

38 Perry St., NYC,  
10014  
March 4, 1982.

Dear Dr. Peeples,

When you wrote me, Nov. 14, 1981 - about Martha Picot, I already knew James Daniel was one of Mrs. Ann Zeigler's stepfathers, and not her father - who was Joseph Pendarvis<sup>3rd.</sup>, a son of Brand Pendarvis.

Since I received your letter I've bought J.B. Heyward's "Pendarvis-Bedon" book (which is grossly inaccurate); also the two Pendarvis files of The South Carolina Historical Society; and consulted The South Caroliniana library - as well as some Pendarvis descendants who've been doing research for years.

Even before I knew of you, I thought; Joseph (2nd.) was terminally ill when he signed his 1735 Will (it was probated in March, less than a month later), so perhaps it wasn't honestly read to him - and the parts re Parthena were inserted without his knowledge, & weren't true.

[ There seems to have been "hanky-panky" about the way the Executor-Trustees handled Joseph's estate. ]

But yesterday I received the Xerox of a 1754 Deed which describes Mary ("Mary Ann") - wife of David Rumph - as a child of Joseph Pendarvis<sup>2nd.</sup> and Parthena, "a Negro woman who lived with him".

The person who sent this was told by a S. C. Genealogist: there are three such deeds, almost identical, on file for 1754.

If this is so (and I have no reason to disbelieve it),

(cont.

I have to give up trying to prove Parthena wasn't the children's mother. Because they certainly knew who their mother was; and they would not have allowed this information to be written into three Deeds, if it were not so.

I "have egg on my face" about this; for, the day before I rec'd a copy of this Deed - I mailed letters to <sup>interested</sup> 3 S.C. Genealogists, "refuting" (I thought) Mr. Heyward's snide, prejudiced account of the Pendarvis genealogy.

Now, clearly, I wasn't playing with a full deck.

Parthena was, and is, a reality.

Her genes went into the gene-pool of her descendants.

I don't think we should be ungrateful to this woman who lived 10 generations ago - and who had no choice in the matter. The Renaissance came about because the end of Feudalism caused a mingling of the bloods of peoples who had not inter-married before.

Prejudice against the descendants of Parthena didn't exist in the 18th. Century; her children married well. In my line (which is what I know most about) they continued to marry well, and to achieve.

The discrimination seems to come from Mr. Heyward and his book. I'm not going to subscribe to that discrimination.

Regarding the Picot/Piquot article: if you wish, I will say Mrs. Ann Zeigler was a child of Mrs. Ann Daniel - and leave it at that. But I should prefer to tell the whole truth "and shame the Devil"!

With all good wishes,

Sally Dwight