

October 12, 1990

Dear Dr. Peeples,

It seems I can wait only about a year without going to the mountain, thus my annual letter to you.

I hope all has been well with you, and that this past year has been a good one. I sold my home of 21 years in June after nine months on the market - nine months of having to keep the house spotless and my genealogy up and out of the way. I'm now in a condominium with a lot less responsibility and more time, so maybe it will allow me time to travel and do more research.

I have been able to gather a little more information on the Martinangeles, Greens, and Tuckers, and some of it may be of interest to you because of the association with Hilton Head and your familiarity with these people. It has brought up two puzzlers, and in passing them on, I would very much value your opinion on them both.

The first involves the Martinangele property on Hilton Head. I don't know of anyone more qualified or knowledgeable than you as to Hilton Head land holdings. Approximately where was the Martinangele land on Scull Creek? I have referred to your map in Tales Of Ante Bellum Hilton Head Island Families as it's the best I've found of the Island, but I cannot tell from it the detail of Scull Creek I need.

Philip Martinangele purchased two parcels of land - each of 200 acres. The first was in May 1752 from William Blakeway's estate described as 200 a N on Scull Creek, NE & SE on Alex. Trench, S on Christopher Dawson. (It does not give an E or W boundry.) In Jan. of 1753 Christopher Dawson sold Philip 200 a bounding E, N, & S on Alex. Trench and W on Scull Creek.

Assuming that Christopher Dawson owned only the one tract, then it appears Philip's second purchase was the adjacent land to the S of his original purchase. The configuration would appear somewhat like this:

1.

My other puzzler concerns Thomas Tucker who married Sarah Green. You asked in your last note who he was, so first I'll try and give you an answer. Young Thomas was the son of Nathaniel and Sarah Hazzard Tucker. Thomas' father, Nathaniel, was born in Bermuda, and of the line from George Tucker, who went to Bermuda during the English Civil War. George was the son of a leading member of the Warwick party in the Virginia Company, George Tucker of Milton-next-Gravesend, Kent, England. His brother, Daniel, was Governor of Bermuda from 1616 to 1626.

Nathaniel Tucker is said to be the brother of Edward Tucker, (although I have yet to find proof of this) which would make him the son of John Tucker, who came from Bermuda to Charleston prior to 1722. John Tucker's Will dated 29 March 1757 names sons Thomas and Edward, and dau. Mary. Nathaniel was dead by then so would not have been mentioned. This Thomas Tucker, brother of Nathaniel & uncle of young Thomas, had sons, Benjamin, who m Sarah Ballentine, and Daniel, who m Elizabeth Hyrne, and a dau., Sarah, who m George Heriot. From this line comes all the Hyrne/Heriot/ Tuckers of Charleston & Georgetown.

John's son, Edward, married Mary Hazzard, sister of Nathaniel's wife Sarah Hazzard. So we have a case of brothers marrying sisters. John's dau., Mary, m Miles Tedor.

Now back to Nathaniel. He & Sarah had a dau. Elizabeth, who was born in 1750 and died in 1753. Young Thomas was born May 29, 1752, and his mother, Sarah, died in Feb. 1754. At that time they evidently lived on the Hazzard plantation as both mother and dau. were buried there. By Dec. 1755 Nathaniel had remarried. His second wife was Sophia McGillivray, youngest dau. of Dr. William McGillivray and his wife Elizabeth Sams, dau. of Bonum & Elizabeth Brewton Sams. Nathaniel & Sophia moved to Charleston where they lived until he died only a short time later. He was buried in St. Phillips churchyard on Nov. 17, 1756. Sophia was Administratrix when an inventory of his estate was presented in Nov. 1756. One of the appraisers was Sophia's brother, Alexander McGillivray. She advertized a sale of Nathaniel's property "at his house in King Street" to be held Jan. 5, 1757.

So, young Thomas was orphaned by his mother's death when he was age 2, and his father's death when he was age 4. We find out more about him from his mother's side of the family. Sarah Hazzard Tucker was the dau. of William Hazzard Jr. & his wife Sarah Cowen, and the grand daughter of Col. William Hazzard. Old Col. Hazzard outlived his son, William Jr. & his grand-daughter Sarah Tucker, and in his Will dated 29 Jan. 1757 he left a bequest of slaves to his "Great-grandson" Thomas Tucker" who was then only age 5.

Thomas received yet another inheritance under the Will of his grandmother in 1766 when he was age 14. Sarah Cowen Hazzard, widow of William Hazzard, Jr. had remarried to John Cattell and been widowed again before her death in 1766. In her Will, she names her children as William Hazzard (III), Mary Tucker (wife of Edward), and Sarah Tucker, deceased. She leaves bequests to all of her grandchildren, naming them by name and parent, including "Thomas Tucker, under 21 years, son of my daughter, Sarah Tucker, deceased". The slaves she left Thomas were to be held in trust for him until he reached 21 by his uncle, William Hazzard (III), which may indicate that he was raised by his uncle William.

Interestingly, Sarah Cattell's Executors were George Livingston Sr. and Jonathan Norton, grandfather of Sarah Green, who Thomas later married.

So this is the background of Thomas Tucker. He was certainly a young man of good family connections, and when he came of age in May 1773, he probably had a considerable estate due to the early death of so many of his family.

Carrying it forward to his death, we can piecemeal somewhat the events and dates. We know he married Sarah Green after 14 April 1774, when Jonathan Norton drew his Will naming her Sarah Green, and 6 June 1777, when Thomas executed a Deed of Gift to his wife Sarah "late Sarah Green...Whereas a marriage hath been some time past had". Sarah's brother, Samuel Green, Jr. died 25 Dec 1776. Whether she was married by then or married later is unknown, but his death left her the sole heir of Samuel Sr. and certainly must have occasioned the execution of this Deed of Gift. What is apparent is that this was not a marriage contract as some have stated. The primary purpose of a marriage contract was either to show good faith in the proposed marriage or to protect the property owned or to be owned by the wife. Neither is present here in that this marriage had already occurred without her guardians extracting such an agreement, so its subsequent execution was purely voluntary on the part of Tucker

Further, the agreement does not protect the provisions of Samuel Green's Will which directed that if the sole survivor of his children died without issue, the estate would be divided between Sarah Norton Green's next of kin and Josiah Green's children. Thomas' agreement, signed jointly with Sarah, and with John Norton, William Norton, & George Mosse as Trustees (who would inherit as residuary heirs under Green's will) provides that if Sarah died without issue, the property would go to Thomas Tucker. We can assume their approval of the marriage between Thomas & Sarah by the absence of a marriage contract, which her Norton kin, who were most likely her guardians, could have demanded and their participation as Trustees under an agreement which would void their potential inheritance.

Pope Family records indicate Sarah Green Tucker married William Pope in 1780. At that time, she would have been a young widow of 21 with considerable wealth, so it is reasonable to speculate that she did not remain a widow long. I think we can assume that Tommy Tucker may have died in 1779, and that something in connection with either his death or Sarah's forthcoming marriage occasioned Samuel Ladson coming forward on Dec. 4, 1779 to register the Deed of Gift executed some 2 1/2 years before.

Why would it be necessary for Sarah (and/or her Trustees) to prove in late 1779 that property had been given her which she would normally have inherited anyway at Thomas' death? Obviously, there was some claim by another interest against the estate, otherwise the late filing of the Deed of Gift would not have been necessary.

Now enters a most interesting & intriguing document which I have found in a Chatham County (Ga.) Deed Book, and which I enclose. It is an affidavit filed by WILLIAM GREEN on 10 May 1779 attesting to a Deed of Gift executed 24 June 1773 between Thomas Tucker and William's sister, CATHERINE GREEN.

You recall, Catherine Green was the daughter of Josiah Green and Catherine Beale. Although her birth is not recorded, she is mentioned as a beneficiary in both Samuel Green's and Daniel Williams' (her stepfather) Wills. Catherine was born in late 1756 or early 1757, so in June 1773 she would have been about 16 1/2.

Why would Thomas Tucker be making a gift of seven slaves to young Catherine? My first reaction was that he was turning over to her the slaves left her in Samuel Green's Will. But Thomas did not marry Sarah until after April 1774 & before June 1777, and he would have had no connection with Samuel's estate until then. Also, Catherine's bequest consisted of only one slave. Why would William have come forward in May of 1779 if not to make or support a claim against Thomas' estate? And if Thomas had made a gift in 1773 how was he still in possession of the slaves? The date of 27 June 1773 is interesting in that it is only three weeks after Thomas came of age.

I have conjured up every possible explanation I could think of, but can rule out all but one. I think it was a marriage contract, or gift in anticipation of marriage if you prefer, between Thomas Tucker and Catherine Green. If only William Green, in reciting the agreement 6 years later, had remembered to include the purpose of the gift! An interesting addendum that is significant is that of the seven slaves Thomas gave to Catherine in 1773; "Three negro men named Sharper, Toby, & August, one negro boy named Jim, one negro wench named Amy, & one Negro wench named Sarah with her child, Die," Thomas gives to Sarah in 1777 "slaves named Sharper, Toby," (in that order), Jim a man boy,.. Amey,.. Sara, & a boy Dye. Coincidence?

Young men of means often married immediately after reaching majority, and Thomas would have certainly been one of the few of that age with enough property to make a gift of seven slaves. If he and Catherine had married and Catherine then died, the slaves which he had given her would have remained in his possession. Hence the attempt by William Green, as Catherine's heir, to claim the slaves from Thomas' estate.

I can offer no other explanation of why a young man just come of age would make such a gift to a 16 1/2 year old girl. I really would like to have your opinion on this unusual instrument and strange set of circumstances.

Although the above is not relevant to the story of the Green/Popes, I do think it is an interesting addition to the lore in that Thomas Tucker may have married Catherine Green first and then married her 1st cousin, Sarah Green, as his second wife. I would think also that from what is now known of Thomas, Sarah brought to her marriage with William Pope not only her considerable inheritance from her father, but one greatly enhanced by her marriage to Thomas Tucker.

I would value your thoughts on the Tucker item, and would certainly appreciate any information you could give me that might help pinpoint the location of the Martinangele property. It would be of tremendous help in my further deed search.

As always, best regards and many thanks,

Alex

my new address is:

~~112 Burkhardt~~
~~2914 Lenoir Road S.~~
~~Durham, N.C. 27634~~