

[Southern Campaign American Revolution Pension Statements and Rosters](#)

Virginia documents pertaining to William Brent VAS2639
Transcribed and annotated by C. Leon Harris.

[The following are from [bounty-land records in the Library of Virginia](#) indexed as Brent, William and Brent, W.]

Daniel Carroll Brent presents to the Executive of Virginia, his claim to 6666 $\frac{2}{3}$ [acres] of Military Lands. 1st William Brent, to whom he is heir at Law, commanded a Regiment, on the State Establishment during the Revolutionary War. This is proven by an Act of Assembly, passed at the October Session 1783 entitled an “Act for surveying the lands given by Law to the Officers & Soldiers on Continental & State establishments & other purposes” where he is recognized as Colonel.

2dly By the certificates of the Surveyor of his entries (annexed);

3dly He presumes, the Auditors Office will furnish more evidence – other evidence can be produced; but he thinks the Act of Assembly is all sufficient.

4thly The certificate of the Clerk of Stafford proves D C Brent to be heir at Law to William Brent. (annexed)

For a further elucidation of his claim he refers to the copy of an Original letter from Maj’r Croghan, the surveyor to him (annexed), also to his certificates of enteries, & his remarks on each. (annexed)

It appears that the enteries of William Brent interfere with Treasury Warrants.

D C. Brent begs leave to observe, that the mistake or neglect of the Legislature (if there be any) ought not to deprive the soldier of his right – he made his location under a confidence of the correctness of their information, & their laws – also, that the State & General Governments have prohibited surveys to be made on those Lands, the one by Law, the other by proclamation. They still exist besides the Indian Title is not yet extinguished.

The claims then of those officers & soldiers who who located on the South West side of the Tennessee remain unsatisfied, & under the circumstances, that have existed, & now exist, could not heretofore, & cannot now be satisfied – no matter what attention may have been paid, by individuals in prosecuting their claims. They were & are prohibited by laws from prosecuting them.

This delay & ruin, to the fortunes, & fair hopes, of many – in every respect injurious. If the Indian Title was extinguished, many, wou’d have to conflict with Treasury warrants, on which many patents have been granted.

It certainly was the intention of the Legislature to give these lands free from other claims; but other claims exist as to those lands reserved for the army, & under their own Laws too, from a misapprehension or perhaps of the Geography of Country, indeed it must be believed to be so. Will then the state place her soldiers in such a dispute? If she does, does she perform her promise?

Again the Indian Title is not extinguished.

In 1783 the war ended (28 years since) ought not lands to be provided somewhere?

These claims remain unsatisfied & the claimants are by authority prohibited from prosecuting or securing their claims. Has the State given her soldiers the lands which she promised & pledged herself to give?

The Indian Title cannot be extinguished, but by the United States, suppose the locators of the lands on the South West side of the Tennessee, or such as choose, transfer their claims, to the United States, & take lands elsewhere. Whenever then, the Indian Title is extinguished, the lands will then belong to Congress. he suggests this idea as the possible of lessening the difficulties with Congress – it ought also to be recollected that Col. Brent & his regiment served to the North, & were in the action at Monmouth. D C Brent hopes that the Executive will State his claim unsatisfied, & that it ought to be satisfied, by lands free difficulty or dispute. He presumes his case to be within the intention of the resolution of the last assembly – on which respectfully submitted. D C Brent/ Nov’r 10th 1811

To his Excellency The Governor of Virginia

Your memorialist the legal representative of Colo. Wm Brent of the Revolutionary War respectfully represent.

That according to a report of Commissioner Smith made to the General Assembly 10th day of December 1835 Doc. No 6 page 77 Colonel Wm. Brent entered the service of the State of Virginia in 1776 as Ensign. Aid de Camp and Major in 1776. Lieutenant Colonel June 14th 1777. Colonel January 1st 1779 – (Supernumerary April 1782 (See return of 2nd State Reg't) Wm Brent Lieut Hanover Regulars received May 13th 1776 a Commission in the 5th Reg't (see guard[?]) of the Committee of Safety; He received his half [pay] for a service to the end of the War. He received also May 31st 1783 6666 $\frac{2}{3}$ acre of Land the allowance of a Colonel for a service of three years.

His heirs are entitled to an additional allowance for his service of 11½ months over 6 years. To which report he most respectfully refers your Excellency. He therefore requests that your Excellency will direct the Register of the Land Office to issue his certificate for the 11½ months

Richmond May 8th 1850

To His Excellency John B. Floyd, Governor of Virginia.

Sir, By reference to House Journal 1835 - 6. Smith's Report Dec. No 6 page 77 you will perceive that Col. Wm. Brent was Commissioned Lieut. 13th May 1776 and received land for three years up to 13th May 1782, and that there is due his heirs 11½ months for a service over six years which carries him to the 28th Apr'l 1783.

By a paper read to me by Mr. Richardson in his office, I understood that the Gov'r. and Council had ordered additional allowance of land to Col. Brent, deducting the time for which he had received land, counting from 1st Aug't 1776 to end of the war. By this, he should receive 8 months and 22 days, if the date of Governor Harrison's Proclamation is the end of the war. But if the 3rd of Nov'r be considered the end of the war then he should receive more. Your Excellency will please correct the error in the order in the Register's office by saying, issue to the end of the war, instead of to the 19th of April 1783, should this, in his opinion, be in accordance with the best evidence in the case.

Very Respectfully/ Your Ob't. Ser't./ Thos. Sangster[?]

March 14th 1850

Mr Faltons[?] advice.

As it appears by his own certificate filed in 1783, that he entered the service in July or Aug't 1776, I advise that he be allowed from 1st Aug't '76 to 19th Ap'l 1783 – i.e. for 8 months and 19 days additional land bounty. I being of opinion that supernumerary officers are entitled to land as well as those in actual service.

Messrs. Daniel and Wiley advise, that this claim for additional land bounty be rejected.

1850 Mar 30

I adopt the advise of Mr Falton[?] and allow land bounty to claimant for the services of Mr Brent as Coln from the 1st of Aug 1776 until the close of the War deducting the amount heretofore allowed him

J B Floyd