	By d.° paid John Dorsey in (79)	8	4	9
	By d.° paid Mencruff	7	7	8
	By difference of buildings as agreed by Wm. Hammond of Baltimore of Hockley forge & Thos. Constable & Leonard Harbaugh of Balt.e Town	587	12	7
	By your part of a bay mare called Queen Mab and her colt	66	6	"
1787 June 14	By one third of the personal estate of Edw.d Norwood as p. Inventory	269	6	4
	By paid the Sheriff for executions fees	2	14	5
	By paid the State of Maryland for principal & Interest for a negro named Cesar	66	2	6
	By paid Berj.n Hall	12	"	10
	By paid Samuel Godman & Sam. Godman W.m	64	16	1
	By paid Wm. Wright balance due him	17	1	4
	By paid James Walker for wintering a Cow	"	17	6
	By paid Stephen Wes[illegible] in June 1780 £195 in continental money reduced @ 60 for 1	3	6	"
		1708	1	4¾

Dr. Wm. Samuel Norwood in a/c w.th Edw.d Norwood Cr.

1787 June 14	To amount of debit brought from folio 2.	1876	1	8¾
		1876	1	8¾
	To the balance p.r contra	168	"	4

Cr.

1787 June 14	By amount credit from folio 2	1708	1	4¾
	By balance due as this day settled	168	"	4
		£ 1876	1	8¾

June 15.th 1787 Settled by us.

Wm. Hammond
Edw.d Gaither
L. Maccubbin Junr.

The above account is a true copy from Bd.r Edw.d Norwoods book, & copied by me. — Thos. Mockbee

I have compared the above acct. with Bd.r Edw.d Norwoods book & find it to be a true copy. — Wm. Hammond Nov.r 12.th 1798. —

1791 June 17 By your part of your father's estate as settled with the Register of Wills 9 yrs. to this date — 94 10 11

whereupon accordingly issued Subpoena and Injunction against the said Samuel Norwood agreeably to the prayer of the said bill. — at which next court to wit. October term seventeen hundred and ninety six, came the Sheriff of Baltimore county and made return of said Subpoena thus endorsed "summoned" and the said Injunction "served". and at the same term came James Winchester esquire of counsel with the defendant and appeared to the said bill. — and at the same term the defendant by his Solicitor filed in court his answer to the said bill in the words following to wit. —

To the Honorable Alexander Contee Hanson Chancellor of Maryland. —

The answer of Samuel Norwood of Baltimore county) to the bill of complaint of Edward Norwood exhibited in this court against him. —

This defendant now and at all times hereafter saving and reserving to himself all and all manner of benefit and advantage of exception to the manifold errors, untruths insufficiencies and imperfections in the said bill of complaint contained, for answer thereunto or to so much thereof as this defendant is advised materially concerns him to make answer unto answereth and saith — That he admits that the said Edward Norwood the father of the Complainant and this defendant devised to them the tract of land called United Friendship and that after his death they entered into and became seized thereof as tenants in common as stated in his bill of complaint. — This defendant further answering saith that he admits a ferry was established by the said Complainant and this defendant on the said land at their joint expence and was carried on for their mutual benefit and the profits accrued jointly between them for several years, but this Defendant denies that a public highway was opened to the same by them and saith that the road now open and used to the said ferry runs thro' this defendants land, and is used by his permission, and not from any establishment thereof by law, —

This Defendant further saith that there never was any ancient road or highway to the said ferry, but the ancient road was considerably above & crossed a ford of patapsco falls & being more indirect and circuitous than that now used was the reason for permitting the present road to be opened. that the apparatus erected as aforesaid at their joint expence for carrying on the said ferry hath long since been consumed and that the boat, rope and appendages now used for carrying on the same were procured at the sole expence of this defendant. and that the wages of labor for carrying on the same ferry hath been defrayed and borne by this defendant at his sole expence since his refusal to permit the said Edward Norwood to participate in the receipt of the profits of the said ferry. — This defendant