson, Solomon & Mary Parks, 26 April, 1787. Joseph Parks, Sec.
Tillar, James & Martha Dupree, 11 March, 1805. Thomas Dupree, Sr., Sec.
Tooke, Thomas & Delin Howard, 30 April, 1808. John Clack, Sec.
Tomlinson, Benjamin & Nancy Edlow Watson, widow, 28 June, 1796. William Gilliam, Sec.
Tomlinson, William & Elizabeth Stewart, 26 Sept., 1783. Lawrence House, Sec.


Turner, Donaldson & Mary Brown, widow, 8 May, 1794.


Turner, John & Elizabeth Williamson, 3 Jan., 1791. Jesse Grigg, Sec.

Turner, John W. & Rowena Rowell, 15 March, 1808. Isaac Rowell, Sec.


Turner, Miles & Charity Mangum, 25 Dec., 1794. Henry Mangum, father gives consent, & is Sec.

Turner, Person & Mason Taylor Peterson, 16 Feb., 1796. John Sykes, Sec.


Turner, Peter & Drusilla Smith, 20 Jan., 1783. Andrew Jeter, Sec.


Turner, Sugars & Rebecca Delony, 30 May, 1804. Peter Pelham, Sec.


Tyus, William G. & Rebecca Lundy, 2 June, 1802. William Lundy, father, consents. Benjamin Gowing, Sec.

Underhill, Henry & Frances Harrison, 23 Dec., 1790. Matthew Davis, Sec.
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Underhill, John & Rebecca Atkins, 6 April, 1797. Patty Atkins, mother, consents. Jesse Atkins, Sec.
Underwood, Nathaniel & Nancy Underwood, 12 May, 1806. Ingram Blanks, Sec.
Vaughan, Randall & Sarah Harris, 3 June, 1794.
Vaughan, Thomas & Lucy Harrison, 20 Aug., 1789. William Vaughan, Sec.
Vincent, Edmund & Polly Wall Vincent, 15 Jan., 1799. Peter Vincent, Sec.
Vincent, Joseph & Sarah Clark, 8 July, 1795. Thomas Vincent, Sec.
Vincent, Michael & Nancy Webb, 6 May, 1790. Micajah Webb, Sec.
Vincent, William & Margaret Newsom, 28 June, 1787. Holt Clanton, Sec.
Wall, Amos & Sally Murrell, 17 May, 1789. Braxton Robinson, Sec.
Wall, James Augustus Wall, & Rebecca Jeffries, 3 Sept., 1808. Mary Jeffries, mother, consents.
Walton, David & Rebecca Wyche, 23 Feb., 1788. William Wyche, Sec.
Walton, Isaac R. Jr., & Rebecca Randolph, widow, 24 May, 1800. Peter Pelham, Sec.
Watkins, Robert & Sarah Dean, 12 Mar., 1787. Michael Wilkins, Sec.
Watkins, Robert & Nancy Jones, 10 Feb., 1796. Thomas Jones & Rebecca Jones, parents, consent. Abraham Artis, Sec.
Webb, John, Jr., & Jane Vincent, 1 April, 1790. Rebecca Vincent, mother, consents. Charles Webb, Sec.
Webb, Kinchen & Patsy Harris, 26 Sept., 1798. Gideon Harris, father, consents. Thomas Allen, Sec.
Williams, Thomas & Martha Grigg, 10 Nov., 1789. Carrol Grigg, Sec.
Williams, William & Alcy Walton, 9 May, 1808. Isaac R. Walton, Sr., Sec.
Register of Marriage Bonds


Williamson, Tudah & Lindsay Adams, 14 Jan., 1807. John Adams, Sec.


Wilson, John & Mary Chambliss Hicks, 6 Nov., 1794. Robert Hicks, Sec.

Wilkinson, John & Patsy Whittington, 1 May, 1702. Sterling Cato, Sec.

Windham, John & Sally Vincent, widow, 31 Aug., 1797. Wm. Fox, Sec.


Wotten, Stephen & Fanny Scott, 26 Dec., 1789. Drewry Jeffries, Sec.

Woodroof, Benjamin & Elizabeth Bass, widow, 23 May, 1786. John Peebles, Sec.


Woodroof, John & Susan Smith, 12 Oct., 1801. John Wyche, Sec.

Wynne, Green & Hannah Tyus, 22 Dec., 1785. Lewis Tyus, father, consents. William Green, Sec.
Wyche, Henry & Elizabeth Walton, 9 June, 1800, Isaac Row Walton, Jr., Sec.
Wyche, Henry & Nancy Cook, 13 April, 1807. Foster Cook, Sec.
Wyche, William & Elizabeth Malone, 27 Aug., 1789. Peter Wyche, Sec.
Wrenn, Alexander & Lucy Lawrence, 21 Dec., 1785. Carroll Grigg, Sec.
Wrenn, Jones & Cecily Mabry, 5 Oct., 1790. Lewis Grigg, Sec.
Young, Henry & Clark Evans, 5 Feb., 1803. William Evans, guardian, consents & is Sec.
Young, Tarpley & Lucy Wrenn, 18 April 1791. Matthew Davis, Sec.
Young, William & Sally Hart Cook, 22 June, 1797. Henry Cook, father, consents & is Sec.

Additional Bonds.

Allen, Howell & Mary Edwards, 29 Nov., 1785, in Brunswick county.
Bass, McLin & Elizabeth Watson, 18 Oct., 1792.
Bradley, Mical & Mary Morton, 15 July, 1791, in Brunswick Co.
Burnett, Dugger & ———— Branscomb, 8 Jan., 1801.
Brewer, John & Mary Mitchell, 28 Nov., 1787.
Cain, George & Priscilla Bass, 23 Aug., 1787, in Southampton Co.
Camp, Green & Sally Broadus, 4 Dec., 1800.
Cocke, Howell Heath & Mary Woodly, 30 Jan., 1788.
Cooper, Jesse & Sarah Applewhite, 23 Aug., 1786, in Southampton Co.
Emmery, Thomas & Keziah Bishop, 15 April, 1787.
Ewell, Abel & Sarah Whitehorn, 7 March, 1786.
Ferguson, Edward & Elizabeth Hunter, 5 Nov., 1787, in Brunswick Co.
Garner, Presley & Betsy Avent, 30 March, 1786, in Brunswick Co.
Goodrum, John & Rebecca Parham, 29 Nov., 1797.
Green, Sterling & Amy Eaves, 24 Sept., 1787.
Harris, Henry & Mary Drew, 4 Oct., 1787.
Hines, Jacob & Mason Hearin, 14 March, 1804.
Jarratt, John & Lucy Randolph, 23 April, 1789.
Jeffries, Thomas & Selona Heathcock, 28 Oct., 1789.
Lifsey, William & Fanny White, 21 March, 1787.
Little, William & Betsy Bass, 6 Dec., 1785, in Southampton Co.
May, William & Sally Wrenn, 8 July, 1795.
Maclin, Edmund & Elizabeth Pettway, 27 Dec., 1798.
Mason, Peyton & Martha Ann Person Turner, 2 Jan., 1809.
Morris, Chislon & Tabitha New, 30 Dec., 1794.
Newett, Sammons & Claramond Lawrence, 18 Feb., 1787.
Peebles, Edmund & Harriet Harrison, 20 Feb., 1786, in Sussex County.
Phillips, Thomas & Ann Clarke, 10 Nov., 1787.
Prince, John & Elizabeth Freeman, 24 Sept., 1787, in Brunswick Co.

Rawlings, Hambleton & Susanna Clifton, 25 Dec., 1797.
Richardson, Samuel & Charlotte Woodruff, 10 April, 1791.
Robinson, Littleberry & Sally Robinson, 13 Dec., 1790.
Saunders, John & Peggy Pentecost, 23 Dec., 1785, in Brunswick Co.

Sims, Howell & Lucy George, 30 Nov., 1785, in Brunswick Co.
Slate, Robert & Sally Turner, 13 Nov., 1785.
Tarver, Andrew & Elizabeth Heartwell, 28 Jan., 1791, in Brunswick Co.

Wall, Willis & Polly Camp, 7 Jan., 1791.
Walton, Drewry & Grace Ingram, 26 Sept., 1785, in Brunswick Co.
Watson, Gursham & Nancy Watson, 3 June, 1807.

LANIER FAMILY—SOME CORRECTIONS OF ARTICLE IN LAST NUMBER.

To the Editor of Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine:

I have read with much interest what is contained in No. 2, Vol. 3, of your Quarterly concerning John Lanier and his descendants. You have placed the numerous members of this family under many obligations. I regret that I did not know that you contemplated making this publication, for I could have helped you to avoid a few errors that I see. On page 134 you mention Sampson Lanier and his wife, Elizabeth Chamberlain, and on the following page you say that no mention is made in the records of Brunswick County of a son named Lewis Lanier. My great grandmother, Agnes Lanier, who married William Davis in Brunswick County on August 29, 1769, was a sister of Lewis Lanier and a daughter of Sampson and Elizabeth. The pro
bate records of Brunswick County show that on April 23, 1763, William Lanier was appointed Guardian for Lewis and Agnes Lanier, orphans of Sampson Lanier, deceased. They also show that prior to this, Lemuel Lanier was appointed guardian for Lewis and Agnes and described them as orphans of Sampson Lanier. Burwell Lanier, after he had reached his majority, acted for some time as guardian for Lewis and Agnes. The same records that prove Winnifred, Buckner, Martha, and Anne to be the children of Sampson and Elizabeth show that Agnes and Lewis were also their children. The children all received the same from the estate, except Buckner who was the oldest son and inherited the land, there being no will. The error started with Mr. Nelson who was employed by the descendants of some of the other children. His notes show that Lemuel Lanier was appointed guardian for Lewis and Agnes, orphans of Sampson, deceased, but he evidently didn't investigate the matter any further.

Yours truly,

W. O. Davis.

POLLARD FAMILY*

Mrs. Charles W. Dixon to Henry R. Pollard

Douglas, Arkansas

Oct 3, 1921

My dear Mr. Pollard:

I saw your name and address in the Virginia Magazine of History & Biography, and that is why I take the liberty of writing you and I trust you will pardon my intrusion. My ancestor, James Gaines, Jr., the son of James Gaines, Sr. and Mary Pendleton, (James Sr. died in 1781, & Mary in 1803) married Mildred Pollard in Virginia. As I do know that they had children born between 1760 and 1770, & a son, Abner, was born in 1766, I feel that you, perhaps, have a history of the fine old Pollard family and can be of some assistance to me, if you have the time,—& rest assured, I shall be most grateful for any information you may give me. I want the history of the Pollard family from Mildred Pollard back as far as it goes in that line. Also date of her birth, marriage & death, including date of James

*For information in regard to Pollard Family, see William and Mary Quarterly, Vol. VII, 102, 103, 104; X, 202; XV, 64-69.
Gaines, Jr., birth & death. There is a tradition that he fought in the Revolution—have you any record of this in your record.

My husband is a member of the N. C. Society in Genealogy for the sake of our only son.

Abner Gaines, son of Mildred and James, Jr., b. 1766, married Elizabeth Matthews, & moved from Charlotte Co., Va., when Maj. John Pollard Gaines (their son) was a boy. Hoping to have an early reply, and that you will not hesitate to notify me as to the charges for this if there are any.

Yours very truly,
Mrs. Chas. W. Dixon.


31 October, 1921

My dear Madam:—

Your favor of the 3rd inst., was duly received but on account of the pressure of business I have not been able to give due consideration of how your inquiries had best be answered, confronted as I am with so little information which would enable me to give a satisfactory reply or one that would aid you in the quest you are in pursuit of. After considering the matter, I concluded that the best I could do would be to send you a copy of the History of King and Queen County, Virginia, written by my cousin and brother-in-law, Rev. Alfred Bagby, D. D., of this City and though he is now in his 93rd year, his mental faculties are unabated and his memory in many things reliable far beyond what would be expected of one of his age. This book, which I send you by parcel post, contains much information concerning the history of your ancestors and in order that you may readily refer to what I think affords that information, at least in part, I have taken the time to re-examine it and make notation of the names and family connections which relate to the descendants of the intermarriage between Joseph Pollard and his wife Priscilla, who was Miss Holmes of Caroline County, and of that marriage there were nine children, two sons and seven daughters. One of the latter, Mildred, spoken of frequently as Milly, intermarried with Col. Edmund Pendleton, a nephew of Judge Edmund Pendleton, who left no descendants, each of whom figured prominently in public affairs immediately before and after the Revolutionary War. Edmund Pendleton was a Colonel in the Revolutionary War and was an intimate friend and advisor of Washington in military affairs, and his descendants of the marriage mentioned are numerous and I have practically no knowledge at my command as to their names or prominence except that furnished by the volume
referred to above. Their descendants are frequently mentioned in that book and I have made notation of the pages on which those references are made, and they will be given in an addenda to this letter. The cost of the book on sale in this City is $3.50, which you can remit by postoffice order to Rev. Alfred Bagby, D. D., 2206 Monument Avenue, together with the postage which you will be able to ascertain from the wrapper.

I never had the pleasure of meeting with any of the Gaines family, but I frequently heard my father and mother speak of this family as people of great worth and as leading citizens of the County of King and Queen, Va. John Gaines was an intimate lawyer friend of my father, who was also a lawyer, and his brother, Harry Gaines of Woodlawn, where he lived and where his wife, who was Miss Muse, conducted a very popular female seminary which my mother, Miss Juliet Jeffries, attended as a pupil and to whom she was much attached. See History of the Gaines Family by Rev. Chas. R. Ryland, D. D., on page 335-6 of the book, and in the same connection see data concerning the Fleet family on page 334, and concerning the Garnett family on page 337.

The only descendant of Col. Edmund Pendleton whom I intimately knew was Mrs. Anne Woolfolk, who before her marriage was Anne Turner and whose mother was a granddaughter of Col. Edmund Pendleton. I knew her practically all her life. She was a native of Caroline County and was universally recognized as one of the most, if not the most, popular young woman in her native and adjoining counties. She left no issue. I have her picture, taken at the age of about seventy, which bespeaks her beauty even at that age. She died in this City about three years ago and was an intimate and loved relative of ours, and Mrs. Pollard was especially devoted to her and had her frequently as a visitor in our family. Mrs. H. R. Pollard, Jr., my oldest son’s wife, was at her bedside when she died as a devoted and intimate friend. If you wish this picture copied and sent you I can do so but I am really afraid to trust such a treasure to the mails.

For information concerning my own life, the volume sent largely sets it forth and it need not be repeated here except to say that I am now at the age of 76 years, or will be on the 28th proximo, and am still serving as City Attorney of Richmond, having served as such since the year 1898.

With assurances of high esteem, I remain

Sincerely yours,

H. R. Pollard.
Memoranda of page references in History of King and Queen County of Virginia, by Rev. Alfred Bagby, D. D., to Genealogy concerning the Pollard, Pendleton, Gaines and other families.


Since writing the above, I find that President Madison in his last message to congress concerning the conduct of certain military operations in the War of 1812 refers to Brigadier General Gaines, whom I have no doubt was a descendant from ancestors of King and Queen County, Va., but I have no definite information at hand by which this fact can be sustained. H. R. P.

MR. LEIGH AND THE VICE PRESIDENCY.*

To the Editor of the Virginia Magazine:

You will pardon, I hope, a correction of the statement made in your note 25 of the very interesting article entitled "Letters from William and Mary College," published in your April number.

The autobiography of the late Senator George F. Hoar is quoted to show that the Vice Presidency in 1839 was offered by the Whig Convention at Harrisburgh, in the first instance, to Benjamin Watkins Leigh, and that John Tyler received it after Leigh's declination of the offer. This is a misstatement which is proved by a letter of Mr. Leigh himself, highly honorable to his sense of fairness.

After Mr. Tyler vetoed the Bank bills in 1841, the Whigs—especially the Northern Whigs—knew no limit in their abuse of him. Every means was had to detract from him, and so this story among others was devised, only some had it that the nomination was offered to half a dozen other persons besides Mr. Leigh, and that when the Convention could find no other to accept the nomination, they unfortunately stumbled on John Tyler.

Mr. Leigh was a strong party man, but withal an honorable gentleman, and the following is what he says substantially in his letter (Niles' Register, Vol. 61, p. 232.)

The Whig Convention met at Harrisburgh on December 4, 1839, and was organized in the usual way. A grand committee was appointed consisting of one or more delegates from each State Delega-

*This letter was published in the Virginia Magazine, XXIX, No. 3, pp. 357-359. (July number, 1921.)
tion. Before voting they were to consult their respective delegations and receive instructions.

For the presidency Mr. Clay had a plurality of the Grand Committee, but he never could get a majority, and finally his enemies, chiefly Northern delegates who hated him for his compromising the tariff in 1833, succeeded in securing the nomination of General Harrison. When next the Grand Committee canvassed for Vice President, Maine or New Hampshire led off with nominating John Tyler. Massachusetts, where the opposition to Mr. Clay was greatest, nominated Benjamin Watkins Leigh, who was the Committeemen from the Virginia delegation. Mr. Leigh rose and declined the nomination and asked the Massachusetts Committee to go back and get their delegation to release them. But says Mr. Leigh the request was not at all necessary: "For the several Committees from the other delegations, that from Virginia alone excepted, acting under instructions given before I had said a word, and therefore uninfluenced by my declining the nomination, announced in order as they were called the votes of their respective delegations. Not another vote was given to Me (Mr. Leigh's Capitals). A majority of the whole number of votes and a large majority was given for the nomination of Mr. Tyler."

Mr. Leigh's narrative shows that Mr. Hoar did not know what he was talking about. No doubt some of the same kind of intrigue was attempted against Mr. Tyler that the Massachusetts delegation and their allies tried with so much success against Mr. Clay. Mr. Tyler's well known strong states views made him even more distasteful to the Northern Nationalists, and it is perhaps true that they tried to make Crittenden, Tallmadge, Leigh, Bell, Owen, Preston and other prominent Whigs their instruments for defeating Mr. Tyler. But these movements to Mr. Tyler's injury were mere whisperings in dark corners, as evidenced by the admission of one of the conspirators, who says that they had to give up William C. Preston "since not a single Southern delegate approved the suggestion of his nomination."

In the single instance of Mr. Leigh was there any open manifestation of this opposition, and this was confined as above narrated to the vote of a single delegation in the Grand Committee.

Mr. Leigh, who represented Virginia on the Grand Committee,* did not vote from motives of delicacy, but he states that even before the voting was had he was satisfied from informal conversation with members, that Mr. Tyler was the favorite, and he represents Governor Owen, who was chairman of the Grand Committee, as saying that

*He was the sole committeeman.
Tyler's nomination would be "judicious" for various reasons which he gives.

Mr. Leigh was a man of great ability and would have made a fine Vice President, or fine President; but the simple fact is that in refusing to obey instructions from the State Legislature in 1836, he was unpopular in 1839, and as he himself says no one of the Virginia delegates ever suggested his nomination. On the other hand, John Tyler had already been voted for by most of the Southern States for Vice President, at the election before this, and as the martyr of instructions yielding up his seat as Senator in 1836, and as of much longer National Service than Mr. Leigh, he was the most widely known Southern Whig and the most influential, and so continued till as President he came into collision with Mr. Clay. This rupture was brought about by Clay's reviving in Congress the old National Republican measures of Bank Tariff and internal improvements, which the Whigs as shown by Dr. A. C. Cole, of the University of Illinois, in his recent prize essay on the "Whig Party in the South," had expressly disclaimed in the canvass of 1840.

Lyon G. Tyler.

MILITIA OFFICERS COMMISSIONED FOR AMHERST CO., VA.

Communicated by Wm. M. Sweeney, Astoria, Long Island.

Court held June 5, 1769.

James Nevil, Colonel
Geo. Stoval Jr., Esq., Lieut. Colonel

Court held July 3, 1769.

John Higginbotham, Captain
Gabriel Penn, Lieutenant

Court held August 7, 1769.

Aaron Higginbotham, Captain
Charles Tuley, Captain
Nathaniel Davis, Lieutenant
Samuel Higginbotham, Lieutenant Order Book, p. 519.
The following is the form that was used in entering all these commissions as entered on the Order Book:

“At a Court held for Amherst County at the Courthouse the seventh day of August 1769, and in the ninth Year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord George the third now King of Great Britain &c

Before his Majesty's Justices, to-wit
James Nevil                James Dillard  Gentlemen
John Rose                  Henry Rose

Aaron Higginbotham produced his Commission to be a Captain, Charles Tuley produced his commission to be a Captain, and Nathaniel Davis and Samuel Higginbotham produced their Commissions to be Lieutenants of the Militia of this County who severally took the usual Oaths to his Majesty's person & Government, and the abjuration Oath, & Repeated & subscribed the abjuration Oath & Test.

Order Book, 1766-69, p. 519.

June 27, 1745.

William Cabell
Joseph Thompson
Charles Lynch
Thomas Ballow
David Lewis

Gent

Commissioned Captains of Militia.

July 25, 1745.

James Daniel
James Nevels
James Martin

Gent

Albemarle County, (Va.) Order Book, 1744-1748.
Commissioned Captains of Militia.
HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL NOTES.

WASHINGTON AND LEE: "A study of the names of the men comprising our expeditionary forces in France shows that there were seventy-nine Robert E. Lees, seventy-four George Washingtons, seven Grants and two Lincolns. Note the standing of the two great Virginians."—Cazenove G. Lee, Jr., Washington, D. C., in New York Evening Post, August 4, 1921.

A LESSON IN POLITICS.—After Bacon's Rebellion the Royal Legislature, assembled in 1677, imposed a fine of 400 lbs of tobacco on any person who by the employment of such terms as "rebells," "traitors," &c., should delay the restoration of the Colony to its "former condition of peace and love." After the American Revolution the Virginia Legislature made haste to repeal all the laws banishing the Tories, and Benjamin Harrison, the Governor, directed all prosecutions against persons charged with unfriendliness to the State to cease, as the best means of healing the sores of the war. The Northern Congress had little of this liberality after the war for Southern Independence.

How the Northern speakers and writers did love the term "rebels." It was "rebels" this and "rebel" that, and neither circumstance nor place—neither delicacy nor generosity—could induce them to forego its use for long years after the war. It was resented by Southern men not only as historically untrue, but as an insult. In this matter the Northern people wore the cast off shoes of the British, who applied the term during the American Revolution to Washington and to Americans generally. Alexander Graydon, of Pennsylvania, in his Memoirs, p. 227, says that the term was "extremely offensive to his ear, however appropriate it might be" (in the particular case of the Americans in 1776). He writes: "In the English language it is too much interwoven with the idea of a state of criminality to be other than highly opprobrious."

MRS. JANE VOBÉ.—Among the residents of Williamsburg well known in her day was Mrs. Jane Vobe. She kept an ordinary in Williamsburg which was much frequented from 1752 to 1784.
In Governor Benjamin Harrison's *Letter Book*, p. 287, she appears as the claimant against the State, in the latter year.

The Players.—A Mr. Ryon asked permission in 1784 of Governor Benjamin Harrison to introduce into the State a Company of Commedians. The Governor very willingly gave his consent, declaring his opinion that "a well chosen & well acted play is amongst the first of moral lessons and tends greatly to inculcate & fix in the mind the most virtuous principles." *Executive Letter Book*, p. 286.

Notes from the Virginia Gazette for 1780: (1) William Cole and John Cole advertise for sale the Estate of Capt James Cole, of Goochland Co. (2) Martin Key and John Ware, as commissioners for the State, advertise for sale the escheated estate of Walter King. (3) Walker Maury's School in Orange Co. (4) Notice of fees, by "the practitioners of Physic and surgery" in Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County: Charles Mortimer, John Julian, George French, Robert Wellford. (5) Extraordinary meteor seen in Williamsburg after sunset 31 October, 1779. (6) A large collection of books, consisting of history, law, novels &c., belonging to the Estate of John Semple attorney at law to be sold at King William C. H., July 20, 1780. Catalogue at printing office or at Mrs. Semple in King & Queen Co.

Mill Creek.—This creek in Elizabeth City County seems to get its name from a tidal mill established upon it at a very early date. There was a grant made to Major Richard Morison on June 5, 1645, for 160 acres commonly called "Downs' Field" on the Strawberry Bank. The tract began at the "Look out Tree" by "Pine (Point) Comfort Creek" (Mill Creek) side "near the round mill." (William and Mary Quarterly, IX., pp. 90.)

Capt. Thomas Claiborne.—The wife of Capt. Thomas Claiborne, son of Col. William Claiborne, the Secretary of State, was Sarah Fenn, of Middle Plantation, daughter of Samuel Fenn. (*Ibid.*, III, p. 77.)

After the death of Capt. Thomas Claiborne, in 1701, his widow, Sarah, married Capt. Thomas Bray, of New Kent. She survived him, and later established a scholarship in William and Mary College. She died October 18, 1716. (*Ibid.*, XIII, p. 266.)
Yerby-Stonham or Stonum.—In 1822 two brothers, Wm. and Henry Yerby, came to Ark. from Va. and bought land in Phillips County. A little later their brother-in-law, Stonum, came.

Henry Yerby mar. a Miss Dickson.


BOOK REVIEWS.


We hail this pamphlet with great satisfaction as the initial number of what promises to be a decided contribution to the literary activities of the State. The table of contents shows a fine selection of interesting articles. The first of these is very properly an account of the aborigines of the county, first published in this magazine for July, 1920. Then follows an account by H. C. Groome, of the Northern Neck, of which Fauquier was a part. This is decidedly the fullest and most satisfactory history of the Northern Neck which has appeared. The remaining papers are scarcely inferior in interest: "18th Century Maps"; "Prices to be charged by Keepers or Ordinaries, 1760"; "Plan of Warrenton"; "Robert Eden Scott"; "Marriage Bonds"; "North Wales"; "Six Weeks in Fauquier." The Bulletin contains 108 pages and its mechanical execution is faultless.


Probably no other writer—certainly no other poet—has so aptly caught the spirit of the old Plantation Negro as Benjamin B. Valentine, whose labors “will always live in a world which he has himself left.” The "Foreword," written by Mary Newton Stanard, is a just commentary upon both the author and the book. Mr. Valentine would himself have been an ideal "Ole Marster," who regarded his negroes as something far more than slaves, something more than servants, but as friends whom he loved, dependent members of his family whom he cherished, and for whom he was ready to perish rather than evil should befall. His negro dialect is undoubtedly excellent, and his different poems illustrate admirably the quaint way in which the negro viewed things happening about him. So, besides the humor and
the quaintness, they afford a philosophy of life which is unique and suggestive of a condition that may have had its objections and abuses, but was relieved by a happiness and cheer that has never been surpassed. That was slavery as it existed in old Virginia.

IN MEMORIAM.

ANNIE TUCKER TYLER.

Died, in the sixty-seventh year of her age, at St. Luke's Hospital, Richmond, Va., on Wednesday, November 2, 1921, at 10 o'clock A. M., after an illness of several months, ANNIE TUCKER TYLER, wife of Dr. Lyon G. Tyler, and daughter of the late Colonel St. George Tucker, of the Confederate Army, poet and novelist, and of Elizabeth Gilmer, daughter of Thomas Walker Gilmer, Governor of Virginia, and for some time Secretary of the Navy of the United States. Her father was well known as author of "Hansford, A Tale of Bacon's Rebellion," and as author of the "Cross of the South," a stirring lyric, which was very popular in the South at the beginning of the war for Southern Independence.

However, it was not the lineage from which she sprang that ennobled this much-lamented lady, but her own character. Never lived a person who had sweeter and more lovely traits. As wife of one who had charge of William and Mary College, as president, for many years in its days of trial and struggle, she was endeared to hundreds of young men who attended the courses of that ancient and honorable institution. During that time, of how many entertainments for the college circle was she the guardian genius, and of how many visitors from all over the world was she the sweet and genial hostess. Her interest in the College never failed, and among other evidences of this is the English ivy on the main College building and the President's house, developed from scions transplanted by her from the ivy in the Jamestown churchyard.

Mrs. Tyler was formerly president of the Williamsburg Chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy, and was at the time of her death a member of the Governing Board of the Colonial Dames of the State of Virginia, a member of the A. P. V. A., and other useful and patriotic organizations. To her was principally due the erection of the monument to the soldiers and sailors of the Confederacy, which stands today on the Palace Green in Williamsburg.
During her long illness her room at St. Luke's Hospital was a flower-garden, made so by the devotion of her friends. She loved flowers as the emblems of immortality, and with the certainty of death before her she said, "I am seeing the flowers on my grave before I die."

Attacked by disease when she never appeared so well or so happy, she confronted the inevitable with a calmness that was simply marvelous to those who love life, and she had every reason to be as one of these; for, beloved by her husband, children and friends, and surrounded by many of the good things of earth, it seemed especially hard for her to leave them. But she looked death nobly and bravely in the face and never questioned or complained. Was it her faith in a future life that sustained her? As she drew nearer to the end she was weak and passed most of the time in a semi-unconscious condition, but in the dead hour of the night, shortly before her death, while her husband was watching by her side, she cried in a strong, clear voice, "Oh, Jesus, take me to Thy arms. Oh, God, care for Thy child!" It was touching to observe how, almost to the very last day, when any of her dear friends entered the room, she would rouse from her comatose state and greet them by name and with a warmth of her old cordiality. Her sufferings were intense, but they were greatly relieved by the sympathy of her visiting friends, and the tender care of her physicians and nurses. At last, after an interval of peace, she passed into eternal rest with just a sigh.

The esteem in which she was held was attested by numerous letters of sympathy after her decease, received from members of Congress, former Governors, judges of courts and others in public prominence; from the president and faculty, students and alumni of William and Mary College, and from many of her numerous acquaintances.

Her remains were taken from St. Luke's Hospital to the home of Charles G. Bosher, 422 East Franklin Street, where her face, freed from its suffering and care and seeming among the roses that surrounded it like that of some beautiful queen, was viewed by many friends.

The final services took place on Thursday, at 4 o'clock P. M., at Holy Trinity Church, under the ministration of Rev. J. J. Gravatt, assisted by Rev. E. R. Jones, rector of Bruton Church, Williamsburg, which she had attended so many years during her stay in that city. The floral offerings were beautiful and even magnificent. She was interred in the Tyler section in Hollywood the same afternoon.
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Jamestown on the James

First honors due to Jamestown—Old Jamestown on the James,
Where our Fathers came a-sailing—a-sailing from the Thames,
In a Trinity of good ships—of Destiny in deed,
Sarah Constant as the flag ship, the Discovery and Goodspeed.

The birth-place of Virginia—The Mother Colony,
The birth-place of our Freedom, Independence, Sovereignty;
The birth-place of Democracy by Legislative claims,
The birth-place of the Nation—is Jamestown on the James.

They reached there May the thirteenth in the year of sixteen seven,
Thus priority of settlement to the famous spot is given.
Next day they made their landing on Jamestown’s sacred sod,
When Robert Hunt with pious words made thankful prayer to God.

The Thames and James—Their waters—are one within the Sea,
Their Shores are one by Kindred-tie, and will forever be;
The English-tongue, our common tongue, weighed anchor in the Thames;
The English-tongue, our common tongue, drop’d anchor in the James.

Then let us sing of Jamestown—of Jamestown on the James,
Where our Fathers came a-sailing—a-sailing from the Thames;
The birth-place of the Nation that sweeps from sea to sea,
The birth-place of Democracy—the People’s Sovereignty.

STERLING BOISSEAU, Richmond, Va.
VIRGINIA FIRST.

I.

The name First given to the territory occupied by the present United States was Virginia. It was bestowed upon the Country by Elizabeth, greatest of English queens. The United States of America are mere words of description. They are not a name. The rightful and historic name of this great Republic is "Virginia." We must get back to it, if the Country's name is to have any real significance.

II.

Virginia was the First colony of Great Britain, and her successful settlement furnished the inspiration to English colonization everywhere. For it was the wise Lord Bacon who said that, "As in the arts and sciences the first invention is of more consequence than all the improvements afterwards, so in kingdoms or plantations, the first foundation or plantation is of more dignity than all that followeth."

III.

On May 13, 1607, the pioneers brought over by the Sarah Constant, the Good Speed, and the Discovery arrived at Jamestown on James River, and Founded the Republic of the United States based on English conceptions of Justice and Liberty. The story of this little settlement is the story of a great nation expanding from small beginnings into one of more than 100,000,000 people, inhabiting a land reaching finally from ocean to ocean and abounding in riches and power, till when the liberties of all mankind were endangered the descendants of the old Jamestown settlers did in their turn cross the ocean and help to save the land from which their fathers came.

IV.

Before any other English settlement was made on this continent, democracy was born at Jamestown by the establishment of
England's free institutions—Jury trial, courts for the administration of justice, popular elections in which all the "inhabitants" took part, and a representative Assembly which met at Jamestown, July 30, 1619, and digested the first laws for the new commonwealth.

V.

There at Jamestown and on James River was the cradle of the Union—The first church, the first blockhouse, the first wharf, the first glass factory, the first windmill, the first iron works, the first silk worms reared, the first wheat and tobacco raised, the first peaches grown, the first brick house, the first State house, and the first free school (that of Benjamin Syms, 1635).

VI.

In Virginia was the First assertion on this continent of the indissoluble connection of representation and taxation.

In 1624 a law was passed inhibiting the governors from laying any taxes on the people without the consent of the General Assembly, and this law was re-enacted several times afterwards. In 1635 when Sir John Harvey refused to send to England a petition against the King's proposed monopoly of tobacco, which would have imposed an arbitrary tax, the people deposed him from the government and sent him back to England, an act without precedent in America. In 1652 when the people feared that Parliament would deprive them of that liberty they had enjoyed under King Charles I, they resisted, and would only submit when the Parliamentary Commissioners signed a writing guaranteeing to them all the rights of a self-governing dominion. And when after the restoration of King Charles II, the country was outraged by extensive grants of land to certain court favorites, the agents of Virginia, in an effort to obtain a charter to avoid these grants, made the finest argument in 1674 for the right of self-taxation to be found in the annals of the 17th century. Claiborne's Rebellion and Bacon's Rebellion prove that Virginia was always a Land of Liberty.
During the 18th century the royal governors often reproached the people for their "Republican Spirit," until on May 29, 1765, the reproach received a dramatic interpretation by Patrick Henry, arousing a whole continent to resistance against the Stamp Act.

VII.

Virginia *Founded* New England. In 1613 a Virginia Governor, Sir Thomas Gates, drove the French away from Maine and Nova Scotia and saved to English colonization the shores of Massachusetts and Connecticut. In 1620 the Pilgrim Fathers were inspired to go to North America by the successful settlement at Jamestown. They sailed under a patent given them by the Virginia Company of London, and it was only the accident of a storm that caused them to settle outside of the limits of the territory of the London Company, though still in Virginia. The Mayflower compact, under which the 41 emigrants united themselves at Cape Cod followed pretty nearly the terms of the original Virginia Company's patent.

In 1622 the people at Plymouth were saved from starvation by the opportune arrival of two ships from Jamestown, which divided their provisions with them. Without this help the Plymouth settlement would have been abandoned.

The 41 Pilgrim Fathers established an aristocracy or oligarchy at Plymouth, for they constituted an exclusive body and only cautiously admitted any newcomers to partnership with them in authority. As time went on, the great body of the people had nothing to say as to taxes or government.

Citizenship at Plymouth and in all New England was a matter of special selection in the case of each individual. The terms of the magistrates were made permanent by a law affording them "precedency of all others in nomination on the election day." The towns of New England were little oligarchies, not democracies. It was different in Virginia. There the House of Burgesses, which was the great controlling body, rested for more than a hundred years upon what was practically universal suffrage (1619-1736), and even after 1736 many more people voted in Virginia than in
Massachusetts. There was a splendid and spectacular body of aristocrats in Virginia, but they had nothing like the power and prestige of the New England preachers and magistrates.

"By no stretch of the imagination," says Dr. Charles M. Andrews, Professor of History in Yale University, "can the political condition in any of the New England Colonies be called popular or democratic. Government was in the hands of a very few men."

VIII.

Virginia led in all the measures that established the independence of the United States. Beginning with the French and Indian War, out of which sprang the taxation measures that subsequently provoked the American Revolution, Virginia under Washington, struck the first blow against the French, and Virginian blood was the first American blood to flow in that war. Then, when, after the war, the British Parliament proposed to tax America by the Stamp Act, it was the Colony of Virginia that rang "the alarm bell" and rallied all the other colonies against the measure by the celebrated resolutions of Patrick Henry, May 29, 1765, which brought about its repeal.

Later when the British Parliament revived its policy of taxation in 1767 by the Revenue Act, though circumstances made the occasion for the first movements elsewhere, it was always Virginia that by some resolute and determined action of leadership solved the crisis that arose.

There were four of these crises:

(1) The first occurred when Massachusetts, by her protest, in 1768, against the Revenue Act, stirred up Parliament to demand that her patriot leaders be sent to England for trial. Massachusetts was left quite alone and she remained quiescent. Virginia stepped to the front and by her ringing resolutions of May 16, 1769, aroused the whole continent to resistance, which forced Parliament to compromise, leave the Massachusetts men alone, and repeal all the taxes except a small one on tea. After the Assembly, "The Brave Virginians" was the common toast throughout New England.
The next crisis occurred in 1772. In that year the occasion for action occurred in the smallest of the colonies, Rhode Island, by an attack of some unauthorized persons on the sloop Gaspee, which was engaged in suppressing smuggling. The King imitated Parliament by trying to renew the policy of transporting Americans to England for trial, but Virginia caused the King and his Counsellors to desist from their purpose by her system of inter-colonial committees, which brought about a real continental union of the colonies for the first time.

The third crisis occurred in 1774, after a mob of disguised persons threw the tea overboard in Boston harbor. Though Boston did not authorize this proceeding, Parliament held her responsible and shut up her port. Virginia thought this unjust, and was the first colony to declare her sympathy with Boston, and the first, in any representative character for an entire colony, to call for a Congress of all the colonies. And to that Congress which met September 5, 1774, she furnished the first president, Peyton Randolph, and the greatest orators, Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee.

The remedy proposed by this Congress was a plan of non-intercourse already adopted in Virginia, to be enforced by committees appointed in every county, city, and town in America. The fourth crisis began in 1775 with the laws passed by the British Parliament to cut off the trade of the colonies, intended as retaliatory to the American non-intercourse. This led to hostilities, and for a year, during which time the war was waged in New England, the colonists held the attitude of confessed rebels, fighting their sovereign and yet professing allegiance to him. When the war was transferred to the South with the burning of Norfolk and the battle of Moore’s Creek Bridge, this attitude became intolerable to the Southerners, and they sought for a solution of the difficulty in Independence.

While Boston was professing through her town meeting her willingness “to wait, most patiently to wait” for Congress to act, and the Assembly of the Province deferred action till the towns were heard from, it was North Carolina, largely settled by Virginians, that on April 12, 1776, instructed her delegates in Con-
gress to concur with the delegates from the other Colonies in declaring independence, and it was Virginia that on May 15, 1776, commanded her delegates to propose independence. The first explicit and direct instructions for independence anywhere in the United States were given by Cumberland County, in Virginia, April 22, 1776. Unlike the tumultuary, unauthorized, and accidental nature of the leading revolutionary incidents in New England, such as the Boston Tea Party and the Battle of Lexington, the proceedings in Virginia were always the authoritative and official acts of the Colony.

All the world should know that it was Richard Henry Lee, a Virginian, who drew the resolutions for independence adopted by Congress July 2, 1776, and that it was Thomas Jefferson, a Virginian, who wrote "the Declaration of Independence" adopted July 4, 1776, a paper styled by a well known New England writer as "the most commanding and most pathetic utterance in any age, in any language, of national grievances and national purposes."

IX.

During the war that ensued Virginia contributed to the war what all must allow was the soul of the war—the immortal George Washington, whose immense moral personality accomplished more in bringing success than all the money employed and all the armies placed in the field; and the war had its ending at Yorktown, only a few miles from the original settlement at Jamestown. The Father of this great Republic was a Virginian.

X.

Virginia led in the work of organizing the Government of the United States. She called the Annapolis Convention in 1786, and furnished to the Federal Convention at Philadelphia which met, as the result of this action, its chief constructor—James Madison—who has been aptly described as Father of the Constitution. She furnished the two greatest rival interpreters of its powers, Thomas Jefferson and John Marshall, and gave the Union its first President, George Washington.
Virginia, through her explorers, generals and presidents, made the Union a continental power.

It was Patrick Henry and George Rogers Clark who effected the conquest of the Northwest Territory, which eventually added five great States to the Union. Meriwether Lewis and William Clark made the first thorough exploration of the West. And Louisiana, Florida and Texas were added to the Union by Virginia Presidents—Jefferson, Monroe, and Tyler. Nor can it be forgotten that all the far West was the result of the annexation of Texas by Tyler, indirectly leading to the Mexican War, whose success was assured by two Virginia generals—Zachary Taylor and Winfield Scott.

Had the New England influences, which were opposed to the Annexation policy, dominated, the United States to-day, if it existed at all, would be confined to a narrow strip along the Atlantic shore.

A Virginia President, James Monroe, gave to the world over his name the Monroe Doctrine, which has regulated, to the present day, the relations of America to the nations of Europe and the rest of mankind. "America for Americans," he said in substance.

Virginians created those ideals for which the Republic of the United States stands to-day—democracy, religious freedom, and education.

Democracy: Not only did Virginia have the first legislative Assembly, which rested for more than a hundred years on universal suffrage, she was the headquarters, after the American Revolution, of the great Democratic-Republican party, under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson. This party was the champion of the popular idea against the aristocratic notions of the Federalists, who had their headquarters in New England. By completely destroying the
Federalist party Virginia sowed the seeds of democracy throughout the United States, and the world. All political parties in the United States since that time have the same creed as to the equality of the citizen. Thomas Jefferson is incomparably the greatest living influence in America. He is, in fact, the Founder of Americanism, as we understand it.

Through an act, of which the same great man was the author, Virginia was the first State in the world to impose a penalty for engaging in the slave trade (1778), and in the Federal Convention in 1787 her delegates bitterly opposed the provision in the Constitution supported by the Puritan delegates from New England, permitting the slave trade for twenty years. New England men were great shippers of slaves.

Religious Freedom: After the same manner Virginia sowed the seeds of religious freedom. All New England, except Rhode Island, in Colonial days, was principled against religious liberty. Even after the American Revolution the preachers and a group of laymen in each community grasped all power and the people were forced into submission. In 1793 only one in twenty of the people in Connecticut exercised the right of suffrage. Even in Rhode Island there were, till a late date, laws against Roman Catholics voting or holding office, and it took Dorr's Rebellion in 1842 to break up the restrictions on the ballot handed down from Colonial days.

The persecuting spirit was not absent in Virginia, but it was never so severe or relentless as in New England. And for many years before the American Revolution there were no religious qualifications for voting.

The Declaration of Rights of Virginia, drawn by George Mason in 1776, and imitated by all the other States, placed the principle of religious freedom, for the first time, upon a truly philosophic basis. Virginia was then the First State in the world to proclaim absolute equality and freedom of religion to the people of all faiths—Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, etc. The principle enunciated by Mason was enacted into law by Thomas Jefferson, whose bill for Religious Freedom in 1785 invested conscience with the wings of heaven.
**Education:** Finally, it was a Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, that furnished the ideals of popular education. The system of schools as they existed in Massachusetts in Colonial days did not remotely resemble the present ideal. As a system they were under no central authority, were not free to the scholar who had to pay for tuition, and were primarily directed to the maintenance and upholding of the Congregational Church. None but members of that Church could be teachers in Massachusetts. In practice, the towns neglected their responsibilities "shamelessly," and a large percentage of the people could neither read nor write.

Virginia did not go far in her educational system, but in her ancient laws for educating poor children, and establishing and financing William and Mary College, the colony clearly recognized education as a public function. As to the general supply of education, however, the Colony had by far the best libraries and teachers, and, according to Mr. Jefferson, the mass of education, accomplished through tutors and private schools, "placed her among the foremost of her sister States," at the time of the Revolution. But it was the great bill of Thomas Jefferson in 1779, correlating the different gradations of schools—beginning with the primary schools and ending with the University, that furnished the real ideal on which the public school system of the United States rests to-day.

XIV.

Before 1861 the Union consisted practically of two nations separated by Mason and Dixon's line, differing in habits of thought, customs, and largely in institutions. It was only the pressure of British taxation that brought these two nations together, and immediately after the peace in 1783 the separative forces began to exert themselves. They were first sharply manifested in New England, where plans of secession were discussed as early as 1800. So far did this spirit proceed that in 1812-1814 the New England States professed the extreme doctrine of States rights, and did all they could to paralyze the arm of the Federal Government during the course of a war with the greatest power in Europe. As late as 1844 the Massachusetts Legislature, after declaring that "uniting
an independent foreign state" (like Texas) "with the United States was not among the powers delegated to the General Government," stated its resolve to be "to submit to undelegated powers in no body of men on earth," and in 1845 it announced the doctrine of nullification by declaring that the admission of Texas "would have no binding force whatever on the people of Massachusetts."

But by this time the great increase in the wealth and population of the North, chiefly due to the foreign immigration, caused New England to abandon the separative policy and substitute that of nationality to be preserved by force. The South now being the weaker section was compelled into the opposite policy, and finally, obeying the dictates of its economic and social forces, seceded from the Union and organized a separate government.

Virginia, who had a sentimental attachment to the Union, attempted to preserve it by the Peace Conference, but finding that impossible, and placed in a dilemma of fighting the northern Union or fighting the Southern Confederacy, she allied herself with the latter, of which she was really an integral part. In the light of the doctrine of self determination, now so generally admitted, it appears one of the most astonishing things in history that eight millions of people, occupying a territory half the size of Europe, with a thoroughly organized government, and capable of fighting one of the greatest wars on record, were not permitted to set up for themselves.

By the results of the war, one of the two nations of the old Union was wiped out and incorporated into the other. But Virginia was the capital of the Southern Confederacy and the battlefield of the war, and the veterans of Virginia and the South have lived to see the principle of self government and self determination for which they fought accepted by the world at large.

In the war for Southern Independence, as in the American Revolution, Virginia furnished the Ideal Man. In one war it was George Washington, and in the other it was Robert E. Lee. Both these great men were distinguished by the union of a handsome person with a supremely majestic soul, brave, refined, dignified and clean. They were, indeed, kingly men.
The contributions of Virginia to science should not be passed by in this summary of her priorities. Among the creators of an epoch the following may be mentioned particularly. James Rumsey first demonstrated in her waters in 1786 the possibilities of steam as applied to a river boat. Cyrus Hall McCormick revolutionized agriculture throughout the world by his invention of the reaper. Matthew Fontaine Maury about the same time did the same thing for ocean navigation. He furnished the plans for the laying of the Atlantic Cable, and was the father of the modern science of torpedo and mine laying. In recent days Walter Reed, of Gloucester County, was foremost in discovering the cause of yellow fever and rendering that dread disease innocuous.

During the war for Southern Independence, it was the ironclad Virginia (or Merrimac), constructed by two master engineers, John L. Porter, of Portsmouth, Va., and John Mercer Brooke, of Lexington, Va., that showed in an epoch making battle fought in Hampton Roads, March 8, 1862, with the Federal wooden battleships, the superiority of iron ships over wooden ones, no matter how gallantly manned and bravely fought.

Then and there Virginia genius and invention Founded the present navies of the world.

The Monitor, which engaged the Virginia the next day (March 9, 1862), had no share in this glory. Naval warfare would have been revolutionized if it had never showed up. The battle of the ninth is only interesting as it affords a test of the prowess of the two vessels. The Monitor was driven from the field, and ever after avoided conflict with the Virginia, though repeatedly challenged in Hampton Roads to a new trial of strength.
THE VIRGINIA DYNASTY.


Mr. Morgan has written a very valuable work, which should be duly noticed by the public for several very good reasons. In the first place, it shows a great amount of scholarship, and, in the second place, it is an exception to the generality of books written by Northern men. The author himself makes a tremendous, but just indictment, of the writers of the North, when he says that in that region "no historical misjudgment is so common as the offhand condemnation of slave state statesmen"—"the very fact that they came thence being sufficient warrant to neglect them or minimize any merits they may be grudgingly allowed." Here are fairness and frankness for you, and such a man is to be admired.

Mr. Morgan instances the late Henry Adams, of Massachusetts, whom he states is "hard on Monroe" in his history, and he deftly repels many of Adams' ill-founded conclusions, by contrasting them with those of his able grandfather, John Quincy Adams, who appreciated Monroe and delivered a eulogy upon him. He instances Edward Everett Hale, another man from New England, who felicitated himself upon his ability through Henry Adams' "very entertaining history of the United States" to tell the whole truth about the "Virginia dynasty," Jefferson, Madison and Monroe. Hale describes it as a "precious example of failures, follies, fuss and feathers and fol-de-rol."

Upon this Mr. Morgan remarks that "Mr. Hale is a good man and a patriot who made his mark, but his ante-bellum history is woefully distorted."

Next he instances Theodore Roosevelt, who, in his literary works as in his political career, walked along with a big stick, a poor excuse of an historian. This strenuous gentleman of aristocratic antecedents, in his laudation of the "high-strutting, federalistic and anti-Gallican Gouverneur Morris," calls poor democratic Monroe "a frenzied Jacobinical republican," capering like an Indian before the French court.
This is the way it has always been. With the exception of a few noble and generous spirits like George Bancroft, John Fiske, Gamaliel Bradford, Charles M. Andrews, and now George Morgan, the South has received very little mercy at the hands of Northern writers, who, because they have the money and through it the ear of the world, seem to feel that any statement in regard to Southern men must be either derogatory or positively malicious. Nearly all history in the North has been written by persons with politics, most out of sympathy with the South.

We have seen this spirit reach a climax, when men of standing in the North, in the face of all the facts in history, wipe Jamestown from the map and make Plymouth in New England the first English colony in America and the beginning of the American commonwealth. This shameless distortion of the truth has one consoling feature, however, that it makes clear the fact, hard to believe, that the statements of few Northern writers or speakers on matters of history can be accepted without important modifications.

Fortunate for the men from the Southern States who, like John Marshall, had a measurably sympathetic connection with the men of these northerly climates. They indeed have had a chance to have their merits recognized. There is Mr. Beveridge, who has written of Marshall a very interesting and valuable life, but, with Mr. Beveridge, as with Mr. Henry Adams, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe were largely theatrical performers, full of wild notions incompatible with the safety of the republic.

One cannot help thinking Mr. Morgan intended his work as an answer in some measure to Mr. Beveridge. Without naming him to any great extent, he appears to show that he, like other critics of the "Virginia dynasty," is decidedly too uncharitable.

In the days of which Mr. Morgan has written, the struggle was between the Democratic-Republican party and the Federalists. The latter were completely destroyed, and for many years after 1816 Federalism was a word of scorn and contumely. In more modern times an effort has been made to give it a good character, and the Federalist party is referred to as "the party of law and order." And so the attack has been made all along the line on the
motives, ability and patriotism of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe.

Passing by, however, their minor shortcomings, which these modern critics love to emphasis, the great measures of the "Virginia dynasty" give direction to the government to-day. The Union rests quite certainly upon the strong foundation which they built. And to no section of the Union have they proved greater benefactors than to that section where they have been most abused and carped at.

What were these measures? (1) Mr. Morgan makes the telling point that "the prime, the vital struggle" of the Virginia "dynasty" was in behalf of "American democratic government against the aristocratic rule of the few." Here is where the shoe most pinches. New England and the Federalists, instead of standing for democracy, stood for the rule of the classes, and this "slave-holding dynasty" stood for the rights of the people. This seeming contradiction has an easy explanation in the fact that slavery of the blacks did away in public with all the old distinctions among white people. These distinctions continued in New England because white people there had to do the menial duties. In the South the suffrage, too, in colonial times had always rested upon general laws, while in New England citizenship had been a matter of special selection in each individual case.

(2) The next great measure for which these slave-holders stood was annexation of territory. Mr. Beveridge claims that Mr. Jefferson "did not want Louisiana" and cites his instructions to Monroe as a proof, but the evidence set forth by Mr. Morgan is that Jefferson and Madison, his Secretary of State, were always alive to the importance of Louisiana as affecting the interests of the Union, and that, while the instructions to Monroe contemplated the acquisition of only New Orleans and Florida, there is nothing in them to support the idea that Jefferson was hostile to the acquisition of Louisiana. On the contrary, he readily accepted the work of the Commissioners, of whom Monroe was one, and did it against the strenuous opposition of the New England men, who fought and continued to fight against any enlargement of the territory of the Union. They fought against the annexation of Florida, and later they threatened nullification against the an-
nexation of Texas, and wanted neither New Mexico nor California. Had the policy of the Federalists been accepted, the Union would be to-day but a narrow strip along the Atlantic Coast.

(3) Again the Virginia dynasty stood for European immigration. When Mr. Jefferson came in, he found laws on the statute books requiring a residence of nineteen years in the country before an alien could become a citizen, and these people were so hated by the Federalists that the President had been given power to ship any back on his mere suspicion of unfriendliness. Mr. Jefferson had the law repealed, made the length of residence what it is now, and encouraged all he could the admission of immigrants, and no other act of his contributed more to the development of the country. These people, coming by thousands, filled the waste places, especially in the North and West and built up the vast fortunes of Boston and New York. No part of the country profited by them more than New England, where the old Puritan families exploited in their factories the cheap labor thus afforded, like the Southern planters exploited their slaves. From these immigrants came chiefly the armies that finally defeated the South in 1865.

(4) Next the Virginia dynasty stood for the protection of the flag to every man and everything on board ship. They stood against impressment, and declared for the doctrine accepted to-day of “Free ships make free goods.” Where were the Federalists on these matters? On impressment they made all sorts of excuses for the British, and Marshall and his fellow Federalist judges defended in American courts the English view of international law, both as to allegiance and search.

(5) Then this “slave state dynasty” opposed the claim of Marshall and the Federalists for a universal common law jurisdiction in the Federal Courts. The recognition of this claim would have made every local question cognizable in the national courts, but the accepted doctrine now is that the powers of such courts are statutory only.

(6) Marshall and the Federalists wanted to make the Federal Supreme Court “the arbiter” on all questions involving sovereignty, but here again their plan of action was defeated and has no place in our governmental system to-day. Wherever the final arbiter
exists, whether in the States, a convention of the States, or the mass of the people, it necessarily never did, and does not now rest in the Supreme Court of the United States, or any other Federal Court. There are many questions of vital importance that can never get before the Federal Courts for decision. Such, for instance, has been the tariff question, which came near bringing about war in 1833 and which was the final factor in bringing about war in 1861. After signing an order for the withdrawal of the troops from Fort Sumter, Lincoln was induced to send troops through the pressure of the high tariff governors who came to Washington about April 1, 1861.

(7) Then there was the conscription bill proposed by Madison’s administration in 1814. It was bitterly denounced as contrary to the constitution, state sovereignty and individual rights by the Federalists, including Webster, who made a disunion speech against it. It was by a far more drastic bill in these latter days that the United States, under a Democratic President, was enabled to muster its strength and decide the issues of the World War.

(8) There is next the slavery question, the moral side of which the New Englanders have tried to monopolize, filling huge libraries with books of self-laudation and abuse of Southern men as “slave drivers,” “slave barons,” etc.

As a matter of fact, the three members of the “slave state dynasty” were conspicuous for their opposition to slavery and the slave trade, greatly in contrast to the New Englanders, whose eagerness for commerce made their moral vision obtuse during all the early history of the Union. Against the strong protests of James Madison, one of the dynasty, the New England delegates in the Convention of 1787 had voted to permit the slave trade for twenty years. In that interval thousands of negroes were introduced in the country, chiefly by New England ships, and this influx fastened slavery on the country. Under Jefferson in 1808 the slave trade was prohibited by the national Congress, and under Monroe it was declared piracy, and such was the zeal of the latter that he made a treaty with Great Britain permitting the mutual right of search off the coast of Africa.

(9) Even for the Embargo and Non-Intercourse laws New
England historians should have a kind word, though they never have. Similar measures were adopted by the country, including New England, before the Revolution. The Embargo and Non-Intercourse laws were hard on New England, but out of this policy and the War of 1812 grew the high tariffs on which New Englanders have luxuriated. They ought to be grateful to the "slave state dynasty" for diverting them from commerce to manufacturing.

(10) The Virginia dynasty was certainly not always consistent in interpreting the powers of the government under the constitution, but on the fundamental question of the relation of the states to the Union they undoubtedly took the states rights view in contradistinction to the principle of nationalism espoused by John Marshall and carried by Lincoln and the Republican party to lengths undreamed of by the great Chief Justice. The Virginia Presidents clearly recognized that the Union consisted practically of two really distinct nations, differing in occupations, institutions and ideals. Their union had been brought about originally by the pressure of British taxation and the constitution of 1787 had been only possible through compromise. The policy recommended by the Virginia dynasty was one of confining the government as much as possible to foreign relations so as not to awaken the sectional jealousy inherent in the nature of the Union. But with extraordinary fatuity the Northerners pressed the principle of nationalism which meant, of course, sectional rule, and brought about the crises of 1820, 1833 and 1861.

Pushed to a conclusion at either of these earlier dates, nationalism would have undoubtedly broken the Union to pieces. It came near doing so in 1861 when the North had increased enormously in power through immigration, the tariff and other measures of the Federal government. Even then, to conquer the South Lincoln had to impress the negroes of the South, making the extraordinary confession that without the 200,000 negro soldiers thus enlisted he would have had to give up the war in "three weeks."

The result of the war was to destroy the Southern nation and there emerged out of the bloody strife but one nation—the Northern nation, to whose wishes the South ever since has had to conform all
its political and economic activities. But in what kind of strain would the eulogists of nationalism and the abusers of the Virginia dynasty be talking, had the Union been broken under the aggressive teachings of the nationalists? Certainly, then, it was a most fortunate incident that the states rights principle prevailed in the earlier days, for it made possible the compromises by which war, with very probable fatal results to the Union, was averted both in 1820 and 1833, when the South was relatively much stronger than in 1861.

(11) Finally that "slave state dynasty" stood for the Monroe Doctrine. Here again little appreciation is shown. The zealous attempt is made to divest Monroe of his true character as the author and to give the credit to a New Englander, John Quincy Adams, the Secretary of State. Monroe is called a "weak President" and Adams is exalted, but the truth is, all the glory Adams ever won came from separating himself from the Federalists, disowning his own section and identifying himself with this much reviled "Virginia dynasty." I do not mean to detract from Mr. Adams, who was an honor to the whole country, but he was never a leader of men, and his administration (1825-1829) was a conspicuous failure on account of his irritable nature and ferocious prejudices that drove everybody from him. Subordinate to Monroe, he performed his part well, but he was not the author of the Monroe Doctrine.

In a broad construction of its meaning, the Monroe Doctrine expressed the stand of the "Virginia dynasty," which was "America First." In manifesting friendliness to France, neither Jefferson, Madison nor Monroe intended to ally themselves with the world-conqueror, Napoleon. What was the situation of the Federalists? They took sides with England, which was unfortunately allied with the effete monarchies of Europe, who on the downfall of Napoleon entered into a "Holy Alliance" to repress all reforms and "representative governments." When England declared against this combination, the "Virginia dynasty," instead of siding with France, stood by England's side, and Jefferson wrote in her favor.

Mr. Morgan, however, seems to agree with Mr. Beveridge in characterizing Mr. Jefferson as unfit to deal with menacing condi-
tions. Was this really a fact? Who was more aggressive than Mr. Jefferson in all the period leading to the American Revolution? He was abused as Governor of Virginia, but he had to deal with a State which had sent all its arms to the north and the south. Is it certain that any one could have done better? Why do Mr. Morgan and Mr. Beveridge, after referring to Jay’s treaty as “the most humiliating” to the United States ever negotiated, justify the soldier Washington in approving it, because it postponed war, and condemn Mr. Jefferson for the Embargo and Non-intercourse, when he had the same object in view?

Mr. Morgan, in another place in his book, remarks, “We take on prejudices early while in this mortal clay,” and a statement of his, rather unnecessarily brought in, shows that he is not entirely free from the prejudices which he imputes to other Northern writers when dealing with Southern slaveholders. He refers to John C. Calhoun as representing “the dread idea of disunion and death on many a bloody battlefield.” This is a very cruel statement. New England preached disunion long before Mr. Calhoun entered public life and he was dead more than ten years before any war ensued. The responsibility for “the bloody battlefield” lies with Lincoln and his party, who declared that the Union could not endure “half slave and half free.” To the impasse thus announced there were only two solutions possible—secession or war. The South wished peaceable secession, and Lincoln would not permit it and insisted on war. He made “the bloody battlefield.”

When, however, all is said, we cannot be too grateful to Mr. Morgan for writing this book. Mr. Monroe was a man of consummate tact and judgment, and Mr. Morgan’s book is a splendid defence of one of the ablest patriots of the country against the miserable attempts which have been made to detract from his character and his ability. Few men, indeed, have trod the paths of glory so wonderfully as James Monroe! It almost seems as if moral character counted as nothing with many Northern historians, who exalt Benjamin Franklin and Alexander Hamilton into great exemplars. Monroe was a contrast to these men in the purity of his private life. It is a distinct element in his greatness which the historian seeking an ideal may justly appreciate.
LEADERSHIP OF VIRGINIA.

When, after the peace in 1763, George Grenville, Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain, took up his plan of taxing America, he suggested a new sugar bill to be passed immediately and a bill for levying stamp duties in the colonies to be brought in a year later. The Chancellor’s resolutions to this effect were agreed to in Committee of the House of Commons; and on March 10th, 1764, formally accepted by the House. On April 5th a bill called the Sugar Act received the royal approval. Agitation in the colonies immediately commenced, but it is to be noted that, while opposition in New England developed strongly against the Sugar Bill, opposition in Virginia was directed chiefly against the proposed Stamp Act.

It is a mistake, therefore, to say that the resolutions proposed by Samuel Adams at the Boston Town Meeting May 24th, 1764, were a protest against the Stamp Act. On the contrary, they were directed against the Sugar bill. This is the character of the memorial and instructions drafted by James Otis and adopted by the House of Representatives on June 13th. It is also the character of the pamphlet written by him on “The Rights of the British Colonies,” published in the early part of 1764, and of the pamphlet by Oxenbridge Thacher on “Sentiments of a British-American,” published two months later. These pamphlets had only local significance, and were not known outside of Massachusetts. It is likewise the character of the formal address of the Massachusetts Provincial Assembly adopted in October, 1764. It continued to be the general tone of all the writings in New England until the early part of November, 1764, when, in a leading newspaper of Rhode Island, there appeared the first serious consideration of the proposed Stamp Act. (Literary History of the American Revolution, by Moses Coit-Tyler, II, 61.) “From that time writings appeared in New England taking notice of the impending measure;” but they were singularly free from grasping its appalling significance. The center of objection in New England continued to be the sugar tax, but this was not a measure sufficiently general in its
Leadership in Virginia

operation to unite the Colonies at this stage of the Revolution. Palfrey, the New England historian, says that "it is by no means improbable that, after all their remonstrances and complaints, they (the New Englanders) would have ended by reconciling themselves to the new restrictions on commerce as they had done to the Writs of Assistance," and, as a matter of fact, the Sugar Bill continued in existence after the Stamp Act had been repealed. On the other hand, "the Stamp Act," to quote Palfrey's language, "being simply the imposition of an internal tax, presented the question of right in a form cleared from all subtlety and qualifications." It was chiefly the preamble of the Sugar Bill, describing its purpose to raise revenue that distinguished it from the Sugar Bill of 1733, which, as a bill to regulate trade, had been submitted to by all the colonies.

Now the new Sugar Bill cut very little figure in Virginia or any of the Southern colonies. The New Englanders wanted molasses from the West Indies to make rum for African slave trade, but a strong sentiment against the continuance of this trade had sprung up in Virginia.

The occasion of alarm in Virginia was almost entirely the Stamp Act, in which they showed a much greater prescience than the Northern brethren. This was a measure wholly unprecedented and came to the fireside of every man on the continent, since it proposed a stamp on all wills, deeds and every species of writing. It furnished a basis for union of colonial opposition, overriding all differences of institutions and climate. Now, it is in the early appreciation of what the Stamp Act meant to the continent that Virginia undoubtedly leads Massachusetts.

On June 15, 1764, the Committee of Correspondence, meeting at Williamsburg, ordered a letter to be written to their agent in London to oppose with all his influence "the laying of any duties on us and particularly taxing the internal trade of the colonies without their consent," and on July 28th George Wythe and Robert Carter Nicholas, who had been appointed to write the letter, proposed a draft which was adopted. The importance of the communication lies in the fact that it is the first earnest discussion of the Stamp Act in America. At the succeeding session, begin-
ning with October 31st, strong resolutions against the Stamp Act were adopted November 14th, 1764, and on December 18th, 1764, three remonstrances, addressed to the King, Lords and Commons. Nevertheless, the Stamp Act was approved by the King on February 17th, 1765, but it was not to go into effect until November 1, 1765.

For a long time after its passage, the sentiments of New England were pacific enough. When the Massachusetts Provincial Assembly met in May, 1765, Otis recommended a Congress of the colonies to be held in October to join in "a united, dutiful, loyal and humble representation of their condition to his Majesty and Parliament." New England gave unmistakable signs of surrender and Hutchinson, the Chief Justice, wrote to the ministry that "the Stamp Act would execute itself without trouble." It is an old story, not necessary to be repeated here, that Virginia sprang to the front and saved the day through the resolutions of Patrick Henry, offered on May 29th, 1765. Otis pronounced them "treasonable," but, as Governor Bernard, of Massachusetts wrote, "the publishing of the Virginia resolutions proved an alarm bell to the disaffected." "Two or three months ago," he continued, "I thought this people would submit to the Stamp Act."

In another respect full justice has not been done to Virginia, and this is in regard to her stand taken in the inception of these troubles as to the powers of Parliament. In 1761 the Massachusetts Assembly admitted the supremacy of Parliament in these positive words: "We have maturely considered and beg leave to observe that we are far from apprehensive that an act of this Court can alter an act of Parliament. . . . Every act we make, repugnant to an act of Parliament, extending to the plantations, is ipso facto null and void." After the passage of the Sugar Bill in 1764, this doctrine was again admitted, both by the Massachusetts Assembly and James Otis. The latter declared that "in all possible contingencies Parliament has the right to levy internal taxes on the colonies." With the full knowledge of these sentiments, the town of Boston in May, 1765, re-elected Otis to the Assembly and that body re-elected Thomas Oliver as Councillor, although he had been appointed stamp distributor.
When Samuel Adams came to represent the spirit of New England, Massachusetts took a bolder stand, but it did not (until a much later date), go beyond denying the power of Parliament to tax America, after the example in each case had been set by Virginia. Now, in Virginia, from the start the position taken was not merely "no taxation without representation," but no legislation without representation. This doctrine had been asserted by Richard Bland in his pamphlet, composed in 1763 and published about July, 1764, entitled "The Colonel Dismounted," and written as a reply to Reverend John Camm in the controversy over the Two-Penny Act in 1758.

So this act passed in 1758 may be justly looked upon as the true prelude to the Revolutionary drama. It directly involved the question of local taxation and asserted this right against the King's authority, just as the resolutions of Patrick Henry in 1765 asserted the same right against the Parliament. The agitation over the Two-Penny Act prevailed for years and involved the whole colony of Virginia. It mingled with the agitation over the Revenue Act of 1767, excited great interest in England, and powerfully swelled the tide of opposition in Virginia.

On the other hand, the affair of the writs of assistance in Massachusetts was a mere local matter and of short duration. The Supreme Court decided the issue against Otis, and the people of Massachusetts, according to Palfrey, became entirely reconciled to the issuance of writs. (History of New England, V. 279.) It had connection with the enforcement of the Sugar Act of 1733, which was a trade measure and not a revenue measure; and Otis' speech in 1761 was not known outside of Massachusetts. No copy of it has been preserved and the importance attributed to it later is largely due to John Adams, who many years after its delivery galvanized it into historic importance. Otis spoke merely for the rights of the British subject against general warrants, which were contrary to the spirit of Magna Carta. Whatever credit Otis deserves for his speech in 1761 is largely discounted by his subsequent backdown on the stamp act and revenue act, resistance to which he pronounced "treason."

In the hot discussions over the lawfulness of the Two Penny Act
Col. Landon Carter, in 1759, and Richard Bland, in 1760, assumed the ground that the royal instructions forbidding any change of the law respecting taxation to pay the ministers could not stand in the way of "the salus populi," and in 1763 Patrick Henry declared that by disallowing the new act which had received the approval of his Governor (Fauquier) the King had "forfeited the allegiance of the people of Virginia." (William and Mary College Quarterly, XVIII, 149, 150.)

Bland's pamphlet, however, "The Colonel Dismounted," written the latter year, contained the fullest expressions of the controversy.

In this paper Bland denied that Parliament has any right to make any laws for Virginia and asserted that Virginia's code of law consisted of the common law, statutes of England made before the settlement of Jamestown and the statutes of her own General Assembly. He declared that any interference of England "may be opposed." (See Bland's "Constitutional Argument," Wm. & Mary Coll. Quarterly, XIX, 31-42.)

In the resolutions adopted by the Assembly November 14, 1764, the same ground is taken as to local legislation, and one looks in vain for any admission like that of Massachusetts that Parliament is supreme.

After the passage of the Stamp Act, we find the same position assumed in the resolutions of Patrick Henry, May 29th, 1765. The fourth resolution in the series then offered asserted that "his Majesty's liege people of this most ancient colony have uninterruptedely enjoyed the right of being thus governed by their own Assembly in the article of their taxes and internal police and that the same hath never been forfeited or in any other way given up, but has been constantly recognized by the King and people of Great Britain."

From this it was an easy step for Richard Bland in the early spring of 1766 to proceed to a position, probably never quite taken by himself in his "The Colonel Dismounted." In a pamphlet entitled, "An Inquiry into the Rights of the British Colonies," which, unlike all previous pamphlets, had a circulation both in America and England, he announced the doctrine that the British colonies in America were united to the Empire only through the British
crown and not at all through the British Parliament, and to the acts of the latter they owed no more obedience than did the King's Dominion of Hanover.

Dr. Moses Coit Tyler, in his "Literary History of the American Revolution," declares the doctrine thus advanced "a prodigious innovation." But it was afterwards accepted by the American public, and became the ground on which the union with Great Britain was dissolved. In language still bolder than Bland's Jefferson expressed similar views in 1774 in his "Summary View of the Rights of the British Colonies."

And yet, too much stress is not to be laid on Dr. Moses Tyler's words. "A prodigious innovation" Bland's doctrine may have been in New England, but it was not so in Virginia. It was not really a new doctrine there that the colony was solely dependent on the Crown. As early as April, 1624, the Virginia Company of London appealed to Parliament, but King James told the House of Commons that Virginia affairs were none of their business, and the petition was withdrawn. Then, in 1676 a charter was obtained from King Charles II, in which it was declared that Virginia should have an immediate dependence upon the crown under the government and rule of such governors as should be appointed from time to time. (Hening's Statutes at Large, II, 532.) Next, in 1759 Reverend Andrew Burnaby, an English traveler, wrote that "many of the Virginians consider the colonies as independent states not connected with Great Britain otherwise than by having the same common king and being bound to her with natural ties of affection." Finally this may be added. On November 11, 1773, when the doctrine of entire independence of Parliament had been practically accepted throughout the united colonies, a writer in the Virginia Gazette, calling himself "Hampden," reminded "the Parliament of Virginia" (meaning its General Assembly) that "you claim the honor of being the first of the colonies that asserted its exclusive legislative power."

That some English Statutes of later date than 1606 had passed current in Virginia was not deemed by Bland fatal to this claim of independence of Parliament. "She submitted," he says, "as a weaker vessel," but "power abstracted from right cannot give a first title
to dominion” and “though submitted to because of a necessity, may be resisted whenever the sufferer obtains strength enough to do so.”

(See “Virginia Leadership in the Revolution,” in William and Mary College Quarterly, XVIII, 145-164, and XIX, 10-28, 219-262.)

GENERAL WARRANTS.

It is interesting to note that on January 10, 1627, the General Court of Virginia, consisting of the Governor and his Council, noting the inconveniences which had happened by the granting of general warrants, ordered that no more should be issued, but a group of named persons inhabiting in any single plantation might be included in any single warrant. (Virginia Magazine, XXVII, p. 145.) This was 134 years before James Otis spoke against writs of assistance which permitted general warrants for the search of any building suspected of holding smuggled goods. The Supreme Court of Massachusetts overruled Otis and writs of the kind were freely issued in that Colony down to the Boston Port bill.

It was different in Virginia, where in 1769 Governor Botetourt and his Council declared such writs of assistance as illegal and contrary to Magna Carta.

It may be worth mentioning in this connection that it was not till April 23, 1766, that the English House of Commons, at the close of a long struggle, to which Wilkes’ criticism in No. 45 of the North Briton gave rise, declared general warrants illegal.

When George Mason drew his “Declaration of Rights” in 1776, which was imitated in all the other colonies, he made section X declare “That general warrants, whereby an officer or messenger may be commanded to search suspected places without evidence of a fact committed, or to seize any person or persons not named, or where the offence is not particularly described and supported by evidence, are grievous and oppressive, and ought not to be granted.”
Nevertheless, in our day and generation, when past history is known only to a few, we see a marked return to the evils against which our ancestors struggled. The prohibitionists want general warrants to enforce the laws against the sale of liquor. The good church people want a board of censors to repress immoral representations in the motion pictures, and legislation more or less in restriction of the press is considered at each meeting of the Legislature. This is all wrong. If the present laws are not effective, the remedy should be sought in increased penalties both on offenders and on the officers who are negligent of their duty. The remedies proposed are against Magna Carta and our Declaration of Rights and they afford a precedent, which, if invoked in a bad cause, might lead to the gravest consequences.

---

RECORDATION OF DEEDS AND WILLS.

The instructions given by the Virginia Company of London to Sir George Yardley in 1618 required him and his Council to assign to the inhabitants of Virginia their shares of land according to designated rules. These basic deeds were called land grants and the evidence of their registration is preserved in the Land Office in Richmond. An early book appears to be lost, for these land books start with the year 1623, which leaves a gap of four or five years. It is in evidence that many persons received land before 1623 and there is no reason to suppose that they were not recorded (Brown’s First Republic, p. 605). The transfer of some of these lands is sometimes entered in the same books.

The Council Journal from 1607 to 1622 has been lost and what remains is defective, but on October 13, 1626, is this order:

“It is ordered yt a publication shall be sent to all plantations yt as soon as may bee after the Death of any man there may be an inventory taken of all his estate & goods whatsoever & yt such wills and testaments shall be proved as soone as may be & yt it be not deferred beyond ye next quarter Court at ye farthest upon penaltie of censure of ye Governor and Counsell as in a matter yt divers times may prove of great inconvenience as has been apparent by many ex-
 samples. And it is farther ordered yt all such as have not proved any Wills or neglected to deliver forthw'th the Inventories of ye goods of persons deceased within one year last past doe prove ye said wills and deliver in ye Inventories at or before ye next quarter Court held at James Citty upon ye penalty aforesaid.

"It is ordered at this Court yt all sales of lands and deeds of gifts of lands made and agreed on between partyes within this Colonye be brought into ye Court at James Citty & there recorded and enrolled within one year and a day next after ye date thereof." (See Virginia Magazine of History and Biography XXVI. p. 242.)

It is apparent from the language of the order regarding wills that the proving of wills and taking of Inventories had been usual in the past, but some irregularities had resulted which needed to be corrected. Now, as in England the proof of a will was accompanied by recordation, this was undoubtedly the case in Virginia. Previous to this entry, but at the same court, it was ordered in regard to Mr. Richard Bennett, "who deceased about the 28th of August last," without a will, that "ye severall Inventories of ye goods, & a receipt of all books and accounts" be "recorded in ye Court." Many proofs of wills occur in these Council notes, previous to the general order cited.

June 6, 1625, a contract was recorded in the Council minutes. (Ibid., XXV, 36.)

In 1634 counties were formed with county courts. Only the records of one of them are preserved from the first court—Northampton County—and the registry of deeds and wills in this county proves that it was common to all. In York County, where the earliest records are not preserved, a will is recorded in 1637.

In Massachusetts the first act requiring general registration was in 1634. Plymouth had practically no records till 1633, when its first court book begins. In 1620 the settlers at Plymouth were given a plot of land each, but there was no actual record of this till 1627. (See Plymouth Records.) As this may be considered a basic grant, it was subsequent to the basic grants in Virginia (the Land Grants) and its recordation subsequent to the general order as to deeds (October 13, 1626).

In Virginia it is probable that wills and inventories were recorded from the very beginning (1607?), and that deeds began to
be recorded after 1619, when lands were laid out for the settlers.

There is nothing too ridiculous for some writers to assert, and Douglas Campbell's book, "The Puritan in Holland, England and America" is a good example of this. The claim that he makes, among other absurd things, that the recor
dation of deeds and wills was brought to America from Holland by the Puritan settlers has, like many other claims for New England, no foundation. The settlers, being Englishmen, reproduced both in Virginia and New England the institutions of their homeland, and the system of the registra
tion of deeds is the outgrowth of English statutes and customs. For by 27 Henry 8th, Chap. 16, in order to be valid all deeds of bargain and sale had to be recorded. The government of Virginia adopted a system of allowing a wife to join in a deed on privy examination, which was kept up till a few years ago. This was following a custom of London, and was nothing new. (See Charles V. Meredith's review of Mr. Campbell's book in Virginia Magazine of History and Biography, I, 100-104.)

THE ASHBURTON TREATY, 1842.

LETTER OF MRS. JULIA G. TYLER.

Mr. Curtis

Dear Sir,

I had just replied to a letter from Prof. Horsford desiring me if possible to furnish you with the notes of Mr. Webster to Prest. Tyler relating to the Ashburton Treaty, when I recd. through Mr. Choate the expression of your wish on the same subject. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than to be able to enclose you the notes referred to, but all the papers of my Husband, public and private, left to my care at his death, were destroyed in the burning of Rich'd, where I had stored them for safe keeping on leaving Virginia in a perilous manner during the War.

It may be, however, that his sons who were his private sec'ies for some time have preserved some interesting notes. I have
written them making enquiry. I shall probably hear in reply in a few days.

I have it in my power to say that Mr. Tyler always expressed the warmest admiration for Mr. Webster—not only on account of his great talents, but because of their harmonious association in the cabinet. Mr. Webster as Sec'y of State never forgot the relation in which he stood to the President and never acted independently of him. Thus, in regard to the Ashburton Treaty, every part of the correspondence passed under the Prest's supervision Mr. Webster before communicating with Lord Ashburton always rec'd, his views & brought his letters to him to revise as he wished.

Perhaps the original drafts may have been preserved among Mr. Webster's papers & by their marginal additions or interlineations in the President's handwriting prove my memory to be correct of our conversations on the subject. Mr. Webster in his notes to the Pres't cordially acknowledged his valuable aid. It was these notes that Mr. Horsford must have seen (& writes me he mentioned to you) when visiting us at Sherwood Forest.

I hope, dear sir, I have not seemed to laud Mr. Tyler at the expense of Mr. Webster. It is far from my intention, but, as a true historian, I am sure you wish to do justice to their combined noble intellects & generous natures.

I thank you for the kind & appreciative terms in which you refer to my Husband in your note to Mr. Choate. I am yours,

With great respect,

J. G. Tyler.

Envelope addressed to D. Gardiner Tyler,
Lexington, Virginia.

Endorsed: Copy of letter to G. T. Curtis.

*Prof. E. N. Horsford, formerly of Harvard University, who married successively two sisters—Misses Mary and Phebe Gardiner, first cousins of Mrs. Tyler.

Note.—The above is a copy of a letter written to George Ticknor Curtis, and enclosed by Mrs. Tyler to her son, now Judge D. Gardiner Tyler, then a student at Washington College, Lexington, Va. This identifies it as written when Mr. Curtis was engaged in preparing his life of Daniel Webster. For an account of the Ashburton Treaty and
OLD TIMES IN VIRGINIA.

Communicated by Dr. A. J. Morrison.

A correspondent in Middle Virginia, writing for Edmund Ruffin's Farmers' Register (article copied in American Farmer, Baltimore, May, 1834), said of those modern times: "A new era seems to be commencing in Virginia, whether for good or ill, time must determine. The simple grandeur of the Ancient Dominion has departed—perhaps forever—and cannot long be enjoyed by any country. With very little trade, but that free and simple, and with a hard money currency, the days of the wooden trencher and pewter plates and dishes were glorious days—when every man understood and minded his own business. Now many a planter furnishes a carriage for his wife and daughter to ride in costing more than the legacy he could bequeath to each of his children. Towns, villages and manufactories are beginning to be erected—internal improvements are much talked of, and every man is a politician. If things progress as they have done for a year or two past, we shall soon have consumers enough within our own territory, and agriculture will be much encouraged."

the agency especially of President Tyler, apart from his Secretary of State see Wm & Mary Quarterly, XXV, 1-8. This shows (1) that Mr. Tyler long preceded Mr. Webster in his acceptance of the basic idea that the North Eastern boundary was determinable only by compromise. (2) That what was known as the "Cruising Convention" for the suppression of the slave trade was placed in the treaty at his suggestion. (3) That it was due to his correction of the letter of Lord Ashburton, as first submitted to him, that the principle was saved which secured full damages under the Convention of February 8, 1853, for the slaves aided by the British authorities at Nassau in escaping from the Creole. (4) That it was due to him that the three subjects of the negotiations were submitted in one treaty for the ratification of the Senate, against the opinion of Mr. Webster, who wanted them submitted separately. (5) That it was largely due to his happy tact and manners that the New England Commissioners and Lord Ashburton, representing the British government were made to harmonize and deadlocks prevented—a fate which had overtaken all other negotiations on the boundary question from Washington's administration down.
In this connection it is of interest to read a letter or two from Tidewater, giving some idea of the wonderful wheat farming of that region seventy-five or eighty years ago. Benjamin Ogle Tayloe reported in John Skinner's *Journal of Agriculture*, July, 1846 (Vol. II, p. 57), that there had been a great improvement in farming methods below Fredericksburg. But, added Mr. Tayloe, a former proprietor of "Mt. Airy" had occasionally sent in one year thirty thousand bushels of wheat to market at near two dollars a bushel. And for 1846 Mr. Tayloe said that on his "Nanjemoy" plantation he had 500 acres in wheat, early sowed and turning out above the average. He had sowed before the middle of September.

Late in 1847 Robert B. Bolling, of Charles City County, wrote to Mr. Skinner about the wheat crop (*Journal of Agriculture*, III, 461). He said that the past season his own wheat on 500 acres had averaged twenty-three bushels; and that Hill Carter of "Shirley"; William Harrison, of "Brandon," and John Selden, of "Westover," had averaged thirty-one bushels on fields of 100 to 200 acres.

Naturally, those were the days when the Richmond mills were so conspicuously in the South American trade. It was shortly before the Revolution that Virginia began to make wheat a money crop.
"A TREWE RELACYON"
VIRGINIA FROM 1609 TO 1612

Students of Virginia history will be gratified to know that a copy of George Percy's manuscript in regard to events occurring in Virginia between the years 1609 and 1612 has been obtained from England and placed in the State Library. With the permission of the Librarian it is published here for the first time.

Efforts to obtain a copy of this old document had been made several times during the last forty years. In 1884, when Dr. Edward D. Neill was preparing to publish his "Virginia Vetusta," he ascertained that a writing of interest purporting to be "A trewe relacyon of the peedeinges," by George Percy, was in the library of the then Lord Leconfield, at "Petworth House," in Sussex.

Dr. Neill wrote to Lord Leconfield and asked for a copy of the manuscript to be incorporated in the volume he proposed to publish. The first three pages and the last three were carefully copied and forwarded to Dr. Neill with expressions of regret that the intervening thirty-eight pages could not be found. However, Neill published the fragments that were sent him and the dedicatory letter addressed by George Percy to his brother, the Earl of Northumberland.

Some twenty years later Dr. Lyon G. Tyler, then President of William and Mary College, feeling sure that all the sheets of the Percy manuscript must be somewhere in the "Petworth House" collection, and that they had not really been lost, but were merely misplaced, wrote and asked that a copy be made and sent to him. But Lord Leconfield at that time, apparently misconstruing the request for a "copy" into a request for the original document replied that he was not willing to part with it.

Not long ago Dr. Tyler renewed his efforts and finally succeeded, through the friendly offices of Ambassador George Harvey, in obtaining the consent of the present Lord Leconfield to have a copy of the entire manuscript made and this copy was received February 8, 1922, by Dr. Tyler and handed over to the Virginia State Library.

George Percy, as is well known, was three times at the head of the affairs of the colony during the periods of the first and second charters. So any observations made by him on the Virginia of his period are of necessity of interest and of value to historians. The manuscript throws a new light upon certain phases of Virginia history, and is at places somewhat critical of Capt. John Smith; and gives a fresh point of view.

The present Lord Leconfield, to whose kindness Virginia is in-
debted for the copy of the Percy manuscript is Charles Henry Wyndham, Third Baron Leconfield, who was born in 1872, and succeeded to the title and to "Petworth House" estate in 1901.

In his letter to Dr. Tyler, Ambassador Harvey says:

"It gives me the very greatest pleasure to send on to you, with this letter, a copy of the George Percy manuscript, which I have had made through the help and good offices of Lord Leconfield. I trust you will permit me to present it through you to the Library Board of the State of Virginia, which holds such a warm place in my memory and affections."

To the right honorable the Lorde Percy

My Lorde

This Relacyon I have here sente your Lordshipp is for Towe respectts. The one to Sheowe how mutche I honnor yo\textsuperscript{u} and desyre to doe yo\textsuperscript{u} service. The other in Regard thatt many untrewthes concerneinge Theis proceedeinges have bene formerly published wherein The Author haethe nott Spared to Aproperate many desertts to himselfe w\textsuperscript{h} he never \textsuperscript{?}formed and stuffed his Relacyons w\textsuperscript{h} so many falseties and malicyous detractyons nott onely of this ?te and Tyme w\textsuperscript{h} I have selected to Treate of Butt of former ocurrrentes. Also So thatt I coulde nott conteine my selfe butt expresse the Trewthe unto your Lordshipp concerninge Theis Affayers. And all w\textsuperscript{h} I ayme att is to manyfeste my selfe in all my Actyons bothe nowe and Always To be

Your Lordshipps humble and
faithfull Servante

G. P.

A Trewe Relacyon of the \textsuperscript{?}cedeinges and Ocurrrentes of Momente w\textsuperscript{h} have hapned in Virginia from the Tyme Sr Thomas Gates was shipwrackte uppon the Ber-
mudes an\textsuperscript{o} 1609 untill my depreture outt of the Country w\textsuperscript{h} was in an\textsuperscript{o} D\textsuperscript{n}i 1612

If we Trewley Consider the diversety of miseries mutenies and famishmentts w\textsuperscript{h} have Attended upon discoveries and plantacyons in theis our moderne Tymes we shall nott fynde our plantacyon in Virginia to have Suffered Aloane.
Ladoniere had his share thereof in Florida nextt neighbour unto Virginia where his sowldiers did fall into mutenies and in the ende weare allmoste All Starved for wante of foode.

The Spanyards plantacyon in the River of plate and the streightes of Magelane Suffered also in soe mutche thatt haveinge eaten upp all their horses to susteine themselves w'hall, mutenies did Aryse and growe Amongste them for the w'ch the generall Diego Mendosa caus'd some of them to be executed Extremety of hunger in forceinge other secrettly in the night to cutt downe Their deade fellowes from of the gallowes and bury them in their hungry Bowelles.

The plantacyon in Carthagena was also Lamentable thatt wante of wholesome foode where w'h for to mainteyne Lyfe weare inforced to eat Toades snakes and sutche lyke venemous wormes sutche is the sharpnes of hunger.

To this purpose many other examples mighte be recyted butt the relacyon itt selfie beinge briefe I have noe intente to be Tedyous butt to delyver the Trewthe briefly and plainlye the w'ch I dou'tt nott butt will rather Lyke then Loathe the Reader nor doe I purpose to use any eloquentt style or phrase the w'ch indede in me is wanteinge Butt to delyver thatt trewly w'ch myself and many others have had bittter experyense of: Many other woes and miseries have hapned unto our Collonie in Virginia bothe before and Since thatt Tyme w'h now I doe intende to Treate of Haveinge selected this pte from the reste for towre Respecttes first in regard I was moste frequence and acquaynted w'ch theis cedeinges being moste pte of the tyme presydent and governour next in respect the leaste pte hereof hathe not bene formerly published. In the yere of our Lorde 1609 Sr Tho: Gates and Sr George Somers accompanied w'ch dyvers gentlemen sowldiers and seamen in nyne good Shippes did beginne their voyage for Virginia the towre Knightes beinge in the Admirall whereof Christopher Newport was Captayne And haveinge sayled w'h sperous wyndes many Leagues at lenghte did fall upon the Bermudes where meteinge w'h A vyoelentt storme the Admirall wherein the towre Knightes were
inbarqued suffred wracke nevertheless hoyseinge outt their boate safely Landed the 2 knightes and the Reste of thatt Company upon the BERMUIDES of whome I will forbeare to Treate of further untill their Arryvall in Virginia.

The other 8 shippes shortly after Aryved in Virginia where the passengers beinge noe soener well landed butt presently A discencyon did growe betwine them and Capte: SMITHE then presydentt, but after some debate all was quyeted and pacifyed yett Capte: SMITHE feareinge the worste and thatt the seamen and thatt factoyn mighte growe too stronge and be a meanes to depose him of his govermentt so Jugled w'th them by the way of feasteinges Expense of mutche powder and other unnecessary Tryumphes That mutche was Spente to noe other purpose butt to Insinewate w'hi his Eeconcyled enemyes and for his owne vayne glory for the w'ch we all after suffred. And thatt w'ch was intollerable did give Leave unto the Seamen to carry away whatt victewalls and other necessaries they wolde doinge the same more safly inn regard the contentts thereof was in the Admirall w'ch was caste away.

Nott long after Capte: SMITHE sentt Capt: MARTIN and my selfe w'hi threskore people to goe for NANSEMUNDE Capt: MARTINS Leftenantt leadinge moste of the men overland and we towe w'hi the Reste followed them by water where beinge Aryved we inquyred of the Indyans of our men butt they acordinge to their subtellties wold not acquaynte us therew'hi whereupon I requested Capte: MARTIN thatt I mightt goe Ashoare to discover the trewthe to the w'ch he wolde nott condiscende Nevertheless the nighte beinge stormy and wette I wente on Lande w'hi my Company where I fownde our men by goode fyers in Saffety whereof I advertyzed Capte: MARTIN the nextt morneinge who presently w'hi his company did come Ashoare unto us where after some consulta\cyon helde we sentte 2 messengers to the kinge of ——— MANCEMONDE To Barter w'hi him for an Island righte opposite ageintse the mayne we weare uppon for Cop ²⁹ hatches and other comodeties. Butt our messengers stayeinge Longer then we expected thatt w'hi after hapned. So Capte: MARTIN did Apointe w'hi halfe of our men to take the Island ²³ force And beinge upon the
way we espied A Canoe wherein we were swaded our messengers to be butt they ceaveinge us returned backe from whense they came And we never sett eye upon our Messengers after. Butt understood from the Indyans themselves that they weare sacrificysed And that their Braynes weare cutt and skraped outt of their heades w'h mussell shells beinge Landed and acquaynted w'h their Trechery we Beate the Salvages outt of the Island burned their howses Ransaked their Temples Tooke downe the Corpes of their deade kings from of their Toambes And caryed away their pearles Cop and braceletts, wherew'h they doe decorre their kings funerelles.

In the meane Tyme Salvages upon the Mayne did fall into discencyon w'h Capte: MARTIN who seised the kings sonne and one other Indyand and broughte them bownde unto the Island where I was when a shipp Boye takeinge upp a Pistoll accidentyallie nott meaneinge any harme The pistoll suddenly fyered and shotte the Salvage prisoner into the Breste. And thereupon whatt w'h his passyon and fearre he broake the Cordes Asunder where w'h he was tyed and did swimme over unto the mayne w'h his wound bleedinge And there beinge great store of maize upon the Mayne I councelled Capteyne MARTIN to take possesyon thereof the w'h he Refused pretendinge that he wolde nott putt his men into hassard and danger. So haveinge seen Capte: MARTIN well settled I Retourned w'h Capte NELLSON to JAMES TOWNE ageine Acordinge to apoyntementte.

Shortly after Capte: SMITHE sente Capteyne Francis WEST w'h one hundrethe and fortye men upp to the falles w'h sixe monethes victewells to inhabitt there. Where beinge Reasonable well settled dyvs of his men stragled from their foarte. some of them comeinge hoame wounded. others never returned to bringe any Tydeings butt weare cutt of and slayne by the salvages. So thatt in small cesse of Tyme Capteyne SMITHE did take his iorney upp to the falles to understand how things weare there ordered when presently after his comeinge thether A greate deviseyon did growe amongste them Capte: SMITHE ceaveinge bothe his authorety and w'son neglected incensed and Animated the Sal-
vages agenste Capte: West and his company Reporteinge unto them thatt our men had noe more powder lefte them then wolde serve for one volley of shott And so Capte: SMITHE Retouringe to JAMES TOWNE ageine fownd to have too mutche powder aboutt him The wh beinge in his pockett where the sparke of A Matche Lighted very shrewdly burned him. And comeinge in thatt case to JAMES TOWNE Capte RATTLIEFE ARCHER and MARTIN practysed ageinste him and deposed him of his governementt SMITHE beinge an Ambityous unworthy and vayneglorious fellowe Attempteinge to take all Mens Authoreties from them for bothe RATTLIEFE ARCHER and MARTIN being formerly of the Cowncell SMITHE wolde Rule all and ingrose all authorety into his owne hands Although indede there was noe other certeine apointed governemtt then Sir Tho: GATES had commissyon for who was then in the BERMUSES onely a yerely presidenttshipp to governe by the advyse of the Cowncell. Butt SMITHE ayweinge att A soveraigne Rule whoutt the Assistance of the cowncell was iustely depreyved of all.

The place of governemtt beinge voyde the thre busy instrumentts in the plantacyon offered the same unto me the wh att firste I refuséd in Regard of my Sicknes. Butt by their inportunetie offeringe to undergoe the Chefeste offices and Burthen of governemtt for me untill I weare Recovered att lenghte I accepted thereof and then was SMITHE presently sentt for England.

After I had bene presydentt some fowertene dayes I sentt Capte: Rattliefe to pointe Comforte for to Buylde A foarte there. The wh I did for towe Respectts The one for the plenty of the place for fisheinge The other for the comodious discovery of any shippeinge wh sholde come uppon the Coaste And for the honnor of Your Lordshipps name and howse I named the same ALGERNOWNS Foarte.

Nott Longe after Capte: MARTIN whome I lefte att the Island did come to James towne prettendeing some occasions of busyness, but indede his owne safetty moved him thereunto feareinge to be surprysed by the Indyans, who had made dyver excursions againste him, so thatt haveinge lefte Lieftenantt SICKLEMORE to
Comawnd in his absence Amongste whose company shortly after did growe A dangerouys mutenie in so mutche Thatt dyvrs of his men to the number of seaventene did take Away A Boate from him \$force and wente therein to KeKowhaton pretendinge they wolde trade therefore victwells, Butt they were served acordinge to their desertts for nott any of them weare heard of after And in all lykelyhood weare Cutt of and slayne by the Salvages and w^hin fewe dayes after Lieftenantt Sicklemore and dyvrs others weare fownd also slayne w^h their mowthes stopped full of Breade beinge donn as it seamethe in Contempte and skorne thatt others mighte expecte the Lyke when they shold come to seeke for breade and reliefe amongste them.

Baldivia A Spanishe Generall beinge served somewhat An-
swerable hereunto in Chily in the Weste Indies who beinge Surprised by the Indyans inforced him to drincke upp A certeine quantety of melted gowlde useinge theis words unto him now glutt thy selfe w^h gowlde Baldivia haveinge there sowghte for gowlde as Sicklemore did here for foode. And all the reste of Sicklemors Company w^h weare liveinge Retourned to us to James towne to feede upon the poore store we had lefte us.

Also w^hin a shorte Tyme after Capte: Weste did come downe to us from the Falles haveinge loste eleaven men and A Boate att Arsetocke byesdes those men he loste att the Falles so our Number at James Towne increasinge and our store decreaseinge for in charety we cold nott deny them to participate w^h us Whereupon I apointed Capte: Tucker to Calculate and Caste upp our store. The w^h att a poore alowanse of halfe a Cann of meale for A man A day Amounted unto thre monthes vissyon yettt Capte: Tucker by his industry and care caused the same to howlde outt fowere monthes. Butt haveinge noe expectacyon of Reliefe to come in so short A Tyme I sentt Capteyne Ratliefe to Pow-
hatan to \$cure victewalls and corne by the way of comerce and trade the w^h the subtell owlde foxe att firste made good sem-
blanse of Althoughe his intente was otherwayes onely wayteinge A fitteinge tyme for their destruction As after planely appered. The w^h was \$bly ocasyoned by Capte: Ratliefes creduletie for
Haveinge Powhatans sonne and dowghter Aboard his pinesse freely suffred them to depte ageine on shoare whome if he had deteyned mighte have bene A Sufficyentt pledge for his saffety And after nott kepeinge A Æper and fitteinge Courte of Guarde butt suffreinge his men by towre and thre and small Numbers in A Com-
pany to straggle into the Salvages howses when the Slye owlde kinge espyed A fitteinge Tyme Cutt them all of onely surprysed Capte: Ratliefe Alyve who he caused to be bownd unto a tree naked w'h a fyer before And by woemen his fleshe was skraped from his bones w'h mussell shelles and befre his face throwne into the fyer. And so for want of circumspection miserably ¥ished.

In the Meane Tyme Capte: William Phetiplace Remayned in the pinesse w'h Some fewe men and was dyvrs tymes assawlted by the Indyans butt after dyvs conflictts w'h the losse of some of his men hardly escaped and att lenghte Aryved att James Towne onely w'h sixtene men the Remaynder of fifty Capte Ratliefe hathe Charge of at his goeing forthe And so he related unto us the Tragedie of Capte: Ratlife nott bringeinge any Reliefe w'h them either for themselves or us.

Upon w'h defeate I sentt Capte: James Davis to Algernowe foarte to Comawnd there in Capte: Ratlieffes place And Capte Weste I sentt To Potoamack w'h aboutt thirty sixe men to trade for maize and grayne where he in short tyme Loaded his pinesse sufficyently yett used some harshe and Crewell dealinge by cutteinge of towre of the Salvages heads and other extremetyes And comeinge by Algernowns foarte Captaine Davis did call unto them ac-
quainteinge them w'h our Greate wants exhortinge them to make all the Spede they cowlde to Releve us upon w'h reporte Capte: Weste by the Æswasion or rather by the inforcement of his com-
pany hoyed upp Sayles and shaped their course directly for Eng-
land and lefte us in thatt extreme misery and wante.

Now all of us att James Towne beginneinge to feele that sharpe pricke of hunger w'h noe man trewly describge butt he w'h hath Tasted the bitternesse thereof A worlde of miseries en-
sewed as the Sequell will expresse unto yo' in so mutche thatt some to satisfye their hunger have robbed the store for the w'h
I caused them to be executed. Then haveinge fedd upon horses and other beastes as long as they Lasted we weare gladd to make shifte w'h vermine as doggs Catts Ratts and myce All was fishe thatt came to Nett to satisfye Crewell hunger as to eate Bootes shoes or any other leather some colde Come by And those being Spente and devoured some weare inforced to searche the woodes and to feede upon Serpents and snakes and to digge the earthe for wylde and unknowne Bootes where many of our men weare Cutt off of and slayne by the Salvages. And now famin begineinge to Looke gastely and pale in every face thatt notheinge was spared to mainteyne Lyfe and to doe those things w'h seame incredible As to digge up dead corpses outt of graves and to eate them and some have Licked upp the Bloode w'h hathe fallen from their weake fellowes And amongst the reste this was moste Lamentable Thatt one of our Colline murdered his wyfe Ripped the childe outt of her woaambe and threw itt into the River and after chopped the Mother in pieces and salted her for his foode The same not beinge discovered before he had eaten ßte thereof for the w'h crewell and inhumane factt I aiudged him to be executed the acknowledgm^t of the dede beinge inforced from him by torture haveinge hunge by the Thumbes w'h weightes att his feete a quarter of an howere before he wolde confesse the same.

Upon theis Calameties haveinge one boate and A Canoe Lefte us. Our Boate did accidentyally breake Loose and did dryve fower myles downe the River before she was espyed. Whereupon Capte: MARTIN Apointeinge some to followe her the w'h beinge neglected and acquaynteinge me there w'h I stepped outt of my howse w'h my Sworde drawne and what w'h my threatens & their feares happy was he colde shipp himselfe into the Canoe firste And so our Boate thatt nighte was ageine Recovered yett wanteinge more Boates for fisheinge and other nedfull ocassions Capte: DANIEL TUCKER by his greate industry and paines buylded A Large Boate w'h his owne hands The w'h was some helpe and A little Reliefe unto us And did kepe us from killinge one of An other. To eate many our men this starveinge Tyme did Runn Away unto the Salvages whome we never heard of after.
By this Tyme being Reasonable well recovered of my sicknes I did undertake A Jorney unto ALGERNOWNES foarte bothe to understand how things were there ordered as also to have bene Revenged of the Salvages att Kekowhatan who had trecheckousely slayne dyvrs of our men. Our people I fownd in good case and well lykeinge haveinge concealed their plenty from us above att James Towne Beinge so well stored thatt the Crabb fishes where w'h they had fede their hoggs wold have bene a greate relefe unto us and saved many of our Lykves But their intente was for to have kept some of the better sorte Alyve and w'h their towe pinnesses to have Retourned for England nott Regardinge our miseries and wantts at all where w'h I taxed Capte: DAVIS And tolde him thatt I had A full intente to bringe halfe of our men from James Towne to be there Releved And after to Retourne them backe ageine and bringe the reste to bee susteyned there Also And if all this wolde nott serve to save our mens Lyves I purposed to bringe them all unto ALGERNOWNES foarte Tellinge Capte: DAVIS that Another towne or foarte mighte be erected and buylded butt mens lyves onse Loste colde never be recovered.

Our miseries now beinge att the hygheste and intendinge as I formerly Related unto yo' to Remove some of our men to ALGERNOWNES foarte the very nexte Tyde we espyd tewe pinnesses comeinge into the Baye nott knoweinge as yett whatt they weare butt kepinge A Courte of Guard and watche all That nighte Tho nexte Morneinge we espyd A Boate comeinge of from one of the pinnesses So standinge upon our guard we hales them and understood thatt Sr Tho: GATES and Sr GEORGE SOMERS were come in those pinnesses w'h by their greate industry they had buylded in the BERMUDES w'h the remaynder of their wrackt shipp and other woode they fownde in the cowtry upon w'h newes we Receved no small ioye Requesteinge them in the Boate to come A shoare the w'h they refused. And Retourned Aboard ageine for Sr Tho: GATES haveinge noe knowledge of any foarte to be Builded there was dowtfull whether we weare frends or noe butt beinge possessed of the trewe the he and Sr George SOMERS w'h dyvers others did come A shoare att ALGERNOWNES foarte And the nextt Tyde wente upp to James Towne where they mighte Reade A lecture of miserie in
our peoples faces and see the skarsety of victewalles And under
stande the mallice of the Salvages who knoweinge our weaknes had
dyvrs Tymes assawlted us whoutt the foarte Fyndeinge of fyve
hundrethe men we had onely lefte Aboutt sixty. The reste beinge
either sterved throwe famin or cutt of by the Salvages And those
w’h weare Liveinge weare so maugre and Leane thatt itt was La-
mentable to behowlde them for many throwe extreme hunger have
Runne outt of their naked bedds beinge so Leane thatt they Looked
Lyke Anotamies Cryeinge owtt we are starved We are starved
others goeinge to bedd as we imagined in healthe weare fownd
deade the nexte morneinge And amongst the Reste one thinge
hapned w’h was very remarkable wherein god sheowd his iuste
Judgment for one Hughe Pryse being pinched w’h extreme famin
In A furious distracted moodie did come openly into the markett
place Blaspheameinge exclameinge and cryeinge owtt thatt there
was noe god. Alledgeinge that if there were A god he wolde nott
suffer his creatures whom he had made and framed to indure those
miseries And to Bishe for wante of foods and sustenance Butt
itt appeared the same day that the Almighty was displeased w’h
him for goeinge thatt afternoone w’h A Butcher A corpulentt fatt
man into the woods to seke for some Reliefe bothe of them weare
slaine by the Salvages. And after beinge fowndde gods Indignacyon
was showed upon Pryses Corps w’h was Rente in pieces w’h
wolves or other wylde Beasts And his Bowles Torne outt of his
boddy beinge A Leane spare man And the fatt Butcher nott lynenge
Above sixe yarde from him was fownd altogether untouched onely
by the Salvages Arrowes whereby he Receiaved his death.

Theis miseries considered itt was Resolved uppon By Sr Tho:
Gates and the whole Collonie w’h all Spede to Retourne for Eng-
land whereupon moste of our men weare sett to worke some to make
pitche And Tar for Trimminge of our shippes others to Bake
breade and fewe or noene not imploied in one ocassyon or another.
So thatt A Small Space of Tyme fower pinnesses weare fitted and
made Reddy. All prepareinge to goe Aboarde, and if Sr Tho:
Gates had nott Laboured w’h our men they had sett the Towne on
fyer useinge theis or the lyke words unto them, my Masters lett
the towne Stande we knowe nott butt thatt as honneste men as our
selves may come and inhabitt here. Then all of us embarqueinge our selves Sir Tho Gates in the deliveranse wth his company Sir George Somers in the patyence my selfe in the discoverie and Capt. Davis in the Virginia. All of us sayleinge downe the River wth A full intente to have eceded upon our voyage for England when Suddenlye we espyed A boate makeinge towards us wherein we fownd to be Capt: Bruster sent from my Lorde La Ware who was come unto us wth many gentlemen of quallety And thre hundrethe men besides store of victewles municyon and other visson whereupon we all Retourned to James Towne ageine where my Lorde shortly after Landed and sett all things in good order selecteinge A Cowncell and makeinge Captaines over fifty men A piece. Then Sir Tho: Gates beinge desyrous for to be Revendged upon the Indyans att Kekowhatan did goe thither by water wth a certeine number of men and amongste the reste A Taborer wth him beinge Landed he cawsed the Taborer to play and dawnse thereby to Allure the Indyans to come unto him the wth prevayled. And then espyeinge A fittinge oportunety fell in upon them putt fyve to the sworde wounded many others some of them beinge after fownde in the woods wth Sutche extraordinary Lardge and mortall woundes thatt itt seemed strange they Cold flye so far. The reste of the Salvages he putt to flighte. And so posseseinge himselfe of the Towne and the fertill ground there unto Adiacentt haveinge well ordered all things he lefte his lieftenant Earely to comawnd his company And then Retourned to James Towne, ageine and shortly after did take his voyadge for England. My Lord Generall aboutt this Tyme sentt Captaine Howldcrofte to buydle A foarte in the woods neare unto Kekowhatan. The wth beinge finished my Lord named the same Charles foarte in honour of our Kings Matie that now is.

Also my Lorde sentt Sir George Somers and Capt: Argoll in towe shippes into the Bermudes to make visson of hoggs and fishe for us Sir George aryved there where Shortly after he dyed his men makeinge good fitt of Amber griese and other comodeties Retourned for England. Butt Capt: Argoll sayleinge of the place fell to the North ward where he hapned upon some fishe
there w'h haveinge salted and dried Retourned there w'h to us to James Towne ageine

Sr Ferdinando WAYMAN aboutt this Tyme dyed whose deathe was mutche Lamented beinge bothe An honeste and valyantt gentleman.

My Lord Generall not forgetteinge owle Powhatans subtell Trecherie sentt A Messenger unto him to demawnde certeine Armes and dyvrs men w'h we supposed mighte be liveinge in his cowntry Butt he Retourned noe other then prowde and disdaynefull An-

swers.

Whereupon my Lorde being mutche incensed Cawsed A Comis-

sion to be drawne wherein he apointed me Chief'e Comawnder over Seaventie men and sentt me to take Revendge upon the Pas-

paheans and Chiconamians and so Shippeinge my selfe and my sowldiers in towre boates I depted from James Towne the 9th of August 1610 And the same nighte Landed W'hin thre myles of Paspahas towne Then draweinge my sowldiers into Battalio placeinge a Captayne or Leftenante att every fyle we marched two-

wards the Towne haveinge An Indyan guyde w'h me named KEMPES whome the voste marshall ledd in A hande locke. This Subtell Salvage was leadinge us outt of the waye the w'h I mis-
dowteinge Bastinaded him w'h my Truncheon and threatened to cutt of his heade whereupon the slave alterred his Cowrse and browghte us the righte way near unto the towne So that then I Comawnded ever Leader to drawe A way his fyle before me to besett the salvages houses thatt noene mighte escape w'h a charde nott to give the allarume untill I weare come upp unto them w'h the Cullers. At my comeinge I appointed Capte: WILLIAM WESTE to give the Allarume the w'h he 'oformed by shooteinge of a pistoll. And then we fell in upon them putt some fiftene or sixtene to the Sworde and Almoste all the reste to flyghte Whereupon I cawsed my drume to beate and drewe all my Sowldiers to the Cullers My Lieftenantt bringeinge w'h him the Quene and her Children and one Indyann prisoners for the w'h I taxed him be-
cawse he had Spared them his Answer was thatt haveinge them
now in my Custodie I mighte doe w'h them whatt I pleased. Upon
the same I cawsed the Indians heade to be cutt of. And then
disposted my fyles Apointinge my Sowldiers to burne their howses
and to cutt downe their Corne groweing aboutt the Towne, And
after we marched w'h the quene And her Children to our Boates
ageine, where beinge noe soener well shipped my sowldiers did
begin to murmur beacwse the quene and her Children weare spared.
So upon the same A Cowncell beinge called itt was Agreed upon
to putt the Children to deathe the w'ch was effected by Throweing
them overboard and shoteinge owtt their Braynes in the water
yett for all this Crewellty the Sowldiers weare nott well pleased
And I had mutche to doe To save the quenes lyfe for打att Tyme.

Then sayleinge some towne myles downe the River I sentt Capte:
Davis A shoare wth Moste of my Sowldiers my Selfe beinge
wearyed before and for my owne Æte butt an easie foote man Capte
Davis att his landeinge was Apponted by some Indyans who spared
nott to send their Arrowes amongst our men but w'hin A shorte
Tyme he putt them to flighte and landed w'houtt further opposi-
tyon marchinge Aboutt fowrtene myles into the Cowntry cutt
downe their Corne burned their howses Temples and Idolles and
amongste the reste A Spacyous Temple clean and neatlly keppt
A thinge strange and seldome sene amongst the Indyans in those
Ætes So haveinge Æformed all the spoyle he cowlde Retourned
Aboarde to me ageine and then we sayled downe the River to
James Towne.

My Lord Generall not beinge well did lye A Shipboard to
whome we Rowed he beinge joyfull of our Safe Retourne yett
Seamed to be discontente beacwse the quene was spared as Cap-
teyne Davis towlde me and thatt itt was my Lords pleasure thatt
we sholde see her dispatched The way he thowghte beste to Burne
her. To the first I replyed thatt haveinge scene so mutche Blood-
shed thatt day now in my Cowldbloode I desyred to see noe more
and for to Burne her I did not howlde itt fitteinge butt either
by shott or Sworde to geve her A quicker dispatche So Turninge
my selfe from Capte Davis he did take the quene w'h towne sowl-
diers A shoare and in the woods putt her to the Sworde and al-
thoughge Capte: Davis towilde me itt was my Lords direction yett
I ame swaded to the contrary.

Nott longe after our Retourne to James Towne Capte: Argoll
was sentt wth the lyke Commission ageinst the Wariscoyans.
The Salvages beinge warned by their neighbours harmes weare very
vigilante and Carefull and all of them feldd and escaped So thatt
Capte: Argoll Cowlde have other Revendge then by Cutteinge
downe their Corne burneinge their howses and Sutche lyke The
wch being formed he Retourned to James Towne ageine.

The Salvages still contineweinge their mallice Ageinst us
Sentt some as spyes to our foarte who beinge Apprehended my
Lord Cawed one to have his hande Cutt of And so Sentte unto
his fellowes to geve them warneinge for Attemptinge the lyke.

Aboutt this Tyme there was A Conspiracy plotteinge amongste
some of our men wh wroght in Iron mynes To Runn away wh
A barkque The same beinge discovered my Lord for An example
adiudged one of them by marshall lawe to be executed. The
execution veinge strange And seldome heard of I thoughtte nott
to omitt, for the bty beinge thrown of the Lather whatt wh
the Swindge and weighte of his body the Roape did breake and he
fell upon the grownde And in Regard of the Accident my Lord
doned him althowghe itt nothinge Avayled him haveinge Received
his deathe wh the gerde of the Roape and extremety of the fall so
that wthin 2 days after he dyed My Lord intendinge to searche
for Mineralls and to make further fe of the Iron mynes sentt
dyvrs men in A barkque upp to the falles and goeinge by A
Poamatake they weare called A shoare by the Salvages and beinge
to fill their Baricoes wh water weare easely thereunto induced
and after intysed by the Salvages upp to their howses pretendeinge
to feaste them butt our men forgetteinge their Subtellites lyke
greedy fooles accepted thereof more esteameinge of A Little foode
then their own lyves and saffety for when the Indyans had them
in their howses And found A fitteinge Tyme when they Leaste
dreaded any dawnger did fall upon them Slewe dyvrs and wounded
all the rest who within towe dayes after also dyed onely Dowse the Taborer who flyeinge to their boate was hardly pursed with but gayneinge the same he made A vertewe of necessity useinge the Rudder insteade of A Targett to kepe their Arrowes outt of his body. And so skullegeinge of by little and little gott out of their Reache and freed himselfe The Salvages be not Soe Simple as many Imagin who be not Acquaynted with their Subtellties for they had nott forgotten how their neighbours att Kekowhatan were alured And defeated by S'r Tho: Gates when he had the same Taborer with him

Presently after Capte: Bruster was sentte upp to the falles with A Certeine number of men To Attende there for my Lords Comeinge who purposed to &cede in the Searche of mineralles In his iornay he had dyvrs encounteres and skirmishes with the Indyans Att Lengthe aryveinge att the falles where my Lord did shortly after Come unto him Leaveinge the Chardge and Comawnd of James Towne with me.

Now my Lorde beinge att the Falles and winter Comeinge on he Cawsed A foarte to be buylded there bothe for their defence and shelter and named the same Lawares foarte Intendinge to have Reposed himselfe there all the winter and to have &ceded upon the discovery of mineralls the next Springe where for A Tyme we will Leave him and Retourne to our &cedeinges att James Towne ageine.

The govermentt whereof beinge lefte to me Paspahe with a small Troope of Indyans in sheowe did come unto our Blockhowse thinkeinge by some pollecy either to have Surprysed the same or some of our men. ' The wh comeinge to my hearinge I presently sent Capte: Powell then my Antyentt with a certayne Number of men to surprise Paspahe Allyve if possible they cowlde for the same wolde have bene to good purpose if itt cowld have bene effected whereupon our men draweinge neare unto him where he stoode upon the ende of A Banke when presently Mr John Waller stepped unto him and cawghtt howlde of him and gave the Watche
A Trewe Relacyon

worde for the Reste to Come to Assisthe him. The w^h the Salvages perceivedeyng d^vrs of them Appeared w^h before weare nott scene senndinge their Arrowes frely amongste our men. The w^h Capte: POWELL seeinge did Apprehend thatt their was small hope to bringe in PASPAHE Alyve for he strugled maynely Whereupon he Thruste him twayse throughghe the body w^h his Sworde and for all thatt the stowte Indyan Lived and was Caryed away upon Rafters by the Salvages And lieftenanttt PUTTOCKE encowntringe w^h one of the Salvages hande to fiste grapled w^h him and stabbed him to deathe w^h his ponnyard.

My Lord Generall all this Tyme Remayneinge att the Falles where nether sicknes nor sakrsety was wantinge had dyvrs encownters w^h the Indyans some of his men beinge slayne amonge the Reste his Kinsman Capte: WILLIAM WESTE and Capteine BRUSTER narrowly escaped.

And now my Lords groweinge very Sicke he was inforced to Allter his former determinacyon and to retourne to James towne ageine where his Sickness nothinge Abated butt rather increased So thatt for the Recovery of his healthe he did take his voyadge for the bathe att MEUTS in the Weste Indies Butt the wyndes not favoreinge them they weare inforced to shape their Cowrse directly for England my Lorde haveinge lefte and apointed me deputy governour in his Absence To execute Marshall lawe or any other power and Authority as Absolute as himselfe.

After my Lords depature the Indyans did fall to their wonted practyses ageine one eaveninge Late and Called att our blocke howse The w^h when I understood I presently sentt to Lieftenanttt PUTTOCKE who comawnded there thatt he sholde by noe meanes Stur owtt of the Blocke howse, butt to kepe An excedinge Carefull guarde and watches, and to strengthen him I sentt him more men to double his guard Ageine expressly geveinge him Chardge thatt he shold nott goe owtt of the block howse upon Any Tearmes whattsoever A^misseinge him that the nextt morn-einge I wolde send him A convenyenttt number of men to discover whatt they weare and of whatt strenghttt w^h had soe called them.
Butt Lieftenantt PUTTOCKE beinge called ageine early the nextt morneinge before our watche was discharged in the foarte, Contrary to my Comawnde and moste unadvysedly did goe outt of the Block howse w'ch the small number of men he had Sheowinge more vallour then will more fury then Judgementt. And some fewe Indyans beinge in Sheowe he followed them w'houtt apprehensyon of that w'ch ensewed for the Salvages still Retyringe he followed them untill they browghte him into their ambushado where beinge five or sixe hundrethe of Salvages lett flye their Arrowes as thicke As hayle amongste our handfull of men And defeated and Cutt them all of in A moment The Arrowes w'ch they had shott beinge so many in Number thatt the grownd there aboutts was allmoste Covered w'ch them upon w'ch defeate the Salvages did so Aclamate Showte and hallowe in Tryumphe of their gayned victory thatt the Ecchoe there of made bothe the Ayere and woods to Ringe. The w'ch filleinge our eares in the Foarte presently w'ch all Spede I sentt lieu tenant ABBOTT w'ch fifty men to Assiste PUTTOCKE nott knoweinge directtly whatt had befallen them Althoughghe we feared thatt w'ch had alereddy hapned. Nevertheless Lieften't ABBOTT encowntred w'ch the Salvages They then Changeinge their noate Cryeinge PASPAHE PASPAHE Thereby importeinge as mutche, as thatt they had Revenged his wrongs att lenghst ABBOTT putt the Indyans to flight Recovered the deade bodyes of our men whome he browghte to our foarte where they weare Buryed.

Upon this disaster I sentt A messenger unto ALGERNOWNS foarte supposeinge my Lorde La Ware had bene noe further on his voydge to have informed him hereof butt the messenger Loste his Labour my Lord beinge before deputed. In shorte Tyme after Capte: ADDAMES did come into our bay in a shipped called the blessinge w'ch freshe Supply bothe of men and victewells geveinge us notice thatt S'r Tho: DALE was to come shortly after w'ch A greater supply the w'ch Pved Trewe for w'hin towe monthes after he Aryved in Virginia and browghtt w'ch him thre hundrethe men besydes greatt store of Armour, Municyon victewalls and other Pvisson. And beinge Landed he ordeyned newe Lawes sett downe good Articles w'ch weare well observed All our men beinge setto
worcke some to plante some to sowe corne and others to buylde boates and howses moste men inployed in one thinge or another. All things in Tyme beinge well settled and ordered S'r Thomas Dale made preparacyon and wente ageinst the Nancemonides w'hir a hundrethe men in Armour where he had dyvrs encountynters and skirmishes w'hir the Salvages bothe by Lande and water dyvrs of his company beinge wounded. Amongst the Reste Capt' Francis Weste was shott into the Thyghe and Captayne Martin into the Arme. Sir Tho: Dale himselfe narrowly eskapeinge for An arrow light, iuste upon the edge or Brimme of his headepiece The w'h if itt had fallen A thought Lower mightt have Shott him into the Braynes and indangered his Lyfe. In theis Conflictts many Indyans beinge also slayne and wounded. And nott beinge acquainted nor acustomed to encounter w'hir men in Armour mutche wondered thereatt especyally thatt they did nott see any of our men fall as they had donne in other conflictts. Whereupon they did fall into their exorcismes coniuracyons and charmes throwinge fyer upp into the skies Runneinge up and downe w'h Rattles and makeinge many dyabolicall gestures w'h many irigramantcke Spelles and incantacionus Imageinge thereby to cawse Raine to fall from the Clowdes to extinguishe and putt owtt our mens matches and to wett and spoyle their powder butt nether the dievall whome they adore nor all their Sorcerres did anytheinge Aways in for our men Cyt downe their Corne Burned their howses and besydes those w'h they had slayne broughtt some of them prisoners to our foarte.

S'r Tho: Dale makeinge more invasyons & excursions upon the Salvages had many conflictts w'h them and one thinge amongst the reste was very remarkable The w'h may be supposed to have bene ocasyoned by the Salvages Sorceries and Charmes for S'r Thomas Dale w'h Some of the better sorte sitteinge in An Indyans howse A fantasy possessed them thatt they imagined the Salvages were sett upon them eache man Takeinge one another for an Indyyan And so did fall pell mell one upon An other beateinge one another downe and breakeinge one of Anothers heads, thatt Mutche mischiefe mighte have bene donn butt thatt itt pleased god the fantasy
was taken away whereby they had bene deluded and every man understood his error.

Aboutt this Tyme A Spanishe Caravell Aryved upon the Coaste and did come into the Bay w'howt command of Shotte. — Thre principall of the Spanyards comeinge A shoare in their Boate nott furr of ALGERNOWNS foarte The w'ch Capte: DAVIS espyeinge layd in Ambushe for them they nott knoweinge of any foarte to be theare and so surprysed them thechefeste of them beinge one DIEGO MALINOS A comawnder of some foarte or houlde in the Weste Indies the other Antonio PEREOS his companyon The thirde A pylott who wentt under the name and habbitt of A Spanyard, butt was after fownde and discovered to be Inglishe man his name beinge LIMBRECKE haveinge lived many years Amongste the Span-yards and Reputed to be A Goode Pylott After the serpryseinge of theis thre the boate wherein they did come putt from the shoare the men therein beinge questyoned pretended to seke for one of the Kinge of Spaynes shippes loaden w'ch municyon bownd for the Weste Indies Requesteinge Capte: DAVIS to lett them have A pylott to bringe their shipp into the harbour the w'ch was grawnted Butt haveinge the pylott noe soener a board hoysed upp their sayles and caryed the pylott quyte away w'ch them Leaveinge the thre w'ch weare surprysed in his steade behynd them, who weare thereupon broughtt to James Towne and sentt as prissoners A board severall shippes And shortly after S'r Tho: DALE sentt my Selfe Capte NEWPORT and Mr STRACY secretary to the Collonie to examin them And so Acuseinge them to have come for spyes they utterly denied the same butt still urgeinge them there w'ch Anto: PEREOS answered thatt we had noe caurse att all to feare any thinge this yere butt whatt mightt happen the nextt he coulde nott tell. And itt after appeared their intente was as eavell as we imagined for the Spanishe Ambassadour shortly after gayned A Commissyon from the Kings Matie Kinge James Thatt we sholde sende the principall DIEGO MALINOS into England the w'ch w'ch all spede was effected Capte: MARTIN beinge his conductt. Don DIEGO stayed nott longe in England. Butt was sentt hoame where he was made Generall of six tall shippes in All lykeliehoode and as we weare
after certenely informed sett outt of purpose to Supplantt us. Butt haveinge bene att Sea about A monthe A mutenie did growe amongste them in so mutche thatt one of diegoes company stabbed him to death Whereupon their Course was altered and their former determinacyon ceased. Antonio PEREOS he dyed before in Virginia and Sr Tho: DALE att his goeing for England did take our hispanyolated Inglishe man LIMBRECKE w'hi him. And acordinge to some pryvate Comissyon when he did come w'hin sighte of the Inglishe Shoare he cawsed him to be hanged upp att the yardes Arme as afterwards itt was trewly reported.

Before Sr Tho: DALES depute Capte DAVIS att ALGERNOWNS foarte espyed nyne shippes upon the coaste Supposeinge them to be Spanishe And Sendeinge notice thereof to Sir Tho: DALE he presently sentt Capte: BRUSTER and Lieftenantt ABBOTT w'h forty men to discover whatt they weare And they nott Retourninge acordinge to Sir Thomas expectacyon he feared thatt they weare either Surprysed or defeated. Whereupon he drewe All his forces into forme and order reddy for encountrer Calleinge A Cowncell to Resolve whether itt weare beste to mete w'h them. A board our shippes or for to maynteine the foarte. My opinyon I delyvered to Sir Tho: DALE and the Reste. Thatt is was dowttfull whether our men wolde stande unto itt A shoare and Abyde the Brunte, butt A shippboard of necessety they muste for there was noe runneinge Away. So makeinge preparacyon to goe A board Capt: BRUSTER and Lieftenantt ABBOTT retourned and broughte us certeine newes thatt itt was Sr Tho: GATES flete who was come now to be governour And Aryved there thatt eaveninge w'h A freshe supply bothe of men And f'hissyon haveinge unladen the shippes & ordered other necessary occassyons Sr Tho: GATES Apointed Sr Tho: DALE their Marshall of the Collonie as itt was agreed upon in England to passe upp into the Cowntry neare unto the Falles w'h aboutt towe hundrethe men to inhabitt there Capte: BRUSTER Leadinge Moste of his men overland and him selfe And A small company goeing by water Captayne BRUSTER in his martche was dyvs tymes assawlted and encountered by the salvages beinge sente from POWHATAN haveinge for their Leader one MUNETUTE comonly called amongste us Jacke of the feathers.
By Reason thatt he used to come into the felde all covered over w'th feathers and Swans wings fastened unto his showlders as thoughe he meante to flye Capte: Bruster comeing to the place apointed where S'r Tho: Dale did also mete w'th him. And after dyvs encountrer and skirmishes w'th the salvages gayned A convenyentt place for fortification where presently they did begin to buylde A foarte And S'r Tho: Dale named the same Henericas foarte in honnor of prinse Henry The Salvages weare nott Idle all this Tyme but hindred their designes as muche as they colde shoteinge Arrowes into the foarte where w'th dyvrs of our men weare wounded & others indangered And some haveinge inployment w'thoutt The foarte did come shorte hoame and weare slayne by the Salvages.

S'r Tho: Dale haveinge allmoste finished the foarte and settled A plantacyon in thatt qu'te dyvrs of his men beinge Idile and not willeinge to take paynes did Runne Away unto the Indyans many of them beinge taken ageine S'r Thomas in A moste severe mannor causwed to be executed. Some he apointed to be hanged Some burned Some to be broken upon wheles, others to be staked and some to be shott to deathe all theis extreme and crewell tortures he used and inflicted upon them To terrefy the reste for Attempteinge the Lyke and some w'ch Robbed the store he causwd them to be bownd faste unto Trees and so sterved them to deathe.

So leaveinge S'r Thomas busely inployed in finisheinge the foarte and settleinge their habitacyons lett us Retourne to James Towne ageine where our governour S'r Tho: Gates was resydentt Onely by the waye Southe A little att Algernownes foarte the w'ch was accidentally burned downe to the grownd except Capte: Davis howse and store howse. Whereupon Capte: Davis feareinge to Receve some displeasure and to be Removed from thense the same beinge the moste plentifulleste place for food, he used sutche expedityon In the Rebuyldeinge of the same ageine thatt it is allmoste incredible.

Dyvrs Indyans used to come to our foarte att James Towne bringeinge victewalls w'th them But indede did Rather come as
Spyes then any good affectyon they did beare unto us. Some of them Sr Tho: GATES cauised to be Apprehended and executed for A Terrour to the Reste to cause them to desiste from their subtell practyses.

Thus haveinge Related unto your Lordshipp the Trewe Relacyon in Virginia from Sr Tho: GATES shipwracke upon the BERMUDES untill my depurte out of the cowntry wh was the 22th Aprell 1612. The wh day I sett sayle in A shipp named the Tryall. And haveinge by computacyon sayled Aboutt 200 leauegs wh A Reasonable good wynde and fayere weather upon A Sudden A Greate storme did Aryse In so mutche thatt the mission maste did springe wh the vyolence of the wyndes. And lyeinge in the Great Cabbin where the mission stoode I was thereby muche indawngered and in perrill of my Lyfe, for the same wh greate force did grate upon my Cabbin and narrowly missed me. And A barrell full wh bere Beinge in the Cabbin the mission strucke the same to pieces thatt all the bere did Runne Aboutt the Cabbin.

The Storme ceasinge and our mission amended we Recovered flores Cowes and St Michelles not towcheinge att any of theis Islands Butt shaped our Cowrse Northwarde where, falleinge becallmed our dawnger was greater then the former for feare of famin and wante of foode haveinge butt a poore small quantetie of freshe water and thatt was so stencheous thatonely washeinge my hands there wh I cold nott endure the sentt thereof. Our greateste store of foode was pease. And those weare so corrupted mowldie Rotten worme eaten thatt there was noe Substance lefte in them butt beinge stiwred wolde Crumbell into duste, so thatt for wante of foode we weare lyke to fishe. Butt god lookeinge mercyfully upon us, when we leaste expected to see our native Cowntry ageine. We happily mett wh A shipp of London bownde for newe found lande one BAKER beinge master thereof who Releved us wh Befe fishe Breade bere and Tobaco wh greatly Comforted us and saved our lyves for itt was Above Thirty dayes after before we made lande wh was Ireland So after A longe dangerous voyage we did fall wh the Lande and putt into CROOKEHAVEN. Where we
Remayned some fowertene dayes in w'th Tyme we Refreshed our- selves and Revicteweled our shipp. And then sett sayle ageine And w'hin eight dayes after Aryved in England and Anchored in DOVER ROADE, where we did mete w'th S'r Samuell ARGALL bownde for newe ENGLAND To displante the frenche Collonie there. The w'th As I after hearde he valliantly ⬩formed, Butt how iuste the Cawse was I refer the same to A Judityous Censure. So stayeinge some fewe dayes att DOVER to Acompany S'r Samuell I toake poaste horse and from thense Roade to London

finis

SYDNOR FAMILY AND ITS CONNECTIONS.

In the Virginia Magazine, Vol. XXX, p. 44, is published an abstract of the will of Francis Sydnor, of Gray's Inn, Middlesex Co., England, dated 1653. In it he refers to his kinsman Fortunatus Sydnor, of Greenwich, in Kent, aged about 15 years.

He was probably the Fortunatus Sydnor who figures in the records of Lancaster County, Virginia, about 1670. There are many references to his descendants in the Wm. and Mary College Quarterly and in the Virginia Magazine, and persons of the Syd- nor name are now to be found in many parts of the State. William Sydnor was living in Lunenburg County in 1804, and according to the Family Bible, whose record is given below, he appears to have been born April 27, 1752, and was son of Anthony Sydnor and Elizabeth his wife. Anthony Sydnor was born January 18, 1712, and was a son of Fortunatus and Ruth Sydnor. Fortunatus Sydnor was born Nov. 8, 1673, and was son of Fortunatus Sydnor the immigrant to Virginia and Joanna, his wife.

A copy of the entries in the Family Bible made in 1896 was furnished to the editor by Mr. Walter Sydnor, of Hanover County, Virginia. The original Bible is still extant in Missouri.

BIBLE RECORD.

Opposite to the first page of the Record is written:

"This Bible is the property of William Sydnor, Lunenburg."
"Marriages

William Sydnor was married to Sarah Garland March 5th 1778 & to his second wife the 27th Jany 1795

Elizabeth Cross.

Ann Sydnor Daughter to William & Sarah Sydnor was married to Thomas Blackwell the 1793

Elizabeth Taylor Sydnor Daughter to William & Sarah Sydnor was married to William Trueheart the October 1799.

Amanda Trueheart Daughter to William & Elizabeth Trueheart was married to Burwell Starke the 15 of April 1828.

Burwell Starke & Ann Baylor Hatchett daughter of William Hatchett were married the 14th of March 1839

Burwell Starke & Fanny Lewis Hatchett daughter of William Hatchett were married the 29th of July 1853.

(Second page of Record.)

Births.

First Column

Children of Fortunatus Sydnor, an Englishman, & Joanna his wife & their births viz.

Ruth Sydnor was born April 11th 1671
Fortunatus Sydnor was born Novr 8th 1673.
Ruth Sydnor was born Augt 24th 1676.
Joan Sydnor was born Augt 2nd 1678.
William Sydnor was born Novr 13th 1680.
Anthony Sydnor was born Jany 18th 1682

[of] Children of Fortunatus & Ruth Sydnor his wife viz.

William Sydnor was born Feby 26th 1699
Judith Sydnor was born May 6th 1705
Fortunatus Sydnor was born Jany 23rd 1707
Joanna Sydnor was born Feby 8th 1709
Anthony Sydnor was born Jany 18th 1711/12
Elizabeth Sydnor wife of Anthony Sydnor was born March 2nd 1722

[Children of Anthony & Elizabeth Sydnor his wife viz.]
Fortunatus Sydnor was born Jany 30th 1737/8
John Sydnor was born March 19th 1739/40

Second Column.
Catharine Sydnor was born Jany. 3rd 1742/3
Judith Sydnor was born April 16th 1745
Susanna Sydnor was born May 27th 1747
Joseph Sydnor was born Oct 17th 1749
William Sydnor was born April 27th 1752
Bettex Sydnor was born Feb 11th 1755
Ann Sydnor was born Sept 9th 1757
Ruth Sydnor was born January 1st 1760
Anthony Sydnor was born May 27th 1762
Fanny Mitchell Sydnor was born Nov. 19th 1766.

Sarah Sydnor wife to William Sydnor was born Octobr 3rd 1752

[Children of William & Sarah Sydnor his wife viz.]
Ann Sydnor was born Feby 18th 1779.
Elizabeth Taylor Sydnor was born Nov 8th 1780.
Elizabeth Cross the second wife to William Sydnor was born in 1741.

(Third page of Record)

First Column.
Burwell Starke was born the 27th May 1806.
& Amanda his wife was born the 31st Dec. 1809.

Benjamin Franklin son to Burwell & Amanda Starke was born June 25th 1829.

Elizabeth Taylor 1st Daughter to Burwell & Amanda Starke was born March 27th 1831.

William Thomas, second son of Burwell & Amanda Starke was born March 5th 1833.
Alfred Lewis third son of Burwell & Amanda was born April 13th 1835.

Amanda Trueheart second daughter of Burwell & Amanda Starke was born 20th of April 1837.

Edwin Temple first son of Burwell & Ann B. Starke was born the 20th July 1840

Virginia Burwell first daughter of B & Ann B. Starke was born 18th July 1843

Judson second son of B & Ann B. Starke was born 21st Nov 1844

Edward Brooke third son of B & Ann B. Starke was born 17th Sept 1846

James Newton fourth son of B. & A. B. Starke was born 4th of Octr 1847.

(Third page of Record. Second column)

Deaths.
Fortunatus Sydnor departed this life 1722
Anthony Sydnor departed this life October 1759
William Sydnor departed this life Jan 23rd 1751
Fortunatus Sydnor departed this life March 14th 1750
Joanna Sydnor departed this life young.
Anthony Sydnor departed this life Oct 5th 1779
Fortunatus Sydnor departed this life February 12th 1781
Judith Sydnor departed this life in March 1778.
Susanna Sydnor departed this life March 5th 1766
Fanny Mitchell Sydnor departed this life Octobr 27th 1769
Sarah Sydnor first wife to Wm Sydnor departed this life Jan 7th 1789
Ann Sydnor departed this life October 23rd 1793
(Fourth page of record. First column)

Elizabeth Sydnor second wife to William Sydnor Departed this life the 1 day of October 1815
Children of B & Ann B. Starke
Edwin Temple born July 20th 1840
Virginia Burwell born July 18th 1843
Judson born Nov 21st 1844
Edward Brooke Sept 17th 1846
James Newton born Oct 4th 1847.

Children of B. & Fanny L. Starke.
Mary Ann born May 17th 1854.
William Gwathmey born Apr 24th 1858.
Lewis Newton born Nov 1st 1859
Robert Lee born Aug 10th 1861
Lucy Gwathmey born the 28th of September 1863
Americus Hatchett born the 4th of September 1865

(Fourth page of Record)

Second Column.

Amanda Starke wife of Burwell Starke & daughter of William Trueheart departed this life July 10th 1837 in the 27th year of her age.

Ann Baylor 2nd wife of Burwell Starke & daughter of Elder Wm Hatchett departed this life March 3rd 1851 in the 33rd year of her age.

Amanda Trueheart 5th child of Burwell & Amanda Starke died 20th of July 1837 aged 4 month.

Alfred Lewis son of Burwell & Amanda Starke departed this life July 18th 1855 in the 21st year of his age.

James Newton son of Burwell & Ann Baylor Starke departed this life January 13th 1855 in the 9th year of his age.

Mary Ann first daughter of Burwell & Fanny L. Starke his wife was born May the 17th 1854 and died the 9th of May 1855

William Gwathmey first son of Burwell & Fanny Lewis Starke was born the 24th of April 1858 and died on the 2nd day of October aged 5 months & 8 days.
Americus Hatchett son of B. and Fanny L. Starke died Oct. 16th 1890. Age 25-1-12
Fanny L. wife of Burwell Starke died July 28th 1891. Age 67-5-6.
Burwell Starke died July 16th 1895. Age 89-1-19.

These Records copied from the Family Record in an old Bible at present in possession of Lucy Gwathmey Fleet (nee Starke) daughter of Burwell Starke by William B. Sydnor.
August 18th 1896.
Corder: Lafayette County, Mo.

NORTON CORRESPONDENCE.

John Norton came to Virginia and settled in Yorktown before 1745. He was one of the Justices of York County and represented the County in the House of Burgesses in the Assembly of 1752-1754. He had a store and warehouse at Yorktown and became one of the leading merchants of Virginia. He married Courtney Walker, daughter of Jacob Walker of Elizabeth City County, who was brother of Margaret Walker, who married Thomas Wythe, father of Chancellor George Wythe. Jacob Walker was son of George Walker, pilot of James River in 1697 and gunner and storekeeper at Fort Point Comfort in 1723, and Anne Keith, his wife, daughter of the celebrated George Keith, who figures extensively in Quaker history (William and Mary College Quarterly, IX, 127; X, 207, 281; XVIII, 289-291).

John Norton was son of John Norton, of London, and Anne Hatley, his wife, daughter of George Hatley and Miss Scott, widow of John Flowerdew. By his marriage with Courtney Walker, John Norton had four sons, John Hatley Norton, George Flowerdew, Daniel and Henry, and one daughter, Frances.

After staying in Virginia many years, John Norton returned to London in 1764, leaving his son John Hatley Norton to represent him at Yorktown. This gentleman was born September 4,
1745, and was a Justice of York County and a prominent merchant. He married, first, Sarah Nicholas, daughter of the Treasurer, Robert Carter Nicholas, and 2dly. Catherine Bush, daughter of Philip Bush, of Winchester. Frances Norton, his sister, married her first cousin, John Baylor, son of John Baylor and Lucy Walker, another daughter of Jacob Walker, of Elizabeth City County.

The letters which follow are selected from a mass of papers in the possession of Judge J. K. M. Norton, of Alexandria, who is a son of George Hatley Norton and his wife Anne Burwell Marshall, grandson of George Hatley Norton and Maria Gault, his wife, and great-grandson of John Hatley Norton and Sarah Nicholas his wife.

To John Hatley Norton.

London the 10th may 1767.

Dear Hatley.

I wrote you the 17th past & intended it pr. Capt. Wilkinson he told me on change he was goe:g to Gravesend himself this afternoon, that Mr. Athawes's youngest son wd. follow him in ye even:g after with all his letters, & if mine were sent any time in ye fornoon they wd. be soon enough, but instead thereof I went with them to Mr. Athawes* in ye morn:g and he went down the Night Tide, so they were left, & those sent pr. post to Ramsgate (it being a bye post) did not get there till day Noon, & they were left likewise as I expected, & have been since returned home, you have them pr. this oppor. in which Mr. Ballard is passenger with Capt. Littell bound to Jas. River. In looking over matters since ye ship sailed I find by Mr. Barwick's neglect: g to make out 2 bills of pchs. 1 for Col. Edw. Digges ye other Mr. Jno. Perrin for each a pr. of silk which your mother bot. for her own wear: g but substituted them instead of those they order'd neither of them have been charged in their invoices. I have wrote them off & must charge them with it, also Mr. Barwick has added his bill of patts(?) for Mr. Prentis's goods £10—— short at least Mr. Prentis is cha:d £10—— too little for the same pr. his invoice, have since charged him with ye error & pr. the 1st oppor. advised him of it. We are all much as you left us, your Sr. has been to Whitfields

*Samuel Athaws a prominent merchant of London, in the Virginia trade.
Tabernacle & satisfied her curiosity, she seemed much disappointed, his oratory fell greatly short of her expectations. I have done little in the Tobo. way since I wrote have sold only 10 hhds. of Sticky Stript Leaf to Mr. Grote at 3d ye 36 hhds. sold Lyde of Stript Leaf Prov'd in gen'l very rotten on delivery, old Mr. Hodgkin too 900 allowce. & wou'd hardly agree to take them at that, many hhds. turn'd out rotten quite thro, they belonged to Mr. Benja. Herndon, Geo. Halloway, Hy. Hill, Geo. Brooke & Wm. Thomson. I have got off the leaf of that Stamp to Andrews & Co. & Sayer, on pretty good terms, except ye hhd. DVN wch. was so bad I let him have it at 2d & without allowce. I have only 16 hhds. Leaf & 18 hhds. Stript of Anderson's Cargo & 80 of Lilley's by odd ships unsold, many of them by Lilley being new I fear will stick on hand, but the old Tobo. I am not much afraid of as most of the Merchts. have clear'd their warehouses. Lilly has put his ship up at the Coffee house to sail this mo. pr. him probably you hear from me again at prest. remain with all our good wishes to you & frds. in Virga.

Dr. Hadley

Yrs. Affectionately, John Norton.

P. S. I have pd. ye greatest part of the Tradesmen & hope ye remainder will be so before the week expires.

To Mr. John Norton.

Dear Sir.

I shall be obliged to you if you will send me eight or ten gallons of the best arrack in carboys properly secured and some gardenseeds. Your son left us this morning. He is in very good health and spirits. He was was going to Hanover court. With my best wishes for yours and your family's happiness I am,

Dear Sir, Your most obedient sevt.

G. Wythe.

Williamsburg, June 1768.
Addressed "To Mr. John Norton, Merchant in London.
By favour of Mr. Stevenson.

On Back.

To John Norton.

Dear Sir.

I wrote many months ago to Messrs. James Buchanan and Company for an elegant set of table and tea china, with bowls of the same of different sizes, decanters and drinking glasses, an handsome service of glass for a desert, four middlesized and six lesser dishes, and three dozen plates of hard metal, 100 skins of writing parchment proper for enrolling our acts of assembly on, several bundles of bed quilts, two pieces of blanketing and as many of rolls for servants, 10 or 12 pair of shoes and two slippers for myself, and one or two other articles which I do not recollect. At that time there was due to me about thirty pounds, I believe, for I have mislaid their last account current; and besides I had shipped four hogshead of tobacco to that house. The goods have not come to hand, neither have I yet an account of sales of the tobacco. If they have not sent, nor design to send the goods, I desire you will be so kind as to let me have them, with a bonnet for Mrs. Wythe, and present the inclosed order and receive the balance. A few days since I desired you would procure for me an handsome well built charriot, with the device now sent painted on it, for which you may depend on a seasonable remittance. I again beg the favour of your attention to the affair of the journals. If they are not to be procured let me be informed what 120 printed copies of them to the year 1752 will cost. If they do not exceed the sum I suppose the assembly, I doubt not, will defray the expence. The prospect of a benefit to me, I flatter myself, will not only excuse the earnestness and frequency of my importunities, but stimulate your endeavors to serve me in this business. You will oblige me by sending a copper plate, with the arms of Virginia neatly engraved, and some impressions of them to be pasted on the books belonging to the house of burgesses. If any additions are made on the plate in consequence of what is proposed within, I will cheerfully pay the extraordinary cost. J. H. N. left us a day or two ago in good health &c. I forgot to mention that I had drawn bills on Messrs. James Buchanan and company for about sixteen pounds payable to Mr. James Cocke.

I am, Dear Sir, Your sincere friend and well wisher,

G. Wythe.

Williamsburg. Aug. 18th 1768.


On Back.

To John Norton.
Rosewell May the 27th 1769.

Dr. Sir.

I wrote to you some time ago thanking you for the confidence you had put in me in sending me so many goods upon so small a consignment, acquainting you with my disappointment, & showing how far I had complied with my promise of paying your Son &c. I cannot help assuring you again that I should not have sent you such an invoice last year if I had known the amount of my debts here, & could have foreseen the expenses of Electioneering, for nobody hates the thought of being in debt more than I do, but the great scarcity of money here, the shortness of my crops for four years past, & the necessary expences of an increasing family joined to the commencement of house-keeping in a large house, have forced me to submit to it for a while; but I hope it will not be long, as I have a very good prospect for a crop, have engaged a good overseer, have resolved not to send to England for anything this year, & have entered into the Association. I like the Association because I think it will repeal the disagreeable acts of Parliament, open the eyes of the people with you, & must certainly clear us of our debts. All North America will join in this cheme. How must your Manufacturers curse the Minister who has driven the Colonies to this! I am astonished at Ld. Hillsborough. His method of quelling riots in London, & supporting the civil power in America, as he terms it, will render him eternally ridiculous & odious to both English & Americans. I am amazed at the influence he seems to have over both houses of Parliament; their Resolves are almost a copy of his letter to Governor Bernard. Is it not shocking to think that he not only executed that dangerous & impolitic scheme of sending troops to Boston, but was able to get the approbation of Lds. & Commons? Is not every honest Englishman alarmed at their resolves & address? Mentioning their resolves & address puts me in mind of ours,* but I suppose you will see them before you get this. Ld. Botetourt required nothing of the Assembly, but they were so provoked at the resolves of the Lords & Commons that they enter'd the resolves for which his Lordship thought proper to dissolve them. This has not lessened him in their esteem, for they suppose he was obliged to do so; he is universally esteemed here for his great assiduity in his office, condescension, good nature & true Politeness.

I hope our unhappy differences will soon be soon at an end; for

*The celebrated resolves of May 16, 1769, by which Virginia rallied the whole continent to resistance.
I think that the Parliament must be soon convinced that the acts we complain of are unconstitutional & anticommercial, & then will, with a greatness of mind worthy of that august body, repeal them as such.

I have given Capt. Robertson 10 Hhds. which was all I had after paying levies & overseers. I shall be obliged to you if you will insure them. I believe I have had one of the worst overseers in the world. My wife joins me in best wishes to you yr. lady & Family. I am yours sincerely

John Page, Jun.r

On Back.
Ansd. the 26th Augst. 1769. Capt. Cocke.

To John Norton.
York, 14th Aug't, 1769

Dear Sir,

Your kind letter shou'd have been answer'd sooner but some little disappointments and perplexities prevented me. I have now enclosed a bill of Exchange for some necessaries for Housekeeping; I imagine you'll be a little surprised at my undertaking; when I might with more propriety perhaps have consulted the undertaker but such is the propensity of Mankind to be Whimsical that I am affraid wee shall be so as long as wee live in this world.

You'll see by my invoice that I am an Associator; that I am so I am sure will give me some Merit with Mrs. Norton; not that I doubt Mr. Norton neither: But believe me, our poor Country never stood in more need of an effort to save her from ruin than now; not more from the taxes, and want of trayd than from our own extravagances. The 2 shilling linen being for my own Wear, I recommend it to your choice; I expect to be dress't in Virginia cloth very soon, and as I am a little incommoded with corns, in Mockasins likewise. I have given up the Article of Tea, but some are not quite so tractable; however, if wee can convince the good folks on your side the Water of their Error, wee may hope to see happier times. Whatever our fare may be I wish you and yours health and Happiness and remain, Sir

Your Afft friend
and obgd hum Servt.

M. Jaquelin*

*Martha Jaquelin, daughter of Edward Jaquelin, of Jamestown.
For other ladies of the Association, see William and Mary Quarterly, VIII, 36.
Norton Correspondence

To John Norton.

Virginia, Norfolk, December 17, 1769.

Dear Sir:—

It is some time since I had the pleasure of hearing from you, and take this opportunity to ask the favour of your assistance, as I am satisfied from your known disposition that you are always ready to serve any of your friends in Virginia. I have been an Officer of the Customs, a Surveyor of Elizabeth River for better than thirty years and by the records of the Court of Admiralty I have made more seizures than most all the Officers in the Colony, and it is imagined there will be a new Custom House Erected at Norfolk soon. A few days past Mr. Williams, Inspector General, arrived in Norfolk from Boston who is appointed to inspect into the Offices of the Customs in the Several Colonys and on his return to the Commissioners at Boston his report will be accordingly. by what I can understand from him he is much surprised a place of such Consequence in Trade should be without a Custom House, tho he is very Cautious what he sais. Since I made the three seizures which was last winter of two Brigs & a Sloop which I wrote to the Commissioners relative thereto, I had in answer a very polite Letter and highly approving of my conduct. upon the return of the inspector General if he thinks Norfolk ought to have a Custom house Erected there, the Commissioners is to report it home and I am creditably informed Mr. Wm. Bradley is waiting for that purpose, Expecting either to be appointed Collector or Naval officer. now as I have been an officer there so many years, I think in Justice I ought to be prefered, and if you can make Interest for me with your friends to ingage one of those places either Collector or Naval Officer, I shall readily pay with pleasure the Expense you'd be at in obtaining it and do Earnestly beg you will do all you can which I shall ever acknowledge. I have wrote to Mr. Dinwiddie and hope he will do all in his power and shall be glad you will speake to him about it. also wrote to E. Steuart but am doubtful, as he is fond of prefering his Countrymen, tho he promised me. I have not mentioned a word to Col. Hunter for fear of his thinking of Balfour or Barraud, therefore the Sooner if possible it can be ingaged for me the better, and if I am so happy to obtain it, it will suit me to live in Norfolk it being so near and convenient to my Estate, and beg Dear Sir you will be my friend and do all you can, which you may depend I shall do all in my power here to serve you. Mrs. Moseley Joines me with our best wishes to you and Mrs. Norton, and am with great Esteem

D'r Sir your mo't Humble Servt.,
Edw. Hack Moseley.
I have forgot to mention to you one thing that is my son Bassett Moseley who dos business for himself in the dry goods way and is well situated in the Town of Norfolk desires me that I would mention him to you as he wants a few goods to sort his store to the value of one hundred & fifty or two hundred pounds if you'll please to send them out to him he will remit you for them in three or four months tho I believe he will send you a bill much sooner by the next ship. I am D'r Sir,

With great Exteem your
most H. Servt.

E. H. Moseley

Addressed to Mr. John Norton, Merchant in London.

To John Norton.

Virginia, July 20, 1770.

Sir:—

I beg you will excuse my presuming to trouble you with this. perhaps you, or yr Lady, may Remember my Daughter Mary Moir Left two sons & a Daughter when she Dy'd. the boys I Brought up, & they are Bound one to a trade, the other to the sea. the girl my Daughter Davenport took, & is still here. I was oblig'd to break up housekeeping & Live with her after Mr. Davenport Dy'd, and have been a cripple with the Rhumatism this three years. I am more than 70 years old, & am helpt from the Bed to the chair, confined to one Room. Now to the substance of what I Desire to acquaint you with, if I may be permitted so to doe. Mr. Moir was here a few days since, and inform'd me he had Rec'd a Letter from Mr. Mackey, which married his sister, that a friend in Sweeden was Dead & had Left him a Leggacy, and Desired him to come to England, and to bring his Daughter, & his wife would take care of her and bring her up. this I should be glad off, as I am so old, & her Aunt Davenport is so very Low & weak, in a consumption, she is advis'd as the Last Remedy to cross the sea, and is gone to Bermuda. if she should Die, god only knows what will become of poor Nancy Moir, for she has no near Relation here Left. Mr. Wm. Nelson has Let Mr. Moir have money & goods, I am told, on that Letter. Now what I humbly Request of you is, if Mr. Mackey Does not Live at too great a Distance, that you, or Yr Lady if it is not too great a favour to ask, could see Mrs. Mackey, & know from her, if she will send for her Niece Nancy Moir, there is many prittey traids there that she might put her to, that is not in my power to doe here, & Nancy is very willing to goe to her aunt, but she would not goe to Maryland with her father, as he has
another wife. I believe she was afraid he would leave her with his wife, & not carry her to her aunt. as you are the only person I know in England, I thus made bold to write to you, and was encourag'd so to doe, as I know you both delight to doe good, & help the Distrest, and such must poor Nancy Moir be without a friend. I am with the greatest Respect yr most oblig'd & obed. Servt.

Anne Matthews.*

Mr Daniel Mackey Lives in Friday Street Mercht in London
Addressed to John Norton, Esq., Mercht. in London

To John Norton.

Williamsburg 2d Jan, 1772.

Dear Sir:

This will be delivered to you by Mr. William Leigh,† a young Gentleman, who has lately finish'd his Studies at our College & is just embarking for England to take Holy Orders. His exceeding great merit has justly entitled him to the Esteem of all his Acquaintance in Virginia & I beg Leave to recommend him to your particular favour and Regard.

Sincerely wishing you and all yours a long and uninterrupted Service of happy years, I am very truly, D'r Sir,

Yr. afft. hbl. Servt.

Ro. C. Nicholas

To John Hatley Norton.

My Dear Son.

This is to congratulate you & my daughter on your marriage wishing you both all worldly happiness. I expected a letter by Cap. White but imagine it might have miscarried as neither your father nor myself have had any account from you in your last you mentioned that you were to be married tomorrow but as tomorrow is a day that may never come I did not rest myself satisfied with that certainty. Pay my respectful compts to Mr. & Mrs. Nicholas my cousin With [Wythe] & his lady, not forgetting my nephew Jacob Walker, my dear father's favorite; as to your future settlement in life I must

*The will of Anne Matthews was proved in York County 21 Sept., 1772. She names her son-in-law Mr. George Davenport (who was a lawyer), and daughter Catherine, son John Baker and daughter Anne Wright. The will was witnessed by David Jameson, Laurence Smith, Jr., and Matthew Hubberd.

leave that to your father's advice & your own prudence, should be glad to know what your plan is by the first opportunity as a proper beginning often terminates in a happy issue. You are now blessed with a woman capable of making you happy which I hope you will love & cherish as you lately promised, my best respects to all my good friends not forgetting Mr. Reynolds.* I will write him by Cap. Necks as I cannot now being much interrupted by my poor Harry's illness, the rest of the family thank God are very well

Your Affectionate Mother,

Courtenay Norton

By favor of Cap. Robertson."

To John Norton.

Virginia, Williamsburg, 26 March, 1772.

Sir:

I am directed by the Presidt. & Professors of William and Mary College to inclose you a bill lading for 7 hhds. Toba. on board the Greenvale Capt. Bowie, addressed to you. They gave your son orders for 13 hhds. which the Capt. says he sent a craft for, but those were only ready, the other 6 will go, probably, in one of your own ships if they should arrive soon.

Mr. Camm, who was appointed Presidt. during the Comys.† absence, desires me to offer his compliments, & that he would himself have wrote you but that he is not quite recovered from a fit of the gout in his hands.

Pray offer my respectfull compliments to Mrs. Norton & your family, & be assured the Civilities I reed. from you while in London I shall ever remr. with gratitude, & wish for nothing more than an opportunity of serving you.

I am with equal respt. & regard, Sir, Your mo. ob Servt.

Rob. Miller, Bursar of Wm. & Mary College.

*Capt. Thomas Reynolds lived in Yorktown where he was partner in many seagoing vessels. He married Susanna Rogers, daughter of Capt. William Rogers. Reynolds died in 1759 and Mr. John Norton was one of his executors. His son William was the person referred to in the letter.

†Rev. Thomas Horrocks, president of William and Mary College and Commissary of the Church.
John Norton, Esq.
Addressed "To John Norton, Esq. & Son, Merchants, London.
The Greenvale Capt. Bowie, Q. D. C.

On Back.

To John Hatley Norton.
May ye 5th— 1772.

My dear Son.
I hope this will be delivered you by Mr. Powell who goes passenger in Capt. Neocks with a few trifles for you & my daughter pray my love to her. I hope my dear you have had no return of your illness since your marriage but hope a good wife will take care of you & comfort you. Your Uncle Fludger* has lately had a stroke of the palsey but hope if he has no return of it he may get the better. Your Fds. are well and desire to be remembered to you. As I know my dear my health is not indifferent to you I can with pleasure say that I am a great deal better though not quite well. Pray God bless you & yours. Amongst the things your sister has sent a work bag to her sister with her kind love to you both wishing you all the happiness this world can afford.

Your truly affectionate mother

Courtenay Norton.

Addressed "To John Hatley Norton, Esq., Merchant in York Town, Virginia." To the care of Mr. Powell.

To John Hatley Norton.
Oct'br ye 28th 1772

Dear Brother
by your last letter I Understood you were gone up to the Springs for your Health. I heartily wish you a reisestablishment of it as that is Certainly the most Essential part of our happiness. I am sorry to hear that my Sister has had an Inflammation in her eyes I have been in the same state for near these 3 Months past at times so that hardly able to attend either book or work but what has done me the most good of any thing that I have yet Tried is Dipping my head in Cold water every Morning which thank God by his assistance has made them well. My Mama sent out your Goods by Capt. White which she hopes will prove to your entire Satisfaction; she has made some little alterations which she hopes will not be Disagreeable, as

*Flowerdew?
they were ordered to the best of her Judgment I must thank you for your kind letter & the good Instruction which it Contain'd I shall try to follow as near as possible so as deserve the good opinion that my F'ds & Relatives entertain of me & especially to answer the expectations that my dear Parents have of me I have no news to Relate to you at Present except that is thought Wilks will be our Lord Mayor, the other Party have demanded a Scrutiny it will not be finally ended till next Month my Brother George is a strong Wilkite he is continually railing at the Ministry we laugh and tell him he knows better how to add an 8th or a 16th to the pound in selling Tobacco my Mama tells him that neither he nor she were made to rule the state my Aunt Fludger Joins in love, she is now so blind as to be just able to sign her name, therefore beggs leave to assure you of her sincerest wishes for your & my Sisters happiness the same as if she wrote my Mama gives her love she received your letter but has not leisure to answer it at Present we all join in love to you & my Sister

I remain Dear Brother with Fillial Love
your Affectionate Sister
Frances Norton

P. S.
pray my love to Mr. Reynolds tell him I received his letter will answer it by another opportunity
Frances Norton
To John Hatley Norton Esq. Williamsburg

*She married John Baylor
(To be continued.)

HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL NOTES.

GOLDSMITHS AND SILVERSHERMS.—These trades were represented at Williamsburg in colonial days. John Brodnax was a goldsmith in Williamsburg before 1719, when his will was proved, and John Coke before 1744. John Bryan was a silversmith before 1749, when he is mentioned as such. They imported plate from England but also made some themselves. Thus, in the inventory of Henry Bowcock, tavern keeper of Williamsburg, there is mention of "silver" as follows:
Historical and Genealogical Notes

101 oz. 14 wt, plate of new sterling @ 6s = £30.10. 2½
106 oz. 14 do. old sterling @ 5s = £29. 6.10
36 oz. 16 do. Virginia made @ 5s = £ 9. 4.10

Henry Bowcock, Tavern keeper, of Williamsburg, names in his will a son Henry, who married Elizabeth Lowe Tyler, sister of John Tyler, marshall of the Vice Admiralty Court, and in 1742 Henry Tyler, her uncle, administered on the estate of Henry Bowcock, who died without will. They appear to have had at least two children, Mary, mentioned as such in the will of Agnes Hilliard (1746), and probably Henry Bowcock, a printer in Williamsburg, who died about 1779, when his will was proved at Yorktown. In 1752 a deed shows that Elizabeth Lowe (Tyler) Bowcock had married John Palmer, a lawyer, who was also bursar of William and Mary College. He died in 1760. In 1775 John Tyler (afterwards governor) advertised in the Va. Gazette “a brick house and its appurtenances, belonging to the daughters of the late John Palmer.” (Wm. & Mary Quarterly, XVII, p. 150.) Elizabeth Palmer, one of the daughters, married in 1770 Richard Marot Booker, of Halifax County, Va., son of Col. Richard Booker, of Amelia, and Rachel Marot, his wife, daughter of John Marot of Williamsburg. (Halifax Co. Marriage Bonds.)

Gunsmiths in Williamsburg.—Governor Spotswood brought to Virginia John Brush, as gunsmith. His daughter Susanna married I, Thomas Barber, II, Rev. Francis Fontaine, Professor of Oriental Languages in William and Mary College. (William and Mary Quarterly, V, 195, 213.) In 1729 Henry Bowcock bequeaths to his son Henry “his silver watch and gun made by John Brush, and a case of pistols with brass barrels made by Hawkins, and my hosing and holster caps.” In Henry Bowcock's inventory the gun made by Brush is referred to as “1 bird piece made by Brush” (valued at) £2.10. After Brush came James Geddy, gunsmith, to whom in 1738 Samuel Boush and Frances, his wife, sold lot 62 in the plan of the City. And in 1751 David and William Geddy, his sons, were smiths, who, besides repairing all kinds of gunwork, made all kinds of cutlery. At Yorktown similar work was carried on by Ephraim Goosley. He stated that “his materials and workmen were from the best shops in London.” (William and Mary Quarterly, XII, 83, 157.)
Marston Church in York County.—This church was situated near Magruder, in York County, and is marked by some old brick and some tombstones of the Garrett family. It is referred to in the following order: "It is ordered that Richard Booker, Gent., be appointed surveyor of the Road which leads from the old church over the Capitol Landing, in the room of Robert Clarke, but it is ordered that he keep the said Bridge and cosway in good repair at the County's charge."

Bushrod, Thomas.—Judge Bushrod Washington was descended from Richard Bushrod (born 1636). The last was brother of Thomas Bushrod (born 1604), who was a resident of York County, Va. He appears to have come from Massachusetts, being unable to reconcile himself to the rules of that despotic country. Thus, in the Massachusetts Records: "3rd 7 month, 1639, Thomas Bushrode being accused of defaming the Government was convicted and fined 6£ 13s 4d wch paying to bee discharged."

Probably it was not long after this order that he removed to Virginia. We find him in York Count in 1647, where he was a member of the House of Burgesses in 1658-59. He sympathized with the Quakers, and in 1661, when a persecution was begun against them in Virginia, Bushrod was particularly obstreperous. His wife was a Quakeress, and, for his interference with her, Bushrod called Rev. Justinian Aylmer "a blind priest," "anti-Christ" and "proceeded from the Pope," and to Col. Augustine Warner, one of the Council, Bushrod said that he would not meddle with him as a councillor but that "hee ye said Warner," was "a Rogue & a dogg." In these remarks, while paying due deference to authority, he was quite positive in expressing his opinions of Aylmer and Warner. He was arrested and remanded to the authorities at Jamestown, but made his peace in some way.

Bushrod engaged in merchandising and acquired a large estate. He married 1. Mary, widow of Capt. Thomas Hill, of Essex Lodge in York County, and 2. Elizabeth —— whose eldest daughter, Lydia, apparently by another marriage, married Major Edmund Chisman, of Bacon's Rebellion. Mr. Bushrod, describing himself as of Essex Lodge, made his will December 18, 1676, and desired to be buried "in my old garden by the side of my wife Mary without comon prayeres or other customes used at ffunerals."
It is suggestive of the inconstant actions of people at that time, who were much like children in their sudden gusts of passion, that Augustine Warner was one of his executors.

Lydia Chisman was the heroine who, when her husband was arraigned before Gov. William Berkeley, took all the blame of his rebellion on herself and desired to be hanged in his stead. But Sir William repulsed her in a very unworthy manner.

For Bushrod Family, see William and Mary College Quarterly, XIV, p. 177, XI, 29-32.

Irby.—(William and Mary Coll. Quarterly, VII, 61.) Mary Tyler, sister of John Tyler, Governor of Virginia, married William Irby, Jr., not John Irby as stated. There is a deed dated Nov. 24, 1799, from William Irby, Jr., and Mary, his wife, of Charles City Co., Virginia and parish of Westover to Littleberry Irby, of the said county, for 99 1/2 acres, which he, the said William Irby, purchased of Joshua Knibb. It probably indicates the time of Irby's removal from the county to South Carolina. There was a commission appointed by the court priorly to examine the said Mary, and the report says that she was examined March 5, 1802, and that William Irby was then dead.

Rolle.—The will of William Rolfe, dated December 30, 1784, is recorded in Mecklenburg County, Va., in which he mentions his wife, Elizabeth, sons William, Lewis, Edward and John, daughters Elizabeth Brame and Sarah Brame, the wives respectively of Thomas and James Brame and several grandchildren. The given names Addison and Warner Lewis and James Washington appear among the children and grandchildren of Thomas and James Brame. It is desired to know the maiden name of William Rolfe's wife, the names of his antecedents and whence he came to Mecklenburg County. It is also desired to know the maiden name of the wife of Richens Brame, whose will, probated in Mecklenburg County, Va., December 14, 1789, mentions her as Susannah; he removed from Caroline County, in 1760, to the portion of Lunenburg County now embraced in Mecklenburg. What was the maiden name of the wife Mary of John Brame (grandfather of Richens Brame), who patented 200 acres of land in Middlesex County, Va., October 23, 1690, and was he the emigrant of the family and
whom did Melchizedek, Jemima, Kezia and Kerenhappuch Brame (brother and sisters of the above Richens Brame), born in 1717, 1719, 1720 and 1724 respectively in Middlesex County, Va., marry and who are some of their descendants?—Miss Lucile Brame, Apt. No. 2, 1 North Fifth Street, Richmond, Va.

Chiskiack.—At the time of the arrival of the whites the region about the present Yorktown on the south side of York river was ruled by the Chiskiack Indians, whose chief village was located at a place three miles above Yorktown. These Indians were active in assaulting the whites at Jamestown, and in 1612 their chief was named Ottahotin. They took part in the Indian massacre of 1622, and, afterwards, to escape the vengeance of the whites, they emigrated to the Pyanketank river. Here they continued until they dwindled away to nothing.

Among the early proprietors of land in the Chiskiack district of the York was Henry Lee, who was a physician, and one of the magistrates of York County. His residence, called "Chiskiack," was not far from the Indian town. Later, his son of the same name probably built the brick house which was burned and restored not many years ago. It continued in the family till both property and house were taken over by the Federal government in 1917. The last proprietor was W. H. H. Lee, of Richmond, and in the Richmond newspapers is the announcement of the marriage of his daughter, Elizabeth Vestella Lee to W. L. Armstrong, of Boston, by Rev. Dr. Tuttle, of the Methodist Church, on Friday, 11 o'clock, March 31, 1922. The young couple will reside in Augusta County, Virginia.

Information wanted concerning Thomas Lee, of Northumberland Co., Va. Afterwards of Wythe Co., Va., and as early as 1783 he had business transactions in the vicinity of Rogersville, Tennessee. Later, deeds of sale and gift show that he resided there in Lee Valley, now Hawkins Co.

Was he the Thomas Lee who was Adjutant of Grayson's Regiment 1777 to 1778?

He is styled Capt. Thomas Lee. His will was probated July 4th, 1816. He calls his wife Mary Lee.—Mrs. Peter A. Boyle, 2801 Rhodes Circle, Birmingham, Ala.
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