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From the Committee...

by Paul Howes, Guild Chairman

I am writing this in the great state of North Carolina just a few days before the US holiday of Thanksgiving, when Americans give thanks to the Almighty for the bounty bestowed upon this country. Some may see the holiday’s roots in the British or Dutch traditions of harvest festivals. Others see in it a deeper significance of the benefit of private property rights upon the productivity of this land.

Whichever is the ultimate truth, it is certainly true that the early American pilgrims shared a feast with native Indians some time around the year of 1621.

Today, the celebration of Thanksgiving is frequently marked by a strong element of altruism, with the more fortunate among us sharing with the less fortunate, sometimes by preparing and serving food to the homeless, sometimes by providing the money. Some give directly. Others indirectly. And still others enjoy a holiday with their family, one of the very few times during the year when everyone can find the time to meet together.

You will not be surprised to learn that I see huge parallels with the Guild! Some work hard for the benefit of others. Some do what they can, others enjoy the fruits, and all of that is fine. Everyone’s at a different stage of life with different demands upon their time. Some can give today. Others cannot. Some gave in the past. Others haven’t but might in the future. Some don’t want to give at all. Not a problem for anyone as long as there is a net “give”.

Before I go any further, let me say a big THANK YOU to all our volunteers, many of whom do not have a formal post at all. We could not do all we do without you.

My plea is, “Please would you give some thought to serving the public and your fellow genealogists by taking some part in the affairs of the Guild?” We have a wide range of tasks needing to be done, from running our website and thinking about how it might develop, to helping organize seminars, helping others start out on the study of their own surnames, to managing the affairs of the Guild as a trustee, to helping us stay the right side of the law when it comes to managing our own data, to transcribing data, to managing one of our social media platforms, and so on.

Please take a look at the attachment which came with the Journal or which was linked in my newsletter. Do you have experience in IT, in HR, in finance, in event management, in secretarial skills or in organizational management? Do you enjoy helping others, and/or could you spare a few hours to transcribe, or to help other members in your local area? If any of the above, would you please look through the attachments to see whether you might be able to help with the operation of the Guild? Pretty please?!

Don’t worry at all if there is someone already doing a job which you quite like the sound of! Maybe two heads are better than one, or maybe they’ve been waiting for someone else to step forward before relinquishing their post and maybe they’d be happy to train their successor.

If you aren’t quite sure, please do contact myself at chairman@one-name.org or Peter Hagger, our volunteers co-ordinator, at volunteers@one-name.org. Either of us would be very happy to talk confidentially with anyone considering helping. Please note too that this is the very last time that we can lean upon Peter to perform this role for us. He gives up his role as Volunteers Co-ordinator for us as of our AGM in April. Being a Volunteer Co-ordinator is a bit like an HR manager role. Is there anyone with similar experience who might step forward to help us, please?

Two or three direct pleas too:

• our committee has been under full strength for two years now. Before we stepped forward, each of us was an ordinary member, just like everyone else. We would really appreciate it if more people would volunteer to help as trustees, and I know I speak for all of our current committee when I say we would dearly like an election this year. It would be the first for three years!

• I’ve personally been doing a poor job as our Education Officer. While many of us are individually helping others understand the study of surnames, through our own studies, our websites and/or our speaking engagements, I’m certain there is more we can do.

• I would say the same thing about Sales Manager too. We know we can no longer sell books and software. So this position needs some thought as to how we can raise money for the Guild beyond our subscriptions to keep our annual fees down.

Basically, our Guild needs you, please! Can you help? Thanks in advance for giving it some thought.
Marriage Challenge Update: Challenges in Essex

by Peter Copsey MCG
(Marriage Challenge Coordinator, Member 1522)

As many of you are aware, I am an Essex man. I live within very easy reach of Chelmsford Record Office and most of my Marriage Challenges (all but one, in fact) have been for Essex Registration Districts (RDs). My present Challenge is for Halstead RD. I am doing Halstead for the first time; different from those I have completed in the last few years which have all been repeats of Challenges done before. I started Halstead in September. To date, my progress has been minimal but I am expecting to be able to spend more time on it in the New Year.

Essex registers have been digitised but images are not on any of the commercial sites. Essex Record Office have set up their own system of providing register images for public view. It is called Essex Archives Online, previously called SEAX, and still referred to within the Record Office as SEAX. It is subscription based and you can purchase a subscription period ranging from one day (£10) to one year (£85). You can search SEAX without subscription to explore their holdings.

Although digitised, none of the information of the marriage entries has been transcribed. No index to brides’ or grooms’ surnames is available. This is unlike Ancestry or Findmypast where indexes can be searched to find a marriage, making a Marriage Challenge unnecessary. For Essex, a Challenger has to look at the digitised images, one after the next, one church after the next, until the marriages are found.

For a Marriage Challenge in Essex, I am torn between purchasing one-day subscriptions or visiting the Record Office. I usually choose a mixture of both. Either I spend 12 hours on SEAX within a 24-hour period on my home computer, or I visit the record office on a Tuesday (the late-closing day) and spend much of 10:00am to 8:00pm with eyes glued to the monitor. But some visits to the Record Office are important. The non-conformist registers have not been digitised and it is generally necessary to view the original deposited registers. Occasionally a parish church’s records have not been deposited and not digitised. For these parishes, an un-digitised transcript is occasionally available or the un-digitised banns registers could be examined.

For a Marriage Challenge in Essex, I am torn between purchasing one-day subscriptions or visiting the Record Office. I usually choose a mixture of both. Either I spend 12 hours on SEAX within a 24-hour period on my home computer, or I visit the record office on a Tuesday (the late-closing day) and spend much of 10:00am to 8:00pm with eyes glued to the monitor.

But some visits to the Record Office are important. The non-conformist registers have not been digitised and it is generally necessary to view the original deposited registers. Occasionally a parish church’s records have not been deposited and not digitised. For these parishes, an un-digitised transcript is occasionally available or the un-digitised banns registers could be examined.

There is a possibility of change at Essex Record Office which now holds the Superintending Registrar’s copies of all birth, marriage and death registers for Essex, except those of the unitary authority areas of Southend-on Sea and Thurrock. They are not allowed to digitise them at present and can only issue copies of register entries which are endorsed by a Registrar.

The General Record Office (GRO) is now making available to the public digitised PDF copies of birth and death certificates (see separate article in this Journal). Perhaps it is only a matter of time before Essex Record Office will be given permission to allow a general search of Registrar’s registers or even permission to digitise them.

There is only one Marriage Challenge that begins in the coming months, listed below. All members are encouraged to send their requests to the Challenger by email. Send the listing extracted from the GRO Marriage index (FreeBMD will give all of them) for the named Registration District between the years given (Year, Quarter, Surname, First names, Full GRO reference). Challengers will search for and often find your marriages in the deposited church registers and then send you the full particulars.

The key in the last column is:

A. Requests must be sent using the standard “requests.xls” spreadsheet on the MC web-page (exceptions - those without computer or without MS Excel);

B. Requests using the standard Excel template are much preferred, but willing to accept other formats;

C. Requests sent in any form accepted.

Being a Challenger is rewarding and enjoyable and you will be helping your fellow Guild members with their studies. You can share the task with a friend or another Guild member. If you think you could become a Challenger, I look forward to hearing from you. Contact me, the Marriage Challenge Coordinator, on marriage-challenge@one-name.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration District and Period</th>
<th>Request Deadline</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
<th>Challenger’s email</th>
<th>Key (see above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hartley Wintney 1837-1911</td>
<td>23 Jan 2017</td>
<td>Shirley Forster</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elwick@one-name.org">elwick@one-name.org</a></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To commemorate the centenary of World War 1, in 2014, the Guild has a special website at www1.one-name.org where members stories about the life and service of their WW1 ancestors are recorded.

In Flanders fields the poppies blow Between the crosses, row on row, That mark our place; and in the sky The larks, still bravely singing, fly Scarce heard amid the guns below.

In Flanders Fields by John McCrae, May 1915
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Search Family Tree DNA
In the last issue we briefly covered the information you can uncover from the Project Search at Family Tree DNA. This tool has two primary functions. The search is used to determine how many have tested with your surname and if a project exists. This is the first step for those that want a DNA Project.

The Project Search then has an ongoing role when you have a DNA project. It enables you to determine how many with a surname have tested, and you subtract how many with the surname are in your project. The result is how many are in the main database and not in your project. Every six months you can prepare an invitation for those in the database who have tested to invite them to join your project.

Increase your Project participants with Invitations to Join Your Project
It is usually easier to get people already tested to join your project, than recruiting people to test.

The invitation step is easy, and I am always surprised when I search on a Guild registered surname, to see many more in the database than are in a project, yet I haven’t received an Invitation from the project administrator. These persons in the database and not in the project are participants that are usually easy to secure and help you grow your project.

How Project Search Works
Based on questions received this quarter, the Project Search is often confusing. Therefore, in this article we will cover the search in more detail with examples, so the information can be properly interpreted. Then you can easily determine when you need to send an Invite to get people in the database to join your project.

Here is the URL where you search. Use the search box on the right labeled Project Search. The Search box at the top of the page is different.

https://www.familytreedna.com/surname-search-results.aspx?

In Figure 1 we show the results for a search on the surname Brockett. The search results says that there are thirty-five persons with the Brockett surname in the database, and the Brockett surname is included in the Brockett DNA Project. This project has twenty-seven members.

In most cases there should only be one Surname Project listed. A project gets listed if the surname being searched is in the Project Profile for the project. The Project Profile is where you list all the surnames included in the project. The projects are listed because the surname is in the Project Profile, regardless of whether anyone with the surname has tested and is in the project. This distinction is important.

The number tested and in the database, thirty-five, may be male or female. Historically, most participants were male taking a Y-DNA test, and some females taking an mtDNA test. The female component of the database was significantly smaller than the male component of the database. With the advent of the Family Finder autosomal test, many more females are taking this test and are in the database. These females, if they have your surname of interest, would have acquired it from birth or marriage. Therefore the females have value to help you reach out to a male to test Y-DNA for your Surname Project.

We can’t assume that the twenty-seven members in the Brockett Project have the Brockett surname. Most likely they wouldn’t all have the surname, and some will have a variant surname(s). In addition, some members could be females who did a Family Finder test and have a Brockett in their tree. The project may also have some guests, such as friends or relatives with other surnames who tested.

The next step is to determine the surnames of participants in the Brockett project. This is done by looking at the Member Information report, found under the Member Reports selection on the menu bar in the project management system (GAP). Only the project administrator(s) can access this page.

If you are not the project administrator, and you want a rough idea of the number tested with the surname in a project, your best approach is to look at the Y-DNA results page and mtDNA results page, and count up the surnames. Most projects display the surname. Some projects may not display the mtDNA results. Family Finder results do not display.
Adrian Brockett is the Guild member with the Brockett surname registered, and he is the Project Administrator of the Brockett Surname Project. He provided access to his project for this article.

In another month, Adrian is due to send out another Invitation to join his project. You repeat this process every six months because there are new persons in the main database, and not everyone will respond to an Invitation. Some may never respond. Some may not get the email. Some need multiple contacts to take action.

Determining the count for an Invitation
On the Member Information report, counting up the participants by surname shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brockett</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocket</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackett</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total of twenty-seven matches the count for participants provided by Family Tree DNA with the Project Search, so we have confirmed the accuracy of our surname count.

The surnames in the Brockett DNA Project are: Brocket, Brockett, and Brockette.

Therefore:

Line 2 of the chart says that there thirty-five Brockett in the database and twenty-four Brockett in the project. Therefore, there are eleven Brocketts who have tested who are not in the project. It is important to get them to join the project, to have access to their results and family tree information. For the females, they can help recruit a male from their family tree for a Y-DNA test. These females have taken a DNA test, so they can help erase any fears a prospective participant may have.

A sample invitation and the process to submit it is in your Getting Started email, step 7. It is also covered in the Journal issue for April 2016, on page 7.

Every six months, do the exercise to determine the count of those in the main database with your surname(s) and compare this to the surname count in your DNA Project. If there are any in the main database who are not in your project, prepare the Invitation, and send it to me. This is a special service from Family Tree DNA for Guild members only.

If Adrian is successful in getting these twelve persons to join his project, he has increased his participants by 44%. And depending on what trees they represent, there could be some interesting discoveries. All without convincing someone to test – they already have tested!

Search Results Examples
In Figure 2, only one person with the surname has tested, and no projects exist for the surname at the time this screenshot was taken.

In Figure 3, all three sections of the search results page has data. The top section is those that have tested with the surname, the second section is Projects for the surname. These are usually Y-DNA projects. The third section is other projects that exist for the surname, such as geographical projects.

Tips
It is a good idea when you have a new result in your project is to see if you can discover any unknown variants or suspected variants. If your participants are set to search only in the Project, which minimizes match emails which aren’t relevant, just toggle the search to the database and review the matches. For example, a Brockett result came back from the lab and matched a Brackett. The Brackett was then invited to join the project. Once you have a match, the email address of the participant is available.

If you have people join your Surname Project who have taken Family Finder only, and are not a candidate for a Y-DNA test, since they are either female, or a male with your surname of interest further back in their tree, you may, after a while, want a separate project for the Family Finder and mtDNA persons who are not part of your Y-DNA project. These projects are quick and easy to set up and move people, and can be made invisible.
A Computer Model for Estimating Surname Population Numbers

by G. M. Anstey (Member 7086)

No doubt many One Namers at some point in their research have pondered a question along the lines of the following:

- How many people were there with a particular surname in the year XXXX? Or related question:
- What percentage of all the people who existed with a particular surname in the year XXXX do I currently know about?

Obtaining a ballpark figure for surname populations from the nineteenth century onwards is relatively simple thanks to censuses and such like, but what about pre-census, for example in 1600, or perhaps even earlier? This was exactly the problem I came up against earlier this year whilst performing research for the book that I am currently working on, to be entitled:

ANSTEY: Our True Surname Origin and Shared Medieval Ancestry

which should be ready for publication at the end of 2017 (all proceeds being donated to the Guild of One Name Studies Charity).

Whilst performing my research, one of my initial tasks was to collect together as much parish register data for ‘Anstey’ (and registered variants Anstie, Ansty and Anstee) as possible from the 1500s and early 1600s in order to be able to provide a comprehensive overview of the locational distributions and sizes of the various Anstey populations dotted around England at that time. The main problem I faced (ignoring the obvious issues around sixteenth century parish registers not existing, being illegible or such like) was not having the slightest idea as to how many Ansteys I should expect to find living in the years around 1600.

There were two reasons why being able to come up with an accurate estimate for this number was desirable. Firstly, it would give me a good idea as to whether the project I was undertaking was even practically speaking feasible, or whether the numbers were simply too great. Secondly, if I could be confident knowing how many Ansteys I should expect to find in the years around 1600 then I could have an approximate idea as to how many I was ‘missing’ in my dataset (Ansteys who for whatever reason did not get a legible mention in a parish register that has survived to today) and therefore how comprehensive my dataset was.

Of course one way to solve my problem would be to exhaustively map the pedigree of every single Anstey alive today back to their 1600s Anstey ancestors, and perhaps one day in the not too distant future that solution may become a reality, but in the real world of the early twenty-first century we are a long way from being able to achieve that goal. There is another way forward however, that being to build a computer model capable of making relatively accurate predictions of population numbers for any surname in any previous century based on the numbers of people living today who carry that surname.

The basic idea of the computer model is that we input ‘real life’ numbers that we either know are true or can accurately estimate with confidence, and the model then predicts what the approximate circumstances must have been at a specified previous time in order to get to where we know we are today. If we run the model millions of times incorporating random elements such as family sizes and gender of children and the results produced are always very similar with little divergence, then we can have confidence that what the model predicts is ballpark accurate. If, on the other hand, each time we run the model it produces widely differing results, then the model is not useful as a predictor.

For the remainder of this article I will explain how the computer model was able to solve my particular problem, which I can narrow down quite simply as

‘Approximately how many Ansteys were alive in the year 1600?’

However, it is important to note that not only does the model work for any surname in any century, but it can also answer related questions such as ‘How many of the people alive in 1600 have descendants bearing their surname living today?’ Indeed the model can be programmed to become more sophisticated fairly easily in order to answer a multitude of statistical questions one might have about ancestors of a particular surname.

The reason I chose the year 1600 was a balance between analysing Anstey populations as far back in time as possible and having a relatively comprehensive set of documentation from which to work (in this case parish registers). I found that, for various reasons, there were so many gaps in parish registers pre 1600 that analysing for example the year 1550 would not produce a fair view of the population of Ansteys in England at that time; rather it would produce a view of the population of Ansteys in the few parishes where parish records exist from 1550, which is not the same thing at all.

In order to get predictions out of the computer model we need numerical parameters to feed into it; some of these we can determine from official sources and others we need to approximate. The one number we know without needing to resort to approximations is that there are around eight thousand Ansteys (including registered variant spellings) living worldwide today and, as far as my research shows, all of their surnames can ultimately be traced back to an English origin.

Next to the approximations, and it is important to note that we do not need exact input numbers for the model to give useful answers; the results should remain consistent as long
as the input numbers are ballpark correct (however it goes without saying that more accurate estimates produce more reliable results than less accurate estimates!) In any case, input approximations can be changed easily as and when more accurate estimates become available.

The first approximation we need to make is how many generations of ancestors there are on average between 1600 and today. Using my own family pedigree as a benchmark, I have come up with the figure of the average male having his children at an average age of approximately twenty-eight (this may sound quite high at first reading, but a male having a very large family would be fathering children well into his forties, especially if he married twice). This would mean that the middle generation alive today is about the fifteenth generation from the middle generation alive in 1600 (though to reiterate the point just made in the previous paragraph, the results produced from the model are very similar even if we used twenty-five as the average age and therefore sixteen generations, or thirty as the average age and therefore fourteen generations).

The model concerns itself only with numbers of males of each generation (as they are the only ones capable of passing the surname to the next generation), however a simple conversion we can use is that if the model predicts there are ‘n’ males in a particular generation with a particular surname then there are approximately (6 x n) people sharing that surname alive at that time (three generations, half the total being male).

Next we need an approximation as to how many children surviving to adulthood the average male had over the past four hundred or so years. Through various independent calculations and studies, I have come up with 2.4 as being a good average (which incidentally applied to the entire UK population over the same time period would be consistent with its actual population growth, which adds to our confidence in its basic accuracy). As already mentioned, this number can easily be tweaked in any case for surnames where the number is deemed to be vastly different for whatever reason.

Finally we need to add two ‘random’ elements to our model. The first random element is simple, ensuring that every child produced within the model is always randomly assigned a gender, though the second is slightly more complex and attempts to simulate ‘real life’ family sizes.

Even if we have 2.4 children as the average number of children surviving to adulthood per adult, for the model to replicate reality we need some families to have zero children, some to have one, and so on up to rare instances where there are twelve or more children in the family surviving to adulthood. This can be quite easily accomplished by assigning a probability to each possible family size and then randomly assigning these different sized families within the model. Calculating these input numbers is more subjective, but fortunately the model still produces similar results even with different probabilities. The various family size likelihoods I plumped for were zero children: 30% (this would include those who didn’t marry); one child: 20%; two children: 15%; three children: 10% and then decreasing probabilities until thirteen children: 1% probability. This allows the average number of children surviving to adulthood to remain at 2.4 but with a realistic range of individual family sizes (again these probabilities have been gleaned from an analysis of my own family pedigree).

As promised I will not venture too far into mathematics, except this one occasion. We can see that, given the chosen probabilities, it is clear that approximately 46% of males in 1600 will not even pass their surname through the first generation (per our model, 30% of them will be childless, 20% will have one child with a 50% probability it is a girl, 15% will have two children with a 25% probability they are both girls etc and 0.3 + 0.2 x 0.5 + 0.15 x 0.25 etc ~ 0.46). The mathematics becomes increasingly complicated as the generations progress, but it is evident even from a superficial analysis of the first generation results that the overwhelming majority of males alive in 1600 cannot possibly have descendants who carry their surname living today.

Running the computer model millions of times produces remarkably consistent results with very few outliers; the randomness of each individual family size and composition tends to cancel itself out within each simulation and the model predictions are therefore very stable (which adds to our confidence in the ballpark accuracy of the predictions).

So to the results themselves. With an amazing consistency, no matter how many times the model is run, approximately 85% of males living in 1600 have no descendants living today bearing their surname (to be clear the model is only concerned with males passing on their surname, not their DNA). In the 15% of cases where the surname has survived the journey from a male in 1600 to today, each of those males from 1600 has on average about eighty male descendants in the middle generation currently alive sharing his surname (which translates to just under five hundred people assuming three generations and including females), albeit with a wide variation in that average. What these results mean in layman’s terms is that for most of the males in 1600 their particular surname branch has long since died out, but for the small percentage whose surname hasn’t died it has flourished, with hundreds of descendants today bearing their surname. This reflects real life where occasional very large families packed with sons pretty much guarantees that particular branch and surname will proliferate.

From these results we can now answer the question posed, which as a reminder was ‘Approximately how many Ansteys were alive in the year 1600?’ As already mentioned, we know...
there are currently eight thousand Ansteys alive and if on average there are approximately five hundred Anstey descendants living today for each of the 15% of males from 1600 whose Anstey surname has survived to today, then there were originally around a hundred Anstey males comprising the middle generation in 1600 (8,000 ÷ 500 ÷ 0.15 = 106 – 100), so there were approximately six hundred Ansteys alive in 1600 (assuming three generations and including females).

Therefore as a very rough approximation, in the years from 1600 to 1630 (approximately one generation) I should, if I have a complete dataset, find roughly six parish register entries, assuming everybody was baptized, married and buried (slightly more baptisms than burials or marriages given the increasing population each generation), and at least I now have my ballpark figure. The actual dataset I have therefore is ‘relatively’ complete, for I have almost two hundred baptisms and close to one hundred and fifty marriages of Ansteys between 1600 and 1630. Burials were often not recorded so I am not surprised that my dataset there is deficient, being only around the one hundred mark.

My research continues and I am finding more parish register activity all the time to add to my ‘1600 Anstey Collection’, but thanks to the model predictions I can be confident that I am well on the way towards amassing a complete dataset (certainly well over half way) and even with what I currently have I am able to start forming some useful conclusions about Ansteys alive at that time.

The fact that the model predicts that there were very approximately one hundred Anstey males in the middle generation in 1600 also allows me to feel more confident in my prospects of success in being able to prove the main theory which I present in ‘ANSTEY: Our True Surname Origin and Shared Medieval Ancestry’, which is that all Ansteys alive today (and indeed who have ever lived) are the descendants of one Anstey family which came into existence in the twelfth century. This theory is contrary to the opinions of traditional ‘surname origin’ reference books which state that Anstey as a surname predominantly originated in toponymic fashion in around the sixteenth century from various of the villages in England called Anstey or Ansty.

As part of the proof of my theory that all Ansteys worldwide are connected in one comprehensive pedigree originating in the twelfth century, I need to discover family connections between the overwhelming majority of the Ansteys alive in 1600. My research is advancing nicely, though still very much ongoing, and once complete I shall present the evidence backing up my theory in my book. Thanks to the predications of my computer model, I know the ballpark numbers I am working with and can be confident that the endeavour I have undertaken is at least mathematically feasible!

---

#### News from the Guild Website

**by Kim Baldacchino (Guild Webmaster, Member 5434)**

**Recent Additions**

If you haven’t yet checked out the Guild Wiki, you’ll find a wealth of Guild knowledge at the top of the Resources menu on the main navigation bar of the website. A team of Wiki editors has been busy migrating and updating material contributed by many Guild members over the years. The best part is that any Guild member logged into the site can update or add to the Wiki pages so that the information just keeps getting better.

Also, there’s another recent addition to the Forums menu, the Members’ Websites Forum. Guild members are invited to join in the discussion and learn more about this project. For those of you already trying to build or support your websites, there are also three sub-forums for more specific topics on the different types of sites. Be sure to consider receiving ‘Automatic Notifications’ which you can read more about from the sidebar on Forum pages.

Lastly, the new Studies section should be on the website by the time the Journal is published, starting with an alphabetic listing of all the Guild surnames along with a list of studies and variants added in recent months.

**A Little Tip**

If you’re having difficulty logging in, please be sure to double check the directions at the top of the Help menu, Reset Your Password. Be aware that when the system suggests a password, you can type over it with a password of your own choosing, providing the system considers it ‘strong’ enough (upper and lower case letters and the like).

**On the Horizon**

We’ve got big plans for the new year. Regional and Committee news are high priorities as we start into the winter, and they’ll be available from the What’s New menu. We also plan to include the Members’ Register in the new Studies section. There’s still some other big tasks ahead, including lots of Resource pages from the legacy site, payment processing and pages where you need to request services through forms. These won’t all happen at once but they’re definitely in the plan!

Also, don’t forget the members’ websites project (MWP). This is designed to provide a safe haven for members’ one-name study websites. Members can upload a one-name study website to the project’s webserver provided the site is concerned with a surname which they have registered with the Guild. Please follow the link to see full details: [http://one-name.org/the-members-websites-project-mwp/](http://one-name.org/the-members-websites-project-mwp/)

As always, if you have any questions or comments, please get in touch with me via email at webmaster@one-name.org.
Introduction

The royal name Plantagenet occurs at only three times in this English royal dynasty’s long history (1154-1485).[1] The more common surname Plant occurs much more often.[2] Together with the name Planta,[3] there is continuity through two millennia of locations and contexts.

The names Plant and Plantagenet have been interrelated before. For example, in 1958 P.H. Reaney claimed that Plant meant a planter of various plants[4] and likewise the Encyclopaedia Britannica held that Plantagenet meant a broom shrub planter. In the nineteenth century, the names were interrelated in a different way: the Plants were said to be illegitimate descendants of the Plantagenets. As well as disbelief, this has been disconfirmed in the male line, since the Plants’ Y-DNA does not match with any other supposed descendant of the Plantagenets,[5] such as ones with the surname Somerset; nor does it match the recently adduced skeleton of Richard III.

One popular story has been that Geffrey of Anjou (1113-51) wore a sprig of broom in his bonnet and his nickname Plantagenet referred to that sprig. This explanation dates back only to 1605 however, nearly half a millennium after Geffrey’s times. During the intervening five centuries, the story could have changed substantially.

For earlier times, we have pieced together some clues from archaic texts. These reveal some concepts that have since passed into obscurity. In Wittgenstein’s prototype approach to semantics,[6] a list of concepts is assembled for a word. Then, for the word in a particular context, some of these concepts become more salient than others. We have accordingly assembled some concepts that can be related to the coining of the Plantagenet nickname.

Helped by recent documentary finds, it has emerged that the feudal lords over the Plants were a particular line of descend-ants from Geffrey Plantagenet.[7] Hence, some concepts might have carried over between the names Plantagenet and Plant. However, a high level of learning seems less likely to have influenced the latter name which more simply could have been locative, meaning from such a place as la Planta or la Plaunt for example.

An outline of the early evidence

The Plantagenets came from Anjou in France. Their descend-ing royal English dynasty began in 1154 and the first known occurrence of the Plantagenet name is around 1160-70 in France.

In this nobility’s French lands in 1202, Eimeric de la Planta (alias de Plant’) held lands at Chinon and Loudon. We might debate whether the name de la Planta refers to someone from la Planta which could refer to the lands of another noble family: the Planta family, which is found in the Engadine of the Swiss Alps. This name could mean from the garden in as much as Engadine means in Romansh garden source of the River Inn. Near here, at Trento in the Italian Alps, there is a record in 46AD of Julius Planta, a friend and advisor of the Roman Emperor Claudius.[3] Shortly before this in 4BC, the author of De Plantis, Nicholas of Damascus, had arrived in Rome. With De Plantis, we have some clues for discerning some early concepts that can be associated with vegetal names.

Over a millennium later, an illegitimate line began with William Longspée (c.1176-1226), natural son of the English king Henry II and his mistress Ida de Tosnay. William was thereby Geffrey Plantagenet’s grandson. He held such offices as: sheriff of Wiltshire; sheriff of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire; lieutenant of Gascony; constable of Dover (Kent); and Keeper of the Coast (Kent and Sussex); he also held Eye in Suffolk.

When combined with the Audley descendants of Longspée, such locations coincide with all but two of the early locations for the Plant name, to the extent of twenty coincident locations. This may seem more than just accidental. Hence, a member of the Planta family might have come to serve under William Longspée leading on to a proliferating family under this noble lordship. Or, the name Plant might have been coined for followers or peasants of this feudal Lord’s line, with mean-ings related to the Plantagenet nickname of this William’s grandfather.

In particular, there is a triple coincidence in Staffordshire of:

• this illegitimate Longspée line from Geffrey Plantagenet;
• the main homeland of the Plant family; and,
• the surviving copy of De Plantis.

This triple coincidence arises thus. As well as his offices listed above, William Longspée became high sheriff of Staffordshire and Shropshire by 1224. Then in 1244 the Longspée heiress married into the Audley family of north Staffordshire. As well as in north Staffordshire, these Audleys held land in south Staffordshire by 1271, at Shareshill and Saresdons. This location of Shreshill brings us again to the relevance of De Plantis, in so far as the surviving copy of this work was translated by Alfredus of Sareshel (c.1197-1222) – Sareshel apparently refers to Shreshill in south Staffordshire, near Wolverhampton.

The significance of De Plantis

Concentrating on the modern meanings of names that origin-ated in the medieval era can be misleading. In the case of the name Plant, we need to rid ourselves of a bias towards modern botany and substitute clues from the medieval Age of Faith. We are fortunate to have De Plantis which points towards some appropriate learning near the vegetal names Plant and Plantagenet.
De Plantis starts by noting that life is found in animals and plants, though it is more hidden in the latter. It summarises the views of some other ancient philosophers, such as Plato (c.425-348BC) who says that whatsoever takes food desires food, and feels pleasure in satiety and pain when it is hungry, adding that these dispositions do not occur without the accompanied sensation. It adds that this view of plants, having sensation and pain, is marvellous enough; but, Anaxagoras (c.500-428BC) and Democritus (c.460-370BC) and Empedocles (c.490-430BC) declared that plants possessed intellect and intelligence.

Though the author of De Plantis repudiates this, he highlights these beliefs which others had accepted. In particular, before becoming King of Jerusalem (1131-43AD), Geoffrey Plantagenet’s father, Fulk V, had been on crusade (c.1120), perhaps encountering the NeoManichean beliefs of the Paulicians and Bogomils, which are thought to have led on to those of the west European Cathars. Certainly, the belief that plants had both feelings and intellect was held by the fourth century Manicheans and so, perhaps also by the twelfth to fourteenth century Cathars, even though the belief had been denounced in c.388AD by Saint Augustine of Hippo.[De moribus Manichaeorum, Chap.17]

The vegetative in pain; also, uttering into the eye of the soul...[8]

Whether these beliefs of sensation and intellect are applicable to the Plantagenet nickname is not clear. However, there are some concepts associated with the vegetal, in ancient texts, that reach through with more certainty to the late medieval times of English surname formation and beyond. Though rather odd to a modern mind, these concepts include purity, generation, and education, as we outline more fully in the Appendix.

The coining of Geoffrey Plantagenet’s nickname

From late medieval times, one step backwards is straightforward. The name of Bernard Plantapilosa of Auvergne and Velay (c.869-72) means “hairy shoot”. This is relevant in that the most commonly assumed meaning of Plantagenet is a sprig of broom and, as a young shoot, this shrub is hairy. We can accordingly regard Plantagenet as an emblem of a hairy shoot. This then leaves the question of why a hairy shoot had significance for Geoffrey Plantagenet (1113-51).

One possibility of associated sense can be found in some early events in Geoffrey’s life. He was count of Anjou by 1129 and by 1132, he had fathered a future king of England. The first known mentions of his Plantagenet nickname (c.1160-70) were intended partly to please Geoffrey’s eldest son, crowned king Henry II of England in 1154.

The Jersey poet Wace mentions the nickname Plante Genest (sic). This poet’s appointment as Canon of Bayeux was not far from the placename Genêts, near Avranches in Lower Normandy. As a Canon, he might have been aware of vegetal generation as well as of the animation of living things as taught by earlier philosophers. In particular, Anaxagoras (c.500-428BC) had stated that there is nous (mind/intelligence) in all living things and that this is the mover (e.g. of the cosmos), yet also a controller of all things that have soul (including plants).

The Angevin monk, John of Marmoutier also coined this noble nickname. He wrote that Geoffrey Plantegenest (sic) had taken the side of the minority Bretons (c.1131), to even the odds in a fight with the Normans, in sight of Mont-St-Michel (i.e. at or near Genêts). Following victory in battle, Geoffrey had gone on to defeat and behead a giant Anglo Saxon in single combat.

At Genêts, there are the competing motive forces of two river flows, those of the Sée and Sélun. These forces shift courses through the sands near Mont-St-Michel. There were also earlier senses to the word plant, meaning to found or establish,[9] and so we can say that Geoffrey planted (i.e. established) his authority at Genêts in 1131, in the manner of reballancing forces that shift sands. Teleologically, this might have been seen as an omen for the raison d’être of Geoffrey. It happened early in Geoffrey’s life, who later became Duke of Normandy in 1144 in support of the claim to the English throne of his wife Matilda and their eldest son Henry.

Hence, we can regard Genêts as a key place where Geoffrey (1113-51) is credited with some admirable qualities. Still earlier as a teenager in 1128, we can regard him as a vigorously growing young plant or scion[10] when he impressed his future father-in-law Henry I, at his first campaign of knighthood at Rouen, before marrying the widowed Empress Matilda at Le Mans the same year.

Relevance to a sense of plant, as a vigorous young shoot or scion, might lie furthermore in earlier concepts associated with the vegetal soul.[Appendix] The animating force of motion seems to have been pertinent to Geoffrey’s nickname: “This man was an energetic soldier and, as I have said, was most shrewd in his upright dealings, exceptionally well educated ... the father of his country ...”[11]. As well as the Platonic soul mention of his energy and upright purity and education, there is also reference to the Aristotelian vegetal soul’s power of generation in the concept of the fathering of lands.

Geffrey had died in 1151, just before two major expansions of his eldest son’s empire. By the times of the first known mention of the Plantagenet nickname (c.1160-70), Henry had married Eleanor of Aquitaine in 1152 and had become king of England in 1154. Through fathering his eldest son, Geoffrey had fathered the so-called Angevin Empire extending fully between the borders of Scotland and Spain.

For a simple pithy meaning for Plantagenet, we might wonder which of the above four vegetal concepts - energy, upright purity, education, and fathering - was most salient for Geoffrey’s proclaimed character. Perhaps however, the strength of the “hairy shoot” metaphor was its good fit to all four. This might seem complex to a modern mind. However, these concepts could have been more to the fore of a learned mind in medieval times, such that Wace and Marmoutier could see several hairy shoot qualities as being apt for Geoffrey - they could hence have allocated him the Plantagenet nickname to
highlight these qualities, notwithstanding that these associations with a hairy shoot are not obvious to us with our modern minds.

It is possible that this same tradition might have played some part for the late medieval surname Plant. Their feudal Lords would have looked down on their subjects as basic souls, some of whom were called Plant. The Longspée-Audley family could have aimed to train their followers under, as they saw it, an upright authority that had been fathered by their famed ancestor Geoffrey Plantagenet.

However, the Plant surname could have derived from such thirteenth century by-names as de la Planta or de la Plaunt or de Plantes (cf. from le Plantis in Normandy) and could well have meant simply from some such garden or planted or fertile place as the Engadine for example. As we have pointed out earlier, a locative sense for Plant at least seems to fit the evidence more consistently than an occupational meaning gardener.

(a) A crusader supplicates the Lord for His Light with belief in the creative powers of emanations; and, (b) A surviving inscription be-seeming such a planting: Here Doe O Lord Svre Plant Thy Word - Wincle -

Plantings of the Lord’s emanations...

Appendix: Some relevant early concepts

We here outline some ancient concepts that have reached through to the times of English surname formation. Though rather odd to a modern mind, the concepts of purity, generation, and education were all associated with the medieval plant soul. These concepts seem variously relevant to the origins of the Plant and Plantagenet names.

An untainted vegetal soul

Empedocles (c.490-430BC) and, apparently, Pythagoras (c.570-495BC) thought that plants had souls. Human souls, for instance, can come to animate plants. He claimed indeed to have been a bush in a previous incarnation and urged others to follow a vegetarian lifestyle, since the bodies of animals are the dwelling places of punished souls.

Plato related the word plant to human growth, heightened by reason, reaching upright towards the heavenly one soul:

inasmuch as we are a plant not of an earthly but of a heavenly growth, [the sovereign part of the human soul .. at the top of the body] raises us from earth to our kindred who are in heaven. ... [Timaeus 90a]

A similar notion still remains much later in the main Plant homeland. The idea that plants can have pure souls, devoid of any of the original sin of conception, is suggested by Henry Bradshaw (died 1513) who wrote of the well nurtured plant (soul or unborn child) in the Mercian Princess Ermenylde:[14] vertuous doctrine in her so dyd water a pure perfyte plante, Which dayly encreased by sufferance devyne, Merveylously growynge in her fresshe an varnaunt,

A generative vegetal soul

The teachings of Plotinus (c.205-70AD) largely followed those of Plato. In his NeoPlatonic teachings, there is only an indirect mention of a generative (i.e. reproductive) power in the vegetal. For Plotinus, this power is passed into plants from earth.[Enneads 4:4:27]

The teachings of Aristotle came more fully into Western philosophy with the twelfth and thirteenth century Toledo translations from Arabic to Latin. Though the Condemnations of Paris (1210-1277) treated these ongoing translations as heretical, St Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) went so far as to decree that the vegetable soul was the first principal of life - moreover, its generative power was more noble than its nutritive or augmentative functions.

Educating a basic vegetal soul

The vegetal soul is repeatedly mentioned in connection with training or education. For example, Plato identifies the vegetal particularly in connection with cultivated plant life:

Blending it with other shapes and senses, they [the Gods] engendered a substance akin to that of man, so as to form another living creature: such are the cultivated trees and plants and seeds which have been trained by husbandry and are now domesticated amongst us; but formerly the wild kinds only existed, these being older than the cultivated kinds.[Timaeus 77a,b]

As pointed out by De Plantis, Plato writes particularly of sensation in the vegetal soul. He adds that plants are infused by wise men with good sensations, and true ones:

And, O my dear Socrates, I do not call wise men tadpoles: far from it; I say that they are the physicians of the human body, and the husbandmen of plants - for the husbandmen also take away the evil and disordered sensations of plants, and infuse into them good and healthy sensations - aye and true ones;[Theaetetus]

As late as 1621, in the main Plant homeland of Cheshire (adjoining Audley lands in north Staffordshire), we still have a plant as a basic soul ready for training:[10]

his Grandchild [of Sir John Savage], then a young Plant and newly sent to the Innes of Court, to be trained up answerably to his Birth and Dignity ... That hopeful Plant, that is the apparent Heir of all his glory and this great Discent

In particular, the verb to plant is associated with training.
There is Middle English reference to planting virtue, the Word, or the grace of noble lineage.\[15\]

We are grateful to Prof Mick Short for pointing out that the original literal meaning of “train” is very likely to have been related to leading or guiding a climbing plant, such as a runner bean, around a support - hence, the notion of training people is likely originally to have been a conceptual metaphor, analogically based on training climbing plants. More generally, the MAN IS PLANT metaphor\[16\] is very common in English [e.g. Job 14:1-2 and Macbeth 5.3] which highlights the need to try to identify specific concepts that applied to Plantagenet times.

**References**

Note: Website addresses, beginning http://www.plant-fhg.uk/... which were used in previous articles, are now cloned at http://plant.one-name.net/... with the latter being expected to be preserved longer than the former.


**Could you be a Challenger?**

The Guild is always looking for Marriage Challengers. If you live fairly close to a county record office and can afford to spend some time there to help other Guild members with their one-name studies by finding marriage entries, then becoming a Challenger could be an option.

Even if Ancestry, Findmypast, or FamilySearch have done some indexing, there are likely to be some parts of the county or some period where a Challenge would still be practicable. You could do a Challenge with a friend or fellow Guild member; a sense of camaraderie is easily achieved.

Peter Copsey MCG (Marriage Challenge Coordinator) will give advice on what is needed and on any aspect of a Challenge that is concerning you. Most Challengers find the Challenge a rewarding and interesting experience. Why not send him an email at marriage-challenge@one-name.org if you think you can contribute.
Frank Weaver Margrett and his part in the Theft of the Queen of Siam’s Pearls

by Bruce Margrett (Member 461)

Scotland Yard, Singapore and Siamese police had to admit themselves baffled by this theft which probably stands unequalled in its daring and audacity. So cleverly was the theft carried out that the pearls might well have vanished for all the trace they left.

(Straits Times, 17 May 1936, Page 4)

Frank Weaver Margrett was born in Reading in 1867 of a reputable family with his father a Master Ironmonger. He was the eldest of five children, all boys. Two of his brothers died in England aged under thirty years, and the other two emigrated to Argentina. Frank himself died in Bangkok which will be the stage on which our drama begins.

In April 1891 he admitted to the Census enumerator that he was a jeweller’s assistant aged twenty-four in Brompton, London but by the time he married a few months later he described himself as a Goldsmith. Soon, he had a family of three children, two of whom were twins.

There is no specific evidence of the date he set up his business in Bangkok, but a 1938 Tourist Guide to Bangkok contained an advertisement of his, claiming he was established there in 1909. Therefore, he must have excelled in business during the intervening eighteen years after marriage to enable him to start the Bangkok business in 1909. And why Bangkok?

But in June 1908, having had previous business with them, King Chulalongkorn of Siam gave a commission to Mr S Smith, (governing director of the Association of Diamond Merchants, Jewellers, and Silversmiths Ltd., of Trafalgar Square, London).

For the Queen’s birthday, a rope of 251 pearls was ordered, measuring some five feet in length. It was later stated in the court in Singapore that the value and insurance cover taken out with Lloyds of London was for £8,200 (today worth £83,366,000). The agreement was for the central pearl to be just over 19 grains and successive pearls to reduce in weight by 20%. There is conflicting evidence whether or not some of the pearls came from the King’s collection and others were purchased in Europe from the marketplace.

In April 1909, when complete, this precious item was packed, with other jewellery of not great value, in three boxes and in an outer wooden case, which was zinc-lined, 18 inches (460 mm) long, 15 inches (380 mm.) wide and “sufficiently deep”. The zinc lining was soldered closed to give a damp-proof container with a wooden lid screwed down, and clamped with hoop-iron and seals at the top and bottom of the box. This packing was “standard” and the Diamond Merchants usually entrusted such packages to a P. & O. steamer, but on this occasion to a North German steamer “Luctzow” setting out from Southampton.

A newspaper report during the Singapore trial in 1912 said “By curious and undesigned coincidence, Mr Reginald Smith and Mr Frank Weaver Margrett, both directors of the Association of Diamond Merchants, and who delivered the precious case to Southampton, happened to travel to Singapore in the same boat to which they entrusted the case” It was conveyed as bullion; this “means that it was the subject of particular care”.

The cost of the freight was £125 (today equal to £17,000). When the NDL steamer Luctzow reached Singapore the case was transferred by the German purser to the steamer “Deli” which ran from Singapore to Bangkok. The case was personally handed to the head wharfinger, Jules Paul de Boseck, an employee of Messrs Windsor & Co, of Bangkok at 9 or 10 o’clock on the morning of arrival.

After receiving notice of its arrival, Chamun Chong Kwa, Siamese Court Chamberlain, went to the harbour and signed for it, after checking that the seals were intact, and took it to his house to open it in the presence of his wife and possibly others.

When the lid was lifted breaking the seals, it was found that “the zinc lining has been clumsily cut open on one side and the leather boxes inside were empty”. The Chamberlain immediately went to the hotel of Mr. Margrett and Mr Smith, with the broken case. They determined how the lid, of two pieces of wood, tongued and grooved, had been easily separated and the smaller six-inch piece removed without disturbing the bands or seals, and glue and sawdust had concealed the fact that it had been opened.

But where had the robbery taken place? In Southampton, at sea, or at Bangkok? At the opening of the trial in 1912, the pearls were described as “the property of one Frank Weaver Margrett”. Could that really be a personal cost? The Lloyds agent was notified immediately, but quickly declined to settle any claim for lack of evidence in the circumstances of the theft. A second pearl rope was made and shipped in time for the Queen’s birthday, but obviously either the Association of Diamond Merchants or Frank Margrett was out of pocket.

In the days after April 1909, none of the 251 pearls from the rope were actually traced, but during 1910 a Singapore pearl
dealer called Hamovitch bought pearls from a man called Jules Paul de Boseck but the pearls could not be proved to be from the theft.

In 1911 this man had obtained a loan of HK$800 using two significantly large pearls to secure the loan and then the lender sold them and they were taken to Australia. This became known by agents, Messrs Allen & Gedhill who purchased them for Frank Margrett. Having been so involved, Frank Margrett immediately recognised and was able to identify the unique central pearl from the necklace.

It might have been the way of life of Jules Paul de Boseck, between 1909 in Bangkok and his arrest in London in 1912, aged thirty-three, that helped convict him in Singapore that year on a charge of retaining stolen property (not a charge of theft).

He had left Bangkok sometime in 1910 and arrived at Singapore where he was employed by well-known local accountants which had gone out of business by the time of the trial. Whilst in Singapore, he gambled openly and on a fairly large scale with book makers. There was report of his selling pearls. “A long and assiduous investigation by the Singapore police” identified the sale of the two pearls which Mr Margrett purchased for HK$1,500. It was Frank Margrett who applied for a warrant for the arrest of the accused on 28 September 1911.

The arrest was made in London in 1912, and the Magistrates gave an order for extradition, and Chief Inspector Bower, of Scotland Yard, (of the Moat Farm murder fame of a few years earlier) was entrusted with conveying Jules Paul de Boseck to Singapore.

In the court in Singapore he explained he was aware the two pearls were stolen but claimed to have purchased them, after first lending money against them to one of the ‘kranis’ (steamer clerks) who called himself Siang Heng.

In the course of the trial, facts about the accused were presented to the court by witnesses. He was described as a journalist. He had used the name Charles Chilsworth “when making inquiries respecting a political offence in Java, the result of which he sent to the Chinese Minister at the Hague”. Cross examined, he was asked, “if on 14 June (1910) he sold twenty-three pearls to Hamovitch in the name of Charles Melville Williams”, replying “may have done”. “How many other occasions?” “More than once.” “Did you tell him the pearls belonged to you?” “I would not be able to sell them if I did not.” “Did you sell him six pearls for $600?” “I believe there was a number sold, but I would not say the figure.” “You were in want of money at the time?” “Yes, that is why I was disposing of the pearls.” “When did you leave Singapore?” “On April 23, 1911, I returned to Singapore from Java on my way home.” “Under what name did you come from Batavia?” “Charles Chilsworth.” “The name is that of a police officer in Bangkok, is it not?” “No, Sir.”

Challenged, he admitted it was the name Charles Chilsworth he traveled under and not his own, and that when he landed at Colombo he had not touched the letters in the letter rack in his own name, arriving eventually in England in that assumed name. “Why did you ask that all letters should be addressed to you, care of Sir George Reid, High Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Australia, London?” “I was writing a modern history of Java and Mr. Willis who was with me said that that was a good address to write to if I wanted any letters in London.” “When did these political negotiations make it necessary for you to change your name?” “About fourteen days before I left Java.” “You are quite certain you did not adopt this name when you went to Rangoon from Penang?” “It is quite possible.” “From whom did you get the two pearls you gave to Cowan?” “Those are the pearls I say I received from Habib in 1908.” “He was a well known man, is he not?” “He is a very good friend of mine.” “Do you know what happened to him?” “I do not.” “Quite sure?” “Sure of it.” “You don’t know that Habib, the well known pearl man, was drowned in the La Seyne, Paris?” “It is the first I have heard of it.”

Earlier in the case Frank Weaver Margrett was in the witness box and confirmed his circumstances and involvement in the case. He had not been present at the packing process carried out by Mr Samuel Smith and his two sons, and the zinc lining was soldered by the firm’s usual packing man. After consigning the box containing the pearls to the ship in Southampton, “he had returned to London, then joined the same ship in Genoa”. The counsel for the defence cross-examined him establishing that he had not produced evidence of the order placed with his firm, thinking it unnecessary.

Mr Margrett told the court that he had been twenty-six years with his firm, (that would be since 1885) having worked his way up from junior assistant to the position of manager and buyer. The centre pearl was a most unique one. It had a beautiful pink hue; on each side there were “broque” marks in a pronounced and regular manner. On it was a hatchet mark and regular manner. On it was a hatchet mark close to which was a small pinhole. The jewel was specially bought for the centre of the rope and, at the time the purchase was under discussion, considerable curiosity was exhibited in the trade.

Summing up, the defence counsel addressed the jury for 2½ hours observing “Are the statements of Mr. Margrett to be accepted?” The jury should have expected him to call at least one other witness from England to testify to the packing of the box. There was no record of what was supposed to have been sent out. “There was no doubt that the pearl weighed in court showed a great difference on the weight testified to by Mr. Margrett, who had
had it in his possession quite long enough to be able to give its accurate weight.” Counsel admitted that it was a foolish thing to assume names, but the accused had given his reasons for having done so - there was a lady in the case. Finally, after the theft, there was no evidence that in Siam any steps were taken to detect the crime and why was there no offer of reward? He suggested that the box in which the vast value was shipped would not have been sufficient to ship whiskey.

The prosecution took only forty-five minutes to sum up and likewise the judge forty-six minutes. The jury were even more businesslike and made their “guilty” decision in seven minutes. After a further hearing to decide three points of law that had arisen during the trial, a sentence was given down on Jules Paul de Boseck of two years’ rigorous imprisonment dating from May 14, 1912.

And then, twenty-eight years later, The Straits Times reported on Sunday 16 June 1940, “With the death of Mr. F. W. Margrett, one of the best known Bangkok personalities has passed on. Mr. Margrett was seventy-three and was a resident of Bangkok for thirty years. He first went to Thailand on behalf of his firm, S. Smith and Sons, London, and after the last war, in 1919, he became resident director of that firm. It then became S. Smith & Sons (Siam), Ltd.

“Later on, in 1924, he opened his own business as a jeweller and engraver which was in 1937 converted into the firm of F. W. Margrett (1937), Ltd. Mr. Margrett kept excellent health until three years ago, but since then he had been more or less an invalid. He, however, persisted in going to office until a month ago. In his younger days he was very keen on athletics, boxing, cycling and clay-pigeon shooting, but his main hobby was racing, and for many years he acted as a paddock steward. Another interest was amateur theatricals and several presentations at the Theatre Royal, Bangkok, owed their success to the long hours he put in at rehearsals, with Mrs. Margrett in the casts.

“Perhaps Mr. Margrett’s greatest thrill in his business life was the disappearance of ‘one rope of 251 pearls of Orient hue’ dispatched by his firm in London in 1909 for the Queen of Siam. The box arrived in Bangkok in May 1909, and was delivered to the Queen’s representative. When opened it contained empty cases only. The centre pearl weighed nineteen grains and the remainder were matched in pairs with a graduation of 20 per cent. to the end. The firm replaced the stolen necklace, and after long negotiations the underwriters paid about £35,000 [sic] and the leading underwriter presented Mr. Margrett with a James II silver loving cup as a memento of his assistance in solving the mystery of the pearls’ disappearance.”

THANKS - Most of the content of this report is because of the gift of thirty-three press reports covered by eighty-two pages. Many thanks for this are due to Dr. James Nye of the Institute for Contemporary History, London who was commissioned to write the official history of the Smiths Group, the modern-day business for whom Frank Margrett worked in the early 1900s. Thanks too, to Alyson Hartley who put us in touch.

[Editor’s Note - In the end, only the two pearls sold by de Boseck in Singapore were ever recovered from the original necklace of 251. The remaining 249 are now scattered all over the world]
The BRAZENOR Lines

Robert Brasner 1670-? and Elizabeth Brasner 1681-1762

This couple is responsible for about three quarters of the total present day bearers of the name Brazenor/Brazener. They married in April 1703, at Llanllwchaiarn, Montgomeryshire, Wales, though they were both of the parish of Worthen, Shropshire. Their surnames were recorded as BRAZENER. Robert was the son of Randle and Margareta Brasner of Lee, and Elizabeth was the daughter of Ricus (Richard) and Miriall (Muriel) Brasner, née Olivers, who had married at Meole Brace, in 1678. Why then did Robert and Elizabeth go to Wales to get married? Perhaps their families were not too happy with their relationship, as Robert and Elizabeth were almost certainly cousins and Elizabeth was expecting their first child Elizabeth, whom they baptised at Worthen, in August 1703. Their first son Ricus, was baptised at Worthen, in July 1704, and they went on to have another twelve children, all at Worthen. Even so, most present day holders of the name Brazenor owe their name to just one son, Thomas, who was baptised at Worthen, in 1719.

Thomas Brasner 1719-1805 and Elizabeth Rutter 1726-1783

Thomas married Elizabeth Rutter at Meole Brace, in 1749, he being of Dyther, an anglicized corruption of Deu ddwr - Two waters, in the parish of Llansantffraid ym Mechain, Montgomeryshire, and Elizabeth being of the parish of Alberbury, Shropshire, though she was probably born at Worthen. They had seven children, all at Llansantffraid, the eldest being Thomas, baptised in 1752, though the line to present day holders of the name is through Richard, baptised in 1755.

Richard Brazenor 1755-1840 and Mary Cooper 1792-1874

Richard, son of Thomas and Elizabeth of Llansantffraid, was indentured as an apprentice saddler to Thomas Dale of Oswestry, Shropshire, duties being paid in April 1770. In 1781, he was to become a member of the Saddlers Company and a freeman in the county town of Shrewsbury. He was admitted as a “foreigner”, which conveyed the fact that he was not a native of the town and had served his apprenticeship elsewhere. He married Mary Cooper at old St Chad’s Church, Shrewsbury, Mary being of that parish and Richard being of the parish of Pontesbury. They baptised nine children at Pontesbury and all five sons were to become saddlers. Richard maintained a dwelling and saddlery business in Shrewsbury, because his name appears in the list of inhabitants in the Shrewsbury Visitors Pocket Companion, published in 1793, by T. Minshull. Richard’s place of business was in a short street known then as Carriers Inn, now part of Shoplatch.

Richard’s baptism entry has not been found but in July 1805, the Universal Magazine of London, in its section Provincial Occurrences, was to record in its report for Shropshire, “Died at Pontesbury, at an advanced age, Mr Brazenor, father of Mr Brazenor, saddler”. It so happened that Thomas Brazenor, farmer of Bulthey, Shropshire, had been buried at Alberbury, on 30 June 1805, and there had been no other recent male Brazenor deaths in Shropshire.

Richard took his five sons William, Thomas, Richard, Samuel and Robert, and also his youngest brother Randal, into the saddlery trade. William, once he had learnt his trade, left Pontesbury and set up shop in Birmingham. He was later to spend some time in Australia, of his own volition, before returning to Birmingham. Thomas went into business consecutively in Shrewsbury, Oswestry and Birmingham. Richard did likewise at Wem, Shropshire and in Birmingham, whilst Samuel took over his father’s business at Pontesbury. Randal, after learning his trade at Pontesbury, went to work for his brother William, in Birmingham, before migrating to Marylebone, London, where he worked as a saddler. Randal, Richard senior’s youngest brother, set up in business at Prees, in Shropshire.

Richard senior died at Pontesbury, and was buried 3 April 1840. Mary passed away in 1852, and was buried at St George’s, Pontesbury. The Brazenor name and saddlery skills were passed on through their sons Thomas, Richard and Robert.

Thomas Brazenor 1792-c.1874 and Ann Maria Wilding c.1797-1883

Thomas, the son of Richard and Mary née Cooper was baptised at Pontesbury. In 1817, he married Ann Maria Wilding at St Alkmunds, Shrewsbury, and by 1819, they had produced two children, Robert and Mary. Thomas was a saddler, initially in business with a partner in Shrewsbury, but this failed and by 1823, Thomas had moved to Oswestry, where he again set up a saddlery business, later being helped by his son Robert. They were to have six more children at Oswestry, the last being George, in 1839.

Sometime between 1841 and 1851, the family moved to Birmingham, where Thomas again had a saddlery business, and by 1861, his youngest son George had joined him in the firm. Thomas received a windfall inheritance in 1864, when his brother Samuel died childless, leaving him significant property at Pontesbury. Unfortunately, Thomas mortgaged the property to provide funds for his son George, in a business venture which was to fail. George defaulted and the Pontesbury property was sold to recover the loan. In 1871, Thomas and Ann, as well as George and his family, were living with
their daughter Mary Beckett, at Kempsey, Worcestershire. Thomas died at Clifton, Gloucestershire in 1874, aged eighty-one. His wife Ann and daughter Mary were in Birmingham in 1881, where Ann was to pass away in 1883. This Brazenor line continued through Thomas and Ann’s sons Robert Wilding and George.

**Richard Brazenor 1795-1870 and Mary Lewis c.1807-1870**

Richard was the third son of Richard and Mary Brazenor, née Cooper, of Pontesbury. Richard’s baptismal record has not been found but an affidavit which he made in 1865, and is preserved in Shropshire Archives, confirms his identity beyond doubt. In 1829, he married Mary Lewis, at the church of St Beuno, Berriew, Montgomeryshire. They set up home at Wem, Shropshire where they were to have six children, including Mary, William, Richard, Annie, Edward and Sarah. Sometime between 1842 and 1846 they moved to Birmingham, as the 1851 Census has Sarah born at Wem, in 1842, and Henry at Birmingham, in 1846.

In 1851, Mary their eldest child was looking after her grandfather Edward Lewis, at Trwstywelin, Montgomeryshire. It is probable that Mary was their only child not to emigrate overseas. Instead, she went up to London and married well, in 1886, to David Dolby, a wealthy tallow chandler. William emigrated to Australia in 1857, probably influenced by his uncle who was also named William Brazenor, and who had spent some time in Victoria. All known present day holders of the Brazenor name in Australia, derive their name from William Brazenor, son of Richard and Mary Brazenor, née Lewis.

Edward Lewis Brazenor emigrated to the USA, arriving possibly before 1860, as an Edward Braznor is recorded that year at Kings, New York, but he had moved on to Bourbon County, Kentucky, by 1861. He was a horse collar maker at Hamilton, Ontario, in 1868, but was back in the Paris ward of Bourbon County, by 1870, where he was joined by his brother Richard.

The brothers were lodging with the family of William Dickey, who was a saddler and probably their employer. Edward married Jane Lily Beebey in 1874, probably at Hamilton, Ontario, where their son Robert was born in that same year. Their daughter Grace was born there in 1881, and later they moved to Gore Bay, Manitoulin Island, in Lake Huron, where they ran saddlery and hardware businesses. Edward passed away in Chicago, Illinois, in 1904. Nothing further is known of their son Robert. Grace had a son whom she named Edward Lewis Brazenor and his name was also given to her grandson. Jane and her descendants are buried at Norfolk, Virginia.

Richard Brazenor arrived in Bourbon County, Kentucky and was lodging in the Paris ward with his brother Edward in 1870. He became a US citizen there in 1873. He probably married Susannah Gibson in Kentucky, but by 1880, they were in Indiana. In 1885, the family was in Kansas City, where Richard had a saddlery business. They had a daughter Margaret Alice, who was born in Kansas, in 1883. Richard passed away in Wyandotte County in 1898, and was buried at Oak Grove Cemetery.

Sarah Brazenor was with her parents in Birmingham in 1851. She had a son Frederick Lewis Brazenor, born in 1867, at Kings Norton, Warwickshire. In 1871, Sarah and Frederick were in a Birmingham workhouse, her parents having died in 1870. Her four brothers had emigrated and both her sisters were at Newbury, in Berkshire. In 1881, Sarah is nowhere to be found but Frederick was living with his uncle Henry, in Birmingham. It is likely that Sarah was in the USA.

A Sarah Brazenor gave birth to a daughter Lizzie, in 1876, in Jersey City, Hudson, New Jersey, her father possibly a William Jones. In 1878, a child Jas Otell (O’Dell ?) was born at Jersey City, to a father Jas Otell and a mother whose maiden name was Braznor.

In 1885, Fred L Brazenor arrived at Quebec on the SS “Paisian”, from Liverpool. Was he intending to find his Uncle Edward, or his mother Sarah? Nothing more is known of him.

Harry (Henry) Brazenor, a twenty-four year old salesman, born in England, was in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1870. This was almost certainly Richard and Mary’s youngest son.

He returned home to Birmingham and was with his sister Annie in 1881. Annie and Harry were to eventually emigrate to Australia, to be with their eldest brother William, at Balarat, Victoria.

**Robert Brazenor 1806-1873 and Lucy Liddelow 1812-1896**

Robert, the youngest of the saddler sons of Richard and Mary Brazenor, née Cooper, was born at Pontesbury. After learning his trade he went to Birmingham to work for his eldest brother William. He was still with William in 1838, when they were the victims of a crime of theft. However, by the 1841 Census, Robert Braznore (sic) was at Marylebone, Middlesex, working with, or for a William Crowther, saddler.

In about 1842, Robert met and married Lucy Liddelow, presumably at Marylebone, where they were to have three children, Samuel in 1843, Mary Liddelow in 1845 and Robert Liddelow in 1848. Samuel died an infant in December 1843.

In 1851, Robert, Lucy, Mary and Robert were recorded at Marylebone, but the entry is very poor and difficult to read. In January 1852, Mary and Robert were baptised together their address then being 17 George Street, Marylebone. In 1871, they were at the same address and Lucy’s birthplace is given as Ringland, Norfolk. Lucy’s baptism has not been found but the surname Liddelow (Littlelow), was in use in Norfolk in the 1800s.

Robert died in 1873, aged sixty-seven. The National Probate Calendar records he was late of 17 George Street, Portland Place. Probate was proved by Lucy Liddelow Brazenor, widow, relict and sole executrix, of the same address. Lucy passed away at Marylebone in 1896, aged eighty-four.
Robert Wilding Brazenor 1818-1901

Robert, born at Shrewsbury, was the eldest son of Thomas and Ann Maria Brazenor, née Wilding. He was brought up at Oswestry, where he assisted his father in his saddlery business. However, in 1842, he was advertising his services as a bird preserver in Pigot’s directory. In 1843, he married Sarah Pearce of Penrhos, Montgomeryshire, at Oswestry, where they had their first child Mary, in 1844. Their son John Pearce Brazenor was born in 1847, at Gloucester. John was to become a saddler, eventually setting up in business in the Camberwell Road, London.

Things turned sour for Robert in August 1848, when he was taken into custody for theft. In October, of the same year, he was convicted, at Warwick, of Larceny by Servant and sentenced to six months imprisonment. The situation became tragic with the death of his wife Sarah, at Oswestry, and his daughter Mary, at Birmingham, both deaths occurring in late 1848. It may be surmised that Sarah passed away while visiting or staying with her parents during Robert’s incarceration. Mary had probably died in Birmingham, while she and her brother John were being cared for by Robert’s relatives.

Robert Wilding Brazenor’s second marriage was to Rhoda Ferris at Aston, Warwickshire in July 1850. Rhoda had been born at Biddestone, Wiltshire, in about 1826 (from the 1861 Census). They were to have at least six children including Charles, born at Brecon, Wales in 1853; their daughter Sarah Ann at Reading, Berkshire in 1855; Rhoda Clara at Stefford, Bedfordshire in 1858; Frederick at Worcester in 1861; Harry at Kensington in 1863; and finally Alfred at Brighton, Sussex in 1868.

The reason for Robert & Rhoda’s frequent relocation is uncertain. In 1871, Robert gave his occupation as a naturalist and artist, though in reality he was a taxidermist. That same year he became involved in a notorious poisoning case, appearing as a prosecution witness. He described himself in court as a bird, reptile and fish stuffer, of Lewes Road, Brighton. He had worked on the carcass of the poison victim’s pet dog and had recognised from the condition of the carcass that the dog had also been poisoned. The case was widely reported around the English speaking world.

By 1878, Robert had reverted to being a saddler as he is listed as such in the Post Office directory for Sussex. The following year he advertised for sale a collection of circus costumes and also items of saddlery in “as new or better condition”. Had they been working with a travelling circus during their period of frequent relocation? Robert & Rhoda were to remain at Brighton until their deaths in 1901 and 1909, respectively. All their children, except Frederick, became involved in the taxidermy and fur trades, Harry setting up in business in Manchester.

The Brazenor name was continued by their sons John, Charles, Frederick, Harry and Albert.

Charles married Evelyn Pratt, in 1896, and one of their sons, naturalist Charles Walter Brazenor, emigrated to Melbourne, Australia in 1923, where he eventually became Director of the National Museum of Victoria, in 1957.

William Brazenor 1833-1916

William Brazenor, eldest son of Richard and Mary Brazenor, née Lewis, was born at Wem, Shropshire, where he was still to be found with his family in the 1841 Census. They moved to Birmingham between 1842-1846 and were still there in 1851, when William was an eighteen year old surveyor’s assistant.

In April 1857, William arrived at Melbourne, Victoria, on the ship “Lightning”, out from Liverpool, and in the following year he married a young Scottish migrant Ellen Harmer Innes, at St Kilda, Melbourne. A keen sportsman, William was an early member of Melbourne Football Club (Australian Rules Football), playing in the 1859 and 1860 seasons, at the Melbourne Cricket Club ground. This was before the establishment of the Victorian Football League.

William worked on several public works projects in Melbourne, including Flemington Livestock Yards and Racecourse, before moving to Ballarat, Victoria, in about 1861.

At Ballarat, he won a tender for the construction of some railway earthworks and went on to design and layout the site of the Ballarat stockyards. An adjacent street is named after him and close by he built his own hotel, the Cattle Yards Inn, receiving his publican’s licence on 23 January 1864. He entertained Prince Alfred, the Duke of Edinburgh, at the Cattle Yards Inn, during the latter’s tour of Australia, in 1867. That same year William and Ellen had a daughter Mary Isabelle, who unfortunately died in 1868. William founded an architectural practice in Ballarat, and designed houses, hotels and sporting venues in the town.

In April 1883, William’s wife Ellen Harmer Brazenor, née Innes, died in a buggy accident, near Ballarat, aged forty-seven. She had arrived in Australia in 1856, and had married William when she was twenty-one. Tragic though this sad event was for William, it was to have huge implications for the Brazenor name. The chances of William and Ellen having further children had surely passed and it was likely therefore that the Brazenor name, in Australia, would have died with them but for Ellen’s untimely death.

Following this tragedy, William’s younger sister Annie, joined him at Ballarat in September 1883, presumably to keep house for him. Henry, William’s brother John were being cared for by Robert’s relatives. In 1848, it may be surmised that Sarah passed away while visiting or staying with her parents during Robert’s incarceration.
their youngest sibling arrived in late 1884. There were then three of Richard and Mary’s children in Ballarat, probably three in North America, leaving only Mary Dolby in England.

On 7 February 1888, the birth was registered at Ballarat, of a boy named William Brazenor Coogan, born at Sturt Street, Ballarat, the informant being a Susan O’Reilly, as authorised agent. The mother was Ellen Coogan, aged twenty-three, who had been born at Carngham, Victoria. There were no details given of the father, whatsoever.

It had been a common practice, at least in England, that illegitimate children be baptised or registered with the father’s surname as a forename. That way, parish administrators had some idea of whom they could call on for maintenance should the need arise.

On 18 June 1888, William married a Maria Smyth, née Nutt, at Ballarat. He was a widower aged fifty-five, an architect living at Alfredton, Ballarat, whilst she was a widow aged thirty-one, a ladies draper living at Clifton Hill, North Fitzroy, Melbourne. Maria had three children, the offspring of Thomas Smyth, including John Alexander, Mary and Isabella. All were to take the Brazenor name when their mother married and today approximately half the present day holders of the Brazenor name, in Australia, are descended from John and his wife Florence.

In 1890, Ellen Coogan, mother of William Brazenor Coogan, died at Horsham, Victoria. The circumstances of her death are not known. It is also not known when exactly William became a member of the Brazenor family household. In 1909, William, Maria, John and his wife Florence, Mary, Isabella and William junior were on the electoral roll and living together at Latrobe Street, Ballarat. William, John and William jnr all gave their occupation as architect.

When William jnr married Annie Mabel Cunningham, on 22 November 1911, at Ballarat, he gave his parents’ names as William Brazenor and Ellen Coogan. William and Annie are the ancestors of the remaining half of the present day holders of the Brazenor name, in Australia.

In December 1913, William Brazenor senior made a will in which he left everything to his wife Maria Brazenor. However, should she happen to predecease him his assets were to be divided equally between his children John Alexander Smyth Brazenor, Mary Smyth Brazenor, Isabella Smyth Brazenor and his adopted son William Brazenor, clerk of the Ballarat Water Supply Office.

William Brazenor snr, one time surveyor, draftsman, architect, hotel owner, foundation Aussie Rules footballer, horse breeder, huntsman and friend of the poet Adam Lindsay Gordon, died at his residence “Severn”, Carlton Street, Ballarat West, aged eighty-three, on 21 September 1916.

Robert Liddelow Brazenor 1848-1918 and Elizabeth Sophie Brodie c.1851-1933

Robert, the son of Robert and Lucy Brazenor was born at Marylebone, London in March 1848, and married Elizabeth Sophie Brodie at Holy Trinity, Marylebone in October 1876. Robert did not follow his father into the saddlery trade instead becoming a carpenter and joiner. They had five children including Robert Goode, born at Holborn, London in 1877; William Herbert, born at St Pancras, London in 1879; Albert Ernest, born at St Pancras in 1881; Lucy May, born at Marylebone in 1883; and lastly Walter Liddelow, born at Marylebone in 1885. In 1911, Robert and Elizabeth were living in Marylebone and with them were their sons Walter and Albert, together with Albert’s wife and family.

Robert Goode Brazenor married Agnes May Bannon in about December 1899, at Westminster, London. Their first two children Agnes May and William James were born in London, before the family emigrated to the USA, in about 1903. Robert’s younger brother William Herbert was already in the States, having married Sarah Gannon, in Massachus-sets, in 1902. William and Sarah later moved to Providence, Rhode Island, where the Brazenor name is still known today. Albert and his family remained in the UK, as did Lucy May.

Robert and Elizabeth’s youngest son Walter, died in France, in September 1918, just a few weeks before WW1 concluded.

His father Robert Liddelow Brazenor passed away in the September quarter of that same year. Albert and his wife Louisa Florence Reading had six children two of whom, Walter and Reginald, and their families, were to emigrate to Australia, in the 1950s.

In conclusion

Firstly, the surname Brazenor/Brazenor originated in the late sixteenth to early seventeenth centuries, at Worthen, Shropshire, as a variation of the surname Brasnell.

Secondly, the disappearance of the surname from Shropshire and adjacent Montgomeryshire, can primarily be sheeted home to the migration of Brazenor males, with or without their families, to the English Midlands, in particular to the counties of Warwickshire, Staffordshire and Worcestershire.

The males who remained in Shropshire, and who married, seem to have either produced no children or a preponderance of daughters, who whilst they may have brought forth a multitude of children, the great majority of these, of course, were not named Brazenor.

The last nail in the coffin, so to speak, was the case of Thomas, the last male Brazenor to live and die in Shropshire. Thomas produced eight offspring with two wives, including six daughters and two sons. His sons migrated to the Midlands, where they both married, and where they remained for the rest of their lives. ■
The Programme
The 38th Guild conference will take place from late afternoon on Friday 31 March to late Sunday afternoon 2 April 2017. The AGM will take place at 9am on Saturday 1 April.

Once again we are offering 10 percent discount to those members who have never attended a Guild conference. We are also offering for the first time a payment plan option; if you are interested in taking advantage of this please email conference@one-name.org or call the helpdesk and you will be provided with the details. For those members who live close enough to the venue we are offering the chance to join us for the activities on Friday afternoon and the buffet dinner at a reduced evening delegate price of £20.

We have an amazing amount of experience and knowledge amongst our members and we have drawn upon this in formulating the programme. I have attempted to give the entire conference an international feel underpinning the ethos of the Guild, global studies and global members.

The conference programme is provisional and can be found alongside. There are still a few sessions that need to be confirmed but please keep an eye on the webpage.

Venue
The venue is the Botley Park Hotel and Spa which is part of the Macdonald Chain of hotels - http://www.macdonald-hotels.co.uk/our-hotels/macdonald-botley-park-hotel-spa/. We have arranged a special rate of £89 bed and breakfast rate for those members who wish to stay on Thursday before the conference or stay on Sunday evening. These will be required to be booked direct with the hotel (the booking is under Guild of One-Name Studies or GOONS) and payment will need to be made direct with the hotel for the extra night(s). As always email conference@one-name.org or call the helpdesk if there are any questions.

I hope to see you in Southampton, the area is rich in historical areas and of course there is Hampshire Records Office which is a particular favourite of mine.

Julie Goucher
Conference Organiser

Macdonald Botley Park Hotel & Spa
A
s we have come to expect through guided tours and presentations arranged by the Guild, this Seminar once again provided professional insight into name rich sources and a peek into social history. On this occasion we had opportunity to gain better understanding of Asylums and Children’s Homes, what is available through the archives at the Borthwick Institute and National Railway Museum (NRM), and professional guidance in terms of Copyright and future readability/archiving of documents and pictures. Please read on for a short précis of each element of the event, full copies of most of the slides and presentations given at the Seminar being available through the Guild Website.

For some the event started on Friday with a visit to Borthwick Institute for Archives. The Guild had arranged a guided tour and document display. Mr Gary Brannan gave an introductory talk covering the origins and workings of the Archive. Starting with the original York Diocesan Archive, there are now many other collections including: York probate records; 14,000 cause papers relating to cases heard between 1300 and 1858 in the diocese of York (https://www.hrionline.ac.uk/casepapers/); history of the chocolate industry from the Rowntree & Co and Terry’s chocolate archives; and The Retreat archive. On display were original parish registers, cause papers, maps, wills and Retreat case books; during the tour we even saw the baptism entry for Guy Fawkes. Details of the collections (many of which are digitised), searchable catalogue, opening times etc are available on the website https://www.york.ac.uk/borthwick/.

The opening presentation on Saturday was ‘Exploring The Retreat’, presented by Dr Katherine Webb (Borthwick Institute for Archives, University of York). The Retreat was founded by the Society of Friends (Quakers) and opened in 1796. It was a pioneer in less restrictive methods of treatment for the mentally ill, and influenced the development of care in the United Kingdom, North America and elsewhere, hence its inclusion in the Wellcome Library Mental Healthcare Digital Collection at http://wellcome.library.org/collections/digital-collections/mental-healthcare/. The Wellcome Library is free and open to anyone interested in the history of health and medicine, and has funded the digitisation of 800,000 pages of a selection of UK asylums, psychiatric institutions and personnel: Ticehurst House Hospital, Rother (1787-1975), The Retreat, York (1792-2000), Garnetval Royal Hospital /Glasgow Lunatic Asylum, Glasgow (1811-2000), St Luke’s, London (1750-2001), Priory Hospital, Roehampton (1905-1909) and Manor / Chiswick House Asylum, Chiswick (1870-1925)

The Retreat archive is held at the Borthwick Institute, spans 1792-2000 and includes administrative, financial, staff and patient records. In addition to bound volumes, photographs and loose papers, a number of paintings have also been digitised. The papers are name rich, with patient records sometimes including photos. Through the presentation we were able to get a feel for some of the processes and conditions for the mentally ill and in particular the wealthy/middle class inmates of The Retreat. The original papers may be consulted at the Borthwick Institute for Archives at University of York. The digitised records can be accessed for free through the Wellcome Library or the Borthwick sites detailed earlier. (You do need to register online to use the Wellcome Library site and patient records from 1920 onwards are excluded from the digitisation project).

After coffee break (with biscuits!) we became enlightened on ‘Copyright - Help or Hindrance in the Electronic World’. This was presented by Rev. Graham Cornish, Copyright Consultant and author of Copyright - Interpreting the law for libraries, archives and information services. Using his many years of experience, Graham talked us through copyright in terms of what we may be copying or publishing for our ONS. If you are reproducing images, sound or info for your ONS I strongly recommend viewing the whole presentation. It covers ownership of rights, use or not of ©, dispels some urban myths, covers what is and is not covered by copyright including photos and images on the internet, databases, social networks and the duration of copyright (which the answer seems to be seventy years unless otherwise, and there are plenty of otherwise). Graham can be contacted through his website at www.copyrightcircle.co.uk

Lunch was provided as part of the Seminar by the catering at NRM. Plenty of tasty and fresh sandwiches and pastries with tea/coffee/water and cake. It was during lunch that many of us were able to join Alison Kay for a tour of the Search Engine - the library and archive centre of the National Railway Museum. The NRM archive holds part of our railway heritage, alongside the TNA and other archives. Their website at http://www.nrm.org.uk/researchandarchive has a helpful guide as to how to undertake research and where records may be held.

In the NRM Archive we saw many name and photo rich old company magazines/journals, photos, film, posters as well as accident reports and technical/engineering drawings. These cover a vast range, from unique items such as the notebook of John Rastrick - the judge at the Rainhill Trials in 1829 - to the sole surviving personal diary of Robert Stephenson, through to large collections such as the papers of Timothy Hackworth and his family, and the papers of the inventor William Yorath Lewis, who tried to bring a perpetually moving ‘never stop railway’ to fruition.
It never ceases to amaze me just how much information has survived fire, flood and the bin. The internet of things is undoubtedly helping us have better awareness of the existence of some of the information and even the ability to view digitised copies directly from our devices. But it may be a double edged sword for the future historian as we were shown how the same internet of things, along with e-mail and digitisation, creates new archiving challenges, for the professional archivist, the One-namer and even those who may have only a passing interest in family or social history. Consider this: can you pass to your descendants human readable photos and correspondence of your life?

‘Caring for Your Digital Records’ was presented by Stefanie Davidson, (Records Management, Collections and Digital Archives Co-ordinator, West Yorkshire Archive Service). Stephanie reminded us that many old documents survive and are human readable after hundreds of years and have had very little or no care. Conversely our digital records and storage media can easily become obsolete/lost within a generation, are not human readable and require active care.

To help us care for our digital records Stephanie reminded us of the importance of offsite copies and checking we could recover from the offsite copies, also that software and hardware become obsolete. So try to keep on top of this, for example by scanning your files with a file profiling tool. The TNA have produced a helpful online guide to managing digital continuity, including software to see what is/is becoming obsolete. Consider following the guidance at http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/information-management/manage-information/policy-process/digital-continuity/. Further resources to help consider and prioritise our caring for digital records are published by the Digital Preservation Coalition in the Digital Preservation Handbook at http://handbook.dpconline.org/.

‘No Place Like Home - The Institutions that Housed Britain’s Children’ was the final presentation of the Seminar.

Peter Higginbotham introduced us to the wealth of information available from 1552 to the present day, much of which can be seen through his extensive website on the subject at http://www.childrenshomes.org.uk/. Peter guided us through the origins, development of blue/grey coat schools starting with the founding of Christ’s Hospital in 1552 in London, admissions processes, competition in the voluntary sector, in particular the ‘big three’ of Barnardo’s, National Children’s Home and the Waifs and Strays Society. Also covered was how the Poor Law System also used workhouses, cottage homes and scattered houses for children. There were also the Reformatory Schools, providing an alternative to prison for children, and Certified Industrial Schools, both of which were renamed Approved Schools in 1933. The big change came with the 1946 Curtis Report which concluded that for children without parents or a satisfactory home, adoption was proposed as the best option, with fostering the next best.

So, my takeaways from the Seminar, in priority order? Get an off-site back-up of my digital records; actually test the recovery of some back-up records; print off a few of my key family photos and write on the back some details; check my digital file using DROID; crosscheck Bilbow and its variants on the Borthwick and Wellcome websites. Well, maybe just a quick check of the websites before doing anything else!
Fort Collins, Colorado. The Windsor, Colorado Daughters of the American Revolution chapter, Friday’s Council Tree, has been researching for the identities of previously “unknown” soldiers who died while in service at Camp Collins 1862-1865.

One of those soldiers is James Featherstone (Featherston) who enlisted in the 11th Ohio Cavalry in 1863 at age twenty-seven and died at Camp Collins of disease on 8 February 1865. The DAR arranged for a monument with the names of nineteen previously unidentified soldiers, including James, with a ceremonial unveiling on 5 November 2016 at Grandview Cemetery in Fort Collins where our Civil War soldiers are buried (Cover photo).

The unusual name of the DAR chapter is taken from the location of the Council Tree that was located northwest of Timnath, Colorado. Chief Friday and his Arapaho Tribe used this tree as a meeting place and significant landmark. The Arapaho and Cheyenne tribes would meet and hold council under a tall cottonwood tree along the Poudre River. Chief Friday of the Northern Arapaho Tribe was given his name by Thomas Fitzpatrick who found the young starving boy on the prairie in 1831. Thomas adopted him and took him to St. Louis where he placed him in a Catholic school. Later, as an adult, he worked as an interpreter. A soldier described him as “a tall noble looking man, well dressed in skins with good buffalo robes as blankets.”

Brian Carroll has been researching these soldiers for the DAR Historic Marker Project in Fort Collins, Colorado. This Historic Marker Project came about by locating historic markers at Grandview Cemetery, Fort Collins, Colorado that need restoration or serious cleaning. This eight-year-long project consisted of photographing every marker in Grandview Cemetery, uploading ones not already found on Find a Grave and updating the cemetery database. The theme of their Historic Marker Project is “Beloved in Life, Not Forgotten in Death”.

The service record for James Featherston who enlisted as a private in a Tennessee regiment in 1861 is not stellar. He appears to have been a “problem soldier” with several desertions. He ended up being a prisoner of war at Camp Chase in Ohio. The United States needed soldiers to fight the Indians out west among them the Arapaho and Cheyenne and decided to allow POW’s to get out of their miserable prison if they were willing to go west, and fight Indians. James signed (with his mark) an oath of allegiance to the U.S. Government on 3 June 1863 at Camp Chase, Ohio and coincidentally his enlistment in the 11th Ohio Calvary was the same date.

The 11th Ohio was a regiment formed with volunteers knowing they were going to be assigned in Indian Territory. Under the command of Lt. Col. William Oliver Collins, the companies included the forty former Confederates enlisted from the prisoner of war camp at Camp Chase. During this time period, the 11th Ohio Cavalry suffered three officers and twenty enlisted men killed in action and one officer and sixty enlisted men who died from disease. James died of disease 8 February 1865 at Fort Collins.

James was born in 1834 in Bedford County, Tennessee, the fifth child of John Henry Featherston and wife Nancy Pressgrove. James’s grandfather had served in the War of 1812 and his great grandfather William, was a patriot in the American Revolutionary War. The family could be considered frontiersmen. They had emigrated from Virginia to Kentucky after being awarded land in Tennessee for military service and also family members moved to Illinois as additional land was given for service. Some of the family went further south into Mississippi.

James is listed with his father John, mother Nancy and two of his brothers, Burrell and Columbus Featherston (my great-grandfather) in the 1860 U.S. Census living in Franklin, Simpson County, Kentucky. In the 1850 U.S. Census he is living with his parents and seven of his brothers in Beck’s Creek, Shelby County, Illinois. The family left Illinois under a cloud when his father John Henry was charged with attempted murder, posted bond and fled to Kentucky.

[Editor’s Note - The Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) was founded in 1890 and is headquartered in Washington, D.C., is a non-profit, non-political volunteer women’s service organization dedicated to promoting patriotism, preserving American history, and securing America’s future through better education for children] Guild committee member Paul Featherstone (member 2627) is currently researching his surname (and variants) and can be contacted at featherstone@one-name.org

1 According to Watrous, “History of Larimer County” (page 225) this is Captain Evans’ headquarters with officers in front of the building at the old Fort Collins.
Yorkshire Regional Seminar Report

by Paul Featherstone (Member 2627) and David Burgess (Member 5768)

Yorkshire is a big county containing around 10% of England’s population and measuring over 100 miles across, north to south or east to west. The county is divided into three Guild regions, based very roughly on the three Ridings, with Yorkshire-East covering Hull and East Yorkshire; Yorkshire-North covering North Yorkshire; and Yorkshire-West covering West and South Yorkshire, ie the original West Riding south of the River Wharfe.

Had Yorkshire been a separate country it would have finished 17th in the Medals Table at the Rio Olympics.

Paul Featherstone is the Guild Representative for Yorkshire-North (fifty-six members, of which forty-one have registered their study). Paul is also the Guild’s Stand Manager and a member of the Guild Committee. David Burgess is the Guild Representative for Yorkshire-West (seventy-five members - fifty-five registered studies) and keeps members in Yorkshire-East (twenty-two members - fifteen registered studies) informed as they are without a representative at the moment.

David Burgess took over as Yorkshire-West Representative in the summer of 2014 and asked members what they would like done. He had sufficient replies indicating that they would like to meet other members so he decided to try and arrange a regional seminar. Not knowing how successful the event might be he invited the representatives of Yorkshire-North and Yorkshire-East and their members to participate.

A room was booked at the Guiseley Methodist Church on the north side of Leeds with seating for forty. It was reckoned if it could attract twelve members it would be a goer. Six members came forward to speak on a wide range of topics. Invitations were sent to all Yorkshire members. The programme was circulated to non-members attending local family history classes in the hope it would publicise the Guild and details were posted on the Guild Events page.

In the event thirty-seven attended, including one member who had travelled from sixty miles away.

A charge of £5 per head was made to cover the cost of the room and refreshments. Delegates brought their own lunch. The modest surplus helps fund postage costs and future regional events. It was felt appropriate to make a charge to encourage commitment to attend. At the end of the seminar there was an overwhelming request to hold another one.

The next regional seminar was held in Harrogate in November 2015, organised by Paul Featherstone and this was attended by thirty-seven members and non-members. Delegates included two from Sussex, Ken and Jean Toll.

This was followed by one in Barnsley Old Town in May 2016 attended by twenty-four members and non-members, including ones from Cheshire, Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.

The Regional Representatives for Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire had kindly publicised the event to their members.

There is no locally organised seminar in the autumn of 2016 as the Guild Seminar is based in York.

The next seminar will be held in Wakefield on Saturday 18 March 2017. One speaker has been booked; Paul Featherstone will repeat his talk on Methods and Tools for Websites, which he gave at the Website Creation Seminar in Oadby in July.

All the Yorkshire Regional seminars have speakers drawn from the membership. Topics have ranged from members One Name Studies to dealing with Databases, Maps and a One Place Study.

As a result of the liaison, we are now cooperating on manning the Guild Stand at local fairs in Yorkshire and in organising the 2018 Guild Conference.

Newswatch Project

Many of you will have benefitted from information gleaned under the Guild’s Newswatch project. The idea of this project is that members volunteer to ‘adopt’ a local newspaper (purchased or freebie) by checking it for Announcements (Births, Marriages and Deaths – ‘Hatches, Matches and Despatches’) concerning Guild names, and sending the details to the relevant member. Please contact Jim Isard, newswatch@one-name.org, to volunteer or for more information.
What Fate had in Store for my Ancestors?

by Steve Tanner (Member 6995)

Steve Tanner considers the joys and horrors of finding what happened to his ancestors in the British Newspaper Archive:

The British Newspaper Archive, searchable at british-newspaperarchive.co.uk/ for a variety of subscription options, is by now probably well known to many GOONS. The BNA has been a salutary reminder to me of the transience of life and human frailties. Within my direct ancestors - back to 4 x great grandparents - I’ve found an amazing variety of incidents.

I have found, however, that one needs to be aware of the capabilities and limitations of the search algorithm, and also the OCR text recognition software. The latter has vastly improved since the early days, but is still imperfect, owing to the uneven preservation of the various print faces used in old newspapers. It won’t for example, deal with the old way of writing “s” like an “f”, so if you’re looking for Isaac pre-1820, you could try “Ifaac”.

To maximise the chances of finding anything, it helps if you’re searching for an unusual surname, as GOONS mostly are. Since the search results are ranked according to how close together in the text two or more search terms occur, it is also helpful if you can use a distinctive place name, and/or occupation. Most reports begin: “John Smith, of Poppleton, baker….” etc. though the first two names in that example are unlikely to find anything among the mass of irrelevant results thrown up. You also then need to develop a skill of homing in on the period (50 year period, decade, year, month, week and day are all possible) and also the region, county and newspaper where your previous research leads you to suspect the people in question may have made the news.

The examples below are just a few of my personal “hits” — all either my direct ancestors or their siblings.

1. Sex scandal: 18 March 1791 Stamford Mercury

‘On Monday se’nnight the 7th instant was tried at Lincoln assizes, a cause wherein William Harrison, butcher, of Donington, was plaintiff, and Lumby, butcher, of the same place, defendant, for criminal conversation with the plaintiff’s wife, in which frequent acts of criminal intercourse being proved, the jury allowed the plaintiff 40 l. damages, which they thought, with the costs (which will be considerable), would be sufficient for the defendant’s circumstances. and at the same time make him sensible of his folly and presumption. And on the same day a cause was tried, wherein Lumby was plaintiff, and Harrison defendant, for a supposed debt of 39l. wherein the plaintiff was nonsuited, greatly to the satisfaction of the learned Judge (Justice Grose) before whom the two causes were tried.’

My 4 x great, Isaac, far from being ruined by this financial set-back, seems to have profited from the publicity, founding a successful firm of Auctioneers which lasted into the twentieth century, whereas the cuckolded Harrison only made a laughing stock of himself. The surname Lumby is the subject of an ONS by a fellow GOON.

2. Runaway husband, 1828

Nottingham Review and General Advertiser for the Midland Counties —1 February 1828

The absconder was my 3x great. I don’t know whether the accompanying sketch was specifically drawn to accompany the description, or whether this was such a regular column that they had a standard stylised picture to head it. His wife at the time of the desertion was eight months pregnant, with a child who died at two months.

The next child, Enoch Stafford was baptised on 23 Feb 1829, so conceived about May 1828 - so his father had returned by then. Using the Castle Garden website, I found that he made good later in America, with hundreds of descendants around in the Chicago area. It is a salutary thought that Enoch wouldn’t have been born if they hadn’t managed to get his father back in time to sire him! A lot more efficient than today’s Child Support Agency.

3. Stamford Mercury 20 October 1843

Shock ing and Determined Suicide

‘On Monday Mr. Hitchins held an inquest at Doddington near Lincoln, on the body of Mr. Geo. Mimmack, a very respectable farmer, who terminated his existence by his own hand on the day previous. The deceased had been ill, and his mind had been affected with despondency for some time. His medical attendant, Mr. Hewson, had warned those about him to keep strict watch, and not to leave him for any length of time; and consequently his housekeeper was careful in that respect, and when he shaved sat by him. On Saturday he was sufficiently well.
to be able to transact business, and on Sunday morning appeared more cheerful than usual. He rose about half past seven, went out, and shortly afterwards returned and took up some papers, with which he went up stairs, apparently with the intention of putting them away. The housekeeper followed, and finding him busy with the papers, asked if he was arranging them, to which he simply replied “Yes”; she went down, and in about ten minutes returned, and found that he had left the room in which he had been. Upon her going into an adjacent apartment, a dreadful spectacle presented itself: the deceased lay on the floor with his head nearly blown to pieces, and the gun with which he had committed the suicidal act lying beside him. It appeared that he had got a hooked stick, placed his head upon the muzzle of the gun, and then pulled the trigger with the stick. The shot had penetrated the forehead, tearing away the skin and flesh, and had divided the scalp into three parts, forcing part off and scattering the brains about the room. It is a singular circumstance that the deceased destroyed himself in the same room in which his brother hanged himself on the 28th of March, 1839. The deceased was fond of shooting, and was renowned as an excellent marksman. He made his will some weeks ago. Verdict, temporary insanity.’

I have reason to be grateful to poor George, as he bequeathed the farm to his brother, my 3 x great, so some of his cash percolated down to me. A third brother met a similar fate, as the farm to his brother, my 3 x great, so some of his cash I have reason to be grateful to poor George, as he bequeathed

4. EXTRAORDINARY AND DETERMINED SUICIDE

The Era — Sunday 14 March 1852

“The Gambler’s Fate”

‘On Saturday an inquest was held by Mr. W. Payne, at the Barley Mow, Upper Thames-street, on the body of William Mimmack, aged fifty-nine, who committed suicide on Saturday morning last, under rather extraordinary circumstances, at a coffee-house in Upper Thames-street. Mr. Henry Griffiths, said that he was a coffee-house keeper, and lived at 209, Upper Thames-street. About seven o’clock on the evening of Friday a man, whom he had never seen before came into the house, and inquired if he could be accommodated with a bed for the night. He was answered in the affirmative, and at about a quarter past seven he was at his request shown to his room, and nothing was heard of him until ten o’clock on Saturday morning, when a lodger in the adjoining room had looked through a pane of glass in the door of the room occupied by the deceased, and then saw him lying by the side of the bed. He came downstairs to the shop, and told witness that he thought there was something wrong up stairs, and they went back to the room together. They then found the deceased hanging by a rope round his neck tied to the post of the bedstead. He was lying flat on his belly, and his head was not suspended more than from seven to eight inches from the ground. Witness went up to him, and put his hand on his chest, which he fancied was still warm. He cut the cord and let him down, and sent for a doctor, who, on his arrival, declared that life was extinct, and had been so for some time. When he engaged the bed he observed nothing peculiar in his manner. The bed appeared to have been laid on, but not inside. At about three o’clock on Friday afternoon a person called at the house, and inquired if any person, having the appearance

of a butcher, had been there writing a letter, as a letter posted at Knight Rider-street, had been received by his wife, in which it was said that when it came to hand he should be no more. Before the deceased went to bed witness’s wife suggested to him as to whether he (the deceased) was the butcher. He accordingly went and looked at him while he was reading the paper, and then remarked to his wife that he thought he looked more like an engineer than a butcher, and took no further notice of him.

By a Juror: He must have brought the cord into the house with him, as he did not see it till he saw it round his neck. He did not appear in liquor. He had tied up waistcoat, shoes, &c., in a bundle, and had described the exact amount of money that would be found about him. The letter being posted in Knight Rider-street, his friends, when they got it, concluded he must be somewhere near to that place.

William Joshua Mimmack said that he lived at No. 12, Derby-street, Gray’s-Inn road. The deceased was his father. He left home at six o’clock on Friday morning, to go to his occupation in Newgate market, and heard no more of him until about half-past two o’clock in the afternoon, when a letter was received from him which stated that in consequence of his great misfortunes through investing his money in horse racing, he had come to the determination of making away with himself. This letter was posted in Knight Rider-street, and although every inquiry had been made, nothing had been ascertained until Saturday, when they were made acquainted with his end through the means of a book that had been found in his possession. He had lately been much depressed in spirits through misfortunes in losing large sums of money in his business, as he understood.

A juryman remarked that the deceased’s mind might have been affected thereby. The Coroner said he had no doubt of it, from certain remarks that were written in different leaves of the book that had been found in his possession. The first was: “Thames street, Six o’clock. I now fly in the face of my friend and Maker. Horseracing has killed me. It would be a good thing if it was made felony to bet on any of them.”

After hearing numerous statements, he (the Coroner) thought the jury would have no doubt that the mind of the deceased was affected. It was incidentally mentioned that two brothers of the deceased had committed suicide. The jury, after a short consultation, returned a verdict of “Temporary Insanity.”

5. Reading Mercury — Saturday 11 Sept 1858

‘On Wednesday, at Somerford Magna, on the body of Charles Tanner, 55 years of age. Mr. Poole deposed, that on the previous Saturday afternoon, about 1 o’clock, on passing through his riggeryard, he found deceased prostrate, and groaning at the bottom of an oat-rick which he had been thatching. He was enabled to say that, having missed the round of his ladder, he pitched on his head. Deceased was immediately conveyed home in cart, being unable to walk, and died the next day, from injury to his spine. Verdict, each case. Accidental death.’

This was my 2x great. Tanner is a difficult search term, not
only because it is a common name, but also because of the frequent reference to the occupation. Only the distinctive place name enabled me to make this find which, like the others, was completely new to me.

6. Nottingham Guardian — 1 January 1859
   “Husband and Wife”
   ‘Edward Goddard, a pork-butcher, living in Carter Gate, appeared to a summons charging him with assaulting his wife on Friday, the 24th ult. The row began to this wise, Goddard was about to send a parcel to some of his children in London, and in this parcel he proposed to enclose two pork pies. These pies were selected by himself, when his better-half declared they were too big, and some of less dimensions would answer the purpose just as well. Mrs. Goddard got into a passion and so did her lord. Goddard, giving his wife a blow on the eye, caused it to turn black and a bruise on the nose which had the effect of causing it to assume the colour of red. Mrs. Goddard then threw a cup of tea in her husband’s face, this got his mettle up and the consequence was he struck her again. The bench added the insult was unjustifiable, but at the same time the complainant had no right to interfere between her husband and his children. He was ordered to enter into his own recognisance in the sum of £5, to keep the peace towards his wife for three months.’

NOTES: Edward was my 3 x great granddad, but his then wife was his second, not my 3 x great gran. To me, the most surprising finding is the fact that the post was expected to deliver parcels posted on Christmas Eve in time for the following morning!

7. Stamford Mercury — 16 March 1849
   ‘At Coleby on Monday, on the body of Ann Horton, aged 5 years, whose clothes took fire during her mother’s absence, and literally roasted her. Verdict, accidental death, and the jury expressed their opinion that the mother had not properly looked after her children, as one was burnt to death three years since. The fanatical woman, who seems to be one of the weak-minded class of professes religionists who call upon the Almighty to do for them what it is their duty themselves to do, expressed her concern that she had not committed her child to the care of God before she went out, believing that, had she done so, the accident would not have happened. The coroner reprimed the vain woman, whose notions of the Deity seemed to that He is to be degraded to the office of her child-keeper every time she chooses to call upon him whilst she goes out to gossip, and told her religiousness of character would be better manifested staying at home and performing her duty, than in praying to God to do her work for her whilst she went out to chatter.’

The mother was my 2x great; her other eleven children all reached adulthood.

Checking out the above lady’s brother in law, my first port of call was FREEBMD, where I found:

Horton Mary Ann 60 Sheffield 9c 308
Horton William 62 Sheffield 9c 308

This was an “aha moment” – the entries for the two deaths were listed as on the same page, so must have been nearly simultaneous. We know this sometimes happens with couples - the first one goes, then the second dies of uncontrollable grief within twenty-four hours. But the BNA’s first hit told a sadder tale:

8. Edinburgh Evening News (and many others) — 9 Feb 1885: “Two Persons Suffocated by Gas”
   ‘A lamentable discovery was made by the Sheffield police at Attercliffe yesterday morning. About six o’clock a strong escape of gas was noticed to be issuing from the cellar grate of a small grocer’s shop, occupied by Mr William Horton and his wife. Some neighbours who had noticed the smell knocked at the shop door with the intention of awaking Mr Horton and his wife. Their efforts were fruitless, however, and about nine o’clock messenger was despatched to the police station. Police-constable Boreham procured a ladder, and placed it against the wall by the bedroom window and climbed up. On looking through the window saw Mr and Mrs Horton lying dead in bed side by side.’

9. Nottingham Evening Post — 23 Feb 1900 — “Death of a Chemist From Acid”
   ‘An inquest was held by the City Coroner (Mr. C. L., Rothera), at no. 46, Arkwright-street, Nottingham, this afternoon, on the body of Fred Lumbry, who formerly carried on business as a chemist and druggist and kept a subpost-office at the above address, whose death was the result of prussic acid poisoning.— Mary Lumbry, wife of deceased, said her husband had been very poorly indeed for some time: he had had influenza hanging about since Christmas. The post office business had worried him a good deal, there having been an alteration in the telegraphic arrangements. One of the assistants was away for a fortnight through illness, the pressure of business had been enormous, while his daughter had been ill also. These things seemed to worry him. Deceased had no sleep on Tuesday night and on Wednesday morning said his chest and head were very bad. Witness went an errand for him, as he seemed too ill to go himself, and when she returned her daughter told her something had happened, and she went upstairs, where Drs. Ward, Random, and Hunter were attending her husband…… Dr. Ward said he was called to see the deceased on the Wednesday morning. He was unconscious and witness could detect the smell of prussic acid, but he was too far gone for any relief to be afforded, and died from the effect of the poison. Random and Hunter came and concurred in this view. —The jury returned a verdict of “Death from prussic acid poisoning” but were of opinion that there was not sufficient evidence to show the circumstances under which it was administered.’

This was the great-grandson of the amorous butcher in the first snippet. The story was new to me - I had been told Fred, my great-granddad had died “during a ‘flu epidemic”. Clearly, the details were meant to remain a family secret, at least from sensitive young children like myself.

So, with the above extracts and others which, due to space, have not been included in this article, within my direct ancestors and their siblings, I have found:
A Prospective Patron for the Guild

by Peter Alefounder (Member 252)

“We AGM shall be empowered to elect a Patron,” — Guild Constitution, clause 10.3

The Guild’s new Constitution, adopted at the 2016 AGM, allows the Guild, for the first time, to elect a Patron. For an organisation such as the Guild, a Patron lends a measure of prestige and official recognition. The appointment must be made by an Annual General Meeting, but for practical reasons it falls to the Committee to find someone suitable who is willing to take on the role. This is not always straightforward: in the course of our investigations we learnt of others engaged in a similar search who had not found a candidate.

In the UK, apart from Scotland which has its own system under the Lord Lyon, the College of Arms is the only official entity with an interest in genealogy. It was constituted as a body in 1484, but many of the official posts were instituted long before that date. The College holds records of its own dating from the Tudor period and collections of genealogical material going back a thousand years, including mediaeval chronicles and pedigrees.

Apart from granting coats of arms, the College is also involved with peerages, knighthoods, flags and state ceremonial occasions, but much of its work is proving pedigrees to a standard acceptable in a court of law. An example of this can be found in the article by the late John Blundell, JOONS 11(3) (Jul-Sep 2012), 26-7, ‘Getting Proofed at the College of Arms.’ Much of their work, then, is similar to that of Guild members, and the Committee thought that an officer of the College would be well qualified to be a Guild Patron.

We sought the advice of our President, Derek Palgrave, as he is well-versed in heraldry and has acquaintances within the College. He suggested Peter O’Donoghue, York Herald, and after making an initial, informal, contact, recommended that a meeting be arranged. Paul Howes and myself met York Herald at the College of Arms, and after telling him about the Guild and what members do, can report that he would be pleased to become our Patron.

Peter O’Donoghue was appointed as an Officer of Arms in 2005, and has over twenty years professional experience in the field, including lectures and publications. There has been some previous contact with the Guild. While Bluemantle Pursuivant, he gave a talk to the 2008 Guild Conference on ‘The Records of the College of Arms.’ He was also John Blundell’s contact at the College for the work mentioned above. In more recent times, as York Herald, he has become known as the usual spokesman for the College on the BBC television programme ‘Who Do You Think You Are?’ (UK, USA and Irish versions), and has appeared on other TV programmes. We believe, therefore, that we have found a prospective Patron whose interests are in line with our own, with an official position involving genealogy, and who has gained public recognition of this. The Committee has resolved to nominate Peter O’Donoghue, York Herald, for election as Guild Patron at the 2017 AGM. In line with the Constitution, this would be for a period of five years.

The College of Arms

Peter O’Donoghue, York Herald

To say that the BNA has “brought to life” my family history would therefore be to use the wrong metaphor. Perhaps my ancestry is particularly full of tragedy. But these events are something I would rather know than not know.

Although the examples above are not from my own ONS of HEMPSALL, the relevance of the BNA to One Name Studies is clear: if you’re searching for just one name, then all hits are potentially interesting; I have found many such in my ONS.

One thing I would emphasize is that these searches require more patience than the general run of genealogical enquiry; they need careful consideration of the workings of the search algorithms, and thorough knowledge of the lineages, geographical and social milieus.

Many of these stories have led to further back-up research, and explained the reason why hitherto unexplained family events had happened. Above all, they have taught me the transient nature of the human condition, and given me more empathy with my ancestors, for all their faults and weaknesses.

• one sex scandal
• four suicides (two hangings, one shooting, one poisoning)
• one drowning while skating
• one gassing
• one domestic coming-to-blows
• one fatal fall from a ladder
• one fatal burning
• one runaway breadwinner

To say that the BNA has “brought to life” my family history would therefore be to use the wrong metaphor. Perhaps my ancestry is particularly full of tragedy. But these events are something I would rather know than not know.

Although the examples above are not from my own ONS of

To say that the BNA has “brought to life” my family history would therefore be to use the wrong metaphor. Perhaps my ancestry is particularly full of tragedy. But these events are something I would rather know than not know.

Although the examples above are not from my own ONS of
Forthcoming Seminars

The Name of the Game Seminar
Bearley Village Hall,
Snitterfield Road, Bearley,
Stratford-upon-Avon,
Warwickshire CV37 0SR
9:30 am for 10:00 am, Saturday 11 February 2017

Time for another seminar to attract those thinking about starting a one-name study and to inspire others to progress with their studies. As well as looking at the support and resources provided by the Guild through its website, this seminar will consider the use of official records and social media for one-name studies. There will be advice on managing a surname project and the day will conclude with highlights from different aspects of an established study.

Programme

09:30 - 10:00  Registration and Coffee
10:00 - 10:10  Welcome to the Seminar - Sue Thornton-Grimes
10:10 - 11:10  Discovering Archives at the County Record Office - David Hodgkinson (Warwickshire Record Office)
11:10 - 11:20  Comfort Break
11:20 - 12:35  A Walk Around the Website and Setting Up Your Profile Page - Kim Baldacchino (Guild Webmaster)
12:35 - 13:35  Lunch Break
13:35 - 14:35  Social Media for One-Name Studies - Debbie Kennett (Guild Social Networking Coordinator)
14:35 - 14:50  Comfort Break
14:50 - 15:35  Managing a One-Name Study - Rod Clayburn (Seminar Sub-Committee)
15:35 - 16:00  Tea Break
16:00 - 16:45  More to a One-Name Study than a List of Names - Alan Moorhouse (Seminar Sub-Committee)
16:45  Close of Seminar

Seminar cost, including refreshments and buffet lunch, is £18.00. Bearley is 4.5 miles from Stratford-upon-Avon. If you will be travelling by train to Stratford please contact us for help in finding a lift from the station. There is a station at Bearley itself (approximately 4 minutes walk to the venue) but train services are limited.

Bookings close 29 January 2017. All bookings will be confirmed by email, with full joining instructions, on or soon after this date.

For more information look under the Events tab at www.one-name.org or phone the Guild Help Desk Tel: 0800 011 2182

#GuildName
It was tracing the family history of my grandfather Jack Denman which first got me wondering about the origin of his surname. He used to play chess at county level and a one-time opponent shared his surname, and they speculated as to whether they might be related. They never did establish a connection, but DNA has since confirmed that they were indeed related!

The Denman name is found worldwide, but in England its main concentrations are in Somerset, Sussex and Nottinghamshire.

I’m extracting all the parish records for these ‘hot-spots’ and attempting to reconstruct families, whilst establishing genetic lineages where possible. Luckily collecting parish records hasn’t all been hard work. Local family history societies are a valuable resource for example, Sussex marriages and marriage licences 1538-1837 are available on CD; all records found for the parishes of Sussex have been indexed, and it is possible to generate a map from the results of a surname search.

Most surname definitions give the meaning of Denman as “dweller in the valley” (Reaney & Wilson, 1997; FANUK, 2016). Early variants include Deneman, Dinman and Dunman. “Den” is derived from “denu” which in Old English means valley, “dun” is the Old English word for hill or dune (Robinson, 1992; Poulton-Smith, 2010). The areas where the incidences of the Denman surname were historically highest are valley locations.

The Domesday book (1086) records a village of Dennesmodeswelle (above) in a valley near Broomfield in Somerset. It is thought to have been the estate called Denman’s or Deadman’s Well, possibly from the personal name Denman recorded (as Deneman) in the parish in the early 15th century.

Denman is not a small study, and there is still much work to be done. Most of my focus so far has been on the Somerset Denmans, but I have built a good collection of UK and overseas records, and enjoy finding myself disappearing off at a tangent wherever I see the Denman name.

Liz Jones is the Hampshire Regional Representative studying the surnames Denman and Willsman and can be contacted at denman@one-name.org.