

Subject:Re: Whitelocks of Md  
From:dmwhitlockmd@comcast.net  
Date:Sat, 29 Mar 2008 03:16:24 +0000  
To:whitlock@one-name.org

X6536/1

Great.

First things first. If you're in Hawaii still, stop reading! Have a wonderful time and digest this stuff later! :)

Anyway, I will attempt to plead my case. Please feel free to "counter" with anything to the contrary or on points that I fail to reinforce. You may even bring light to details still dark to my eyes.

First things, first. You can change my name to be spelled correctly from Dwain to Duane :)

My three children are Kristlyn Rae, Brandt Nathan, and Pearce Mitchell Whitlock. My first wife Kim Hong Thuy Kennedy died on May 7, 2005. I will be marrying Lindsay Ann Sollenberger in 2 months!

Now for the details and the evidence to defend myself. There were two Charles Whitelocks (actually probably more) who lived during that time and the two families are being horribly "intermingled" by those researchers before me. Charles Whitelock and Hannah Gray were married in Holy Trinity (Old Swedes) Church on April 6, 1772. I can provide a copy of that citation, if you want. Attachment #1 is the letter from that church. I agree with your current WHIT57 file.

I have great curiosity where the information from their children comes from. I have never been able to find their sources! Then again, I'm not a genealogist. I'm an ophthalmologist with a curiosity about my past.

I will assume that Charles stayed with Hannah until 1786. I can't prove it, but I have a copy of Charles' petition for divorce from Hannah, actually available on the Delaware website here:

<http://archives.delaware.gov/exhibits/document/petitions/petitions/petitions-50.shtml#ToPage>

Let me know if the link doesn't work. There are two pages that describe her infidelity and his desire to divorce her. This is dated in 1786.

Next piece of important information is already cited in your WHIT57 file. Under Charles and Hannah, Ann Whitelock is about a page or so down listed as a daughter. They reference The Chancery Court Case of 1814, which I also have a copy and your WHIT57 file quotes it precisely as written. Unfortunately, this court case is referring to a \*different\* Charles Whitelock. You can't take the information from this court case and apply it to the Charles Whitelock that married Hannah Gray. The following things were taken from this court case and applied wrongly in your WHIT57 file:

1. Charles' death is listed before Jul 1814, from this court case. I don't have any information on Charles' death (Hannah Gray's husband). I do have the other Charles' information (see below)

X6536/2

2. Ann Whitelock is listed as a child of this Charles. Isaac and George may be descendants, but I can't prove or disprove that point, but Ann certainly is \*not\*.

Further on down, listed as "likely related to this family", you mention a Charles of b.? 1705, married to a Jane Welsh and having a son James born in ?1735. \*THIS\* is the family that I am discussing and linking this family to the Charles Whitelock and Hannah Gray hasn't been proven to my knowledge. I don't want to overwhelm you, so I'll say that if you're interested, I can provide the documentation to support the belief that the Charles Whitelock of 1705 did indeed marry Jane Welsh, had three sons, James, Edward, and Charles (only James is shown in your WHIT57) and that \*this\* Charles is the one that is being confused with the one that is married to Hannah Gray. I will fully admit that there is evidence for a third Charles Whitelock as well, a son of James (b.1735?) as your lineage describes, so all the details aren't perfectly worked out yet.

Again, I'm getting off track. I'm after proving that the Chancery Court Record of 1814 refers to a different Charles Whitelock than the one that married Hannah Gray. Let me give you a scanned image of the first page of the Chancery Court record (attachment #2). I apologize but the old scripts are too big for my scanner. If I succeed in convincing you, I will gladly fax pieces of the entire page that you could cut and paste together.

The court record of 1814 is John and Charles vs their sister Elizabeth and her husband William Cowden. All of the children of this particular Charles Whitelock are listed on the first page. Their spouses are listed in the first paragraph (see my underlining?) and the actual children are listed as descendants of the deceased in the second paragraph. They are: John Whitelock, Charles Whitelock, Susan Whitelock (Teal), Anne Whitelock (now Victor--see how this proves we're talking about the same Anne as in your WHIT57 file?), Elizabeth Whitelock (now Cowden), Rebecca Whitelock (now Dashiele), Elisha Whitelock, Samuel Whitelock, and James Whitelock (who died young). I have spouse and marriage dates for most of these siblings as well as indentures with their names proving their relationship as confirmed by this particular page. On a different page, the two husbands (Touchstone and Victor) of Anne Whitelock are ! mention ed exactly as quoted on your WHIT57 file.

What is really exciting is the Chancery Court Case of 1803, which you may not have known about. It is the same family, and here we have Anne Touchstone filing a complaint against Charles and John Whitelock for her share that is due from her father's estate (her 1/9th share). Interestingly, there is a two page tirade on the debauchery of her husband Sampson Touchstone made by Anne Touchstone (Whitelock). Details of their marriage, loss of two children at a young age, and him leaving her to go live in Harford County, MD are described. However, the page that I scanned demonstrates that the phrases, "Charles Whitelock, father of the complaintant and these defendants" and that he died "in the month of August, 1802". (We get the exact date later....Aug 2, 1802 is Charles' date of death.) This 1803 Court Case solidifies the connections between Anne Whitelock, Charles Whitelock Sr ! (decea sed)

and her two oldest brothers John and Charles Whitelock, administrators for their father's estate.

Next, I found amongst the digitalized land records of Baltimore County (on the MDLANDREC.net website where all of Maryland indentures are digitalized) the proof that I needed. Trying to be selective here, I scanned the first three pages of what I have. It is an indenture and a letter and please refer to the second page, although if you notice, this is clearly the same family as the Chancery case of 1814. Please look at page 2: "she is the Daughter of Charles Whitelock and Susanna his wife late of Cecil County" and on the next page, Susanna is shown to be the sister of Samuel Emmitt clearly documenting a different maternal lineage (interestingly, he's the founder of Emmitsburg, MD...I have some of that stuff, too!) .

So clearly, Anne Whitelock is NOT the daughter of Hannah Gray. If Charles Whitelock #1 married Hannah Gray in 1772 and divorced her in 1786, assuming they stayed together during this time, then it would be highly unlikely that Anne Whitelock would be his daughter by a different woman. Possible, but very, very unlikely.

Ok, reading back through this, it all makes perfect sense to me. But have I confused you? If I haven't, what further evidence do you want/need? Would you like copies of anything else to support this? I think without the information provided to you, it would be VERY VERY easy to confuse the Charles Whitelocks of Cecil County. In fact, I have spent an incredible amount of time dissecting the land records and figuring out which indentures and facts fit to which Charles Whitelocks. I wish all of the data fit perfectly, but its close. Charles Whitelock #1 probably stayed in Delaware, though I'm not sure. Charles Whitelock #2 owned and sold property in Baltimore and Cecil Counties. I have an indenture from his mother Jane Welsh to him (1767) giving him property that is later being divided up among his children, but I didn't attach it.

Why am I so deep into this family? Because I really want to connect my family to ANY one of these Whitelock families, but I can't. You see, I am a descendant of James H. Whitlock, husband of Susan A. Price, exactly as your WHIT57 files demonstrates. James H. Whitlock had two siblings, John Whitlock, and Louisa Whitlock (married William A. Norris of DE) and their father was a Samuel Whitelock. You should add Samuel Whitelock to your WHIT57 file as the father. He had these three children with an unknown first wife, and then three more children with a second wife he married in 1825, actually, a neighbor's widow. This is NOT the same Samuel Whitelock listed in the Chancery Case above (absolutely sure of it) and I can't seem to find ANY Samuel Whitelock ANYWHERE. I think he was dropped off in Cecil County around the year 1790 or so by Martians. Anyway, I have all of his land records and he sold and bought quite a bit of land in the early 1800s, but I can't find any other information on him. His children divide his land up after his death in 1833. It is very, very frustrating and I keep waiting for my big break.

X6536/4

And so in my efforts to link up, I have searched and detailed the Whitelock of Cecil County and Baltimore County extensively during \*that\* time period. If you have ANY knowledge of a Samuel Whitelock, with children Louisa (b .1810), John (b. abt 1813) and James (b. 1815), please let me know.

Finally, I can send supporting indentures and administration data on Samuel Whitlock if needed. Interestingly, all of \*my\* Samuel's last names are spelled "Whitlock" in the old papers, while these other families are all "Whitelock". But I'm sure I'm related somehow. Somebody, somewhere, must have the data that I seek. (Wish me luck!)

Thank you again for your time,  
I hope your vacation in Hawaii was enjoyable,  
And I patiently await your reply as your digestion (or indigestion) of this e-mail.

Duane Whitlock

Subject:Re: Whitelocks of Md  
From:dmwhitlockmd@comcast.net  
Date:Sat, 29 Mar 2008 12:51:31 +0000  
To:whitlock@one-name.org

X6536/5

I apologize, but there was a mistake in my last letter. Samuel Whitlock's first three children were Louisa born 1805, John born 1810 and James H. born 1813. I gave you the wrong dates and that's what happens when you go by memory.

Thanks,  
Duane

W57

WDU12/WRR214