

Lawrence E. Hinkle M.D.  
198 Bridle Path Lane  
New Canaan, Connecticut 06840

February 27, 1998

Dear Robert:

Once again I must apologize for my delay in answering your very gracious and helpful letter of January 22. I have finally found the time, as I should have done long ago, to assemble some of the information that I wished to send you.

First, with regard to your query about Edward Darrell Smith. He was, indeed, an M.D., and a Professor of Chemistry as well. I have prepared a small vignette of his life, with a summary of the genealogical information that I have relating to him. I take the liberty of sending this to you, in the hope that you will find it interesting. I shall be very grateful for any comments or corrections that you may be pleased to make. It appears to me that either your informant, Mr. Tiernan, is greatly mistaken, or I am.

Your information on the birth date and parentage of Barbara Atkins is most helpful. It removes some of the Byzantine murkiness in the relationship between the Smiths and the Atkins of that generation. I observe with great interest the fact that Barbara's father had the first name "Aaron". If Barbara, born in 1650, was in fact his first child, I think that we can assume that Aaron was born about 1625. At that date Englishmen who were given the first name "Aaron" were highly likely to have Puritan parents. The adoption of Old Testament first names, in those days of increasing religious polarization, was a sure sign of a leaning toward Calvinism. Orthodox Anglicans of that time continued to give their children Saint's names for first names. The first name of Aaron Atkins thus supports the argument that I made to you in my last letter, that Landgrave Thomas Smith and his immediate forebears and associates were Puritans like their friends and associates the Blakes and the Mortons.

I cannot say that I am impressed with Mott Alston Reid's arguments relating to Landgrave Thomas Smith's parents and immediate forebears. Smith was, indeed, recognized as a member of a prominent family of Devon, and there is very good reason to believe that the Proprietors urged him to come to Carolina and made him a Landgrave and Governor. But when Smith came to America the Proprietors were under the leadership of Anthony-Ashley Cooper, a Whig, a former supporter of Cromwell, and by religious proclivity a Dissenter. Smith came to Carolina in his own ship, but he came with the wave of Dissenters that came in the few years before and after that 1684, which included the Mortons and the Blakes. In the Colony he consistently supported the Proprietary Party and opposed the Anglican Party that was led by the Goose Creek Barbadians. He was made a Landgrave and then appointed Governor not through any influence of the Moncks, but because he had supported Governor Colleton a few years before when Colleton tried to enforce martial law in the

Colony.

Nor am I impressed by the finding of a gloss on a copy of Arthur Smith's book in Exeter, purporting to support the Larkebeare parentage of the Landgrave. As you well know, at the beginning of this century and earlier, many descendants of the Landgrave accepted Mrs. Poyas' book as Gospel. The good ladies of the Colonial Dames -- my mother among them -- were outraged when "Mr. Salley" and Judge Smith cast aspersions upon its accuracy. At about that time "glosses" began to appear here and there supporting the account of Mrs. P. I can think of one, on an early map of Charles Towne, showing the "first rice patch" on Landgrave Smith's town lot. Many descendants of the Landgrave have traveled to Devon looking for traces of the Landgrave and his family, and I would not doubt that one of them might have felt the urge to add a little of the True Gospel to a copy of Arthur Smith's book at Exeter.

So my position remains as it was before: I do think that you and I and the Landgrave are descended from John Smithe of Borage and his wife Alice Muttlebury, but not through Sir Nicholas Smith of Larkbeare.

The identification of the date of birth of Barbara Atkins raises some interesting points about the Landgrave. If we accept the date of birth of her eldest son, the second Landgrave, as 1663-64, then Barbara must have been thirteen or fourteen years old when he was born. And if we accept the date of birth of her second son, George, as September 1674, she was twenty-four years old when George was born. There is a ten year interval between the births. Why were there no children in the interval? And we also find that Thomas Smith, who was undoubtedly a Gentleman, was called "Doctor" by William Dunlap, but was nevertheless the possessor of surgical instruments. At that time there was a strong distinction between physicians, who were called "Doctor" and were Gentlemen, and surgeons, who were called "Mister" and were not Gentlemen.. Thomas Smith could hardly have had the degree "Doctor of Medicine" -- few physicians of that time did. (Oxford was, I believe, the only English University that conferred this degree in the 1660s and 1670s.) In any case, physicians with or without the degree of Doctor of Medicine disdained surgeons. Surgeons of that day were considered to be artisans, apprenticed, not educated by other physicians or at universities, and certainly not gentlemen. A gentleman might become a Doctor of Medicine, as John Locke did, but he would never become a surgeon -- except, I believe, under one condition.

I believe that there is an explanation for all of this. I have speculated about these matters -- how Barbara became pregnant when she was thirteen and Thomas was sixteen; whether Thomas was living in an Atkins household without either of his parents present; why Thomas and Barbara had no more children until ten years after the birth of their eldest; what Thomas was doing in the meantime; and why, as an adult, we find him the possessor of Surgical instruments, but being called "Doctor". It seems to me that these matters may be related, and that they might even have some relation to General George Monck, who is admired by so many of our relatives.

I shall be interested to hear your comments on this.

With best regards and many thanks,

