

## ANCESTRY OF GLENDON JEAN STARR

### GROUP SIX

#### **Captain John Dent and Mary (Hatch)**

Peter Dent's grandfather was the emigrant Captain John Dent who was born about 1635 in Yorkshire, England. He came to Maryland in 1658 with his kinsman Thomas Dent. The exact relationship between the two is unknown, but Thomas is generally thought to be John's uncle. This John first appears apart from Thomas when he witnessed a will in 1662 in St. George's Hundred, St. Mary's County Maryland. Then in 1663 he witnessed a deed for land sold by John's future father-in-law. By September 1666 Captain John had moved to a plantation in Charles County for he entered his cattle brand mark in the court records there. He purchased Cumberston before March 1679, but then moved back to St. Mary's County perhaps at the time of his marriage to Mary Hatch. He reputedly built Charlotte Hall; the house was still standing in the 1960s according to *The Maryland Dents* by Harry Wright Newman.

Captain John's name is among those involved with Josias Fendall in the 1681 attempt to overthrow Lord Baltimore's government that is covered in my narrative on John Hatch. Even so he was commissioned a Justice of the Peace for St. Mary's County at various times between 1680 and 1689. Then in 1689 he was appointed Captain of the Foot for Chaptico Hundred during the successful overturn of Calvert rule. In 1694 he was a Justice of the Quorum for the county.

Author of several books on early Maryland families, Harry Wright Newman suggests John Hatch's influence caused Captain John to "espouse the cause of liberalism. He sent his son, Peter, back to England to study at Jesus College, Cambridge, always known for its liberal teachings, and when his son, Michael, was admitted to the bar in Maryland, he refused to take the Royal Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, but subscribed only to the Oath of Parliament." Thus John and his sons were aligned squarely with the Anti-Proprietary Party and life was good for the Dents during the reign of William and Mary.

But Captain John ran afoul of the Maryland Assembly in 1698 when he refused to sell a portion of one of his tracts. A spring, noted for its reputed curative powers over lameness and other diseases was located on his land. The General Assembly threatened to seize it by eminent domain when John ignored their offers to buy it. They even passed an act November 1, 1698 appropriating £100 for purchase of the spring and buildings or small tenements for diseased persons. The local parish got into the act too, but only offered Capt. John £25 for his interest in the 50 acre tract. He rebutted with a request they give him a license to operate an ordinary or inn near the spring as further compensation to him. The last note in the local records regarding the spring is his denial he'd made any bargain with the county and his flat refusal to hand over a deed to that property. The case is last found in the Lower House records in a July 1, 1699 statement they had no power to grant an ordinary license "without the usual fees" and referred him back to the County Court.

Captain John died in April 1712. His personal estate came to £269.10.7, a rather large sum for the time. According to Newman, among the more interesting items in the inventory was: one drum, three swords,

two canes and books. He adds no slaves or indentured servants were listed. Mary (Hatch) Dent died in 1726.

## **Peter Dent and Margaret (Holt)**

Credit goes to Leon Wilde who analyzed the data and continued gathering information until he was able to place your Peter into the Dent family. Peter was born about 1718 in Newport West Hundred in Charles County, Maryland. A "hundred" is an Old English term referring to the amount of land needed to support 100 people. The specific year comes from Peter's deposition in December 1752 in which he gave his age as 34.

In 1737 Peter married Margaret (Holt), the widow of Joseph Ward whose grandfather Andrew was a very early emigrant to Maryland. Wilde suspects Margaret and Joseph had at least one child, a daughter who married Lemaster Cooksey. The Cookseys named their eldest son "Joseph Ward" and they traveled with Peter and Margaret to Virginia. A Charles County deed gives us a good clue to Margaret's early life, but not who her parents were. Between them, the wills of John and Margaret Blee devised all their real estate to "Margaret Holt, an orphan girl whom they had raised." She was likely kin to one of them, but who and how is not known. Margaret was in possession of three tracts once owned by the Bleees prior to her marriage to Joseph Ward.

After their marriage Peter and Margaret lived on her inheritance from Ward's estate, a tract called Tilney, located in Newport East Hundred. Peter was appointed constable of the Newport East Hundred in 1742, but was removed from office in August 1747. That same day a bench warrant Proprietary vs Peter Dent was ordered but the specific reason for it isn't given. One researcher guesses it may have something to do with his performance as Constable. From this point on, things go downhill for the Dents in Maryland. In September Peter put up his livestock, personalty and a servant man named Dennis Macnamara for security, thus holding the co-signer of his loan "harmless" should Peter fail to pay the debt.

Although not an unheard of practice, this kind of record usually wasn't placed into court records unless action was necessary. Philip Key loaned Peter £17.5.6 and 3900 pounds tobacco, but the deed of record was to relatives of Margaret's first husband. They perhaps had reason to better protect themselves against possible loss. In May 1750 Peter complained to the Assembly of Maryland that Judge Robert Yates had abused his powers as a judge. It seems the Judge brought charges against Peter for an altercation between them which Peter claimed was started by the said Judge. All that came of this was the Assembly's suggestion the Judge be more circumspect in his future judgements.

About this same time Peter and Margaret moved from Newport East Hundred back to his old home territory, Newport West Hundred. My guess is there was also a son born of Margaret's marriage to Joseph Ward, and that son was coming into his inheritance. Although I haven't seen Joseph's will, often times the widow was allowed to live on an estate until a son reached his majority. In June 1751 Peter brought charges against Thomas Barron for slandering Peter's character and falsely accusing him of stealing tobacco. Following several delays, the case was heard in August 1752 and Barron was ordered to pay 20 shillings and 1399 pounds tobacco in damages. In December 1752 Peter Dent Sr. was questioned about the boundary lines for a tract called Norwood. He was involved because part of the line abutted the tract Tilney where he and Margaret had lived when first married. Apparently no one had built fences

around their property and the original owners of the tracts were now deceased. But Peter had been present during a discussion between the original owners about the boundary line. Ownership in Tilney is traced back to 1722 when John Vaudry deeded it and the adjoining tract called Wilton to his son-in-law William Ward (father of Margaret's first husband Joseph) and John's daughter Elizabeth, widow of Benjamin Ward.

On June 13, 1753 Peter received a deed to 150 acres from his elder brother John, part of a larger tract called Dent's Inheritance. This was the key to unlocking Peter's place in this Dent family. The wording of the deed is such that if Peter didn't have an heir "of his body lawfully begotten," the tract was to return to the "next heir to the land." The legal stance behind this is all bound up in the laws of primogeniture. As eldest son, Peter's older brother John inherited the land. He then divided this and another tract among his siblings. Peter is listed on the county debt books as the owner of this tract from 1754 to 1763.

Trinity Parish records dating from October 1755 list Peter among those Protestant Freeholders wishing to use a lottery to distribute the pews at the newly built parish church. In May 31, 1756 one-third of pew number twenty was assigned to Thomas Dent, who paid 13 shillings, 4 pence for his family's seats and the other two-thirds of the pew was assigned to Hatch and Peter Dent who paid £1.6.8 for the right of their families to sit here. These three were brothers.

Relevant court records are missing, but we have a March 1761 entry showing Peter was sued for non-payment of debt; his defense was ownership of the land was still in court-ordered arbitration. The verdict was not noted in the court minute book, but Peter sold what he still owned of the 150 acre Dent's Inheritance January 21, 1763. Later that summer Peter was again in court for non-payment of a note dating back to 1757. The jury awarded the plaintiff £5.13.3 in damages. At the August 1763 court session Peter acknowledged his debt to yet another person.

Then on September 28, 1764 the final blow came. His brother Michael Dent was awarded all of Peter and Margaret's personal possessions, including three featherbeds, iron pots and hooks, a table and half dozen chairs, 3 cattle, all his crop then growing and "other Trifles Now Remaining & being in Charles County." Actually collecting on that judgement, however, would be more difficult. It appears Peter and Margaret left in the middle of the night without a forwarding address. A search for their whereabouts the next few years has come up with nothing.

Leon Wilde believes they headed straight for the hills of Amherst County, Virginia where he found Peter on a road order dated March 7, 1769. They disappear again, then Peter resurfaces in 1777 petitioning the Bedford County Court for an exemption from paying the tithe on himself. It was granted, probably because of his age. But he still had to pay taxes on his horses and livestock. In 1782 he owned 2 horses and 11 cattle; in 1783 he acquired a third horse, but the number of cattle dropped to 9. Taxes for the next ten years are more consistent showing Peter with two horses, and only a minor change in the number of cattle. Only stock dealers accumulated large herds; all a family needed was a team of horses, one or two cows to supply the family milk needs and one or two steers for the smokehouse. Extra livestock were used for barter or to sell as needs arose.

Margaret died sometime before May 5, 1789, the marriage date for Peter Dent and Milley Dollard who gave consent for herself. As Amelia Dollard she had appeared on Bedford County tax lists from 1782. Peter's co-signer for the marriage bond was his step-son-in-law Lamaster Cooksey. The marriage bond was insuring Peter meant to go through with the marriage and there was nothing hindering him (like a

wife in another county or state) from getting married. On September 24, 1792 John Dollard sold Peter 33 1/2 acres on Beaverdam Creek that may have been Margaret's dower land from her former husband. Then in July 1795 Peter was the highest bidder for 12 acres adjoining his land that was auctioned by the County Sheriff for taxes due.

This second marriage was not made in heaven for in 1797 Peter was ordered to pay Mr. Stith \$6 each quarter "for the support and maintenance of Mildred Dent." Perhaps there was too much difference in ages: Peter was by then nearly eighty years old. Although by this time parishes were defunct in Virginia, my guess is Stith was acting in the same capacity as a Church Warden whose job was to see that destitute individuals and families were taken care of by the county tax payers. But another part of his job was keeping people off the tax rolls by forcing those who could and should support these persons to do so. We suspect Peter died in 1803, for that's the year his son, your John, began paying taxes on land which had previously belonged to Peter.

### **Captain John Hatch**

Information on your Captain John Hatch comes from various internet sites and Charles County Gentry [by Harry Wright Newman, Clearfield Co., Baltimore, 1990.] I debated writing this narrative since I've done absolutely no research on him, but Newman is considered a good researcher and others cite the sources which prove the connection between John Hatch and your Captain John Dent. John Hatch's birth year is given as 1614 and one account provides Devonshire, England as his birthplace. One of John's daughters married your Captain John Dent and another married Josias Fendall, at one time Lt. Governor of Maryland. The immediate problem is Fendall's wife is supposedly a "Mary" per one researcher and the widow of Capt. John Dent was also "Mary."

Newman says John Hatch's way to the colonies was paid by Clobery & Co., the financial backers for the trading post established a few years earlier by William Claiborne (Clayborne) on Kent Island in the Chesapeake Bay. "Island" is a misnomer for a contemporary map shows it as part of what is now known as the eastern shore peninsula. Sometimes referred to as "the Evil Genius of Maryland," Claiborne was appointed surveyor of the plantations in Virginia by the London Company before 1620. By 1632 there were so many settlers on Kent Island they qualified for their own Burgess in Virginia's General Assembly. The next year the first group of settlers who were taking up lands granted to the first Lord Baltimore arrived on a nearby shore. Only then was it discovered Kent Island was included within the large land grant given to the Calvert family that became Maryland.

The Virginia Burgesses backed Claiborne in his attempts to keep control of the island that he had purchased from the native Indians with an assortment of axes and metal cooking pots. He used his own money to acquire the items used in the exchange and thus thought the land was his. The Calverts naturally thought otherwise. This is considered the first of many confrontations between the two colonies. The larger theme pits Protestant (cavalier or royalist) Virginians against the mostly Catholic Marylanders with a few Puritans tossed into the mix. Many of the Puritans in Maryland had earlier been driven out of Virginia, thus adding more fuel to the smouldering flame.

A fire, probably set by Calvert's followers, destroyed all the Kent Island warehouses. Most held beaver and other furs destined for the London market, but some stored the island's food supply, thus reducing residents to a diet of only oysters. Unfairly or not, they blamed Claiborne and his trading partners in London were better at reading the political winds. They replaced him with a new manager who immediately swore allegiance to Lord Baltimore, but more importantly, agreed to give the Lord a percentage of the profits -- all things Claiborne had flatly refused to do.

On his deathbed Claiborne was still suing for restitution of his personal financial loss in the Kent Island affair. Virginia and Maryland continued arguing over ownership of the island for another century. The Virginia Bill of Rights, signed in 1776, finally released its claim to the area.

Meanwhile John Hatch and his wife had settled in St. Mary's County which he represented in the Lower House between 1654 and 1658. Beginning in November 1659 his wife, referred to only as "Mis Hatche" was involved in an interesting lawsuit. The recorded court proceedings are posted on the net under the title Witches of Wicomico [River], Charles County, Maryland. It begins with the request of Thomas Michel (Mitchell) that Mr. Thomas Lomax and Elisabeth Atwicks "might haue thear oaths giuen them concerning the abusful reproaches offered unto his wife by Mis Hatche." It appears Thomas Lomax overheard "goodie Michel asking Mis Hatche how she did" and Mis Hatche "replied that she thaught she had bewitched her face whearupon goodie Michell asked her if She wear in earnest or no, and She replied Shee was for shee enduered abundance of Miserie by the soarnes of her mouth and did verilie beleeeue that shee was bewitched ..."

In other words, Mrs. Hatch was suffering toothaches or some such, blamed the affliction on a spell cast by Mrs. Mitchell, and got hauled into court for slandering the good woman Mitchell. Nothing more of this suit is found in records until September 24, 1661. The now widowed Joan Mitchell sued four prominent St. Mary's County residents (including the Puritan minister) for defamation of character. She claimed they "raysed schandalous reports of mee ... that I salluted a woman at church and her teeth fell a Acking as if shee had been mad" and "the hene and Chickens that she had of Goodie Mitchell ... did die in such a strang manner that she thaught sum old witch or other had bewitched them." Sadly the outcome of the suit was not noted by the court clerk.

In 1655 Puritans living in Maryland successfully took control of the government from the Catholic majority. To keep a modicum of authority, the Calverts agreed to appoint a Puritan -- Josias Fendall -- as Lt. Governor. In reality Cromwell's government in England had the final say over what happened in the colonies, but Cromwell wasn't too happy with this particular group of "extreme" Puritans as he thought them.

Everything changed with the return of King Charles II who restored Lord Baltimore's autocratic rule over affairs in Maryland. As you can imagine the Maryland Puritans weren't happy and a few leaders under Josias Fendall attempted another coup. Fendall and Thomas Gerard, a member of the Council, were tried for sedition late in 1660 or early 1661. Found guilty, all their estate holdings in Maryland were confiscated and both were banished from the province. Gerard just moved across the bay to his Virginia estates, but no one mentions Fendall's immediate movements. They later applied for and were granted pardons, but neither were allowed to hold elective office in Maryland again.

Twenty years later, in 1680 Josias Fendall attempted another coup that also failed. John Hatch was understandably eyed with suspicion after two attempted coups by his son-in-law. Things haven't

changed all that much in politics. To regain favor with the Calvert government, and thus maintain ownership of his estates and manors, John Hatch paid a hefty sum assuring them of his loyalty. John Hatch died the spring of 1681; the Fendall & Coode sedition trial was that November. Your John Dent was summoned to the Providential Court to testify against his brother-in-law. How difficult it must have been for Dent! He reportedly said later that "if he had declared all that he knew about Fendall and which he heard Fendall say at his father-in-law Hatch's burial, he could hang him."

### **Thomas Hord and Jane (Miller)**

The specific birth date for Thomas Hord, father of Elizabeth who married William Withers, is given as September 7, 1701 and England as his place of birth. However, documentation for his birth year as 1699 is found in a February 23, 1721 deposition Thomas gave before the Essex County, Virginia Court when proving the will of Nicholas Brame. He stated his age was "21 years or thereabouts." Perhaps he thought 21 years sounded better than 19 or 20 -- or he really didn't know. Many people living in the colonial period didn't know the exact date or even year of their births for birthdays per se just weren't celebrated. Even more difficult to reconcile is the statement Thomas's father John emigrated to Virginia in 1685 with Thomas's birth in England in 1701. Researchers cite Robert Hord's 1838 manuscript *The Hord Family in America* (which I haven't personally seen) for most of the early "tradition" on the Hord family.

Modern day researchers cite an Essex County Court Order Book entry for proving Thomas's birth in England. Thomas reportedly stated he "came into the colony to dwell in 1737 ... [and] this is the first time of proving his importation either by himself or his parents." This is the first time I've seen someone mention his father's "importation list" when getting his own claim for headright land entered into the books. Unless there were two contemporary Thomas Hords, one was certainly in Essex County many years before 1737. What's more, the Justices all knew him personally, thus would know how long he'd been in the area. An examination of other Essex County records doesn't suggest two Thomases, but clearly obtaining a copy of the actual entry is needed.

As an adult his name appears frequently in the records of Essex County and in later King George County. The term "Gent" for Gentleman usually follows his name in court entries, thus placing him in the upper crust of county society. He was sub-sheriff for Essex County and was also called on to survey proposed new roads in the county. This doesn't mean he was a trained surveyor however. Usually three or four trusted men were asked to determine which of the proposed routes across fords and over ridges would serve the greatest number of county (or parish) residents. Some people wanted roads to go by their planned mill or to direct traffic to their ferry instead of the free crossing around the bend. Others absolutely did not want roads cutting across their fields. Thus choosing the route involved politics as much as locating the easiest grades over ridges and shallowest fords through streams.

Thomas married Jane Miller, daughter of the younger Simon Miller June 24, 1726. They lived on the tract in King George County willed to him by his father. Jane's birth in King George County, Virginia is given as about 1710. They had ten children; you descend from their eldest daughter, Elizabeth, who married William Withers.

## **John Hord and Jane**

According to the entry for descendant Benjamin Hord in Virginia Biography at pages 309-10, John Hord was born in Elwell, England December 29, 1664 and came to Virginia in 1685. It goes on to state the "ancient seat of the family was in Oxfordshire in Bampton Hundred, the ancestral home bearing the name Cote House." This article apparently was taken from Robert Hord's 1838 manuscript The Hord Family in America. John Hord reportedly emigrated to Virginia shortly after the rebellion in England against King James II (1685). However, this is refuted by a statement made by Thomas Hord before the Justices of the Essex County, Virginia court. He explained this was the "first time of proving his importation either by himself or his parents." This suggests Thomas was a minor when he was brought by his parents to Virginia. But as noted in the narrative for your Thomas Hord, there are possibly two Thomas Hords here.

Other statements attributed to the manuscript raise questions of its overall reliability. It goes on to recite an incredible story of John's bringing his "house from England in sections and reassembling it here." More than likely his Virginia home, called Shady Grove, was copied from his family home back in England. Reportedly it was a "large double mansion ...[with] A spacious hall ten feet wide through the centre, having on each side rooms twenty feet square. The Mansion, two stories high, built of massive timbers, resting on a brick foundation ... having hardwood floors, tall white mantels and handsomely panelled doors ... with brick foundations and chimneys." [Early Families of Eastern and Southeastern KY, by William C. Kozee, 1979 Gen. Publ. Co. MD.]

We do know John and his wife, Jane (surname unknown) were living in Christ Church Parish, Middlesex County, Virginia by December 1703 when their daughter Elizabeth "Hore" was baptized. Baptisms of Susana in 1706 and James in 1713 are also recorded. Your Thomas is listed by genealogists as their eldest child and Elizabeth the second. Thus Thomas's birthplace is the only one of the older children that is in question. Births or baptisms of the younger children were apparently recorded in parish registers that are no longer extant.

According to tradition passed down through several generations, John was paralyzed several years before his death. It sounds as if he had a major stroke while horseback riding around the plantation. For his convenience a small door was built into the side of his house, leading from his downstairs bedroom onto a covered porch. He could sit outside and oversee the plantation workers from afar.

John divided his 1000 acres in King George County between his four older sons, one of whom was your Thomas. His youngest son received the house and land in Caroline County where John was then living. This plantation is reported to be about two miles south of the Rappahannock River and eight miles from Port Royal near the present day boundary line between Essex and Caroline Counties. The rest of his lands and slaves were divided between his sons and son-in-law William Miller.

## **Matthew Keene and Bridget**

Due to the loss of many Stafford County, Virginia records, our knowledge of Matthew and Bridget (surname not known) Keene is limited. Matthew probably had no memories of his father, but based on what we know about his mother, she surely must have been a presence in his childhood home. Even so,

he was not quite a teen-ager when she died. However, she left her two youngest sons in the care of a trusted friend and saw they received an education. His parents settled in Northumberland County, and that is where he grew up. But the tract given him by his mother lay in Westmoreland County. He and Bridget may have moved to it when they married and then later settled in Stafford County. We know even less about Bridget's background. Perhaps their plantation in Stafford was a gift from her father?

His mother's will was that the 870 acre tract originally purchased by her husband Thomas Broughton would be equally split between her youngest son, Matthew, and a family friend named Thomas Daniel. But Matthew somehow ended up with the entire tract. He may have purchased Thomas Daniel's half, or perhaps Daniel left the tract to Matthew in his will. On December 21, 1705 Matthew as resident of Stafford County sold the entire Westmoreland County tract to his two nephews, John and Henry Garner. According to the wording in the deed, he gave them the land "for the natural affection and kind love I bear to my well-beloved sister Susan Garner." Witnesses to the deed were his son-in-law, your James Withers, and his brother-in-law and father of the boys, Thomas Garner. He then gave power of attorney to his friend, Mr. George Eskridge of Westmoreland County, to acknowledge the deed in Matthew's name at the next Westmoreland County Court session. Unless there was more than one George Eskridge, this George was a namesake and godfather to the future President, George Washington.

Matthew's Stafford County will was dated 1723, but not probated until 1731. He left to his wife Bridgett his land and a negro boy, "Matt". His daughter Elizabeth Withers and her husband James were to get the land and everything else when Bridgett died. From this we can conclude your Elizabeth was their only child, or at least the only one to reach maturity. A 1730 codicil changed the devisees to grandson John Withers.

## **Thomas Keene and Mary**

The closest we can get to the emigration date for your Thomas and Mary (surname unknown) Keene is before November 1652, the date he signed his will. We do know your Matthew was born in Virginia for his name is not listed among those transported by the Keenes and then used toward their headright land claims. Also it took time to choose the land, get the survey run and then complete the paperwork. Thomas had completed everything necessary for obtaining the patent, but died before the land was his. Thus we estimate their arrival date in the latter part of the 1640s.

His will, entered for probate January 20, 1653, gave each of his three sons a heifer, but he adds that Matthew will have to wait until the next one is born "of the old Cowes Matthew Rhoden giventh me for a hhead" (hogshead). He then listed several debts owed him by others totaling £3305. It sounds as if Thomas was much better off than most immigrants. If he had lived, he would have made a name for himself in the Northumberland County planter society. Then everything not specifically given to his children, and not used for payment of his debts, was to go to his wife "for bringing up my Children." At her death the plantation was to go to his son Thomas. Overseers of the will were Henry Mosely, John Stanly, Thomas Oxlye and Matthew Rhodon. Thomas owned other land that automatically went to William as eldest son under the rules of primogeniture. However, Thomas's purchase deed record is among the missing. Your Matthew, the third son, lost out for his father didn't have another farm to pass on to him.



The names used for headrights for Thomas's 527 acre patent granted October 13, 1653 were: Thomas Keene, Mary Keene, Wm. Keene. Susan is omitted and only one Thomas is on this list, showing us your Thomas Keene was more a stickler for doing "the right thing" than some Virginia planters. "Thomas Keene" is listed among the headrights used by William Claybourne for land granted in September that year. Perhaps Thomas exchanged one or two of his "headrights" for something in Claybourne's store; and then Claybourne may have used the one for daughter Susan Keene as payment for merchandise. This is a suggestion only, but "Susan Keene" appears as headright for another Virginia planter. My statement about Thomas being a stickler for doing the right thing is based on the common knowledge that some of the wealthier and politically influential planters used the same, duplicated list of names for more than one headright claim. Thomas's patent was renewed March 18, 1662. Although Mary's patent doesn't appear in the transcription of land grants book (some early patents are known to be missing), the Northumberland County Court Order Book shows that in March 1653 Mary Keene petitioned the court for 200 acres headright land for transporting "Tho: Keene, Wm: Kenne, & Herselfe, [and] Susanna Keene." This is the basis for our saying Matthew was born in Virginia. Unless the entire family made an unknown trip back to England, it also tells us she wasn't as good as Thomas about following the rules.

For once we know far more about the wife than the husband. Mary obviously had a head for business, and she was a wealthy enough widow to marry "often and well." Some time after 1653 Mary married Henry Rayner, but not much is known about him. Northumberland County records indicate he qualified for 240 acres December 23, 16( ). The land was located on the "Patomack" River near mouth of Moseley's Creek and Henry Mosley's land. You may remember Henry was one of the overseers of Thomas Keene's will. In 1655 Henry assigned half this tract to William Hopkins. Then following her next marriage and as Mrs. Mary Broughton, she renewed this patent September 21, 1663.

March 22, 1658 was a busy day for Mary ( ) Keene Raynor. As "widow & Relict of Hen: Rayner deced," Mary was granted administration on Raynor's estate. She knew the ropes and that same day presented an appraisal of his estate as well as all the necessary papers to prove Henry's will, and now she was eligible for 500 acres headright land. Henry listed himself as one of the ten people whose way to Virginia he had paid. Additionally as Mary Rayner "Administratrix of Henry Rayner deced." she accepted the assignment of half this patent to her and her children while acknowledging Henry's assignment of the other half to Hopkins. That same day William Hopkins obliged himself to offer Mary first refusal if and when he decided to sell his half of the tract. A witness to this obligation was Tho: Broughton.

Broughton as witness wasn't a mere coincidence. That same March day in 1658 Mary and Thomas Broughton signed a prenuptial agreement: "I Mary Rayner Widow, being of a mind to match my self to Mr. Thomas Boughton in the Honble Estate of Marryage, for severall consideracons moveing mee thereto have resolved to preserve the property & power of all my Estate moveable or unmoveable unto my own possession to sell alienat or dipose of it at my pleasure & as I shall thinke gud. The whc: condicon the sd. Mr. Boughton doth by these pr:sents yield & consent unto; & doth agre & consent to & wth: the sd Mary Rayner to ..." Mary must have been uncommonly self-confident and assertive; being fully in control of one's financial position was a rare status for colonial ladies.

On October 10, 1659 an accounting by the guardians of the Keene orphans was entered into court: William owned two coves, one three year old heifer, two steers and three calves; Susanna one cow, one heifer and two yearlings; Thomas one cow, two calves and two steers; and your Matthew one "heyfer"

and "su( ) old a Guilt [?gelding] of the subs( )." A note says one of Thomas's steers was given to the school master for two years schooling.

As the widow and administrator of Henry Raynor and later Thomas Broughton, Mary was in court several times. Broughton apparently died before he wrote a will, for only the accounting of his estate is extant. But as the "relic of Thos: Broughton deced." Mary acknowledged on July 22, 1661 receipt of 870 acres from William Thomas and his wife. Although not specifically stated, I assume Thomas had purchased the tract from them, but the title wasn't handed over until this date. At the time of his death Broughton owed five pounds "lawfull money of England" plus 1565 pounds tobacco to Mr. Tho: Brereton which Mary apparently paid for that is the last record of that debt. However, she and Francis Carpenter apparently disputed his claim against the estate. From my distant perspective, Carpenter just wanted to harass her. He or his attorney "arrested her to court" (subpoened her appearance) twice, but both times he failed to appear. His fine for non-appearance was 50 pounds tobacco, plus the case was dismissed. Meanwhile, at the September 9, 1661 court representatives of a London merchant filed a claim against Henry Rayner. The original bond, signed by Henry on October 16, 1658 was for 5200 pounds tobacco and caske [i.e. tobacco in barrels] plus five sides of bacon. Partial payment had been made, so the bond then stood at 3486 pounds tobacco and the bacon; they offered to lower the amount due them to 2814 pounds tobacco and caske if it was paid by "tenth of 9br: next".

The Virginia resident Isaak Allerton, whose father arrived on the Mayflower, reported at the July 21, 1662 court that Thomas Broughton stood indebted to him for 790 pounds tobacco and caske. He explained this was the remainder of an original note for 2686 pounds signed over to the James Cade & Company and by them to Allerton. He probably wasn't paid, for the next entry in the Order Book is Mary's final accounting of her Administration of Thomas Broughton's estate: "shee hath paid 149 lbs of tobo. And caske beyond assets. It is ordered that shee bee discharged from the sd. Administracon & that this bee her Quietus."

Is it any wonder that Mary chose to remain single? True, she didn't have much time to find another husband, but I'm sure she had ample opportunity. Broughton apparently died in early 1661, and she died about a year later. Despite her being well into middle age for the era (she was bout 40), in view of all the property she inherited, it's likely that suitors were lined up at the door of her sick room. She signed her will January 2, 1662 and it was probated February 10. On April 30, 1663 William Keene as executor sued William Davis for the 650 pounds tobacco and caske owed his mother's estate. An accounting of the cattle due Thomas and Matthew Keene was entered July 20, 1663. Thus we have proof that William is the eldest son and he was of age in 1663, backing his birth to 1642 or before. He is listed on a guardian account record in October 1659, showing he was still a minor on that date. Perhaps his becoming of age was the impetus for filing this latest (1663) guardian account record. This does give us another date: William's birth was between 1638 and 1642. Thomas and Matthew were still minors in 1663, thus were born after 1642. Susan was named second in the 1659 guardian accounting records, thus I think she was the second child.

Mary signed her (now tattered and torn) will "Mary (her mark) Broughton" and identified herself as "Widdow, the Relict of Thomas Broughton deced." She named William (last name torn off) executor of her will and "sonnes" Daniell and George Courtnell overseers. She bequeathed them certain items as payment for their services. Thus we learn she was married before she wed Thomas Keene -- giving us

four known husbands for her. Other family named was her daughter Susanna Gardner and grandchildren John and \_\_\_\_ Gardner.

Her son, your Matthew Keene, received "halfe of my land at Yeacomoco ... the whole tract being Eight hundred & seaventy acres; the other halfe I give to my loveing friend, Thomas Daniell, provided my Sonne, Matthew, may have his first choice." This is the land Thomas Broughton purchased from William Thomas and his wife. When Matthew sold it to his Gardner nephews, it lay in Westmoreland County, Virginia. Matthew also received a "bed & bolster with a rugg & blanket as likewise a Chest that stands in the Shed at the end of my Lodgeinge roome." The rest of her household "stuffe" was to be equally divided between her sons William, Thomas and Matthew Keene. She emphasized that "not any part nor p:cell to be made away or sold." How many times have we heard "waste not, want not and don't sell it" from her descendants? Turning to her livestock, "when eyther of my Sonnes depart from the other, my desire is that at their seperating that my Executor will give to eyther of my Sonnes, Thomas & Matthew, one breeding Sowe; as for my Cattle, my desire is that after my debts be satisfied that they may be shared betweene my Sonnes, Thomas & Matthew, onely to my Sonne, Matthew, I give two Cowes more then to Thomas."

One shouldn't take this as Matthew was her favorite son; it's an indication he was the youngest. Both William and Thomas had previously received land from their father and over the years Matthew's livestock holdings had grown at a slower pace than those of his brothers. She was just making Matthew equal to them.

The will continues with her godchild William Mouseley getting a "Cowe Clalfe" (heifer). In the days when parents died young, accepting the position of being a god-parent meant more than a promise to see the child was knowledgeable about Anglican doctrine. She also gave a heifer to Elizabeth Perry (relationship not mentioned) and her servant Robert Brierie. One last proof that Thomas and Matthew were minors: "Friend Thomas Daniell, my desire is that hee live upon my nowe dwelling plantacon fower years after my decease & to see that my Sonnes, Thomas & Matthew, may be educated in learning & for the reall p:formance hereof I leave my Servants for their maintenance ..."