

caps; the excessive rent was the paramount cause for migration at the time Rev. William Martin brought his people to South Carolina. (This theme recurs over and over in the petitions to the Governor for land by those coming from Ireland.)

Thus that portion of the tradition is true—this group, at least, left because they could not afford to remain, and for a place where they could get land virtually "for free," that is, South Carolina.

III

South Carolina: land offered to settlers

The first settlements in South Carolina were along the Coast, and the economy of the first fifty years was to a considerable extent based on rice plantations and slave labor.

Realizing that it would be advantageous for many reasons to have the settlements extend farther inland, where the soil was more suited to other uses and crops, and the increasing population would strengthen the colony, as early as 1731 "poor Protestants" were offered land if they came to the colony to settle. This was on the basis of 100 acres for the head of the family and 50 acres for every other person in the family. Instructions to Governor Lyttelton in 1755⁷ spell out the terms of the grant. The quit rent was to be 4 shillings proclamation money per 100 acres after two years from the date of the grant. When conditions of the grant were fulfilled, the grantee was entitled to another grant on the same basis. The grantee was required to clear and cultivate the land granted at the rate of three acres out of every hundred acres per year. As an additional encouragement, in 1752 it was provided that there was to be supplied for tools and provisions Five Pounds (£5) proclamation money for each person under 50 and over 12 years of age, and Two Pounds Ten Shillings for each under 12 and over 2 years.⁸

In 1754 a portion of the tax from which was provided the

"bounty" mentioned above, was authorized to be used to pay the fees for surveys and grants for such "poor protestants."⁹

There were changes from time to time in these Acts, mostly with respect to the taxes from which they were to be paid but also in the amounts and purposes of payment to the settler.

In July 1761, as the "encouragement heretofore given to poor protestants to become settlers in this province hath not had the desired effect," the bounty was changed. Hereafter, £4 sterling or the value thereof in current money of the Province would be paid to defray the expense of the passage from *Europe* of "every poor free protestant who hath not already received any bounty from this province, and who shall arrive in this province to settle from *Europe* within three years from the passage of this Act above the age of 12 years, and who shall, in case they come from *Great Britain* or *Ireland*, produce a certificate under the seal of any corporation or a certificate under the hands of the minister and church wardens of any parish, or the ministers and elders of any church, meeting, or congregation, of the good character of such poor protestants above the age of twelve years," and £2 sterling or the equivalent for such poor protestants under twelve and above two years or age brought within the time and for the purpose aforesaid; also twenty shillings sterling or equivalent to such poor protestants above the age of two years, to enable them to purchase tools and provisions. The passage money was to be paid to the owner or master of the vessel unless the emigrant had already paid for his passage, in which case it was paid to him.¹⁰

This legislation recognized the fact that the cost of transportation was a deterrent to migration and also that not all immigrants had funds with which to procure the type of tools needed to clear land and build a shelter. At the same time, the requirement of references insured settlers of high quality.

The several acts under which these "bounties" were paid

⁷ South Carolina Statutes, vol. IV, p. 11, No. 826, 11 May 1764.

¹⁰ Acts of the General Assembly of South Carolina passed in the year 1761. (From Microfilm Records of State of South Carolina, Session Laws 1760-1761; taken from Microfilm SC/R.2, Reel 4a, p. 7).

⁸ Public Records (South Carolina), vol. XXVI, p. 316 (ms.) in South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

⁹ South Carolina Statutes, vol. III, p. 781-782, No. 809, 7 Oct. 1752.

were repealed, amended, or expired from time to time, but were equally often "revived." Ultimately, however, at the close of the term of the General Assembly in 1768 all authority for the payment of bounties finally expired.

News of this spread slowly, however, and for several years thereafter ships continued to bring persons who expected to receive the bounty. (This resulted in a great help to future genealogists, since often their petitions for aid furnish names, both of the petitioners and the ships on which they arrived, and hence their port of embarkation in Ireland can be determined.)

In 1768 the Attorney-General was requested for an opinion on the subject, and his opinion¹¹ was conclusive that there was no longer authority for the payment of any bounty, but that such "poor protestants" were, however, still entitled to their lands free of charge.

(It should be noted that as late as 1774, emigrants from Ireland arriving to take up lands who did not have funds to go to such lands given them (usually some distance from Charleston) were often given help by the Government and thus, in many cases, there is a record of their names and that of the ships on which they arrived.)

So the group coming with the Rev. William Martin, which arrived late in 1772, were not entitled to a bounty but were possibly entitled to their lands free of charge.

And that brings up the matter of fees.

A person granted land did not get it without any expense, as the fees paid at every step of the procedure could mount up to a considerable sum.

There are numerous references in the statutes and the reports to England as to changes in fees for various transactions but those on the granting of land were remarkably constant. The Commons House of Assembly steadily insisted one of its prerogatives was that of fixing fees. While the fees fixed as early as 1698 were not formally approved by the

¹¹ *Council Journal*, vol. 34, pp. 262-265.

King, Governor Bull stated in 1764¹² that most officers "conformed thereto."

These were as follows—

Fees:¹³

	Pounds	shillings	pence
To the Surveyor General—			4
For running a line, per acre		2.	10.
For a plat, certificate and copy			30.
For an attested copy of a plat			2.
For a warrant			10.
For a copy of a warrant and precept endorsed hereon			—
To the Deputy Surveyor—			—
For each day he has to ride to place to be surveyed and back, if over 20 miles			50.
To the Governor—			—
For a warrant			2.
For a grant of 500 acres or under			10.
if over 500 acres		1.	—
To the Secretary—			—
For a warrant			2.
For filing the surveyor's certificate			1.
For a grant of 500 acres or under			10.
For a grant of over 500 acres			15.

Of course, the amount paid depended on the requirements in each case, but even if the Deputy Surveyor did not have to travel far or often, the total sum might well be as much as Five Pounds, a considerable sum in those days.

The procedure followed in acquiring land may be of interest.

Persons who applied for land had to appear in person before the Governor in Council, and make their request, show they were of good character and in condition to improve the land by settling on it, etc. If the Governor was satisfied on these points and therefore decided the person was entitled to land, such fact was recorded in the *Council Journal* and the preparation of a warrant for survey was directed.

The person receiving the warrant took it to the Surveyor General, who prepared an attested copy with a general precept

¹² Bull to Board of Trade, 21 December 1764; British Record Office, XXX 284.

¹³ Thomas Cooper, ed., *The Statutes at Large of South Carolina* (Columbia, S. C., 1889) vol. III, p. 346.

endorsed thereon, and gave it to the person presenting the warrant—after the fee was paid to him, of course.

That person then took the attested copy and precept to the appropriate deputy surveyor, who made the survey, prepared a plat, endorsed the warrant and gave the survey and plat to the person taking up land, again after payment of the fees.

That person, within 30 days, returned the survey and plat to the Surveyor General's office (on penalty of land being declared vacant).

The Surveyor General within 20 days would certify and deliver the plats. The person for whom the survey had been made could then apply to the Secretary of the Province for a grant.

* * * * *

North of Ireland families, and some from elsewhere in Ireland, flocked to a colony that advertised for and wanted settlers who were willing to work hard if they were allowed to have security in their lands and to be free to have their own churches. The migration began with a trickle in 1750, became a flood in the 1760s, and while it slackened somewhat after the bounties were terminated, still continued up to the beginning of the Revolution. Even after the Revolution, during the latter part of the century, individuals and small parties continued to come from Ireland into South Carolina.

IV

Identification Procedure

The problem has always been to distinguish between persons of the same name, some of whom may have come directly from Ireland and some by way of Pennsylvania or Virginia. But as most of those coming from Ireland applied at once and in groups they can usually, by sufficient study, be identified.

The steps taken to determine the general location in Ireland from whence came the settlers on the five ships carrying the Rev. William Martin's party will be outlined in detail herein.

In this case, the known facts as to a large number of the

emigrants on these ships being his congregation and their friends made it possible to work in both directions — back toward origin in Ireland, forward toward place of settlement in South Carolina. (For suggestions as to procedure for tracing others *back* from the residence in South Carolina of the ancestor, see Chapter 5.)

In compiling this identification of the settlers in Rev. William Martin's group the purpose has NOT been to trace descendants or even definitely to identify these immigrants after their arrival in South Carolina, but instead to demonstrate the use of various types of records (newspapers, surveys, grants, ship arrivals, ports of sailing, diaries, ecclesiastical records and histories, histories of specific areas here and abroad, etc.) to determine the origin abroad of settlers here during the colonial period.

The key factor in this case was Rev. William Martin, as leader of the group. As shown in Chapter 3, he is so referred to in the *Council Journal*.

This is further documented by numerous references to Rev. William Martin in Presbyterian periodicals,¹⁴ as well as in the letters and articles of Daniel Green Stinson, and statements of those who, as children, came with the party.

In the *Council Journal*, names are given of the following ships: the *Lord Dunluce*, *Hopewell*, *Pennsylvania Farmer*, and *Free Mason* (group) without giving the name of the ship on which they came.

A search of the Charleston, South Carolina, newspapers from midsummer 1772 to mid-January 1773 showed arrival of five ships from north Ireland ports at the right time, furnished names of the captains and port from which they sailed, and these ports were all those from which passengers from the Ballymoney area might logically have embarked. Four of these ships were the *Lord Dunluce*, *Hopewell*, *Penn-*

¹⁴ Among them: William Glasgow, "Sketches of the Ministry of the Reformed Church in America, No. 8, William Martin," *Reformed Presbyterian Church and Consociation*, vol. XXIV (1886), p. 400. Rev. James McConnell, *Faith of the Irish Presbyterian Church, 1613-1840*. Revised by Rev. S. G. McConnell; Appendix, *American Century*; Ministers of Irish Origin who Laboured in America During the Eighteenth Century, compiled by Rev. David Stewart, Belfast, 1948.

sylbonia Farmer, and *Free Mason*. The fifth was the snow, *James and Mary*, which sailed from the same port as the *Lord Danance*, and, as will be seen later, passengers on it are known from several other sources to have been part of Rev. William Martin's party.

The authorization for surveys of land were issued to persons grouped by the ship in which they came, except in one case where the name of the ship is not given. Further investigation showed the authorizations for persons on the unnamed ship were all dated December 11 and included persons known from other sources to be in the Rev. William Martin's party, and while dated December 11, the names of the individuals to whom they were to be issued were not entered in the *Council Journal* until January 6, when they were entered with the others of the Rev. William Martin's party. Apparently, the sequence of events was as follows: The *James and Mary* arrived long before the rest of the ships (stating others would follow), was detained for some time in quarantine because of smallpox having been on board; then persons on it applied for the bounty and land, were refused bounty but after some delay surveys were authorized and apparently warrants and precepts prepared December 11 but not issued, nor were the names of the individuals entered in the *Council Journal* until after the arrival of the Rev. William Martin.

This sequence of events, compiled from contemporary accounts, is identical with the tradition with respect to early arrival, illness on board, delay in getting land until arrival of Rev. William Martin, etc.

The names of all individuals on the five ships for whom surveys were authorized have been checked against surviving surveys and some 80% identified. Doubtless more could be found by checking all variations in spelling (i.e., Ervine, Irvine, Irving, Erwin; Rork, O'Rourke, McRook; Galispy, Gillespie, etc., see Chapter 6).

At the time the surveys were made and until 1785, the county unit as now known did not exist in South Carolina. True, in 1682, three "counties" were laid out. Roughly, the locations were from points along the coast as follows, the

line extending up fairly straight, though probably following the rivers to some extent—

Craven County: From the North Carolina line to Seeew Creek (present Awendaw Creek) emptying into Bull's Bay.

Berkeley County: From Seeew Creek to the Stono River.

Colleton County: From the Stono River to the Combahce River.

Later another was added: Granville County, from the Combahce to the Savannah.

These names were continued in use until after the Revolution, but largely merely as a means of locating lands granted or sold and as the jurisdiction of militia units.

In 1769, Judicial Districts were created. Along the coast and extending about fifty miles inward were three—

Georgetown, from the North Carolina line to the Santee River.

Charleston, between the Santee and the Combahce River. Beaufort, between the Combahce and the Savannah Rivers.

Above these were the remaining districts—

Cheraws, above Georgetown, bounded on the west by Lynches River.

Camden, west of Cheraws, bounded on the west by the Santee-Congaree-Broad River system.

Between Camden District and the Savannah River was divided into two districts.

Orangeburg was the southern one.

Ninety-six was the northern one.

For a good description of the changing names of counties, districts, etc., see *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, vol. 69, page 155.

It was not until 1785 that the county system as we know it now was set up, and records kept in the counties.

The statement in the survey that the land was in a certain county therefore does not indicate it was in the county of the same name at present. However, by means of identifying the watercourses mentioned in a survey and by checking the

location of abutting owners, in many cases it has been possible to determine the county in which the land fell in 1785, and so the courthouse in which records thereafter made affecting such land may be located. It could be determined for most of the other cases by completing such research.

The land grants made as a result of the surveys have not been examined. Such examination may aid in further identification of the subsequent county in which the land was located.

By examination of the *General Index of Wills of Counties of South Carolina* (typescript in South Carolina Department of Archives and History), names identical with those of some of the persons taking up land under these surveys were found in the counties in which their surveys had been located. Such wills were examined and when there was reasonable identification of the maker of the will with the person taking up the survey a brief abstract of the will was made. Enough of these were so located to indicate it would be worthwhile for one descended from or interested in a person of the name of one taking up a listed survey to have a thorough search made in the records of the county in which the land covered by the survey was located for a deed (to see if the identical land was sold by such person or by his children) and if none, for the will, administration or settlement of estate of such person, etc., and thus determine whether the person concerned is actually the person for which the search is being made.

The index of deeds for a few of the counties in which surveys were located was examined for deeds by a grantor bearing names of "Martin party immigrants" who had surveys in such counties, as some of them no doubt sold the land sooner or later. Such deeds were examined and when the land sold appeared from the description to cover the land that had been surveyed for such person, abstract of the deed was made.

A few "spot checks" were made of other records and when such record appeared to refer to a "Martin party immigrant" a note was made of such record.

The results of this research appear in Chapter 3, Section

II, following the abstract of the survey and note of the county.

It should be borne in mind that no attempt was made to do any research on most of the names of persons listed as coming on these five ships, nor exhaustive research on any of the names listed.

It should also be remembered that these are NOT passenger lists but lists of those who *applied* for land grants. It is known that some persons who came on these ships bought their land and did not apply for grants; also some who applied for grants never went any further, and did not have a survey made.

In some cases no doubt a survey plat was prepared but cannot now be found. However, in such cases, there still may be available the subsequent grant. Rev. William Martin took up a grant, but also bought much additional land. Others may have done the same.

What has been done demonstrates that it will not be difficult to establish the identity of the first and probably the second generation in this country of a large percentage of this group of immigrants. The majority of them were probably from the vicinity of Ballymoney, Ballymena, Kells-water, and Vow, County Antrim. Those who can *prove* descent from such a person will know the general area in Ireland in which to begin the search for the immigrant ancestor abroad and his antecedents.

For this purpose the maps and general information in *Ulster Emigration to Colonial America, 1718-1775* will be most helpful. It is recommended that it be read carefully before work in Ireland is initiated. (See Footnote 5.)

CHAPTER 4

SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH CAROLINA

I

Getting Their Land

The *Council Journal* for January 6, 1773 states:¹

"The following persons who had lately arrived from Ireland into the Province on the ship *Lord Dunluce* presented petitions for warrants of survey agreeable to their Respective Family Rights, vizt.,"

followed by the names of the persons and acres of land to which entitled.

A somewhat similar statement is made preceding the list of names of those on the *Hopewell, Pennsylvania Farmer* and *Freemason*. In each case, after the list of names is the statement, "Ordered that the Secretary prepare survey as prayed for by the several petitions."

Between the lists of those coming on the *Pennsylvania Farmer* and the *Freemason* is a list headed "It is ordered by his Excellency the Governor that the Secretary do prepare warrants of survey for the undermentioned persons," without mentioning the ship on which they came or that they have petitioned for land. As the warrants for the persons named in this list are all dated December 11, 1772, at which time the snow *James and Mary* was the only vessel recently arrived from North Ireland ports whose passengers had not already received their warrants and the names of some of the persons on this list to whom warrants were so issued are signed to the letter sent to Ireland by passengers on that vessel and others are known from other sources to have been members of the Rev. William Martin's congregation or to have been passengers on that vessel, it can be definitely stated that the names listed are those who arrived on the snow *James and*

¹ [South Carolina] Council Journal, vol. 37, p. 15 et seq.

Mary; that the entry in the *Council Journal* of December 1, 1772, referred to them, that the warrants, dated December 11, had been duly prepared but held for the arrival of the Rev. William Martin and final determination as to the procedure to be followed.

The list of persons on each ship is divided into two groups; one, those who have £5 and so will pay fees for their land, and second, those who have sworn they do not have £5, so are deemed "poor persons" and thus do not have to pay the fees. (In this connection, it may be of interest to note that the fees, as listed in Chapter 1, sec. III, for the cost of the survey would usually amount to from £3 to £5, depending on exactly what was required in the particular case. If Five Pounds was all a family had, in the majority of cases they would have no money left by the time they had their land.)

Extensive research in the "Instructions," statutes, *Council Journal* and other records has failed to discover any authority or reason for the sum of £5 being required. But as only "poor protestants" were entitled to their land free of charge it seems probable it was fixed by administrative decision as the amount which would determine the category into which emigrants from Ireland who petitioned for land would be placed, that is, that a person who arrived in the Colony and did not have as much as £5 would be deemed a "poor protestant."

For names appearing in the *Council Journal* of those to whom warrants were issued and the number of acres to which each were entitled, see sec. III.

It should be remembered that these are not "passenger lists" but lists of those arriving on the respective ships *who applied for free grants of land*. It seems probable that the majority of the passengers *did* apply for free land, even in cases where they had funds and also bought land, as it is known that several did.

Daniel Green Stinson (born 1794, son of William Stinson (Stephenson) who came in the Martin party), writing in the *South Carolina Reporter* at an early date,² stated he had in

²In an article (date unknown) which he furnished to and which was printed in *The Reformed Presbyterian* (1876).

his possession a letter from Henry and Margaret Malcolm, dated 30 May 1773, County Antrim, Ireland, to their son-in-law, John Lin (who came on the *Lord Deville*) in which they mention, "We hear it reported here that Mr. Martin and his Covenanters had ill getting their land and John Cochrane had the occasion of their trouble." (This allusion is not explained. A John Cochrane was a passenger on the *Pennsylvania Farmer* and was granted land on Rocky Creek, Chester Co., but no reference has been found to any "trouble." It would be interesting to know what caused the comment.)

Daniel Green Stinson then went on to say that *he* supposed the trouble was that they had all expected to settle together in a colony, but found lands would not be granted in such a way as to permit it, and they had to scatter. While all were entitled to land, he continues, "Those who had means bought from old settlers." Records indicate, however, that while those with "means" may have bought improved property from earlier settlers, in a number of cases they also took up the free land to which they were entitled and improved it. Nevertheless, it is clear there were those in the group that did not take up any land. For example, Robert Chesney bought his land even before he came (or at least before he left Charlestown) but his young son Alexander took up a grant. Others no doubt did the same.

It is quite understandable that so soon after the Regulator troubles the Governor would not have wanted to see a colony of around 1,000 Irish, who felt they had been forced out of their home in Ireland, settled in one place, and would see to it that they were scattered. There was, however, some freedom of choice, for in many instances it has been noted that the land surveyed for one of the Martin party adjoined land which was already possessed by someone of the same surname; if they could not remain in a group there was a tendency for each to settle where there were relatives.

II

Steps Taken to Collect Data on Each Immigrant

The names listed in the *Council Journal* of those for whom surveys were authorized are those of heads of families (which

might consist merely of a single man or woman if such person comprised the family.

The head of a family was entitled to 100 acres for himself and 50 acres for his wife and the same for each other member of his family.³ In a number of cases adult sons and daughters in a family, who were single, took up land in their own names. (It would be interesting to trace the disposition of the land taken up by young single women, since the condition of receiving a grant was the clearing and improvement of the land.) In some cases it appears that a person did not take up in the beginning all the land to which he was entitled; it has been *assumed* this was because there was not, in the location in which he wished to settle, enough land available, or he may have had some occupation such as weaver, smith, or store-keeper, and only took up enough land for his own family's subsistence. Therefore, the number of acres surveyed for a man does not necessarily indicate the size of his family.

In order to bring together information developed about each immigrant in the Martin party and to avoid much repetition, in Section III of this Chapter instead of giving first the complete extract from the *Council Journal*, then all the surveys found, then any deeds, wills, etc., all data pertaining to one man has been assembled under his name, in sequence and with abbreviations as follows:—

(a) First, the entry in the *Council Journal* for January 6, 1773, giving ship by ship introductory statement and name of ship, etc., name of person to whom warrant is to be issued and number of acres to which entitled. (Instead of prefacing this line by "(a)," each individual will be designated by a number, assigned in the sequence in which the name appears in the *Council Journal*.)

(b) Abstract of survey, if identified (see below).

(c) Suggestion as to the county in which, subsequent to 1785, such land was probably located (see below).

(d) Will, deed, or other data which *might* relate to such person (see below).

³ Instructions to Governor Lyttelton, Public Records (South Carolina) vol. XXVI, p. 815 (man.), in South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

In the abstract of survey mentioned in (b) above—

(1) The following abbreviations are used to identify the records in the South Carolina Department of Archives and History from which data was taken:

P.F. — Plat folder, Pre-Revolutionary plats.

Pl. Bk. — Pre-Revolutionary Plat Book.

Mem. v. — Memorial, volume.

(2) Data is given in the following sequence:

Number of Plat folder or Book;

Date of precept or warrant (i.e., authorization of survey);

Number of acres surveyed or laid out;

Description;

Names of persons whose land adjoined tract being surveyed (abbreviated as "Pd'd.")

Date of survey or of certificate of survey.

With reference to (c), the county in which located: If a stream or other physical feature indicated in the survey is one of which the location is known or has an unusual name so could be identified with reasonable degree of accuracy, the county into which a landmark of that name subsequently fell, when counties were established, is indicated. In many instances there are numerous streams of the same name or one traverses several counties. In such case the various possibilities are indicated. For positive identification, deeds and wills, in the counties suggested, of persons of the name of the person for whom the land was surveyed and those shown as adjoining owners will need to be consulted. It has been noticed that within a short time after settlement there were a number of instances in which the land taken up was sold and land bought in another county. Particularly noticeable was the shift from what is now Spartanburg and York to what is now Chester and Fairfield. Reasons may have been the proximity of Indians in the first named, or desire to be nearer their minister and church.

As for the deeds, wills, or other documents cited or abstracted which are in some instances included under (d) —

it must be emphasized that such additional data is NOT based on an absolute identification of the person making such will or deed with the immigrant whose name appeared above; it is a *probable* identification which may be readily checked by further search in the records of the county indicated. Such citation or abstract is used to demonstrate the procedure to be followed by utilizing one record to indicate another record and so on, in order to trace the connection and so to identify the known ancestor with an immigrant or conversely. Positive identification was made in a few cases in order to demonstrate it is practicable to determine whether the immigrant settled on the tract surveyed for him or sold it. If he settled there, often he can be traced further by subsequent records until it can be proven whether he is or is not the progenitor of a latter known ancestor. If he sold it soon, frequently his new place of residence at that time can thereby be discovered and records there utilized in the same way.

III

"In the Council Chamber, Wednesday the 6th January 1773" *

* * * * *

The following persons who had lately arrived from Ireland into this province in the ship *Lord Darluce* presented petitions for warrants of Survey agreeable to their Respective Family Rights, viz—

In South Carolina

Acres

1. Rev'd WILLIAM MARTIN 400
 - (b) P.F. 1264; 6 Jan. 1773; 400 acres, Craven Co., on waters of Fishing Creek; bd'd Mary Gaston, John Gaston, Elizabeth Strong; 8 March 1773.
 - (c) Chester.
 - (d) See Chapter 2 for further account of Rev. William Martin.
2. JAMES MYURKAM 300
 - (b) P.F. 1226; 6 Jan. 1773; 350 acres in Craven Co., on Durbin Creek branch called Bowen Branch; sur. 3 Feb. 1773.
 - (c) Laurens or Greenville (but see Chester).
 - (d) Chester Co. Will Bk. 1, p. 110; James McClurken, 9 Dec. 1794; pr. Sept. 1795; sons, Thomas and Sam; daughters, Eleanor, Jean, Cath-

* [South Carolina] Council Journal, No. 87, pp. 15-33, 1nc.

erine, Jenet, Lillys; James' children; John's sons Andrew and James; Samuel's son James; Dau. Catherine's son James Boyd; Dau. Jean's son James Waid; Dau. Jenet's son James McClurken; Dau. Eleanor's dau. Mary Young. Ex: Sons-in-law John Maben and David Waid.

3. ROBERT JAMIESON

250

(b) Pl. Bk. vol. 15, p. 489; 6 Jan. 1773; in Craven Co. on waters of Rocky Creek; bd'd Robert Coulter, John Gasky, Thomas Huston, David Grims, Mary Coulter, vacant land; cer. 6 June 1774. Ord. Co. 3 April 1775 for Thomas Singleton.

(c) Chester.

4. ANDREW AGNEW

300

(b) P.F. 13; 6 Jan. 1773; laid out to John Agnew (earlier first name erased and "John" substituted); in Craven Co. on south fork of Wateree Creek; bd'd Nicolas Thompson, vacant land; sur. 24 Feb. 1773.

5. DAVID MONTGOMERY

350

(b) P.F. 1387; 6 Jan. 1773; in Craven Co. on branch of Wateree Creek called Horse Branch; bd'd John Agnew, Moses Hollis; sur. 8 March 1773.

(c) York, Lancaster, Chester or Fairfield.

(d) See Fairfield Co., Wills 1, Bk. 5, p. 78.

6. JAMES BROWN

350

(b) P.F. 209; 6 Jan. 1773, Craven Co.; Waters of Kings and Connors Creek; bd'd Frances Wilson, James Neal, David Tennant, vacant land; sur. 25 Feb. 1773; Dd. 9 Aug. 1774.

(c) Newberry.

(d) See Laurens Co. Will Bk. 1-E-96 (?).

7. JOHN HEWIE

150

(b) P.F. 844; 6 Jan. 1773; in Craven Co. on branch of Pacolet; bd'd Joseph French, Zack Bullock; sur. 10 May 1773.

(c) Spartanburg, Union.

8. JOHN RORR

100

9. WILLIAM STORMONT

150

10. JOHN MCCCHANTS

100

(b) Probably P.F. 1159; 6 Jan. 1773; laid out to "John McCants" 100 acres in Craven Co., waters of 25-mile Creek; sur. 11 Feb. 1773.

(c) Kershaw.

(d) Fairfield Co. Will Bk. 1-6, p. 25. John McCance — 14 Jan. 1813; Wife Sarah; sons, Robert, Samuel, John, William, Jim; daughters, Amy, Sarah, Lillah; children under age: Alexander, George, Jeremiah, Andr', Mary, Margaret, Rosey. (But see Nos. 88 and 204)

376. JOHN SNODDY 300
 (b) P.F. 1764; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co., on small branch called The Mill Creek, waters of Tiger River; bd'd vacant land; sur. 9 Jan. 1773.
 (c) Spartanburg, Union.
 (d) He signed the above mentioned letter as "John Snoddy."
377. MARY SNODDY 100
 (b) P.F. 1764; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co., on small branch of waters of Tiger River; bd'd James Edmondson, "old lines," vacant land; sur. 17 Jan. 1773.
 (c) Spartanburg, Union.
378. SAMUEL SNODDY 100
 (b) P.F. 1764; 2 Dec. 1773; in Craven Co., on north side of north fork of Tiger River; bd'd river, John Brown, vacant; cert. 9 Jan. 1773.
 (c) Spartanburg.
 (d) Probably taster Spartanburg Will Bk. 1-A-98; Samuel Snoddy, 6 April 1817, pr. 9 June 1817; wife; sons: John, Isaac, Andrew, Samuel, Alexander.
379. THOMAS DUNLAP 100
 (b) P.F. 505; 11 Dec. 1772; in Barkley Co. in fork between Broad River and Saludy, on small branch of Tiger River called Pounding Mill Branch; bd'd William Smith, Robert Condon; sur. 19 Jan. 1773.
 (c) Spartanburg, Union.
380. ROBERT HADDIN 150
 (b) P.F. 678; 11 Dec. 1772; to Robert Hadden; in Colleton Co., on small branch of northwest fork of Long Cane; bd'd William Ellis, vacant land; sur. 10 Feb. 1773.
 (c) Abbeville.
- (d) He signed the above mentioned letter as "Robert Hadden."
381. WILLIAM BOYD 250
 (b) P.F. 170; 11 Dec. 1772 (Pl. Bk. 18, p. 328, 5 Dec. 1772); in Berkeley Co., in fork between Broad and Saluda, on branch of Patterson Creek called Scott Branch; waters of Enoree River; bd'd William Proctor, John Kennedy, vacant lands, Mr. Robert McCleto, James Proctor, Alexander Turner, John Armstrong, William Scott (Pl. Bk. substitutes Robert McCants for Mr. Robert McClinto, and Alexander Furman for Alexander Turner).
 (c) Newberry.
- (d) Chester Co. Wills, vol. 1, Bk. B, p. 25, will of William Boyd of Chester Co. 2 June 1800, pr. August 1800; son Alexander; eldest daughter Mary Boyd 100 acres of the 250 acres in Newberry; and daughter Martha Boyd, her sons William and Robert Boyd, her daughter Mary;

- youngest daughter Jennet Keede, her son William Keede; wif.: John Keede, etc.
 He signed the above mentioned letter.
382. JOHN THOMSON 100
 (b) P.F. 1867; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co.; bd'd William Williams; vacant land, on waters of Turkey Creek; sur. 17 Feb. 1773.
383. THOMAS MCKEE 200
 (b) P.F. 1209; 11 Dec. 1772, in Colleton Co., Boonsborough Township; bd'd vacant land; sur. 23 Jan. 1773.
 (Another Thomas McKee (No. 412) also came on this ship, and was also entitled to 200 acres. The above survey was for one of them, but which is not known.)
 (c) Abbeville.
- (d) May be testator, Abbeville Wills Bk. 1, p. 208; Thomas McKee; 20 Oct. 1796, pr. 26 March 1798; wife Martha; daughter Jean; sons Thomas, William, John, James, refers to unmarried children. He signed the above mentioned letter as "Thos. Makee."
384. WILLIAM ANDERSON 150
 (b) P.F. 35; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co. on branch of Singletons Creek; bd'd William Marshall, ——— Snow, vacant land; sur. 1 Feb. 1773.
 (c) Kershaw, Chester.
- (d) William Anderson married in 1772 in Ireland Nancy Stephenson, born in Ireland 1750, sister of James and William Stephenson (Stinson). He was killed at King's Mountain, leaving sons Robert and William and a daughter Mary, born 1774 who married Joshua Smith in South Carolina, and moved to Tennessee. His widow married second Daniel Green.
- An account of Nancy (Stephenson) Anderson appeared in Mrs. Ellet's Women of the American Revolution (vol. 3), information being furnished by Daniel Green Stinson (son of her brother William Stephenson (Stinson)), see No. 362. William Anderson signed the above mentioned letter.
385. JAMES MCCLINTO 100
 (b) P.F. 1226; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co. on waters of Raburns Creek; bd'd Joseph Babb, William Burris, Elizabeth Hood, vacant land; sur. 29 Dec. 1772.
 (c) Laurens.
386. WILLIAM SIMPSON 200
 (b) P.F. 1721; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co., on waters of Little River; bd'd Jacob Jones, Elizabeth Caldwell, vacant land; sur. 9 Feb. 1773.
 (c) Fairfield, Laurens, Newberry.

- (d) He signed the above mentioned letter.
387. ALEXANDER SIMPSON 100
388. ROBERT SIMPSON 100
- (b) P.F. 1720; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co. on waters of Bush River; b'd'd Silvanus Walker; vacant land; sur. 30 May 1773.
- (c) Laurens, Newberry.
389. JAMES SIMPSON 100
- (b) P.F. 1717; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co. on waters of Warriors Creek; b'd'd vacant land, old surveys; sur. 14 Jan. 1773.
- (c) Laurens.
390. PETER WYLLY 150
- (b) P.F. 2076; 11 Dec. 1772; to Peter Wyley; in Craven Co. waters of Fishing Creek; b'd'd William Taler, Jas. Farginson, Robert McFadin, John Wyley, John Downy; sur. 9 Jan. 1773.
- (c) Chester, York.
- (d) He signed the above mentioned letter as "Peter Willey."
391. ROSEY WYLLY 100
- (b) P.F. 2076; 11 Dec. 1772; to Rose Wyley; in Craven Co., on waters of Fishing Creek; b'd'd Samuel Kivwell, William Farginson, John Wyley; sur. 1 Jan. 1773.
- (c) Chester, York.
392. ELIZABETH MCGROY 100
393. WILLIAM ERVING 100
- (b) Pl. Bk. vol. 15, p. 72; 11 Dec. 1772; to Wm. Ewing; on north side Broad River, on branch of Little River; b'd'd John Thompson, vacant land; sur. 9 Feb. 1773.
- (c) Fairfield, Chester.
394. CHARLES MILLER 150
- (b) P.F. 1301; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co. on branch of Rocky Creek; b'd'd vacant land; sur. 5 Jan. 1773.
- (c) Chester.
- (d) He signed the above mentioned letter.
395. ROBERT NEIL 100
- (b) P.F. 1393; 11 Dec. 1772; in Belfast Twp., 96 Dist.; b'd'd vacant land; sur. 5 Feb. 1773.
- (c) Abbeville.
- (d) He signed the above mentioned letter as "Robt. Neile."
396. JOHN THOMSON 100
- (b) P.F. 1867; 6 Jan. 1773; in Craven Co., north side of Tyger River, on waters of Cane Creek; b'd'd Agnes Elliott, vacant lands; sur. 2 Sept. 1773.

- (c) Union, Spartanburg.
- (d) He signed the above mentioned letter as "John Thompson."
397. CHARLES BARBER 200
- (b) P.F. 73; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co. Camden Dist.; south side Wateree River on Milstone Creek; b'd'd George Summers, David Miller; sur. 7 Jan. 1773.
- (c) Kershaw.
- (d) Probably testator Kershaw Wills, vol. 2, Bk. G, p. 10; Charles Barber, 23 Aug. 1810; wife Peggy; grandchildren Arthur B. Edwards and Diana Edwards; son-in-law George Marlor; cousin Charles Barber, son of Robert Barber, senior; Charles Barber Howel, son of Eps Howel (under age), son Nathaniel, Charles B. Marlor and Pegey Marlor.
398. JOHN DICKEY 150
- (b) P.F. 457; 11 Dec. 1772; in fork of Shudy and Broad, on Kelleys Creek of Anoree in Barkeley Co.; b'd'd Daniel Hasey, Alexander Dickey, Joseph Fish; sur. 9 Jan. 1773.
- (c) Laurens, Newberry.
- (d) He signed the above mentioned letter as "John Dicky."
399. ALEXANDER DICKEY 100
- (b) P.F. 456; 11 Dec. 1772; in forks of Broad and Saluda Rivers on waters of Enoree, on Kelleys Creek; b'd'd Crison Graber, John Boyd, Pit (?) Beninger, Joseph Fish, John Dickey, David Hasey; sur. 9 Feb. 1773.
- (c) Laurens, Newberry.
400. JANE DICKEY 100
- (b) P.F. 457; 11 Dec. 1772; in Craven Co., between Broad and Saluda Rivers; b'd'd Paul Williams, Daniel Horsey; sur. 8 March 1773.
- (c) Laurens, Newberry.
401. JOHN DICKEY 100
- (b) P.F. 457; 11 Dec. 1772; on south side Broad River, on south fork of Dunkings Crick, in Barkley Co.; b'd'd Nathan Brown, Rubin Flenigan, vacant land; sur. 2 Feb. 1773.
- (c) Laurens, Newberry.
402. ROBERT ROSS 200
- (b) P.F. 1624; 11 Dec. 1772; 115 acres, part of a 200 acres warrant, in Long Cane, in Ninety-six Dist.; b'd'd S. Edward, James McFaron, _____ Jones, Pat Calhoun, Joseph Holms, Wm. Gervais; sur. 28 April 1773.
- Also P.F. 1624; 11 Dec. 1772; 70 acres, part of a 200 acre warrant near Long Cane Mill in 96 Dist.; b'd'd by prior survey, James Faron, Thos. Grasswell, Benj. Watson, Pat. Calhoun, Sr., Pat. Calhoun, Jr.; cert. 11 Feb. 1773.