

I have created below an index, plus notes (not full abstracts), for most of the Granville Grants involving ALLENS as grantees, and for all ALLENS with given names Charles, David, Drury, Reynold, Richard, Robert, and William, of whatever spelling. Except for Charles and Richard, these are the given names recognizable as being associated with [ALLEN Patrilineage 1](#) stemming from a set of patriarchs of the certain early Virginia tidewater counties, especially NewKent County. ALLENS named Charles and Richard were of interest to me, both because I happen to have researched them to the point of being able to say that at least one line running from John of BertieCoNC through Richard and William of NorthamptonCoNC are of a different patrilineage, and also because ALLENS named Richard, and later Charles, were neighbors to the ALLEN Patrilineage 1 patriarchs back in NewKent, and also Hanover, and LunenburgCosVA.

I want to make clear that the NC Granville Grants noted here comprise only a portion of the colony, and only for the limited span of time that the Granville District land office was issuing grants, but this time and place happens to coincide almost exactly with the period when ALLEN Patrilineage 1 descendants first began to buy their way in, and also settle, in North Carolina.

### North Carolina Land Grant History, in a Nutshell

In 1663, newly restored monarch Charles II, granted his north American holdings from the southern Virginia border to Florida to eight English proprietors, presumably to cement his political position, or as a reward for aid in the Restoration. As the colonies began to burgeon in subsequent decades, the Crown came to regret it's former generosity and by 1729 it had negotiated a buyback of 7 of the 8 proprietorial shares. From 1729 on, though not, perhaps, continuously, there was therefore a royal land grant system in effect, but the remaining portion of the original territory, comprising most of northeast and central North Carolina, remained in the hands of the last proprietor, John, Lord Carteret, who subsequently upgraded his title to Earl of Granville. Granville began organizing a system for granting land and collecting quit rents on it in 1744, and this culminated in a period of active land granting that ran from from 1748 through April 1763, when the Earl died, and the issuing of land grants ceased in the Granville District until the Revolution, when the proprietorial interests of the succeeding Earl of Granville were appropriated by the new State of North Carolina.

### The Records

#### Sources—Secondary

Margaret M. Hofmann, *The Granville District of North Carolina, 1748-1763: Abstracts of Land Grants*, 5 vols.  
(WeldonNC,1986-1995)

In the five volumes of this series, and in several others, Margaret Hofmann has abstracted all the North Carolina grants she was able to find at the NC land office, at the NC State Archives in Raleigh, and (in some instances) the county deed books.

Although my local library (the Virginia Room of the Roanoke, VA, Public Library) has only the first two volumes of this series, I believe that these comprise all of the grants *per se*. The remaining volumes, I believe, are based on ancillary Granville District office papers, including accumulated warrants. The closest library I have been able to find with the complete set is the Greensboro, NC, Public Library, about 75 miles away.

### Sources—Primary

My source here is the set of original Granville Grant records on film at the North Carolina State Archives in Raleigh. Although I didn't note the film series numbers, there are always helpful people at the front desk to point them out to the researcher. These folks need to be consulted anyway if one wishes to consult the alphabetical surname index, since that is to be found in a non-obvious section of the card catalog. For the records I have examined and listed below, I *have* noted the film section number for each item. Although I scanned all the items briefly, noting the salient data, there wasn't time for a more detailed study, nor even time to photocopy everything. The items I did photocopy, are flagged with an asterisk.

I'm sorry to say that most of these images are quite difficult to read. There are a number of reasons for that. I generally prefer to take my own photographs of the projected microfilm, rather than rely on the sometimes dubious quality of microfilm reader/printers, and have to pay for these copies to boot. Since I like to photograph all documents of conceivable interest, often amounting to 100-200, the cost of photocopies I don't make myself is not negligible.

More progressive libraries these days (for example my local public library), have digital film scanners attached to PCs with appropriate software to allow the image to be tweaked and saved in PDF format to a flash memory stick. One would think that a state archive would be able to find the wherewithal to install such equipment, especially given the fact that many of the NCSA's reader/printers are on the blink, or break down in various ways, requiring employee intervention. Also, NCSA began collecting and filming NC county records very early, and many of their films are of such abominable quality that its necessary to order the generally better done films of the LDS. Finally, the NCSA microfilm viewers project the image at a steep angle with respect to viewer and have limited ability to adjust the image size compared with the more popular Northwest Microfilm viewers, which makes the projected images harder to read with the naked eye, and even harder to photograph entirely in focus. If I had had more time I could have improved the focus for some of these documents, the surveys in particular, but alas, I didn't.

### Reconciling these two sources

When Ms. Hofmann published her books, the primary records hadn't yet been merged into a single series of items, but her work in effect, accomplished the same thing. Consequently, there is a pretty complete parallelism between the records I found on microfilm, and Hofmann's abstracts. My own abstracts are naturally based wherever possible on my readings of the original records, and for the most part, I used Hofmann only as a check.

For most filmed grants there are two or three loose paper documents, plus an occasional duplicated entry. First, there is always at least a pre-printed boilerplate filled-in form comprising all the basic data, including the metes & bounds, and for most the back of this document provides a summary caption. For nearly all of these items there is also a survey or a plat. although thanks to my difficulties in photocopying these surveys, they are often only semi-legible. Legally, these grants took the form, not of a conveyance, but of a contractual agreement—a set of mutual promises: on the one side the British monarch, through his own grantee, John Earl Granville (and Granville through his agents), promised to convey to Granville's grantee a particular piece of land set forth by a set of metes & bounds, and on the

other the grantee promised to pay yearly quit-rents to the Crown in the amount of 3 shillings sterling, or 4 shillings “proclamation money” (the local currency, North Carolina pounds).

As Hofmann explains in the excellent and comprehensive introduction to Volume 1 of her work, when the Granville District land office drew up the final grant document on its pre-printed forms, they made three copies of it, and correspondingly, three copies of a plat, which was based on the submitted survey. The three copies of the deed form were aligned, folded, and their borders trimmed in a unique way, so that in future the authenticity of any two copies of the deed could be verified simply by aligning them (thus was a revival of the original practice—and meaning of the term “—indenture”). One copy was meant to be kept by the local Granville District land office, one returned to the Earl Granville’s agents in London, and the third released permanently to the grantee himself (the two copies kept by Granville’s agents were called “counterparts”). First, though, the grantee was required to subscribe his witnessed signatures to all three copies—a unique and genealogically valuable feature of this land grant system.

Most often all three witnessed signatures were obtained, and the final business concluded during one of the district circuit court sessions held at Edenton, New Bern, Halifax, Hillsborough, and Salisbury, in rotation. The sessions of these regular district courts were staggered so that Granville’s agents could ride circuit with justices and lawyers, and conduct their own land business as an adjunct to the regular court sessions. If it was inconvenient for the grantee to travel to any of these sessions, the indenture system made it possible for Granville’s agents to leave the two counterpart copies with friends or agents of the grantee for him to sign and have witnessed at his leisure; then when the counterparts were returned at a subsequent court session, or directly to the land office, the grantee could obtain his own official copy of the grant by exchanging the counterparts he had signed for his own unsigned copy; this copy he could then sign, with witnesses, at his own convenience. Most often, the witnesses who subscribed to these grant forms were courthouse officials or habitues, but occasionally the witnesses might also be friends or relatives of the grantee, who came with him to the court session, or gathered at his home to witness his signature on the document.

### **Appearances of the Surname ALLEN in the Grant Documents Other than as Grantees**

Besides the official and surveyors whose names appear in the grant or survey, one also encounters the names of neighbors or relatives. Neighbors might be named as bounds in the metes & bounds language, either of the survey or on the grant document (and sometimes the metes & bounds vary from one document to the other, so both should be examined). Or these other names could appear as witnesses to the grant document, or as “chain carriers” for the survey. Chain carriers (a.k.a. “chain bearers”, “sworn chain carriers”) may or may not have actually assisted the official surveyor; they were there primarily to act as witnesses, and just as deeds are often witnessed by neighbors, as often as not the chain carriers were there representing their own interests—making sure that the survey didn’t encroach on their own land.

Hofmann’s every-name index renders these other names accessible, and I have naturally noted them below whenever they appear in grants to ALLENs; but I haven’t abstracted the grants to others in which the surname ALLEN appears, although I have examined and noted all such cases found in Hofmann for the given names listed above. The one case of some interest might be the appearance of the name Regnald Allen as a chain carrier, with Jephtha TERRELL, for the survey on a 13Jan1761 grant in JohnstonCo to Aacquilla SUGG.

## ALLEN Granville Grantees: the Abstracts

### Chain Carriers, and Metes & Bounds

The surveys are signed by the surveyor, of course, himself an official or deputy, and by SCC (sworn chain carriers), CC (chain carriers), or CB (chain bearers). These terms are distinctions without a difference and I have represented them all by “**CC**” in the abstracts below. Chain carriers or bearers, although they may have incidentally assisted the surveyor, were there primarily as witnesses that the boundaries were being run correctly, and they may be regarded as a vestige of the original English land jury of knowledgeable neighbors who witnessed the traditional feudal conveyance by *livery and seizin*, or who adjudicated land cases in court: this land jury was the foundation of the jury system that is in turn the one essential component of the common law on which our legal system rests.

I believe that it was customary with this North Carolina institution for certain neighbors to be invited to serve as chain carriers to represent their own boundary interests (and to avoid possible squabbles or litigation later), as well as a relative or friend of the grantee to represent his, and if I am correct in this supposition the names of these chain carriers of genealogical interest.

In Virginia, and in most (if not all) other North American colonial jurisdictions, this same vestigial validative function of land conveyance was performed by witnesses to the drafted deed, which was supposed to include in the document itself the detailed metes & bounds language from the survey, or at least a citation to another document (an original grant or deed) in which these were set forth—not that this system was always rigorously observed in Virginia or elsewhere. It may well be though, that the reason detailed metes & bounds are so typically glossed over in NC deeds is that the representative function of chain carriers was taken quite seriously.

In this documentary system for the Granville Grants, the detailed metes and bounds language of the survey is generally copied to the pre-printed grant form, although sometimes valuable ancillary locational information is omitted so it’s important to examine the survey as well as the form. Metes and bounds in deeds and surveys are traditionally framed by the word “Beginning ... to the Beginning”, and I have used “**BEG ... ttBEG**” below to bracket my own extracts and abstracts from this language. Although the survey language is more complete, because my photocopies of the surveys are so out-of-focus, I have often found it necessary to make use also of the version of the survey text copied to the form. Each line of the plot is represented by a direction and a distance, and these I have abbreviated, e.g. “N30E, 120p”, meaning North, 30 degrees East, 120 poles (a pole, perch, or rod, being 16.5 feet). In metes and bounds, lines are alternated with some identification for the point they terminate with, typically a tree, e.g. “WOak” is my abbreviation for a white oak tree.

I have used the abbreviation “**adj**”, meaning adjoining or adjacent to, as a catchall to represent all references to bounding landholders or landmarks.

Finally, the “Film Section” in the leftmost column is a citation to the sequentially numbered microfilm section comprising the particular batch of loose paper documents for a grant: the **survey**, the obverse of the filled out pre-printed **form** which is the grant itself, and in some cases the reverse, or **back**, of the form, which is in all cases merely a caption or label for the form comprising the name of the grantee, the date of the grant, and an identifying number for which I have as yet found no explanation, but which looks like a sequence number. In some cases there is also to be found a **plat**—an official reproduction of the survey diagram, with identifying captions or text representing the metes and bounds language.

## Allen Patrilineage 1 Grantees

Film Section	County	Date of Grant	Grantee	Acres	Metes & Bounds Summary
					#<photo number> - <document type> <other data> adj = adjacent; BEGinning ... to the BEGinning CC = (Sworn) Chain Carriers or Bearers (on survey)
31-D*	Granville	1May1752	Runnal ALLEN	400a	both sides Mill Crk, adj ROBERSON [two counterpart versions of form; one says Mile Creek] both forms signed Runnal Allen, with mark "A" CC: John ROBERSON, Tho[ma]s WRIGHT #1198-survey 15Apr1750; #1199,1203-form
31-E*	Granville	27Oct1752	Arundall ALLEN	444a	"surveyed for Arundal Allen lying on Cabbin Creek, & on bothsides the Horse Ford path", adj Rob[er]t COLLIER, ALLEN's corner; Wit: Ja[me]s PAINE, J[oh]n HAYWOOD form signed Arundall Allen, with mark "A" CC: Matthew TOOLE, Robert COLLIER signed with mark "A" #1208-survey 10Oct1751; #1209-form; #1210-back
70-L*	Johnston	25Oct1753	Runnel ALLEN	450a	S side Neuse Riv BEG Hic above Robert Allen on the river side" / S, 54p/ ROak/ N, 400p tt Riv/ down the meanders ttBEG form signed Runnel Allen, with mark "A" #1234-survey 1xJun1752; #1235-form
31-D*	Granville	10Nov1757	Robert ALLEN	600a	"on both sides of Billy's Crk [now in FranklinCo] adj Lawyer PARKERS line signed Robert Allen #1206-form; #1207-back Survey [Hofmann]: 10Sep1754 "on the branches of Crooked Creek" CC: Peter LINGON, Thomas TAYLOR, Sher[woo]d HAYWOOD. surveyor
31-D*	Granville	24Jul1761	Drewry ALLEN	80a	both sids of Grassy Crk, adj sd ALLEN & SMITH CC: W[illia]m ALLEN, Jo[natha]n WADE #1194-survey 22Aug1760; #1195-GG form;

## Allen Patrilineage 1 Grantees - continued

70-M\* Johnston 1Jan1763 Reynold ALLEN 625a on Cedar Crk, adj Spencer, & his own line;  
 BEG WOak/ S, 270p/ ROak in SPENCERs line/!, 400p/  
 N, 210p/ his own line/ with his line  
 ttBEG  
 name written Rayland Allen on form, but  
 signature written Reynold Allen, with mark "A"  
 Survey [4]Sep1762 for Raynold Allen  
 CC: David ALLEN, W[illia]m KEETON,  
 Charles YOUNG, surveyor  
 #1237-survey xSep1762; #1239-form

## Other ALLEN Grantees

Film Section	County	Date of Grant	Grantee	Acres	Metes & Bounds Summary
					#<photo number>'<document type> <other data> adj = adjacent; BEGinning ... to the BEGinning CC = Chain Carriers
10-A	Edgecombe	25Mar1752	Roger ALLEN	202a	N sid Tarr Riv, cor Robert WARREN
110-G/C	Beaufort	16Nov1752	Sarah ALLEN	620a	near Pocoson #1234-survey 1*Jun1752; #1235-form
83-B	Orange	20Feb1756	John ALLEN	600a	both sids Cain Crk, W side Haw Riv #1206-form; #1207-back
78-A*	Northampton	25Feb1760	Richard ALLEN	154a	cors Pine, RedOak, ridge #1185,1186-form; #1187-plat
10-A	Edgecombe	17Feb1761	Arthur ALLEN	280a	N side Sapponey Crk
109-A*	Pitt	7Aug1761	Richard ALLEN	590a	S sid Tarr Riv, N sid Tysons Crk; #1241-plat; #1242-form; #1243-back
7-A	Currituck	24Nov1762	Thomas ALLEN	83a	on Currituck Sound

### Analysis of the Granville Grants for Probable ALLEN (I) Patrilineage Descendants

Of the ALLENS itemized below, Richard ALLEN of NorthamptonCoNC can be shown to be the son of John Allen of BertieCoNC (Northampton's parent), and this line of ALLENS may have come from IsleOfWight/Surry Cos VA.

Richard ALLEN of PittCoNC is, I believe, a descendant of Patrilineage 1 and Sarah Allen of BeaufortCo is an in-law of this family.

Arthur ALLEN of EdgecombeCoNC may be a descendant of Arthur ALLEN of Bacon's Rebellion fame.

I know nothing of John ALLEN of OrangeCoNC (further inland), or Thomas ALLEN of CurrituckCoNC (on the coast).

All the remaining ALLENS are beyond reasonable doubt members of ALLEN Patrilineage 1—descendants of a set of early ALLEN patriarchs of tidewater Virginia:

(1) "Robert1 of Henrico" (born say 1680, died abt 1756 in HenricoCoVA);

(2) "William of Albemarle" (born say 1687, died 1752 in AlbemarleCoVA);

(3) "William of Mecklenburg (born say 1729, died 1789 in MecklenburgCoVA);

and (4) "Reynold1 of Iredell" (born say 1724, died abt 1808 in IredellCoNC).

I suppose the Robert Allen who was granted 600a on Billy's Creek in 1757, and the Drewry Allen who was granted 80a on Grassy Creek in 1761, both grants in then GranvilleCo, but now in Franklin and Granville Cos respectively, were sons of Robert1 and brothers. There are many Drury ALLENS of this patrilineage, but Robert's son (born 1714 in NewKentCoVA) is the earliest known, and the only known Drury old enough to have been granted land as early as 1761, but not the qualification: "the only known". There is less doubt that the 1757 grantee, Robert2, was the son of Robert1 of Henrico, because Robert2 was known to have had a son Robert3 and both Roberts turn up in the same household on the 1771 tax lists for ButeCoNC, the parent of Franklin and the locus of Billy's Creek.

Neither of the William patriarchs are known to have had sons who settled in the Granville Grant area, although several sons of William of Mecklenburg settled further south in NC, in AnsonCo.

I believe that the four remaining Granville Grants to ALLENS named Reynold, Runnel, Runnal, and even Arundall, are to the same man: the patriarch Reynold1 ALLEN (a.k.a. "Reynold of Iredell"). [MILLERS](#) *Allens of the Southern States*, p.300, says "it is not possible to determine from the available records if Arendell [sic] Allen and Reynold Allen were the same man", but I beg to differ.

Before the popularization of Noah Webster's *Dictionary* in the early 1800s, American English was pre-eminently an oral language, and when ordinary people, and even professional clerks, came to write things down, the spelling of all but the most familiar words was considered discretionary as long as it conformed loosely to a phonetic soundalike standard. Wide latitude was allowed for the correspondingly wide-ranging vowel sounds, but one spelling constraint nearly always observed was that the written word had to possess the same number of syllables as the spoken word, else it wouldn't really sound alike. And "Arundall" seems to violate that. I had my own doubts about identifying Arundall with Reynold until I examined the signatures on the pre-printed forms used for these Granville Grants, and found that all four Reynold grantees, including Arundall, signed with an "A" as their mark. I think what happened with the Arundall documents is that the Granville agent who received Reynold's notice of entry and application for a warrant to survey, concatenated the applicant's mark with his signature (written out by a friend), and issued the warrant in a composite name: A-Rundall.