



## United Ancestries

2530 West 4700 South  
Taylors Landing — Suite 5-6  
Taylorsville, Utah 84118  
(801) 966-2323

RESEARCH REPORT (#155620 - OLSEN)  
18 September 1985

Our high hopes concerning the loose chancery court papers in Prince Edward County involving the suit by Frances HOGGETT against the estate of her late husband Anthony HOGGETT have turned sour. Our efforts to locate these papers in the Virginia State Archives, where they should be, have been futile. Our agent indicates that there are no loose papers from Prince Edward County prior to 1773 in the Virginia State Archives. These records were transferred to the Archives on 7-8 July 1981. Our agent even checked with the present clerk of Prince Edward County to make certain the papers were still not in the county, even though the county clerk had previously informed us that they had been transferred to the Archives in Richmond.

Among the possible explanations for the situation are:

1. The county may still have the papers, but be unaware of them.
2. The county may have discarded them prior to 1981.
3. The Archives may have them, but not know it. For example, some of the boxes may have become separated from the others.
4. The papers could have been lost in transit to the Archives.

The first two possibilities would seem the most likely.

Despite this discouraging setback, we have again brought together everything we know, and reanalyzed it from a fresh perspective. In the course of this analysis a number of possibilities, probabilities and questions have resulted. For example, we had previously tentatively said

X794/2

that the Dorothy WHITLOCK who married William TURNER in 1726 in St. Peters Parish was not the widow of James WHITLOCK, the kinsman of Anthony WHITLOCK of Lambeth, Surrey. But was this tentative conclusion a correct one? To discover whether it was, we examined the St. Peter's Parish Register. This register is one of the ten or twelve early episcopal registers still extant in Virginia, and this parish covered what is now New Kent County, a county whose records were burned. In the register we found that a daughter Mary was born to William and Dorothy TURNER on 1 May 1730. Therefore, Dorothy was most likely under 45 years old, meaning she was born after 1685. Thus, she was too young to have been the wife of James WHITLOCK, the kinsman, of Ware Parish, Gloucester County, Virginia. Dorothy (WHITLOCK) TURNER was probably born between 1701 and 1706.

Another question concerning the St. Peters register regards the death record of James WHITLOCK who died in 1716, and Alice WHITLOCK, who died in 1717. Were they adults? Or were they children? In other words, did the form of the death register distinguish between children and adults? If so, how? Examination of other deaths in the record indicates that both Alice and James were most likely adults. When a child died (or possibly even a young unmarried adult) the record seems to state the name of the parent of that individual. Servants and slaves were also specified.

Other questions occur which unfortunately we are unable to answer as adequately. Could Dorothy, who married William TURNER, have been a daughter of James WHITLOCK, the kinsman, by a second wife? We know James was married to a Dorothy based upon land deeds. It was a common practice to give the eldest daughter by a later marriage the given name of the wife who immediately preceded. Thus, could Dorothy be a daughter of James and

Margaret WHITLOCK of Christ Church Parish? If she was, could Margaret be the second wife of James the kinsman? Possibly, but this remains only conjecture.

Another question which occurs is just how many unique James WHITLOCKS were there in Virginia in the 1680-1720 period? There were:

1. A James WHITLOCK, the kinsman, who was of Ware and Petsworth Parishes, Gloucester County. He was married to Dorothy. He gave power of attorney to a Francis HORNE. James was in Gloucester County at least from 1680 to 1693.
2. A James WHITLOCK of Christ Church parish, Middlesex County was married to Margaret. Lived there between 1704 and 1708.
3. James WHITLOCK died St. Peters Parish, 1716.
4. A James WHITLOCK (yours) who lived in St. Paul's Parish from at least 1708 until his death in 1736.

There may have been at least the four distinct James WHITLOCKS above. Could 1 and 2 above have been the same man? Could 2 and 4 above have been the same man? On the basis of sparse evidence available, we cannot say either yes or no with any degree of certainty.

James #2 was still in Christ Church parish as of 2 Aug 1708 when a court action against him by Paul Thilman was dismissed. James #4 did not appear in St. Paul's parish until 24 Sept 1708. Unfortunately, that is the earliest surviving record of the parish. He may have been there earlier.

In 1681/2 James WHITLOCK of Ware Parish (#1) appointed Francis Horne of Sittingbourne parish, Rappahannock County as his true and lawful attorney (gave him power of attorney). A Francis Horne appears in the vestry records of Christ Church parish, Middlesex County in 1710:

On 29 Dec 1710 - Ordered that church wardens agree with a Doctor for cure of Francis Horne.

X794/4

On 7 Jan 1711 - Dr. Baker was paid out of the parish funds for a visit to Francis Horne.

On the same date - James Meecham was paid for a coffin for Fran. Horne. It is obvious from this sequence of events that the ministrations of the good doctor were futile and that Francis Horne died between 29 Dec 1710 and 7 Jan 1711. Death records were kept for the parish in this time period, but there was no Francis Horne recorded in the parish register.

Why does not James WHITLOCK appear in the Christ Church parish register or vestry book after 1708. He may have moved or as in the case of Francis Horne died. Or he may have still lived there for some time after that even though the available records are silent concerning him.

Could James #3 be the same man as either James #1 or James #2 or both? The evidence is not sufficient to reasonably answer the question.

Another possible clue comes from the given name of Jordan WHITLOCK, born 1760, Goochland County, Virginia, son of John and Catharine WHITLOCK. A Katherine WHITLOCK, born 1622, in England married a Thomas JORDAN. Katherine was a daughter of Richard WHITLOCK and Catherine BURCHETT. My feeling is that too many generations intervened (5 or 6) for the name Jordan to suddenly crop up again. Furthermore, the given name Jordan is fairly frequently encountered in colonial Virginia.

In a reconsideration of James WHITLOCK, the kinsman who received the power of attorney from Anthony WHITLOCK of Surrey County, England, several conclusions may be made. First, the surname WHITLOCK ranks in the middle as far as frequency occurrence. It is not one of the most common surnames, nor is it one of the least common. Thus, when a statement is made stating that James is a kinsman, one can be reasonably certain that he was indeed related to Anthony. Anthony was of the

X794/5

Wokingham branch of the WHITLOCKS. Thus, we can safely assume that James WHITLOCK of Gloucester County, Virginia also was descended from the Wokingham branch or a WHITLOCK branch known to have been related to the Wokingham branch.

Furthermore, he was closely enough related to Anthony for Anthony to be aware of it. Now Anthony was a cousin german to Thomas WHITLOCK Jr. of (Old) Rappahannock County, Virginia. And upon the death of Thomas Jr. in about 1678, Anthony was his closest relative, then living. Cousin german means a straight first cousin relationship. According to the civil law, which should have been operative in this case, a first cousin relationship is a relationship of the fourth degree. For James WHITLOCK the kinsman, to be more distantly related, he would have to bear a fifth degree or more relationship to Thomas WHITLOCK, Jr. Reference to the Civil Law Degree of Relationship Chart showing Thomas WHITLOCK, Jr. who died 1678, allows us to draw certain conclusions.

1. Thomas WHITLOCK Jr. was probably just barely of age when he died.
2. He was the only descendant of Thomas WHITLOCK Sr. living in 1671/2.
3. Both of his parents were dead by 1681/2. Thomas Jr. left no descendants.
4. His grandparents and great grandparents were dead by 1681/2.
5. He was survived by the Rowzee brothers and sisters, who bore a step relationship to him.
6. None of his uncles or nephews were living.
7. None of his grand uncles or grandnephews were living.
8. Because Thomas Jr. was so young when he died, we can effectively rule out some of the relationships in the upper portion of the chart (see X marks). James was probably of the same generation as Thomas Jr., or possibly one generation removed.

x794/6

9. Therefore, the most probably relationship of James the kinsman to Thomas, Jr. is encompassed by the following:
  - 2 cousin
  - 3 cousin
  - 1 cousin 1 removed
  - 2 cousin 1 removed
10. But we suspect he was not a first cousin once removed because none of the brothers of Thomas Sr. (1615-1659) were old enough to have a grandson the age of James the kinsman.

It must be realized that conclusion nine may have to be extended somewhat. For I am aware of a similar case involving a New England man as the closest relative to an English gentleman, who died in England. In this case the American relative was a fourth cousin once removed. Thus, a third cousin, third cousin once removed, fourth cousin, or fourth cousin once removed relationship of James the kinsman cannot be ruled out.

Sister Olsen, we have been sustained by your faith and financial support in following your WHITLOCK ancestry back in time several generations over the past twelve years. In the time I have been doing genealogical research (about 21 years) the progress on your WHITLOCK line has been the most miraculous series of circumstances I have ever seen. I believe your faith has been the determining factor in promoting the success which has been obtained.

Based upon the track record of the past twelve years why can't we expect additional miraculous progress? What has happened in the past gives us the hope that it will happen again. I have personally had ambivalent thoughts about continuing. There are times in which I feel that we should not. We have done all that we can with the record resources available to us.

John Frederick Dorman, a very respected Virginia genealogist, has investigated the manuscript sources available in Virginia which might have

X794/7

a bearing on the problem. The problem has been investigated from the viewpoint of tracing the descendants of the Wokingham branch of the WHITLOCK family in England.

All the records available from the burned county areas of Virginia have been examined. We have analyzed the evidence available to us to the best of our ability.

Thus, with ambivalent feelings, I have considered whether we should continue. Might it not be better to let the WHITLOCK line lie fallow, awaiting possible further appearance of records? These are some of the considerations which have flashed through my mind.

After prayerful consideration, it is my recommendation that:

1. We make another attempt to find the chancery court records (loose papers) of Prince Edward County, Virginia.
2. If we are unsuccessful in this, we recommend suspension of research on your WHITLOCK line for one year. At the end of a year we recommend re-evaluation of the research situation.

UNITED ANCESTRIES

Larry L. Piatt  
Genealogist

1-800-828-2171

LLP:jhw