

# THE TIMES DISPATCH

## GENEALOGICAL COLUMN

### WYATT. WYATT FAMILY. OF VIRGINIA.



**Wyatt Family.**  
The patronymic of this very ancient Norman family was formed from the Norman-French diminutive "Guyot," which, in England, of course, became "Wyot," and about the thirteenth or fourteenth century assumed "Wyatt" and "Wyatt."

The family are said to have come into England with William the Conqueror, and rose to prominence with Sir Thomas Wyatt, Earl of Northampton, though the family had begun with Admiral Wyatt (or Wiat, as at first spelled), who had lived seven generations before Sir Thomas. After the execution of the second Sir Thomas, who was beheaded April 11, 1554, his estates and titles were confiscated, and his son, George, became plain Sir George, and after his son, Sir Francis, came to Virginia, the title lapsed entirely. Sir Francis Wyatt was born 1557; he was appointed Governor of the colony, and came over in 1611, being the first Governor under the new ordinance and Constitution enacted by the London Company. Upon his arrival in the colony he organized the first legislative body as the "General Assembly of Virginia." It was during his administration that the terrible Indian massacre occurred in 1622. By the disaffection in the colony, the London Company deposed Sir Francis, but Charles I. took the government of the colony in his own hands, and at once reappointed Sir Francis, who retained the office of Governor until succeeded by Sir John Harvey (or Hervey) in 1630. Owing to the death of his father, Sir George Wyatt, in 1626, Sir Francis returned to England for a short time to settle up his father's affairs, and upon his return to the colony in 1633 he was again appointed Governor and held it until 1641. During this term he made and enforced the first real stringent laws for estab-

lishing and maintaining the Church of England against the dissenters in the colony. Sir Francis married Margaret, the daughter of Sir Samuel Sandys, brother of Sir Edwin Sandys, treasurer of the colony. Sir Francis Wyatt died 1644, leaving no issue, but his brother, the Rev. Hauto (or Hawte) Wyatt, who had settled in New Kent county had four sons and one daughter, from whom the many descendants of the family in Virginia sprang. One of his sons, Henry Wyatt, is mentioned as a vestryman in St. Paul's Parish, New Kent, about the year 1685. One of the grandsons of this Henry was Richard Wyatt, of Louisa county, who served in the Revolutionary army with distinction. He married Nancy Ware, and left a large family. One of his sons, Richard Wyatt, settled in Henrico county; he married Harriet K. Harris, of Hanover, and had children. About 1851 he moved to Albemarle county to give his sons advantage of the University of Virginia, and was made colonel of militia, by which title he was always known. His eldest son, Richard Wyatt, graduated A. M. at Randolph-Macon College, after which both brothers, Richard O. and James Walter, in 1832 entered the University, Richard taking the medical department and James the academic. In 1851 the elder son graduated in medicine. He served with great distinction in the Confederate army as assistant surgeon, but in 1862 he took a sudden cold and died of pneumonia at his home, "Clifton," Albemarle county. His brother, James Walter, after graduating in mathematics, entered the Confederate army as captain of the Albemarle Artillery. He served with great distinction upon many battlefields until January 2, 1861, when at the bloody battle of Cold Harbor he lost his life; at the time he was acting as major, though only twenty-one years of age. He was buried beside his brother, Richard, at the old "Clifton" homestead.

Colonel John S. Mosby, of Confederate fame, is also a direct descendant of the Wyatts, being second cousin of Colonel R. W. Wyatt, of Albemarle; also the descendants of the late John Henry Guy, of Richmond, can lay claim of kinship to the Wyatt family; his mother, who was Anne Wyatt, being daughter of Richard Wyatt and Nancy Ware. Belle Wyatt, daughter of —, married Lieutenant-Governor Willard; she was also cousin of the present Governor Montague, on her mother's side, who was Elizabeth Eubank, whose sister married Governor Montague's father.

Quite an amusing incident can be told of a visit made to Clifton during the war by Colonel Mosby's two sisters, Lella and Virginia Mosby, to see their cousins. While they were there, Sheridan made his celebrated raid through the county and visited Clifton, as everyone might have guessed, and he heard his sisters were there. The report that the "Yanks" were coming, threw the family into great excitement; the little negro

of the place asked the little lady visitors: "Weren't dey 'traid of being swung up to some dose trees, 'cause you's Mars Jack's sisters?" They answered very bravely: "No, indeed." But the next morning when they were really confronted with the Yankee troops, they felt great trepidation. The men spoke to the little ladies, saying they must hurry on, "for fear of Mars's men," not dreaming that they were talking with the sisters of their dead comrade.

The daughters of Colonel R. W. Wyatt were: First, Patty, who married Mr. Woodward; their daughter, Annie, married Mr. E. Lansing Fox, son of the venerable A. P. Fox, who once was a noted merchant of Richmond, under the firm of Breeden and Fox. Mr. Fox now lives and owns the old Wyatt home, "Clifton." The other daughters were: Second, Kate, who married the Rev. Mr. Lea; third, Molly; fourth, Alice, died.

We give the coat-of-arms as furnished by one of the family, being described without colors—"On a shield three wild boars' heads, erased, in chief, and one in base; a spray of blue do-ys, each side and crossed at bottom. Crest—A Unicorn, couchant. Motto—"Honor et Veritas"—Honor and truth.

**The Nicholas Family.**  
By request, we here give something on the Nicholas family, and though we fail to bring it in touch with the peers of England, and cannot produce an escutcheon, yet they were so prominent in the early history of Virginia, and there are so many worthy descendants still among us, that their record cannot be omitted among the giant sons of the old Commonwealth. The name itself is very ancient, even to the fourth century, where we find "St. Nicholas," the archbishop of Myra, who became the patron saint of boys, sailors, parish clerks and even thieves. The name since has assumed many forms, as "Nicol," and "Nikol," from which derive the Nicholls and Nicholson. In England it appeared as Nicholas le Chaper, or Nicholas le Hunt, about the twelfth century, and then to Henri (St. Nicholas), as in the writs of Parliament, until it became generally established as Nicholas without any abbreviations or affixions.

The first of the name in Virginia was Dr. George Nicholas, whose name appears as a vestryman in Bristol Parish in 1722. The date of his emigration is not given, but he first settled at or near Williamsburg, and as he had graduated in England as a physician, he obtained a large practice in the colony, and also in the Revolutionary army. He was the widower of Mr. Burwell, of Gloucester, a descendant of the Carters. Dr. Nicholas had six sons: First, Robert

1715; he became distinguished at the bar of Williamsburg, and in the House of Burgesses; then was sent to the first Virginia House of Delegates, 1777 to 1779; then became judge of Court of Chancery and of Appeals; was treasurer of colony, 1778-1779, and was on Committee of Resolutions for Independence, 1776, and during the Revolution was an intrepid patriot. But, as Bishop Meade says, "above all, he was a zealous Christian and defender of the church of his fathers."

The second son of Dr. George Nicholas was Colonel John Nicholas, who married Martha Fry, daughter of Colonel Joshua Fry. They lived at "Seven Islands," on James River, and were the chief progenitors of the family in Virginia, having nine children. He was clerk of Albemarle county, where the courthouse was at Scottsville. His sons were: First, John C. Nicholas, who went to school to William Fontaine at Union Hill in 1775. He married Miss Carter, of Williamsburg. Second, Robert Carter Nicholas, son of Dr. George Nicholas, was a merchant in the Trenton, Virginia regiment in 1812; was major of Twelfth Infantry, 1813, and Lieutenant-colonel in 1814. He was also charge d'affaires to Naples, and then Secretary of State in Louisiana. He died in Louisville, 1857. Third, George Nicholas, and fourth, Joshua Fry Nicholas, Colonel John Nicholas, it is said, took Dr. George Gilmer, of "Pen Park," Albemarle, all the way to "Seven Islands" in his "chariot" to see his father, who had the gout. This was in 1790, and was considered a wonderful feat, for in those days there were few passable roads, and the "chariot" was a very lumbery and lofty affair. Dr. George Nicholas, first, has several daughters, who have married into families from whom many prominent names there, among them Samuel Smith Nicholas, an eminent lawyer, who died at Louisville in 1829. Robert Carter Nicholas, first son of Dr. George Nicholas, married Miss Marks (niece of Thomas Jefferson); they had, first, Martha Fry, married Philip B. Wynn, of Virginia; second, Mary Fry, married a Martin; third, Nancy, married a Travers; fourth, Maria, married a Travers; fifth, Sophy, married a Morse; sixth, Georgiana; seventh, Dr. Wilson Cary Fry; eighth, Robert Carter Fry; ninth, John Fry Nicholas.

One of the sons of Colonel Robert Carter Nicholas of Hanover county, was Judge Philip Norborne, called after Norborne, Lord Botetourne, who had been his father's friend. He was born at Williamsburg, 1773; was an eminent lawyer for many years was resident of the Parlor many years in Virginia, being the first that was started in the State. He also became judge of General Court of Virginia, 1823, when he held until his death in 1849, which occurred in Richmond, Va. Wilson Cary Nicholas, son of Colonel Robert Carter, and born 1757, was, perhaps, the most eminent of all. He was first a soldier, being an aide-major in the Revolutionary War, and a member for ratifying the Constitution; a senator from 1793-1807, and in House of Representatives from 1807 to 1809; in 1814 he became Governor of Virginia, and remained in office until 1817. He died at Milton, Ohio, 1824. The sons and daughters of his daughter, Jane, and Colonel Thomas Jefferson Randolph, of "Edge Hill," Albemarle, were thirteen in number, as follows: First, Margaret, married, William Ran-

dolph; second, Patsy J., married, J. C. R. Taylor; fourth, Mary B., died an infant; fifth, Mary Buchanan, died unmarried; sixth, Ellen Wayles, married, William B. Harrison, of Upper Brandon, James River, leaving two children; seventh, Maria Jefferson, married, Charles Mason, and had three children; eighth, Caroline Ramsey, unmarried, died, 1902; ninth, Thomas, Jr., married, first, Mary Walker Morley, from whom five children; second, Charlotte, who died young; third, she was killed accidentally, 1870; tenth, Dr. Wilson Cary Nicholas, married, first 1855, Mary Holliday, from whom four children; second, Miss McIntire, of Charlottesville; he is an eminent physician of Charlottesville, Va.; tenth, Jane Nicholas, married, 1856, R. G. H. Keen, and had four children; twelfth, Meriwether Lewis, born at Edge Hill, 1830, died there, 1856; he married Anne Daniel, and had one infant child; thirteenth, Sarah Nicholas, born 1838; was principal of Patapsco Institute, Baltimore; was an authoress; died in Maryland, 1872; many of the children and grandchildren of the above are living in Albemarle, but the celebrated one, Bill Homestead has passed entirely out of the family.

Another of the sons of Dr. George, first, of Williamsburg, was Captain Lewis Valentine Nicholas; he owned and lived at "Alta Vista," on the Green Mountain, Albemarle county; he married Frances Harris; they had four children, as follows: First, Wilson Cary Nicholas (second); second, Cary Ann Nicholas; third, Sarah Nelson Nicholas, who married John Harris Coleman, Jr., son of William Coleman, of Spotsylvania county; fourth, Elizabeth Lindsay (sister of Colonel Reuben Lindsay); of the three daughters of Governor Wilson C. Randolph, one married General Smith, of Baltimore, and one Mr. Patterson, of Baltimore; Judge Philip Norborne Nicholas, married a Miss Spears, of Richmond, from whom three children; fifth, Mary, married a Mr. Nicholas, who married William Bruce, of Maryland, and Elizabeth Boyd Nicholas, all of Richmond. E. C. M.

**Leake Family Again.**  
(Some Corrections and Additions.)  
In the article on Leake family, issue of 14th instant, the writer was led in error by a member of the family, in saying, "Captain Walter Leake commanded the Civil War." Captain Leake raised a company called "The True Artillery," which was sent to, and saw service in, the department of South Carolina, Georgia and Florida. Lieutenant A. K. Leake was also in the company, but afterwards was made ordnance officer in the Army of Northern Virginia. He was captured by the Confederate General, Julian Hardee, who commanded the "Goodland Light Division" through the war. It may be, as well, inserted by many of the Leake family, that the late War Leake has become extinct as a name, and that the name of Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time. It is true that many Leake families may seem to be of that name, but they do not claim and have no right to do so. The name Leake is now only to be found in the name of Leake, who had married the daughter of Sir John Rich, of that name, and that the Virginia descendants could not claim to be of that name, as the name was not in the family at that time.