

15 August 89

Dear Robert,

Your latest letter just arrived, but before responding to the particulars in it, I want to explain how to use the little typewriter "correcto-slips" I sent to you last week. I think I know what you did wrong--the same thing I did the first time I tried to use one: You used more than one! You see, the "slip" I sent to you was actually a number of slips--about ten, I believe. They stick together, so check yours out. They peel apart from the yellow end. Once you have peeled one from the rest, hold it in your right hand by the yellow tip, making sure the yellow print on the slip is facing you. (I am taping one to the top of this page to indicate what I mean.) Now--go to your typewriter and type anything, the word "ancestor," say. Now back up to the first letter, insert the slip over the word, and slowly type each letter over the slip. Each letter will "lift off" and you then back up and type whatever word you meant to use--or correct a misspelled word. The great thing about these little slips is that they completely remove all typos, rather than "chalk them over," as that other type of white slip does. Let me know how my instructions work. Believe me: Once you have used one of these clear slips, you will wonder what you ever did without them.

Well, our report from Price was due today, but it did not arrive. Needless to say, I am rather annoyed, since this report was due to begin with in June! When I called Price to find out what was causing the delay (the first of July, I think), he explained that he had run into a few problems, but promised to have everything in our hands no later than August 15. As promised, though, I will send you a copy of this research the minute it arrives.

I am eagerly awaiting also the arrival of a "bundle" of material from Mrs. Brownlee. (I did tell you, didn't I, that she is more or less serving as an advisor-coördinator for us in this research? Anyway, she is, and is of course proving to be most helpful.) In some of her material from New England sources, she has located what might prove to be some very interesting and useful information: Some Tillys, Lawtons, Clarks, Screvens, and others all "tangled up" in New Jersey and Rhode Island. One Tilly is a William, with a wife Mary; one Clark is a Jeremiah; the Screven is a Rev. William; the Lawtons are not yet in "focus"; but the Tilly and the Screven seem to have ended up in Charleston. Of course, all of this might pan out to nothing, but we shall see. As soon as this material arrives, I will send you copies of everything. The only source I recall right now is a man by the last name of Edwards--Morgan, is it? Anyway, we shall soon know.

Like you, I am still wondering where CWL and Mary Clark lived from c. 1735-44, and I am at a loss for anything more than a speculation: Unless he owned land that we do not yet know about--prior to the land that he purchased from Tilly's executors, I mean--I have no choice but to believe that he must have lived with the Clarks--either in their home or on their land. What else would make sense? King Maner's parents lived with my great-grandparents, Maner Soule and Sarah Adelaide Sams Lawton, for several years. Adelaide and King

in fact were born in the house I lived in (in my bedroom, moreover) while I was at Garnett. The Maner house "across the way" was not completed until late 1905, when King was about six months old. Anyway, that's what I "reckon" must have been the case with CWL and Mary Clark: Home Sweet Home until a home of their own.

You are probably right in saying that CWL was not a pirate or anything else so "nefarious," but the man did seem to have money that no one can adequately account for--unless, as I have recently begun to suspect, he acquired the major portion of it from Mary, widow of Paul Grimball. I won't go into "all that" right now, except to say what you already know: My ancestress or not, I do not even just one little bit have good "vibes" about Mary Stone-Grimball-Lawton-Fickling. I cannot for the life of me put my finger on exactly what it is that I do not like about her, but there is (to me) something simply WEIRD about that woman. Like you, Tommy thinks I am reading between the lines something that really isn't "there," and perhaps I am...and perhaps I am not. But enough about her.

Question: What is the source of your statement (which I have read elsewhere, too) that "CWL bought Tilly's land the same day that Tilly died"? Leah Townsend (as I recall) cites 14/15 April 1744 as the date of Tilly's death, but does not indicate her source. My only reason for nitpicking here is this: If CWL was indeed able to purchase Tilly's land on the same day that Tilly died, I cannot help suspecting that there was some **STRONG** Lawton-Tilly connection. When Dad died, I most certainly would not have sold--or otherwise disposed of--anything that had belonged to him to anyone, unless that person had been close family, particularly on the same day that he died. Perhaps again I am reading between the lines something that is not "there," but in case not, what are your thoughts? I reason thus: If CWL was allowed to buy Tilly's land before the man was even buried, then it is obvious to me that CWL was somehow all but (if not in fact) entitled to the land. I know that all this is not music to your ears, since the possibility that CWL's mother might have been a Tilly or a Sealy makes you "nervous," but for what it is worth (in case you do not already know), I think that that is exactly what Tommy believes; though he has not really said so, in so many words. Many times Tommy has told me two things which lead me to think he suspects what I just said--that CWL's mother might have been either a Tilly or a Sealy: (1) Tilly and his wife are buried (Tommy thinks) with CWL and his family in that plantation cemetery (2) CWL named Joseph for Joseph Sealy--or so Tommy strongly and always has suspected. As yet, I cannot quite grasp these possibilities from Tommy's point of view, but then there is Mrs. Brownlee, and I follow her reasoning very clearly, and at this point she seems to be leaning in Tommy's direction, insofar as the strength of Tommy's suspicions are concerned. Mrs. Brownlee has not yet committed herself to any specific theories, beyond saying that there is much more to the Lawton-Sealy-Tilly connections than has heretofore been realized. Like me, she is more intent on the "loving brother Isaac Rippon" than on anything else, but she tells me that sooner or later the Tillys and Sealys are going to enter the picture--in a very predominant manner. So....

If this summer were not practically over (school recommences next Wednesday, after which date I will have little time for correspondence and research), I would write, as you suggested, Mrs. Leila Miles' daughter in Mt. Pleasant, and ask for assistance with the Rippons, specifically for information on Isaac. I am particularly interested in the c. 1734 year of birth for Isaac, which Mrs. Moore and Mrs. Miles both found somewhere-- in what source I do not know. Maybe I will be able to investigate this item later on, after things are "in motion" at school, and I have time for a "breather." Until then, I will simply have to begin lining things up on my "back burner." I will, however, follow up on this lead as soon as I can, and I appreciate your mentioning this contact to me.

I am truly sorry about my own confusion concerning Hannah Rippon. Remember, though, that I wrote you about her without your letter to refer to (Tommy still had it), and my mind was literally swirling with "stuff." You should by now have received my other letter, which I wrote to you after Tommy had returned your first letter. (Is my explanation here getting better, or worse?) ANYWAY--you did provide the information and documentation I needed, and I apologize for being so scatterbrained.

If you think that it's strange that Hannah and Joshua were in St. Philip's Church, where their marriage is recorded, just wait until Tommy sends you a copy of the letter I wrote to him several days ago! (If he forgets to send you this letter, please let me know, and I will remind him.) I will not attempt to go into detail here about it, but one night I read (for the third time) my copy of St. Helena's Register (Vol. XXIII, 1922, I believe), transcribed by Miss Webber. Among others, guess who was in it? John Sealy and Joseph Sealy--clearly the same ones associated with CWL and Isaac Rippons. Tommy was at a loss for an explanation, and I asked him to send you a copy of the information, to see what you might have to say about it. Again, let me know if Tommy forgets.

Correction from Mrs. Brownlee, which I confirmed: Hannah Rippon was NOT the widow of JOHN Sealy, as we at first thought; she was the widow of JOSEPH Sealy--a fact that Tommy said made more sense to him anyway, since it reinforced his belief that CWL named Joseph for Joseph Sealy. I'm still attempting to figure that one out, but no luck. In the meantime, you can check Moore's Wills to confirm Mrs. Brownlee's discovery.

Many thanks for the group picture of the Lawtons in Lawton. Am I mistaken, or are those children kneeling in the foreground? Y'all went to England, on a genealogical quest, with a "kindle" of kids?! How brave--and astounding! I am in awe of your patience and stamina!

After school begins again, my correspondence will be "pretty po," as King used to say, so please understand and be patient. I will be in touch as often as time permits, and you please do the same.

As always, give Miss Cora my love, and be well, both of you.

*As ever -  
Paul*