

Letters: Concerning the Early Lodwicks

In 1989, Jim Alford of Houston, Member #115, began a correspondence with Executive Director Gil Alford and then-President Lodwick Alford discussing several research issues pertaining to the lines of the various early Lodwick Alford. Since many AAFA members are descended from these lines, we began publishing these letters in the last issue. The correspondence continues below.

January 21, 1990

Gil,

.... The stuff you sent is great—it fits like a glove with what I've been developing [copy of that letter is not available]. Now, let me address questions and issues from your letter in order:

I'm interested in unattached Alford in the Carolinas and Georgia because I'm trying to develop stories about the descendants of the other New Kent Co. brothers. One supposition I want to present is that Goodrich, brother of Lodowick Sr., had more children than the three girls listed in New Kent County. Suspected sons might be William and Benjamin, in Wayne County. They were about the same age, stuck together, and didn't really seem related to Lodowick Sr. Their sons were Theophylus and Lodwick of Wayne Co. I know that William of Georgia is claimed to be Lodowick's son but, was it this William?

.... The brother and sister living together thing was a reference to earlier discussions about the 1850 Kaufman County Census showing J.P. Alford living in the household of George W. Morris and his wife Elizabeth Alford. Both were children of Needham Judge Alford.

Anybody can read about Elizabeth—and Susanna—as wives of Lodowick Sr. but,

Cousin Minnie had a source that said Elizabeth Cade and Susanna Cade. I've never run across any other reference that named them Cade although, it does fit the facts. Incidentally, when they moved to North Carolina, Robert Cade Sr., Robert Cade Jr., and Stephen Cade moved with them.

Your reasoning for "Sr." and "Jr." not meaning what they seem sounds like a case of trying to make the facts fit the conclusion. I am wrapping up a massive data-entry project on those counties in the corner and I have concluded that Lodowick Jr. of Wake Co. was indeed the same person as Lodowick Jr. of Bute/Franklin Co. and no second Lodowick existed. Capt. Wick's story about Major Ludy "Tanner" Alford now makes sense—It was Lodowick Jr.! He received the nickname "Tanner" from sentencing petty criminals to 25 lashes on their bare backs i.e., "tanning" their hides.

Try on this intriguing scenario:

1. Lodwick Jr., being granted land on July 24, 1761 had to have been age 21 on that day or earlier and hence, was born July, 1740 or earlier.
2. James, having died at age 72 about November 5, 1812 had to have been born between November, 1739 and November, 1740.
3. Jacob was born in December, 1738 from church records.

It's possible to squeeze Lodowick Jr. between Jacob and James, but it's also possible that Lodowick Jr. and James were twins! How about twin boys named James Lodowick and Lodowick James?! What if they were born in July, 1740 instead of July, 1749 as Wick says?

Oh, one more thing before closing: I went tracing further back on the *Julius and Warren, sons of Lodowick* source and elevated it from a Class C to a Class

B reference. It looks like quality transcribing work and probably should be regarded as a Class A reference.

More later,
Jim/Houston

26 February 1990

Dear Jim:

Gil sent me copies of some of the letters you have written him and I am delighted you are delving into the confusing world of the many Lodwicks. Welcome to the forum. Join the fray. It is free for all and no holds barred. Anyone can play and I have a thick skin to protect me from the slings and arrows of outrageous charges, speculations and theories about our ancestors.

And I have a few of my own which I hope will offend no one but will stimulate research and an intense effort to prove El Presidente wrong. In your letter of Nov. 23 [this letter unavailable] you mention the likelihood of Alford emigrants other than the New Kent county bunch. I heartily agree. I have been hoping Gil would find someone to specialize in ship passenger and crew lists and the ports where they landed. I say Bravo! Go to it! Will help as much as I can.

Now comes your letter of 9 December re: Hartley and Alford connections [published in March 1992 AAFA ACTION]. Note copy of letter from Lodwick Hartley I received over 12 years ago [see following this letter]. I know that does not prove anything but I will bet there is more to Alford/Hartley connections than Susanna Hartley being appointed guardian of Jabell Alford. So, I am buying into and fully subscribing to your well-reasoned arguments that given names which frequently appear in a family line indicate connections by

marriage or some other relationship.

Next, same letter of 9 Dec., page 2: Lodwick Tanner and Major Tanner Alford my ancestor (I think) not proven yet. I have his cane which has a 1-1/4 inch wide gold band around the head with the following exact inscription:

"1770 WAKEFIELD
JAMES LODWICK ALFORD
OR
MAJOR TANNER ALFORD"

I have no doubt the walking stick is completely authentic. It was passed on by his widow to daughter Delany who married Sam High. Then on to her heirs and finally came back into Alford family in 1914 when one of Delany Alford High's descendants graciously decided it should be given to my Uncle Benton Alford. He passed it on to his only son, thence to his only son who had no heirs. Thence to me.

But questions arise. Why is this the only place we have ever seen use of his first name James? He ought to know what his first name is, but why no one else ever used it? Why wasn't he called James to distinguish him from the other confusing Lodwicks? Answer: Because he then would have been confused with his father James b. 1713 and his cousin James b. 1741, son of ole Lodwick b. 1710. But the confusion could hardly be greater than it is with the many Lodwicks. I certainly agree that scribes back there as well as today are very careless and slipshod in use of the junior designation.

We have a record of a grant of 610 acres in Granville County to James Alford in 1761. It was applied for in 1760 when James b. 1741, son of ole Lodwick, was just 19 years old. So it is unlikely he could receive a grant under 21 years of age. I conclude this had to be James b. 1713, father of my JLA then just 12 years old. But he is quite a murky character and we know next to nothing about him. We have two more land grants in 1779

to James in Wake County, but as of now we do not know whether they are to James the elder or James the younger b.1741, son of ole Lodwick. Then we have James administrating the estate of Robert Cade 1769-70—same doubt as to which one. There seems little doubt that it was James the younger who received a land grant in Georgia 1785 and several grants later. But very puzzling are four land grants to James in Robeson County, NC, in the 1790s when he was long gone to Georgia in 1780s. Could this be James the elder then about 80 years when the Robeson grants were made? I think not. My theory: James the younger applied for the grants in Robeson County, NC, on his way to Georgia in the 1780s but the grants were not made until well into the 1790s.

My further theory: That James the elder died in the 1770s leaving property to his son James Lodwick Alford (my ancestor I think) b. 1749, just turned 21 years and married to Susannah Ross in 1770. I believe that accounts for the 1770 year on the walking stick when he became a property owner and riding around his land stopped and cut down a hickory sapling from which he fashioned the cane to commemorate the occasion. At the same time he proclaimed that "This will be my Wake field" since that portion of his property would be in the new Wake County, which was to be formed in 1771. And that is how the town of Wakefield got its name. At least that's how family tradition has it. I believe it. That's my view, I welcome yours.

Obviously the gold band on the walking cane had to have been inscribed no earlier than 1778 when he was appointed 2nd Major of a Wake County regiment. But the big mystery is how he became to be known as Tanner. In 50 years of research and inquiry I have found exactly nothing to account for it. We do know that Lodwick Tanner was a big landowner and relatively famous in the 1740s, 1750s, 1760s, when young James Lodwick was growing up. My theory

about this is very simple. I believe it is just a nickname in exactly the same way a young person would be dubbed by his peers with a nickname relating to names of famous persons. I have noted over many years as I am sure you have that anyone with a surname of Ruth would be immediately be dubbed as Babe. Similarly anyone named Lincoln would be called Abe. All Fords would called Henry, etc, etc. OK take your potshots at my theory. . .

Now I am up to your letter of 31 December, page 1 [published in March 1992 AAFA ACTION]: Agree people were careless with their Jr. & Sr. tags back there. Note that when Lodwick Alford was proposed and nominated as 2nd Major of a Wake County regiment, he was tagged as Jr. but when the appointment was approved and confirmed, the Jr. was not used. Or was it the other way around? I don't think he was shown as Jr. of the Wake County member of the legislature. In any case it is unlikely that the real Lodwick, Jr. b. 1743, son of ole Lodwick who lived in an area which was to become Franklin County in 1779, would have been appointed 2nd Major in a Wake County regiment in 1778 and represented Wake in the state legislature the same year. No, this has to be James Lodwick.

But now, where is ole Lodwick himself in 1778? If our birthyears are correct, he is 68 and an old man. Lodwick Jr. is 35 and James Lodwick is 29. Either could have been a major of militia or been in the legislature. Ole Lodwick could be in the legislature but hardly a major in an active regiment at 68 years of age. There seems little doubt that two land grants in Edgecombe County in the 1750s, six more in Granville County before 1763, were made to ole Lodwick. Lodwick Jr. won't be 21 until 1764. James Lodwick is 15 years old. Ole Lodwick is beginning to dispose of his property—giving or selling it to his children or others. Now we have two land grants to Lodwick in 1780 and two more in 1786, all in Franklin County and most likely to

the real Jr. who lived in that county.

Next we have four grants to Lodwick in Wake County in 1785 and two more in 1779, same county. These total about 2000 acres and are most likely to James Lodwick. This may account for the census of 1790 showing Lodwick of Wake with 24 slaves, quite the largest Alford slaveowner in NC. Remember now, James b. 1741 gets his first land grant 1785 in Georgia and ole Lodwick seems to have disappeared from the radar screen. He is 75 and quite old in those days. While it is unlikely he would be enduring the rigors of travel to Georgia in those days, it is possible and he may very well have done it. Although we have not found any proof, the repeated references in DAR papers that he died 1789 in Georgia cannot be ignored. But I will readily agree anything in DAR papers should be viewed with suspicion.

Too bad ole Lodwick did not live to be counted in the 1790 census. Even if he did not go to GA, he is most likely dead by that time since he would be 80 years old. Everything seems to fall into place for the 1790 census with Lodwick Jr. in Franklin County, James Lodwick in Wake, and Lodwick #4, b. 1768, unnamed but in the 1790 census of Wayne County as one of the men in the William Alford home. Lodwick #5, b. 1775, son of Julius and grandson of ole Lodwick, is only 15 years and does not enter the picture yet and will wind up in Troupe County, GA. Are you with me?

Now in 1792 Lodwick Jr. in Franklin County is not feeling very well and is well advised to write a will. By 1795 he is no better—in fact he is worse and is soon declared a lunatic with a guardian appointed. Ole Lodwick if alive is now 85. James Lodwick is in the prime of life and will serve as Sheriff of Wake County 1794–96. But Lodwick Jr. manages to hang on until 1800 when he dies. His will is probated 1801 in Franklin County. Ole Lodwick would be 90 if alive which is not likely. Lodwick

Jr. leaves a different set of children and different property than his father. When James Lodwick dies in Wake County in 1820 he leaves yet another different set of children, different property, different area, different witnesses. Voila! We have ole Lodwick, his son Jr. and nephew James Lodwick. It has to be. Dave Price, Gil and I agonized over this for years. No other answer makes sense. One lady up in NC says this is all myth and refuses to write me anymore. Are you with me or her?

Same letter of 31 December, page 2: Sarah might have died early before will written or before probated. I hold Lodwick Sr. did not leave a will or if he did it was in Georgia. Lodwick of Wayne County was supposed to have married Mary Hall. Sarah might have been a first or second wife.

Subpara. 4b: Mad at them for leaving NC? Not at all—no way. The real Lodwick Sr. had disposed of all or most of his property, died intestate or if he left a will it was in GA. Your Lodwick Sr. is my Lodwick Jr. who did leave a will of 1792. The reason William, Jacob, James, Julius and Isham are not in it is that they were not his children.

Subpara. 4c: This was Lodwick Sr., but he was the first Lodwick, not the third—if in fact he did go to GA and died there. I believe it.

Subpara. 4d: This one really intrigues me. What available genealogies say that Green Alford was the son of Lodwick and grandson of James? Which Lodwick are we talking about? I say that ole Lodwick, his brother James Jr. and other brothers were sons of James Sr. And that James Jr. was the father of my James Lodwick whose youngest son was Green Alford, my great, grandfather. But here again I have been looking for proof for over fifty years that Green was the son of my JLA. Green was not mentioned in the JLA will of 1820, and I have never seen anything that shows that he was a son of JLA. Tradition has it that old JLA did

not like Nancy Rose Liles, the gal that Green married, and left him out of the will. I don't buy that. I must caution that there was another Green Alford who married an entirely different woman within about six months of each other. This could be two different Greens, the same Green but different women, one might have died or perhaps one was only a marriage bond which never actually took place. But for goodness sake write me or call me quick about these available genealogies mentioning Green before I die of curiosity and suspense. I am not surprised Green does not appear in the Franklin County records. There is plenty about him in Wake County but not who his father was that I have been able to find. If by Lodwick Sr. you mean ole Lodwick b. 1710, I will agree that his brother James might well have had the additional names of William Zion.

Subpara. 4e: Not knowing when a Lodwick Alford was a juror in Johnston County and sued there, it is difficult to comment. There was a land grant to Lodwick 1761 in Johnston County of 632 acres. It is most likely to be Sr. since Jr. is only 19 years and my JLA is 12.

Subpara. 4f: I have long doubted that ole Lodwick married Rebecca Ferrell. His son Lodwick Jr. may have. For the time being I will buy that Isham married Anne. Let me nominate James Jr., father of my JLA, as husband of Polly. We have never been able to find a mother for James Lodwick. Or how about the mysterious Warren, b. 1715 and brother of ole Lodwick, as the husband of Polly?

... Comes now your letter of 21 January 1990 [preceding this letter] and I agree that William of Georgia was not ole Lodwick's son. Believe William of Wayne County, NC, was son of Lodwick Sr. b. 1710. At the bottom of page 1 you left me. No way can Lodwick Jr. b. 1743 and my James Lodwick be the same person. They both left wills in different counties and with different beneficiaries, witnesses and everything. I got a good laugh about Major Tanner

tanning the hides of petty criminals.

Page 2: I am not very enthusiastic about your intriguing scenario and I am especially unimpressed with your twins. It is not quite clear to me what you hope to gain by stretching birthdates and conjuring up twins. Now that does look like a case of trying to make facts fit a conclusion. But what conclusion do you want?

Looking at your letter of 27 January [not available], I agree a lot of those Rev. War pension applications were spurious and practically worthless unless they give valuable family connections. . . .

Although I cannot recall now where I read it, I think there is some other corroborating record that Lodwick "Tanner" Alford was a Justice of the Peace at one time, but I am not sure when. As I remember, the date and location of the service did not seem to be significant at the time. There is certainly no doubt that statements 40, 50 or 60 years after the fact are prone to faulty memories and must be highly suspect.

Will agree that Joseph W. Watson is not the best abstractor in the world. Not to make excuses for him, but I think a lot of copiers, abstractors and other scribblers just did not appreciate the extreme importance of the Sr. & Jr. tag as well the use of first and middle names where persons had them. Or third names if people had them such as James William Zion Alford. My father had three given names and we have always been meticulous about using them, leaving no doubt as to who he was and where he fitted in. But my chief gripe about Watson is that he dresses up nicely bound hardback with such a title as *Kinfolks of Franklin County*, making you think he is tracing some family histories as did Harlee in his amazingly accurate volumes. Then you find nothing but dry abstracts which leave doubt in your mind as to whether he did it accurately.

I have great admiration and applause for your approach to sorting out the many Lodwicks through deeds, wills and in general the ownership of land, grants, etc. Our esteemed genealogist on our masthead, Bill Mitchiner, tells me this may be the only way we are ever going to solve this giant jig-saw puzzle. Somehow, and Gil agrees with me, we have to get out our maps or make them and meticulously locate properties, creeks, rivers, etc., who owned the land when, who had it before and who had it after.

Jim, I have tried in this letter to distinguish what is fact or matter of record and that which is theory or speculation. I may not have succeeded and if I did not, I apologize and will try harder. But there is no doubt in my mind that you will eventually come around to the five Lodwicks I have mentioned. How is that for brazen chutzpah? I have been wrong many times before and have eaten some generous servings of crow. As Gil from Missouri would say, "Show Me." Tell me where I went wrong. "Lay on, MacDuff."

Cordially,
Lodwick H. Alford

25 July 1977

Dear Captain Alford:

My good friend N.B. Watts has only recently told me about your visit to this area a few months ago and about your interest in family history. I regret that I did not see you at that time.

As for Lodwick, the name that we share, I have run into it infrequently. As you doubtless know, it is a good English name—a cognate but not a derivative of the German Ludwig—and dates back at least to the sixteenth century. Shakespeare used it several times in his plays both in the English form as we spell it and in the Italian form, Lodovico.

Edmund Spenser's good friend was Lodowick Bryskett.

In the South Carolina Hartley family the first instance of the name was in Lewis Lodwick Hartley, whose will was dated 1827. His father was Daniel Hartley who fought in the Revolution with Virginia troops under General Morgan. His son was my grandfather, Basil Hartley. Basil's brother, my great uncle, was Lodwick Hartley, whose house in Batesburg, South Carolina, was built in 1785, according to the historical marker that stands there. (All the Hartleys in my branch of the family have from the outset lived in Batesburg or its environs.) My father was named Lodwick and so, of course, was I; and I have a grand-nephew whose name is James Lodwick. My great uncle had a son named Eugene Lodwick and a grandson named Edgar Lodwick who lives in Wilmington, North Carolina. That's about all the story! . . .

Sincerely,
Lodwick Hartley ♦

The Social Security Administration plans to destroy the original 37 million applications for Social Security. These early files include many persons born in the 1860s and 1870s. Many were naturalized citizens. These applications have the address of the applicant, date and place of birth, father's name and mother's maiden name. Concerned genealogists and researchers can write to Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Blvd., Baltimore, MD 21235 to ask that these records be turned over to the National Archives for genealogical research. Also, a letter to your Congressman may be effective. If these records are to be microfilmed before destruction, insist that all film is readable prior to any destruction of the originals. [This notice has been printed in several publications.]