

*Answered
Nov 4, 1996*

Peter M. Whitlock
Whitlock Family Newsletter
47644 Forester Rd.
RR 2, Sardis, B.C.
CANADA, V2R 1B1

Mrs. N. W. Lutz (June)
955 Leonard St. N.W.
G.R., MI 49504-4153

Dear Peter:

It's been while since I last wrote to you, what with being retired & spending out winters out west, I don't have as much time for research as I once did & especially the last couple of years - my husband has had 3 serious operations - nothing life-threatening, but serious enough that I have had to take more time helping him, etc. so I have not been keeping up-to-date with your newsletters, well.....I finally got sort of "caught-up" with things & decided this was the time to go through each installment, which are great - you are doing a bank-up uob - only wish I could have gotten into the computer end years ago - but they were non-existent when I started out back in the 1940's, so I am still doing it the "old-fashioned" way & unless I hit the big lotto or sweepstakes, it's going to continue that way, although my son is passing on to me his older computer which is good enough for me & to perhaps hopefully enter/make an index of my 50 yrs. of research.....at any rate, I am now going through your newsletters & in Vol. 14, No. 1, p. 16 - March 1995 I am having some questions about the line of descent on FILE:ML163 - main line of Mark D. Whitlock & even though it is not my line/concern (I see no connection yet to my Virginia line) I have kept some records on Mark's line as found in the book "Historical & Genealogical Miscellany" Vol. V by Stillwell which covers Mark's earliest ancestor - I don't mean to throw a "monkey-wrench" into what you show to be Mark's line, but I am wondering if maybe one or possibly two generations may have been omitted at the beginning - I will begin as follows which is what you show:

- 11. Thomas Whitlock married - ~~AFT. 1640~~ #1 - Susannah Stock
(1620?-1703) in Eng. + BEF. 1655 (-)
- 10. John Whitlock - SR married - AFT. 1665 Mary ??
b- AFT. 1645 (-)
d- AFT. 1726
- 9. John Whitlock - JR married - AFT. 1690 Elizabeth ??
b- AFT. 1670 (-)
d- AFT. 1744

???maybe a missing generation here???? - the above John. SR (10.), his brother William was married 1669 - using 25 yrs. as a generations timeline - William was born prior to 1644 which says to me, that his brother John. SR (10.) had to be born within a reasonable same timeline, so let's say JOHN SR (10.) was born after 1645, this would mean he married after 1665, putting his son (9.) John JR born after 1670 therefore married after 1690 - my contention is that (9.) John JR. was too old to have had the following - continuing as follows:

- 8. James Whitlock m 1769 NJ Jane Kroeson
b- 1742 -
d- 1802

-----in the book named above on p. 397 - it shows (9.) John JR married prior to 1738 (which in my opinion is not possible - unless he married very late) to Elizabeth & they had 2 sons: John (III) d-intestate 1801
James - the DAR says b-cl739, d-1788,
wife Miss Misserroll

neither of these two sons data match up with Mark's chart - somewhere, somehow I think it's possible someone has goofed & left one generation, at least - out - the dates just don't make sense

KVA
3/11

I hope I have made my ideas clear - it's kind of difficult to know how to put into writing when one does not agree - unless you/Mark have proof of the line of descent - & can advise me of same, then I'm all wrong, but I know the DAR has made mistakes on other family trees, even though they take a lot of care in trying to be accurate - make one mistake in print & it snowballs & is almost impossible to correct, but when something just doesn't jibe, I start questioning everything - unless absolute documentation can be established - nothing is absolute til then.....in every book I've had printed (6 to date) I have made sure to show to readers whether something is a "maybe" or a "possible" so there is no question that it has or has not been documented. Many researchers start taking things for granted & in this research one can not do that - that's why I think I have not been able to trace so many of my lines back - for instance, my Whitlock line - I THINK??? my Rosanna Whitlock COULD? be the d/o James and Martha (?) Whitlock who were married c1802 Berkeley Co., VA - the ages are OK, but I don't have anything to prove they had a dau. Rosanna - ~~and~~ but as sure as I am setting here typing this, I really THINK this is possible/probable, but I just cannot assume this as fact, so everytime I get your newsletter I hope someone has contacted you & found what I need to make the documentation, but no luck so far - hopefully one day before my time is up on this earth that documentation will pop up when I least expect it, so I keep hoping.

Well - enough small talk - I hope to complete my examination of all of your newsletters before it's time for us to head west for the winter - I have been so far behind in catching up on my research, I don't think I will ever get it done - who knows how many more years I have or how much longer my health will hold up - only the Good Lord knows that, so for now, I just keep plugging away loving every minute of it. One thing has been bothering me though, what's going to happen to all my research when I'm gone, I have visions of it being thrown in the trash - I always thought I could just have my survivors box everything & shipping off to the LDS in Utah - so I wrote them & the only thing they will be willing to take is if it's in a neat typed/computer manuscript form, well let me tell you - that does not describe my research....it's strictly in the rough with all kinds of penciled in notes, etc. - lots of marked outs, etc, looking like something the cat dragged in - I was just just born 30 years too early - if I could hit the jackpot I could hire me a full office force & buy a good computer & transfer it all into the computer - what a dream world that would be, but alas, I am so computer illiterate, it's pathetic.....well, enough of that, I want to get this in the mail & see if I'm on the right track with Mark's pedigree chart - or all wet???? Hope this finds you in good health - as I said before, you are doing a great job - keep it up,

June