

Friday, 23rd

Dear Mr. Peeples,

Your lovely letter was a source of much pleasure. I enjoyed every word, and appreciate your kind and warm response.

I am grateful for the corrections on Anna Cornelia Van Myddah (and, please, any others you may ever see which I've done incorrectly!). For years, I was in some confusion over Anna, but, finally, after a several months' wait, received Our Family Circle through out-of-state library loan. (This

2.

during our California days.) The book straightened out my dilemma over Anna, but there may well be other items I overlooked.

The same source also settled my questions about Barbara Atkins, so she was one less concern.

How very thoughtful you to send the Chaplin chart, and I do thank you.

Like you, I've never worried over the indenture of John Chaplin. After all, not every son who came necessarily had money. This may give you a chuckle, but I distinctly recall my Mother's comment (in speaking of intermarriages within the Chaplin families and within

3.

the Tripp families), that they'd often done so because they didn't consider anyone else good enough! And, with you, I'm very proud of them. My Great-Grandmother was Ida Melvina Chaplin (Tripp), daughter of William Tripp Chaplin and Elizabeth Mary Ann Peto.

You don't know how happy you made me when you endorsed Elizabeth Cartwright as the wife of Captain Edmund Bellingew. I had not felt on firm ground until you wrote, and, again I'm indebted.

You may well wonder why, when in doubt, I'd let the questions go back then; at the risk of being tedious, I'll explain.

Jim (my husband) and I,
joined by our daughter Kathie,
home from college, lived for
nine months (1967) in Alexandria,
Virginia. There I had the wonder-
full opportunity of going once or
twice weekly to Library of Congress -
The Genealogical Annex, of course.

At first, it was overwhelming,
but I learned. Not only did I
enjoy it, "ecstatic" would be a
better word, but there was a strong
inner conviction I'd better make
the most of the chance.

The conviction turned out to
be prophetic. My Mother and
Jim died within six months of
each other, each suddenly. Right

after Mother's death, we (Jim, Kathie, and I) had moved to Charlottesville where he died. Kathie and Creighton were engaged, but postponed their June wedding plans until August. I had much to learn and to do, and a wedding to put on. Somehow, I did not get back to genealogy as I once had. But the love of it was there, and those wonderful Library of Congress days remain a continuing source of joy.

I am submitting the papers to First Families on our Thomas. I thought of sending in the Bohun line, but could always send it as a supplement.

Speaking of Thomas, I am mailing separately (Monday) a picture of him. You may well already have one, but even so, I thought you would be interested.

The one I have and from which the copy is made is an original, at least as far as I can tell. There's no doubt it's very, very ancient, and needless to say, one of our most beloved family treasures.

I'm not sure how the original was done. In fear and trembling, I removed it from the frame to ask Be, who knows a lot about paintings and is an accomplished artist herself. Alas, she couldn't

tell, either. It is painted, but whether over a sketch, not sure.

The frame appears delapidated, although my Grandmother would cringe at such a description. I remember she and Mother would have "discussions" about the condition of the frame. Mother, who liked everything to look and be just so, wanted it restored. My Grandmother recoiled in horror; I can hear it all the way from here: "Why, I.D.A., you'd ruin half the value of the frame." Young as I was, I privately thought Grandmother ~~was~~^(Sorry!) right; the frame remains as it was. I am so glad!

Craigton, a long-time camera buff, expanded his interest and equipment to include copying. I asked him to copy Thomas so I could send the likeness to you. I didn't dare upset the original out of my sight so got it professionally done.

We did not remove the picture from the frame as Craigton was concerned about the heat. The copy is just slightly larger than the original and the clothing colors not quite as dark, but on the whole, the likeness itself is a good copy.

Unfortunately, the entire frame doesn't show in the copy, but we did the best we could. The frame itself is a rather deep shadow-box for its size; also it is beaded, which shows at the top. Neither does the

erosion show since the whale is
not included.

I don't know why the entire
frame did not appear in the
copy, and I'm sorry for I'd
like you to see it. (Creighton is
so good to me always that I
hesitated to ask him to redo it,
especially since Thomas' picture
came out well and that was
the objective.)

It was good of you to
include Mrs. Bounds' name
and address. I am always
interested in our cousins, and
hope to send her a little note.
I wish I'd known sooner.
My Mother is buried there,

and I've visited in Richmond
many times.

Before closing, several other things come to mind. One, I, also, have always enjoyed Miss Welker's comment that she was "obliged to rob" of "Colonel William Farr of the Ninety Six District." One day I'll have to send you a copy of Mr. A. H. Alley's letter to my Grandmother on the same subject! Now I'm beginning to wonder how both she and Mr. Fleetwood got off on the wrong track. Thank goodness for Miss Welker and Mr. Alley, and you, in

helping all of us.

The other item: I have my Great-Grandmother's Episcopal Prayer Book, published 1833, Hartford, Connecticut. She was Augusta (Running) Farr. The book is well-worn, especially considering she was only thirty-eight when she died.

Please give my best regards to Mrs. Peoples, along with my apology for taking so much of your time.

And, again, my many, many thanks to you,

(Sister) Elizabeth

I should have typed my epistle, and next time, I shall. Bear with me! My penmanship worsens, which I blame on

12

my hand (knowing full well that
is an excuse!).

E.

Mrs. James A. Boyd

~~100 E. 21st Street~~
~~New York, N.Y. 10010~~

1987