Daniel Fore and Mary Fore Cheatwood

Two parents restored to the Fore-Cosby branch

Daniel Fore / Faure (#1182, A) and Mary Fore Cheatwood (#1183, B+) are the parents of Elizabeth Fore (Ford / Foard) Cosby (#591). Their addition brings the register from 217 to 219 unique direct ancestors and from 247 to 249 occupied ancestral positions. Each is a new person with one position. Generations 0-20 and all military classifications remain unchanged.

The decisive source is an estate dispute preserved among the Goochland County chancery papers: Daniel Fore v. Samuel Cosby, 075-1784-004. The 26 digital scans include pleadings, depositions, commissions, endorsements and reverse sides. They are not 26 separate witness statements.

The younger Daniel sought property from his deceased father’s estate. Samuel Cosby disputed the claim but agreed on the father, the five children and his own marriage to Elizabeth. Mary Burton’s testimony and Matthias Cheatwood’s deposition place Mary within the same family across her two marriages.

The case preserves the names of enslaved people whose lives and families were treated as estate property. Bob, Hannah, Sam, Aggy, Nancy and Ceasar appear in the papers. Similar names in other transactions must be matched by evidence, not assumed to identify the same person.

Daniel: fatherhood proof - p.1570

Mary: correlated maternity proof - p.1571

Checked manuscript excerpts - pp.1572-1573

Chronology and corrections - p.1574

Source inventory and descent - pp.1575-1576

Complete 26-scan original case - pp.1577-1602

Daniel Fore / Faure

#1182 | Generation 10 | Eighth-great-grandfather | A

Biological father of Elizabeth Fore (Ford / Foard) Cosby (#591)

Daniel Fore, formerly of Henrico County, made a will dated 15 January 1740 (Old Style; 1740/41). The original will itself was not recovered here; its terms are recited in the plaintiff's bill and admitted in Samuel Cosby's sworn answer, 16 September 1782.

Both sides name five children: Daniel, Richard, Mary, Frances and Elizabeth. Samuel Cosby expressly says that John Morrissett married Frances and that he, the defendant, married Elizabeth. Mary Burton calls Mrs. Cosby her sister and Daniel and Richard her brothers.

The opposing parties disagree about estate distribution, payment and Daniel the younger's residence, but not about the children or Elizabeth's marriage. Fatherhood of Elizabeth is supported at Grade A.

The reported identification with an unnamed child aboard Mary and Anne in 1700 is not established by this case. No arrival date, French birthplace, earlier parent or military status is added.

Identity correlation: the controlling Douglas Register entry names Samuel Cosbie and Elizabeth Ford as Mary Cosby's parents. The local chancery answer names Samuel Cosby's deceased wife Elizabeth Fore. The matching couple, locality, chronology and recorded surname variants identify the same family. The separate 1790 deed and 1796 hiring account are not required to manufacture a direct maternal statement.

Citation: Library of Virginia, Goochland County Chancery Causes, 075-1784-004, scans 2, 5-6, 8 and 17. Original digitized court papers inspected 15 November 2026.

Open the checked testimony and citations

Mary Fore Cheatwood

#1183 | Generation 10 | Eighth-great-grandmother | B+

Biological mother of Elizabeth Fore (Ford / Foard) Cosby (#591)

Mary is the wife named in Daniel Fore's recited will. Following his death she married Matthias Cheatwood / Chitwood, approximately 1741, based on Mary Burton's recollection forty-two years later.

Mary Burton's sworn deposition, read as 14 August 1783, says Matthias married her mother and calls the defendant's deceased wife her sister Mrs. Cosby. The answer calls Frances and Elizabeth the two younger sisters. Matthias's 19 June 1784 deposition names Mary as his wife and describes their rights under Daniel Fore's will.

The combined widow, remarriage, sibling, birth-order and estate evidence identifies Mary as Elizabeth's biological mother at B+. This is a correlated conclusion, not a direct statement that Elizabeth was Mary's daughter.

A stepmother or half-sibling scenario is logically possible, but no competing wife or distinct maternal household is identified in this case. The repeated family testimony supports the coherent single-mother reconstruction. The unverified 1736 deed allegation is not treated as inspected evidence, and the case does not mathematically exclude every hypothetical intervening marriage.

Mary Fore Cheatwood is distinct from her daughter Mary Burton. No maiden surname or parents are supplied. Matthias recalled a conveyance with Mary eight to ten years before June 1784, supporting her presence approximately 1774-1776, not a precise death date.

Citation: Library of Virginia, Goochland County Chancery Causes, 075-1784-004, scans 2, 5-6, 12 and 17. Original digitized court papers inspected 15 November 2026.

Open the checked testimony and citations

Checked manuscript excerpts: fatherhood

Reading convention

These are selected reading transcriptions, not a complete diplomatic transcription. Spelling is retained where readable; line breaks are normalized. Ellipses mark omitted text. Brackets identify editorial clarification. Scan numbers follow the repository sequence.

Scan 2 - plaintiff’s bill, will recital

“his last Will and Testament bearing Date the 15 January 1740” ... “his dearly beloved Wife Mary” ... “his Children (your Orator Daniel, Richard, Mary, Frances and Elizabeth Fore)”

Scan 5 - Samuel Cosby’s answer

“his Children Daniel Fore the Complt. Richard Fore Mary Fore, Frances Fore, & Elizabeth Fore”

Scan 6 - Samuel’s marriage and the younger sisters

“the two younger Sisters Frances & Elizabeth” ... “John Morrissett who married Frances & this Defendant who married Elizabeth”

Scan 8 - Archibald Cary, 11 August 1783

“a Certain Daniel Fore Decd. whose Widow had Intermarryed with a Mathias Chitwood” ... “Gaurdian to the Younger Children”

The answer was sworn on 16 September 1782. Both sides agree on Elizabeth’s place among the deceased Daniel’s children; Samuel identifies her as his own wife. Cary independently confirms the widow’s remarriage and the younger children’s estate proceedings. Cary also acknowledges the limits of his memory. No explicit filiation is inferred from a catalogue description alone.

Original scan 2 - master p.1578

Original scan 5 - master p.1581

Original scan 6 - master p.1582

Original scan 8 - master p.1584

Checked manuscript excerpts: maternity

Scan 17 - Mary Burton, 14 August 1783

“she thinks it is forty two years Since Matthias Cheatwood Married her Mother, that her Brother Richard died about thirty seven years ago. and that her Brother Daniel the Plaintiff lived with his Father at the time of his Death that he was in this State at the time that her Sister Mrs Cosby the Defendants wife died”

Mary further says that Bob, Hannah, Sam and Aggy were left with Matthias after John Morrissett and Samuel Cosby received their respective shares. She describes Matthias as the plaintiff’s “Father in law,” used in this family context for his stepfather. The deposition also places Daniel the younger in Virginia for ten or twelve years after his father’s death.

Scan 12 - Matthias Chitwood, 19 June 1784

“this Deponent together with Mary his Wife past all their Right and Title to a number of Slaves which they held under the Will of Danl. Fore the Testator to the Complainant Daniel Fore”

Matthias estimates that transaction at eight to ten years before his deposition. He also describes payment to Daniel for his paternal share after Richard’s death. These statements connect the named Mary to the same estate and remarried household.

What the wording establishes

Mary Burton explicitly identifies her own mother and her sister Mrs. Cosby. The biological maternity of Elizabeth follows by correlation with the named widow, the younger-sister description and the shared family estate. “Sister” alone does not exclude a half-sister. The conclusion is B+, with the precise reasoning and remaining limits preserved on p.1571.

Original Matthias deposition - p.1588

Original Mary Burton deposition - p.1593

Chronology and report reconciliation

15 January 1740/41

Daniel's will date appears as 15 January 1740 in both pleadings. The dual year is the conventional Old Style interpretation; it is not his death date.

About 1741

Mary's marriage to Matthias is reconstructed from Mary Burton's approximately forty-two-year recollection in 1783.

About 1746

Richard's death is reconstructed from Mary Burton's approximately thirty-seven-year recollection. Neither estimate is an exact vital date.

26 January 1765

Samuel's answer recites a compromise agreement with Matthias. The earlier will's provisions and later compromises must not be conflated.

16 September 1782

Samuel Cosby's sworn answer names Elizabeth and identifies himself as her husband.

11 and 14 August 1783

Cary's deposition is dated 11 August; Mary Burton's is read as 14 August. The earlier report's 12 August reading is corrected.

19 June 1784

Matthias gives his age as about sixty-two and names Mary as his wife. His statement about their earlier conveyance supports her presence roughly 1774-1776.

1784 disposition

The answer's endorsement records dismissal at the plaintiff's costs. The dispute concerned entitlement and settlement; dismissal is not a rejection of the agreed family relationships.

Corrections and limits

The supplied rebuttal overstates "zero stepmother gap." The original case supports B+ by correlation, not absolute exclusion. The alleged 1736 deed, a 1700 passenger identity and the exact identity of Bob across later transactions remain separate matters. No uninspected deed is presented as an inspected manuscript. The original 1740/41 will is not reproduced as though recovered; the preserved records are later court recitals.

Source inventory and archival access

Controlling source

Library of Virginia, Goochland County (Virginia), Chancery Causes, 075-1784-004, Daniel Fore v. Samuel Cosby. Complete digital sequence: 26 scans. Downloaded from the repository's case viewer on 15 November 2026. Each preserved PDF has a SHA-256 entry in the source manifest.

https://old.lva.virginia.gov/chancery/full_case_detail.asp?CFN=075-1784-004

Scans 1: Repository target card.

Scans 2-4: Bill of complaint and docket endorsement.

Scans 5-7: Answer, oath and court endorsement.

Scans 8-9: Archibald Cary deposition and reverse.

Scans 10-11: Deposition commission and reverse.

Scans 12: Matthias Chitwood deposition.

Scans 13-14: Joseph Cabell correspondence about representation and the suit.

Scans 15-16: Commission to take testimony and reverse.

Scans 17-18: Mary Burton deposition and reverse.

Scans 19-24: Further commissions, returns and endorsements.

Scans 25-26: Process and continuing docket endorsements.

The complete case follows in repository order. The original-resolution PDFs are also preserved as a separate 26-page source file and as individual downloads. The supplied Hidden Crown report is retained as an attachment, with this checked source review controlling the corrections.

Other inspected context: Goochland 075-1796-017, scan 3 (affidavits, 15 January 1796) and scan 7 (1784-1786 William Bowman hiring account), confirms a Cosby-Bowman transaction network. Those pages do not themselves say "son-in-law"; no such quotation is attributed to them.

The complete route and count reconciliation

The checked direct route

#1 Clark Hollin Tucker

#2 Olis Creed Tucker Jr.

#4 Olis Creed Tucker Sr.

#9 Grace Hollingshead

#18 Samuel Hollingshead

#36 James Whitten Hollingshead

#73 Louisa Young Hollingshead

#147 Elizabeth Bowman Young

#295 Mary Cosby Bowman

#591 Elizabeth Fore (Ford / Foard) Cosby

#1182 Daniel Fore / Faure (father, A) #1183 Mary Fore Cheatwood (mother, B+)

Arithmetic and preservation

591 × 2 = 1182; 591 × 2 + 1 = 1183. Both parents are Generation 10. Neither ID nor either position exists in the November 14 admitted register. No repeated route is added for these two people. The existing Bacon/Wythe pedigree-collapse routes retain their established numbers.

217 + 2 = 219 unique direct ancestors. 247 + 2 = 249 ancestral positions. Including Clark: 220 people and 250 positions. The new master preserves the previous evidence-page sequence; this dossier begins after the original 1,568 pages. Updated front matter, register, index and the reconciled p.663 replace current navigational summaries, with prior versions retained in an embedded history file.

No existing ancestor is removed or downgraded. Ten Revolutionary Patriots and all established service colors are unchanged. The Huguenot setting is retained without promoting an unproved passenger-list identity or earlier generation.