

# National Genealogical Society

# Quarterly

A Journal for Today's Family Historian

VOLUME 97  
NUMBER 1  
MARCH 2009

## FEATURE ARTICLES

- Indirect Evidence for the Parents of Joseph Rhodes of  
Graves County, Kentucky  
*Sarah R. Fleming* 5
- Jonathan Turner—More than a Name: A Carolina Case Study in  
Dissecting Records  
*Rachal Mills Lennon, CG* 17
- Logic Reveals the Parents of Philip Pritchett of  
Virginia and Kentucky  
*Thomas W. Jones, Ph.D., CG, CGL, FASG* 29
- Genealogical Research in Kentucky  
*Bettie Cummings Cook, CG* 39
- REVIEWS 73
- 
- COMMUNICATIONS 2
- EDITORS' CORNER 3
- NGS ADMINISTRATION 4
- SIDELIGHT  
A Disgruntled Father-in-Law 16
- UPDATE  
Using French-Canadian Catholic Parish Records to Establish a  
Missing Kinship Relationship 28

© Copyright 2009. National Genealogical Society, Arlington, Virginia (ISSN 0027-934X). Established in 1912, the *NGS Quarterly* is sent quarterly to all members of the society and to libraries by subscription. Periodicals postage is paid at Arlington, Virginia, and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to NGS; 3108 Columbia Pike, Suite 300; Arlington, VA 22204-4304.

---

## Jonathan Turner—More than a Name: A Carolina Case Study in Dissecting Records

---

By Rachal Mills Lennon, CG

*He was more than a name, and his shadowy life was reconstructed to a surprising degree. The techniques, which transcend confines of time, place, and situation, encourage researchers to expand beyond the obvious.*

**T**he problem is vexing but common: people of modest means left few records as they moved among rural settlements. How can modern researchers reconstruct the lives of these shadowy figures when standard records seem to reveal nothing? The answer often lies in expanding the use of records more than finding additional sources. Gleaning all that records offer requires more than harvesting information. Researchers must move beyond genealogical norms to analyze data in historical, social, and political context and then slice into hidden levels of information. As two genealogical authorities recently explained:

“Family-history compilers assemble and describe facts. Unable to observe historical events first-hand, they gather evidence from surviving sources. Analyzing the evidence, they postulate what the facts may have been—at least to the extent sources allow. . . . Facts do not always make sense. How researchers and authors see them, understand them, triage their reliability, and ‘dress’ their meanings, determines the accuracy of their conclusions.”<sup>1</sup>

Jonathan Turner of Spartanburg and Pendleton (modern Anderson) districts, South Carolina, makes the case. Years of research in records of the Carolina backcountry yielded only three census entries to document Jonathan’s existence. He owned no land, paid no taxes, engaged in no lawsuits, and witnessed no legal

---

© Rachal Mills Lennon, CG; 2258 Highway 25; Cottontown, TN 37048; lennonrm@comcast.net. Ms. Lennon holds degrees from the University of Alabama and the University of Virginia. Author of numerous books and articles, she specializes in Southern brick-wall problems and Native American and African American lineages. Robert Hal Turner of Columbia, S.C., who commissioned the research for this article, gives permission for its publication.

1. Thomas W. Jones and Melinde Lutz Sanborn, “Editors’ Corner: Facts and Judgment,” *NGS Quarterly* 96 (June 2008): 83.

transactions during three decades. His wife and children remained nameless tally marks on federal enumerations. He lived near no Turners who could be siblings or forebears. No “triggers” that genealogists are trained to spot were evident. Jonathan apparently was just a name in the census.

Yet, Jonathan’s shadowy life was reconstructed to a surprising degree. The techniques, which transcend time, place, and situation, encourage researchers to expand beyond the obvious.

#### THE KNOWN

In 1800 Jonathan and his apparent eldest son, Sanders Turner, appear in contiguous households in Spartanburg District, South Carolina:

Jonathan Turner, five males under age ten, one male age forty-five and above, one female age sixteen to twenty-six, and one female age forty-five and above

Sanders Turner, one male age sixteen to twenty-six and one female age ten to sixteen<sup>2</sup>

Both men were enumerated five households apart in Pendleton District, South Carolina, in 1810:

“Jonath<sup>n</sup>” Turner, one male under age ten, one male age ten to sixteen, one male age sixteen to under twenty-six, one male age forty-five and above, and one female age twenty-six to forty-five

Sanders Turner, three males under age ten, one male age ten to sixteen, one male age twenty-six to forty-five, three males age forty-five and above, one female age ten to sixteen, and one female age twenty-six to forty-five<sup>3</sup>

As explained below, a process of elimination shows Jonathan Turner of Orangeburg District, South Carolina, in 1790 was not the above Jonathan.<sup>4</sup> Thus, that census’s only candidate for the Spartanburg District Jonathan Turner of 1800 lived in Rutherford County, North Carolina—adjoining Spartanburg District to the north—in 1790:

Jonathan Turner, one male age sixteen and above, two males under age sixteen, four females<sup>5</sup>

---

2. 1800 U.S. census, Spartanburg Dist., S.C., p. 196v, Jonathan Turner and Sanders Turner; National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) microfilm publication M32, roll 50.

3. 1810 U.S. census, Pendleton Dist., S.C., p. 257, Jonath<sup>n</sup> Turner and Sanders Turner; NARA microfilm M252, roll 61.

4. 1790 U.S. census, Orangeburg Dist., S.C., p. 252, Jonathan Turner; NARA microfilm M637, roll 11.

5. 1790 U.S. census, Rutherford Co., N.C., p. 145, col. 2, Jonathan Turner; NARA microfilm M637, roll 7.

Although Jonathan moved at least twice, censuses reveal no cluster of common neighbors. County-level research on his neighbors produced no Turner connections. Page-by-page readings of bound and loose records yielded no hard data on Jonathan or Sanders Turner, clues to possible kinsmen, or reasons for their moves. No county-level record suggests Jonathan's whereabouts before 1790. Information is too meager and his earliest neighbors were spread across too many counties and states for research to target all Turners living nearby.

#### EXPANDED EFFORTS

After exhausting local resources, researchers turn to other jurisdictions. Military records may be valuable when the research subject lived in a place and time of conflict. While they sometimes contain extraordinary data, military records are not always clear, particularly for early Southern research. Like other resources, they can sidetrack researchers looking only for names of interest.

Jonathan was of prime age to have served in the American Revolution, which ravaged the Carolina backcountry. Patriots battled the Cherokee, Tories, and British Army. The intensity and extent of violence left few Carolinians neutral (even if they wished), as the Revolution devolved into civil war among neighbors.<sup>6</sup> If Jonathan was near the North-South Carolina border a decade before his 1790 census appearance, he likely fought on one side or the other. Published and original resources reveal no Jonathan Turner in that region who remained loyal to the Crown. Nor is he connected to known Turner loyalists active in the backcountry, like those of Newberry District.<sup>7</sup> Two compiled sources, however, identify a patriot of that name:

---

6. For further information, see John Buchanan, *The Road to Guilford Courthouse: The American Revolution in the Carolinas* (New York: John Wiley, 1997); Walter Edgar, *Partisans and Redcoats: The Southern Conflict that Turned the Tide of the American Revolution* (New York: Perennial, 2003); Jerome J. Nadelhaft, *The Disorders of War: The Revolution in South Carolina* (Orono: University of Maine at Orono Press, 1981); Patrick O'Kelley, *Nothing But Blood and Slaughter: The Revolutionary War in the Carolinas*, 3 vols. (Lillington, N.C.: Blue House Tavern Press, 2004–5); John S. Pancake, *This Destructive War: The British Campaign in the Carolinas, 1780–1782* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1985); and Robert Stansbury Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists in the American Revolution* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1987). Revolutionary War pension applications provide the best detail about the interactions between loyalists and patriots in northwestern South Carolina.

7. The loyalist Turners of Newberry were well-known in their community. Three brothers appear on numerous pay lists of Cunningham's and Pearson's companies and are mentioned in other published works. See, for example, "List of Loyalists appearing in the Royal Gazette (Charleston), 20 May 1782," *SCIwayNet* (<http://www.sciway.net/hist/amrev/loyalists.html> : accessed 14 February 2009). Also, Murtie June Clark, *Loyalists in the Southern Campaign of the Revolutionary War*, 3 vols. (1981; reprint, Baltimore: Clearfield, 1999), 1:167, 254, 271, 273–74, and 297. For a comprehensive discussion of the loyalists in South Carolina during and after the war, see Lambert, *South Carolina Loyalists in the American Revolution*. Edward Turner is mentioned on p. 296. See also various articles at *Online Institute of Advanced Loyalist Studies* (<http://www.royalprovincial.com/>).

"Turner, Jonathan

"During 1776, he served as a constable. He served in the militia under Col. Roebuck after the fall of Charleston."<sup>8</sup>

"Jonathan Turner in the Militia under Col. Benj. Roebuck and on a separate paper by John Rothmahler it is stated that he served 12 jurors for an inquest into the death of Jonathan Turner."<sup>9</sup>

Both compilers present Jonathan Turner as a militiaman and constable. The reports, however, do not necessarily verify one another. The second, providing no source for its confusing statement, is unreliable. Constables served notices to jurors, but the second entry's wording contradicts the first, identifying Rothmahler as the constable, not Jonathan. Furthermore, neither source pinpoints Jonathan's location nor specifies a date. To assume they are accurate or identify the same individual would be risky. Both entries proved wrong.

The compilers apparently misunderstood information in a set of records called stub indents—certificates South Carolina awarded patriots for services, goods, and damages during the war. The first compiler cited the Jonathan Turner file, which contains three papers providing the following information:

3749 N<sup>o</sup>. 114

X            21 Sept.

Jonathan Turner,

For militia Duty in Roebucks Regiment, since the Fall of Charleston pr. Anderson's Return amt.

to currency    £35.0.0

    Sterling    £5.0.0

Five pounds sterling.

State of Carolina            To Jonathan Turner

for militia Duty in Roebuck's Regt since the fall of Chas town

pr Andersons' Return amotg to Currency . . . . £35.

Stg £5.00

The Public of South Carolina to Barnet Tenison specially appointed Constable 1776, Feb 7th To Summoning Twelve Jurors for Inquisition held this Day upon the Body of Jonathan Turner dec'd, at £3.1

I certify that the above Servise was performed by Barnet Tenison

[Signed] Job Rothmahler<sup>10</sup>

8. Bobby Gilmer Moss, *Roster of South Carolina Patriots in the American Revolution* (1983; reprint, Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing, 1994), 943.

9. Leonardo Andrea, "Turner in South Carolina," p. 8; Turner in South Carolina folder, file no. 917; Leonardo Andrea Genealogical Collection, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia; microfilm 954,597, Family History Library (FHL), Salt Lake City.

10. *Accounts Audited of Claims Growing out of the Revolution in South Carolina*, microfilm publication 8, 165 rolls (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History [SCDAH], 1973–78), roll 148 for Jonathan Turner, file 7,956; also, FHL microfilm 2,410,987.

These three documents contain all of the makings of 1776 constabulary service and militia service after the 1780 American surrender of Charleston, which the two derivative sources reported. Because all three documents are in one file, both compilers apparently believed they pertained to one man. A discerning review, however, shows this could not be: a man who died in 1776 could not be a militiaman in 1780.

Original county records clarify the situation. Jonathan in Roebuck's Regiment was not Jonathan who died in 1776—and neither was a constable. The derivative sources' compilers had merged the identities of three Jonathans: Jonathan of George Town District, Jonathan of Orangeburg District, and Jonathan of Roebuck's Regiment.

#### *Jonathan of George Town*

Jonathan Turner appears only rarely in records of the coastal George Town District. Two documents place him there in time to have died in 1776, and one connects him to the Rothmahlers:

On 19 and 20 January 1772 in Craven County, John Pyatt and "Jonath<sup>n</sup>" Turner witnessed the deeds of lease and release by William Johnston, planter, to Joseph Allston, planter, both of Prince George Parish, of a lot in "Georgetown." The deeds were proved before Job Rothmahler, J.P.<sup>11</sup>

On 20 October 1772 in George Town District, Robert Gibb, Charles Tighe, Robert Dicke, and "Jon<sup>a</sup>." Turner witnessed the will of Hugh Kavanaugh of George Town.<sup>12</sup>

These documents place the soon-to-be-deceased Jonathan in South Carolina's low country rather than its backcountry. Cultural, social, and political barriers between the regions make the distinction important. No known source shows the prominent Rothmahlers ever ventured into the hinterlands. Consequently, Jonathan of George Town was the man whose inquest was certified by the coastal Job Rothmahler. Jonathan's 1776 death eliminates him as the militiaman of 1780 and the later resident of Rutherford, Spartanburg, and Pendleton.

#### *Jonathan of Orangeburg*

In 1790 another Jonathan Turner lived along the border between the low and backcountry.<sup>13</sup> He could be the militiaman. Orangeburg seems relevant because Roebuck's Regiment was active there briefly. Determining this Jonathan's

---

11. Charleston Co., S.C., Deed Book 3Y, manuscript copy made in 1936, refers to original pp. 344-49; Courthouse, Charleston, S.C.; FHL microfilm 23,541.

12. South Carolina Probate Court, Will Book SS:318, Hugh Kavanaugh; SCDAH; FHL microfilm 23,461.

13. 1790 U.S. census, Orangeburg District, S.C., p. 252, Jonathan Turner; NARA microfilm M637, roll 11.

possible militia service hinges on his age, which censuses indicate only broadly and no document states. Finer dissection of available records reveals his age range:

- Jonathan of Orangeburg received a land grant in 1785.<sup>14</sup> He probably was at least twenty-one or married when his claim was surveyed that May.<sup>15</sup> He probably met one or both conditions at least several months prior, because he had to travel to Charleston to file for the land and then return home to wait for its approval, the order of survey, and the surveyor.
- In 1790 Jonathan's household consisted of himself, a woman likely his wife, and two children.<sup>16</sup> This suggests he married about 1784–85. Assuming he was at least eighteen at that time, he would have been born before 1767.
- In 1810 Jonathan was enumerated between his twenty-sixth and forty-fifth birthdays.<sup>17</sup> If this reflects the official enumeration date of the first Monday in August, he was born between August 1764 and August 1785.<sup>18</sup>

Therefore, late 1764 is the likeliest time of Jonathan's birth, making him sixteen when Charleston fell. He was old enough to have joined Roebuck's Regiment in 1780. Jonathan of Orangeburg may have been the militiaman. Because county-level work produced nothing conclusive, research turned to Roebuck's Regiment. Little has been written about the regiment, its activities, or its members.<sup>19</sup> The following regimental history results from original research

---

14. "Plats for State Land Grants, 1784–1868," *South Carolina Department of Archives and History* (<http://www.archivesindex.sc.gov/> : accessed 14 February 2009), search for "Turner, Jonathan." The database refers to South Carolina Surveyor General, Plan Books 1784–1873, 1:159, item 10 for Jonathan Turner; series S213212, SCDAH.

15. Jonathan does not appear in indexes of South Carolina jury lists through 1783, implying he was born after 1762. See GeLee Corley Hendrix and Morn McKoy Lindsay, *The Jury Lists of South Carolina, 1778–1779* (Greenville, S.C.: privately printed, 1975); and Mary Bondurant Warren, *South Carolina Jury Lists, 1718 through 1783: Compiled from Extant Laws* (Danielsville, Ga.: Heritage Papers, 1977). The latter book excludes the two lists published by Hendrix and Lindsay.

16. 1790 U.S. census, Orangeburg Dist., S.C., p. 252, Jonathan Turner.

17. 1810 U.S. census, Orangeburg Dist., S.C., p. 128, "J<sup>o</sup>." Turner; NARA microfilm M252, roll 61.

18. For the official enumeration date, see Ann Bruner Eales and Robert M. Kvasnicka, *Guide to Genealogical Research in the National Archives of the United States*, 3rd ed. (Washington, D.C.: NARA, 2000), 23.

19. See, for example, B. F. Perry, "Benjamin Robuck," in *Biographical Sketches of Eminent American Statesmen with Speeches, Addresses, and Letters* (Philadelphia: Ferree Press, 1887), 592–8. For a nonacademic and brief discussion on Roebuck and his death, see Philip C. Norfleet, "Colonel Roebuck and the Battle of Mudlick Creek (02 March 1781)," *South Carolina Loyalists and Rebels* ([http://sc\\_tories.tripod.com/colonel\\_roebuck\\_and\\_the\\_battle\\_of\\_mudlick\\_creek.htm](http://sc_tories.tripod.com/colonel_roebuck_and_the_battle_of_mudlick_creek.htm) : downloaded 26 February 2009).

in more than one hundred pension applications and dozens of published sources.<sup>20</sup>

A loosely constructed organization, Roebuck's Regiment evolved throughout the war under different commanders and with surprising fluidity among members. First dubbed the "Spartans," it originated in August 1775 from a Whig recruiting drive at Wofford's Iron Works in southern Spartanburg (near the 1800 residence of Jonathan of Rutherford, Spartanburg, and Pendleton). Under Colonel John Thomas Sr. of Fairforrest Creek, the recruits hastily marched against the Cherokee in the "Snow Campaign" of December 1775 commanded by General Andrew Williamson. The following spring and summer the natives retaliated. In a series of raids against white homesteads, they killed hundreds of settlers along the Carolina and Georgia frontier. In response the "Spartans" rejoined Colonel Williamson in the expedition of 1776 and 1777, destroyed the Cherokee threat, and erected Fort Rutledge in modern Oconee County, South Carolina.

Changing circumstances prompted the regiment to split in the spring of 1778. One branch under Col. Thomas Brandon (aka Second Spartan Regiment or Upper Brigade) marched off to other theaters of war while Thomas's men stayed home for local defense. Relative calm over the next two years prompted a flood of settlers into the backcountry patrolled by the regiment. Soldiers traveled as needed between their homes and frontier forts or served short stints in Augusta, Savannah, and Charleston.

The surrender of Charleston to the British in May 1780 abruptly changed the situation for Roebuck's men. The British Army, with an established southern foothold, turned to the backcountry. Anticipating defeat and wishing to spare his men's homes and families, Col. Thomas surrendered to the Tories at the village of Ninety Six a few days after learning of Charleston's capitulation. The following summer saw hostility and violence between American patriots and Tories. Outrages prompted pardoned Spartans to violate their surrender terms and take up arms. Tory authorities quickly arrested many of them, including Colonel Thomas. His son John Jr. responded by reorganizing the regiment under General Thomas Sumter with himself as colonel and Benjamin Roebuck as major.

The new Spartan Regiment sprang into action in the battles of Huck's Defeat (July 12), Rocky Mount (July 30), Hanging Rock (August 7), and the Battle of Wofford's Iron Works (August 8). The British then unleashed the infamous

---

20. The published sources include Lawrence E. Babits, *A Devil of a Whipping; The Battle of Cowpens* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Charles B. Baxley, ed., *Southern Campaigns of the American Revolution*, e-journal (<http://www.southerncampaign.org/mag.php> : downloaded 14 February 2009); Buchanan, *The Road to Guilford Courthouse*; Edgar, *Partisans and Redcoats*; Hank Messick, *King's Mountain; The Epic of the Blue Ridge "Mountain Men" in the American Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1976); and O'Kelley, *Nothing But Blood and Slaughter*, vols. 1-3.

“Bloody Tarleton” to assist the guerilla efforts of local Tory leaders like Patrick Ferguson and “Bloody Bill” Cunningham. The regiment engaged Tory militia and British regulars. Swelled with new recruits, the unit split again. Thomas’s branch retained the name “Spartan” and its position under Sumter. His men—including now—Lieutenant Colonel Benjamin Roebuck—won recognition for service at Cowpens in January 1781. Violence at home accelerated and the regiment evolved further. After Col. Thomas assumed another command, Roebuck replaced him, and the regiment was called “Roebuck’s.” He commanded it only a few months before being wounded and captured at the Battle of Mudlick Creek that spring. Colonel Robert Anderson replaced him, apparently commanding until the British removal from South Carolina, when the regiment was disbanded.

An analysis of these events reveals three recruiting phases—first, an immediate need for defense against neighboring Cherokee; second, increased Tory and British activity in the backcountry after Charleston fell; and third, American victories that turned the war after King’s Mountain. The regiment operated under four successive commands:

August 1775 through May 1780. The regiment, commanded by John Thomas Sr., was concerned primarily with local defense against Indians and their Tory and British backers. It was largely inactive after October 1776.

June 1780 to January 1781. The regiment, commanded by Col. John Thomas Jr., was concerned primarily with fighting Tory militia and the British army. Its engagements included battles at King’s Mountain and Cowpens. Lt. Col. Benjamin Roebuck commanded the regiment’s second battalion.

January 1781 through March 1781. Col. Benjamin Roebuck commanded the regiment.

April 1781 to December 1782. Col. Robert Anderson commanded the regiment.

Jonathan Turner’s stub indent shows he served in Roebuck’s Regiment but not necessarily under Roebuck. Turner could have served anytime from June 1780 until the end of 1782, a time frame too wide to distinguish one man. Missing are two facts, not found in any known document, that would help accomplish that task: his date and location of enlistment. Clues appear in the indents for Jonathan’s service.

Stub indents are a critical source for Revolutionary-era research. Researchers often bypass them, perhaps because they lack specifics. They can be informative, however, when researchers delve into deeper levels:

After the fall of Charles Town in 1780 the American forces within the state faced the problem of how to pay those who served in the military as well as those who provided supplies. A system of credit was established which relied upon an issuance

of receipts in return for military service or supplies. The State of South Carolina promised to redeem these receipts when normalcy was reestablished. On March 26, 1783, six commissioners were elected by the Privy Council to collect the claims from each of the circuit court districts outside of Charleston. . . . The claims were filed in the district [where] the claimant lived and these receipts were later collected by the Auditor General's office. As each account was audited, interest-bearing indents were issued in payment. Each . . . stub contained a summary of the information contained on its matching indent. The information included a letter and a number designation, the date of issue, the name of the claimant, the principal amount of the claim, the annual interest due, and the service or supplies that had been rendered. Stubs were retained in letter-designated books, letters A through FEC. The initial deadline for submission of claims, September 26, 1784, was extended to October 1, 1785. . . . Indents were issued between March 1783 and October 1791.<sup>21</sup>

Jonathan's published entry appears as follows:

To Whom: "Turner, Jon<sup>a</sup>."  
 For What: Militia duty, Col. Anderson, Roebuck's Regiment  
 District: Ninety Six  
 Amount Granted £5<sup>22</sup>

This information on the stub matches that of Jonathan's original indent file with the inquest receipt. It also provides one missing component: his residence. Jonathan lived in the old Ninety Six District, which included Spartanburg when his indent was issued—but not necessarily when he enlisted. Because Jonathan served in a Spartanburg company, he probably was there when Colonel Anderson gathered the claims, compiled the list for submission to the state, and received the stubs for issue. When these activities occurred is unknown. The point is critical because Jonathan could have moved to Orangeburg afterwards. Because indents were issued from 1783 until 1791, the exact year had to be isolated.

The published schedules, compiled by state order in 1791, are grouped loosely by regiment. Most men in Roebuck's regiment appear in three lists. (A few others are scattered throughout other lists.) The men grouped with Jonathan in one list probably either served together or lived in the same community when they presented their claims. Identifying the cluster's location would place Jonathan. Revolutionary War pensions and land holdings of the ninety-two "indent men" on Roebuck's lists could reveal where most of them lived during or shortly after the war and provide a time-frame for patriot Jonathan's residence in that locale.

---

21. John L. Andrews Jr., "Introduction," in *South Carolina Revolutionary War Indents: A Schedule* (Columbia, S.C.: SCMAR [*South Carolina Magazine of Ancestral Research*], 2001), unnumbered page.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 70. Andrews cites Book X, number 3749, for Jonathan's entry.

If the men received their indent stubs at roughly the same time, their year of receipt would date Jonathan's receipt as well. Two of those who applied for pensions supplied indents, both dated to the same month and year:

Francis Powers—indent issued 15 September 1786<sup>23</sup>

William Wood—indent issued 22 September 1786<sup>24</sup>

The month on these indents is the same as that on Jonathan's indent, which does not provide the year. Jonathan the militiaman apparently lived in Ninety Six District before October 1785 and perhaps by September 1784. He therefore cannot be the Jonathan who received a land grant in Orangeburg in 1785 and still resided there in 1790. Jonathan the militiaman was a distinct individual who served in a regiment drawn primarily from Spartanburg and its immediate environs.

#### *Jonathan of Spartanburg and Ninety Six District*

Isolating Jonathan the militiaman from the Jonathans of George Town and Orangeburg led to two additional questions: (1) where did Jonathan the militiaman live in the large Ninety Six District; and (2) what kinsmen were with him, if any? The absence of Turners near him and his apparent son Sanders in 1800 hampers attempts to place them among likely relatives and explain their settlement in Spartanburg. Locating Jonathan's community fourteen years earlier, before censuses identified neighborhoods, could answer those questions.

Again, answers came from the "indent men." The vast majority of them lived or owned land in the Cross Anchor community near the Union District line—the neighborhood where Jonathan appears in 1800. Furthermore, at least five of Jonathan's 1800 neighbors were "indent men."<sup>25</sup> These findings show Jonathan's 1786 and 1800 neighborhoods were the same and his residence there was broken by a temporary move to Rutherford County, North Carolina, before mid-1790. All the other men on the list joined Roebuck after the fall of Charleston as residents of Ninety Six. Jonathan, therefore, lived in that community when he enlisted.

23. *Revolutionary War Pension and Bounty Land-Warrant Application Files*, microfilm publication M804, 2,670 rolls (Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Service, 1974), roll 1,964 for Francis Powers, file R8411.

24. *Ibid.*, roll 2,631 for William Wood, file S21589.

25. Edward Hooker, Thomas Bearden, John Bue (aka Buise, Buice, Buey), James Lee, and Samuel Kithcart appear near Jonathan in the indent list. See Andrews, *South Carolina Revolutionary War Indents*, 66 (Bearden and Buise), 68 (Hooker), 69 (Kithcart and Lee), and 70 (Turner). For their proximity in 1790, see 1790 U.S. census, Spartanburg Dist., S.C., Capt. Meredith's district, pp. 22 (Hooker), 26 (Lee and Kithcart), and 28 (Bue). For their proximity to Jonathan in 1800, see 1800 U.S. census, Spartanburg Dist., S.C., pp. 196 (Hooker), 197v (Turner), 197 (Lee and Kithcart), and 198v (Bearden). Numerous other men who served under Roebuck also lived in the community.

Table 1  
Locations of Jonathan Turner's Neighbors in 1800

NEIGHBORS <sup>a</sup>	KNOWN LANDHOLDINGS
Benjamin Hooker	South side of Tyger River, near the public road, William Smith, and Crows <sup>b</sup>
George Davis	
Seal Beason	South side of Tyger River, Jamie's Creek <sup>c</sup>
John Smith	
William Smith	South side of Tyger River; Dutchman's and Cane Creek <sup>d</sup>
James Vessells	South side of Tyger River adjoining B. Hooker <sup>e</sup>
Jonathan Turner	
Sanders Turner	
William Blackstock	South side of Tyger River near H. Yarbrough <sup>f</sup>
Millington Smith	Tyger River and Cane Creek on north side of Tyger River <sup>g</sup>
Edward Smith	
Humphrey Yarbrough	South side of Tyger River adjoining Ed. Hooker <sup>h</sup>

a. 1800 U.S. census, Spartanburg Dist., S.C., p. 196, twelve contiguous entries; National Archives and Records Administration microfilm publication M252, roll 50.

b. Spartanburg Co., S.C., Deed Books D:192-4, Elijah and Margaret Kelly to Robert Beard, 10 April 1795; F:78, Jonathan and Jemina Pinnell to Humphrey Yarbrough, 9 January 1797; and K:307, Edward Hooker to Benjamin Hooker, 26 February 1805; all at Register of Mesne Conveyances, Spartanburg, S.C.

c. Spartanburg Co., Deed Books D:389, James Crow Sr. and Elizabeth Crow to Ashael Beeson, 14 July 1796; and L:343, James Crow to Aseal Beason, 25 July 1808.

d. Spartanburg Co., Deed Books A:246, William Smith to Abram Moore, 17 March 1787; H:370-4, Edward and Amelia Hooker to Golden Tinsley, 26 March 1803; and H:263-4, William Smith to Solomon Hill, 9 March 1801.

e. Spartanburg Co., Deed Book H:260, James and Elizabeth Vessells to Willis Williford, 9 April 1809.

f. Spartanburg Co., Deed Book K:115, Anthony Foster to William Blackstock, 18 December 1804.

g. Spartanburg Co., Deed Books D:229-30, John and Hannah Forrister to Millenton Smith, 5 March 1797; F:138-40, Owen and Elenor Forrister to Richard Young, 27 December 1796; M:100-1, Joel Hembrie to John O'Sheals, 11 December 1799; and K:26-8, Mellington and Sarah Smith to Voletine Smith, 13 February 1804.

h. Spartanburg Co., Deed Books F:78, Jonathan and Jemima Pinnell to Humphrey Yarbrough, 9 January 1797; K:115-6, Anthony Foster to William Blackstock, 18 December 1804; and M:290, Tilmon and Beulah Bobo to Humphrey Yarbrough, 20 January 1808.

A closer analysis pinpoints Jonathan's neighborhood. Because neither he nor Sanders Turner owned land in Spartanburg they probably lived in the same dwelling or adjacent houses on someone else's land. One of their nearby neighbors in 1800 probably owned that land. Table 1 shows Jonathan's immediate census cluster lay along and below the Tyger River, running slightly south past Wofford's Mill and Cotton Factory to Jamie's Creek and east to the Union District line.<sup>26</sup> Jonathan's residency there during the Revolution was broken by a move slightly northwest into North Carolina. Before 1790 he returned to the same neighborhood.

## CONCLUSION

Given scarce records in Jonathan's name and the inaccuracy of details published about him, his identification, military service, and residence are reconstructed to a remarkable degree. That feat rests upon dissecting the levels of conflicting, confusing, and erroneous data that complicated research even after information began emerging. Jonathan's life reminds researchers that "difficult" ancestors need not remain just names.

---

26. "Spartanburgh [sic] District, South Carolina; Surveyed by J. Whitton 1820; Improved for Mills' Atlas, 1825"; digital image, Cartography Associates, *David Rumsey Map Collection* (<http://www.davidrumsey.com> : viewed 26 February 2009).

---

## UPDATE

### Using French-Canadian Catholic Parish Records to Establish a Missing Kinship Relationship

NGS *Quarterly* 96 (March 2008): 39–46. The author reports that the birth record for Félicité Martin, missing from the copy made in 1899 at the Archives Canada, exists on the original of the parish register for Saint Jean-Baptiste of Port Royal. Images of the original are viewable at the Public Archives of Nova Scotia Web site, <http://www.gov.ns.ca/nsarm/cap/acadian>, although difficult to examine with the site's Viewpoint plug-in software. Copying errors are possible even in copies at national archives. The finding underscores the importance of determining whether a given microfilm copy is made from the original copy of a parish register and, if not, tracking down the original even when difficult to access. None of the microfilm copies of the original at three repositories circulate. To examine a microfilm copy of the register, one must go to the Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax, Nova Scotia; the Centre Acadien, Université Sainte Anne, Church Point, Nova Scotia; or the Centre d'Études Acadiennes, Université de Moncton, Moncton, New Brunswick.