

# Dunham Singletary

---

## FAMILY CONNECTIONS

---

Issue 2

April 2, 2005

Volume 2

---

### From The President

Dear Cousins,

Now that it is finally Spring, we all feel the urge to get things cleaned out and get organized. Let's clean out all of those old files and records that have stacked up on desks and in boxes. You may find some jewels to share with the rest of us via this Newsletter.

Are you looking for someone that is your "brick wall". Let us know and we'll publish your queries. Share this newsletter with your local libraries, you never know who might be reading it there and has the answer to your query.

Stay tuned for bigger and better **CONNECTIONS**

*Jan Erwin Dunham, President*

### Editor's Corner

Times flies—or, more accurately, slips by swiftly in the night when we are unawares, until we wake up, a bit shocked to see the new day's date in the newspaper. Or at least so it has been with me, seeing how fast the deadline for our third, April 2<sup>nd</sup> Newsletter is rushing at me. I hope this Spring '05 finds all of you well and that this Newsletter reaches all by April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Looking ahead, the prime order of business we face is building membership. Our former

association was a "national family association." But DSFC is more accurately "an international family surname association."

There are certainly Dunhams (inclusive of all spellings) living outside the U.S., as our Canadian cousin, Lloyd Dunham, would be quick to remind us. We have identified so far four generic family groups, each internally related to one another, but showing no relationship between them except in the sharing of the surname. To better profile each of these groups, and as a consequence what we can say about them all in relation to one another (their haplogroups, their likely places of origin, etc.), we need more and broader DNA testing. This will involve expense. We ask each person tested, if their curiosity and pocketbooks are sufficient, to pay for their own tests. But we recognize that some people are not so curious, or that they feel the expense (\$99 for the basic, 12-marker test) is more than they can or should afford for this purpose. In those cases, the association will elect to pay some or all of the testing expense, provided that the test in question is a "strategic" one—that is, will give us critical knowledge we cannot otherwise get that solves important questions about the major family groups. We have had already one such case and we shall surely have more.

We are particularly keen on expanding the DNA testing to England (for both the Dunham and Singletary surnames) and perhaps elsewhere if the evidence beckons. In order to do so, we shall probably have to engage an English "agent," an experienced ge-

nealogist who can find Dunhams and Singletarys there, contact them, and persuade them to be tested. And we shall probably have to pay for a higher proportion of overseas tests than we do domestic ones, unless we find English cousins as eager to know about us as we are them. But the harvest from these tests promises to be exciting. Probably we shall be able to push back further in time the roots of all our family groups and learn many more interesting things about them.

All this takes money and effort. The effort your officers and directors will gladly undertake. For the money we must look to building our membership. We believe we should keep annual dues low (\$25) in order to invite maximum participation. But this means we need four new members to fund each DNA test the association covers. Let's say we need to double the number of tests done over the next year (from 38 now to 80 by the summer of 2006), and, because many of these (we hope) will be overseas, let's say we must pay for half of them (20). That's about \$2,000, and translates to 80 new members. (And of course we have other on-going expenses.) Our membership stands now at 66, so we're talking about more than doubling it over the course of the next year plus a few months. That's a tall order, but I believe we can do it.

There are tens of thousands of Dunhams (all spellings) out there, and only 66 of us so far in our new association. What we need is an expanded, methodical recruitment strategy. Donna Jones, our Membership Chair, and I have been talking this over, and we'd like to throw out a few ideas and ask you for feedback. It seems most logical to us to divide the task according to geographic regions. Most usually this can be by states, but in compact areas such as New England a cluster of small states may suffice. Donna can't begin to do it all by herself. We propose, there-

fore, to ask for volunteers from all the states where we're represented now (20), with each state having its own Membership Vice Chair. Big states, like California, might require two (north and south). The task of the Vice Chairs would be to get the contact data for all Dunhams in their respective areas. (At their discretion they might want to enlist membership reps in each city for the large cities.) They would undertake to call these new prospects or forward the contact data to Donna. We shall have an attractive, informative new brochure out by summer and all prospects would be sent one of these, either on-line or via snail mail. The brochures can be sent out centrally, for we shall want to have all the contact data in one central file. But follow-up calls will need to be made to see if they are inclined to join. It's clear that some sort of pyramidal organizational effort will be required if we're to reach a sizeable slice of all the Dunhams out there. This is what we've come up with so far. Tell us what you think. Let us know if you would be willing to help. A half dozen calls a month per Vice Chair would represent a large multiplication of effort.

The harvest from a successful membership drive will pay big dividends, not just financially but in new information, too. Each new Dunham recruited means not just new money but new knowledge. We want to know their immediate web of Dunham family connections and what information they have on *their* Dunham forebears. It is *records plus DNA* that yields the most complete and reliable information. We hope that the analyzed information and family history we can give back to our expanding base of new members—and to all of you—will be worth many times the annual cost of membership dues. That, at least, is our ambition. Send your ideas and comments either to me or Donna: **sdunnam@techconsult.com** for me, **dunham564@surfglobal.net** for Donna.

## This Issue

Three authors have contributed articles to this issue. Two of them are well known to you already: Gratia Mahony and our able secretary/administrator, Paul C. Dunham. The third is a frequent participant on the “list” email forum that we all monitor. She is Audrey Shields Hancock, who has written a piece for this issue on **Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary**, the founder of one of our main Dunham family groups, who changed his surname from Singletary to Dunham on moving from Massachusetts to New Jersey about 1666. This is the first article of probably many to follow on this curious but able man, who seemed to harbor a host of contradictions within his complex personality. There is a great deal more about him we should like to know, and he is certain to be the focus of further research. Audrey has a website (<http://freepages.genealogy.rootsweb.com/~grannyapple/SINGLETERY-DUNHAM/HOME.html>). I recommend a visit to all interested in the Singletary line of Dunhams.

Gratia’s article for this issue follows the career and descendents of Samuel Dunham, Deacon John Dunham’s oldest son. This family migrated from Massachusetts to Maine. Gratia’s overall theme, of which this article is a third installment, is to follow the migration and dispersal patterns of the main Dunham families from their arrival in North America to the latest contemporary abodes of their descendents. That is a large and ambitious writing project. We are lucky to have someone whose interest and research database enables her to make these kinds of contributions to our newsletters.

Finally, Paul’s article is on the wealth of genealogical data and its growing online availability in the archives of newspaper obituar-

ies. Paul has been active in Montana in helping to capture, index, and preserve obituary data. Thus he speaks from inside the growing movement to save this valuable information and make it available online to genealogical researchers. If you are actively trying to track

---

**Editor’s Note** - *The article that follows on the next page went through several edits in a collaborative process between Audrey and I, with the result that two different styles of references appear in it. Audrey’s references are given in parentheses containing sequential numbers: these refer to her sources and are given at the end of the article. I have given, on the other hand, additional comments and observations on text in the body of the article, which I refer to in numbered footnotes in the form of superscripts inserted in the text where the comments are relevant; these are given at the bottom of each page on which the numbered footnote appears.*

### **Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary: A Paradoxical Figure**

by Audrey Shields Hancock (with Sam Dunnam)

Until recently, novice Dunham researchers might spend years trying to discover their earliest Dunham ancestors. If they persisted, they would learn in due course that the earliest Dunham in the New World was Deacon John Dunham (“Deacon John”) and his second wife, Abigail Ballou, who immigrated from Leyden, Holland and settled in Plymouth Colony about 1629-1630. Having discovered Deacon John, these uninitiated researchers would then believe that if they could trace their own ancestry back to the mid-1600s they would surely find their connection to Deacon John.

Some, in the process of their research, would happen upon Jonathan Dunham of New Jersey (formerly of Massachusetts). If they could trace their ancestry to

him (and some could), they would think that just another missing link would complete their tie to Deacon John. This line of reasoning, pursued through old books and records, was destined to generate much frustration, for, as we know today, there was no such link. But with all the frustration, it also generated a number of false assumptions and erroneous histories as attempts to find the link became “creative.”

The cause of all this confusion was a decision by Jonathan Singletary (formerly of Massachusetts) to change his name to Jonathan Dunham, *alias Singletary*, when he settled in New Jersey. We still do not know why he did so, and discovering his reason is now a foremost research goal for those descended from him. The result of his decision was to found a whole new Dunham family in America, who are now numerous and spread all over the North American continent.

What follows is an attempt to put together a few of the curious facts about Jonathan Dunham (alias Singletary), who remains today in many respects a puzzling figure. Jonathan’s father was Richard Singletary, who was born about 1599 in England. We do not know exactly when he arrived in the New World, but he received a land grant in Salem, Massachusetts in 1637, and by October of 1637 had moved on to Newbury, Massachusetts (1). Richard may well have been married at this time, for a record exists that refers to a “Goodwife Singletary” who died in 1638/1639 at Newbury, Massachusetts. It is highly likely that Richard was at that early time the only person in the colony with the surname “Singletary,” which is not a common name. Because of this record, we cannot ascertain the identity of Jonathan’s mother. Some believe that she might have been “Goodwife Singletary,” and, if so, that either her maiden surname might have been Dunham or that she was a Dunham descen-

dent (doubtless in England) by some other connection. Absent knowledge, this remains only a plausible speculation. More likely, however, Jonathan is the eldest son of Richard Singletary and Susannah Cooke, whom Richard married ca. 1639 in Salisbury, Essex County, Massachusetts. Evidence for the latter opinion is a birth record for Jonathan in Salisbury that reads: “**SINGLETARY, Jonathan, s. Ric[hard] and Susannah, 17:11m:1639,**” which would be the 17<sup>th</sup> day, 11<sup>th</sup> month [Julian calendar month of February] of 1639, which is now indicated as 1639/1640. Because of the lingering question, *why did Jonathan choose Dunham as his new adopted surname?*, the identity of his mother remains an important issue in the genealogy of the Dunham family descended from Richard and Jonathan.

One thing we do know for certain is that Richard Singletary, through Jonathan, is the earliest North American progenitor of a very large group of Dunham/Donham/Dunnam families in America today. The DNA testing undertaken by our national family association has proved that. A number of currently living Dunham/Donham/Dunnam men have been tested, some of whom (via records) can trace back to Jonathan (therefore to Richard Singletary). Their DNA test results match exactly or very closely others who cannot, via records, be shown to descend from Jonathan. But the matching tests among this whole group of Dunham men indicate that they have in their pasts a *common mutual ancestor* (CMA), who very probably is Richard Singletary. This evidence was strongly reinforced when a currently living Singletary male, Jerry Singletary, who *can* trace back to Richard, was tested and proved an exact or close match with the tested Dunham men.

In any case, some thirteen years later, by 1652, Richard Singletary had moved

again with his growing family to Haverhill, Essex County, Massachusetts. Richard and Susannah's family by this time included: (i) eldest son, Jonathan; (ii) Eunice; (iii) Nathaniel; (iv) Lydia; (v) Amos; and (vi) Benjamin. Jonathan and his five siblings probably all grew to adulthood in the succession of family homes in Salisbury, Newbury, and Haverhill, all in Massachusetts. During these early times they would have been reared in these communities in the strict religious environment then characteristic of early Puritan Massachusetts.

Except for Jonathan, all of Richard's other sons (three) retained their Singletary surname, as did *their* children after them, and so on, continuing and perpetuating the Singletary line. Eunice Singletary, the oldest daughter, married Thomas Eaton (Jan. 6, 1658, in Andover, MA); Lydia Singletary married Daniel Ladd, Jr. (Nov. 24, 1668). Jonathan, as we have seen, started a whole new Dunham family. But despite their new name, all Jonathan's descendants are in fact *genetically* (per their DNA) Singletarys.

Richard Singletary died on October 25, 1687. One report cited his age as 102—though, if he was born in 1599, he would have been only 88. We do not have an authenticated birth date for Richard. Suffice to say, he was an old man at death. Susannah had died five years before, on April 11, 1682, at Haverhill, at an age of 66 years.

Jonathan's life was one of conflict, contentiousness, questionable behavior, and—paradoxically—also of honor and notable accomplishment. What the records show of him reflects something approaching a dual personality. In Haverhill he led a life that was stormy, or at least full of litigation. He was said by some to be “a scoundrel,” and “a notorious vagabond,” also an antagonist with respect to the Puritan religious leaders.

Whereas in Woodbridge, he built a grist mill soon after he settled and made an outstanding contribution to the economic life of that new town, and led generally a respectable, honorable life that earned him later a public plaque as a monument that stands today.

Much of the trouble Jonathan encountered was caused by his unorthodox religious views. This circumstance was itself a curious anomaly—indeed, a cultural contradiction—for the early Massachusetts Bay colonies. They lacked the religious freedom that so many of the colonists had left or fled England to seek. A stern Puritan faith was the dominant orthodoxy, and it tended to be intolerant of diverse religious thought and practice. Its strict behavioral codes had the force of law and *were* enforced. It is easy to see that in such an environment Jonathan's unorthodox views and related actions would put him often at variance with the authorities. He was accused of being a Ranter, an English radical group that, relative to any of the main line Protestant groups in early America, would have been considered heretical, with the exception of the Quakers, with whom Ranters were sometimes associated. Quakers came in for their share of scorn and discrimination from the Puritan authorities, and Ranters, if indeed Jonathan was one during a period of his life, would have been considered even “farther out” and more deserving of censure and contempt. Some of his behavior later, during an episode in which he became involved with Mary Ross (in 1682-3), does seem to be consistent with Ranter tenets.

We do not know the history of Jonathan's religious beliefs, but such a salient unorthodoxy seems inconsistent with his earlier life. Jonathan married in about 1660 Mary Bloomfield, who was the daughter of Col. Thomas Bloomfield and his wife, Mary. The Bloomfields were people of some status. Thomas Bloomfield had come to Massachu-

setts from Woodbridge, Suffolk County, England, where he had been a supporter of the Parliamentarian cause in the English Civil War and a major in Oliver Cromwell's army. The Parliamentarians had overthrown and beheaded King Charles I in 1649. Cromwell held power for eleven years, until 1660, when he in turn was ousted and the monarchy restored. Cromwell's dissenters had all been Congregationalists who had stoutly opposed the Church of England as well as the monarchy. Upon the Restoration, Congregationalists and supporters of Cromwell were *persona non grata* in England and many had to flee for their lives. It was this reversal of political fortunes in England that had likely brought Thomas Bloomfield and his family to America, though they apparently came safely before the Restoration, sensing correctly an unwelcome trend in the tide of events. In the Congregationalists' new home in America, however, Thomas Bloomfield was in good Separatist company and was regarded as a worthy leader and man of substance. *Prima facie*, Col. Bloomfield must surely have viewed his new son-in-law in a favorable light; otherwise there would likely have been familial resistance to the union. Every indication of record in their future relationship suggests that Jonathan stayed on good terms with his in-laws, though we cannot be certain of that.

By 1662 we find Jonathan in heated litigation in Haverhill with a man named John Godrey. Godrey's original complaint had begun earlier against a man named William Osgood. Jonathan had signed a deposition against Godrey in this case, accusing him of witchcraft, and Godrey later (1664) sued Jonathan and others for defamation and slander. The jury held for the plaintiff (Godrey) and Jonathan, as defendant, was ordered to pay a fine or make a public apology at Haverhill. Which he did we do not know.

During this period, on 8 April 1662, Richard and Susannah Singletary of Haverhill conveyed eighty acres of land in Haverhill to Mary (Bloomfield) Singletary, and pointedly *not* to their son, Jonathan. This curious deeding to the wife may have been a move to protect the gift of property from any potential judgments against Jonathan, as he was then still involved in heated litigation. It was at this time, too, that his unorthodox religious views had begun to attract attention and incur disapproval among the religious elders of Salem and Haverhill. The elder Singletarys must have surmised, "better for the sake of this young family to have the land in Mary's name than Jonathan's."

About 1665/1666, Jonathan and Mary Singletary moved to the new town of Woodbridge, New Jersey with Mary's parents, the Bloomfields. Woodbridge was named in honor of the Rev. John Woodbridge of Newbury, Massachusetts, from which many of the new settlers of Woodbridge had come. It was on the occasion of this move that Jonathan changed his surname to Dunham—for reasons still unknown. Since all his land deeds in Woodbridge were signed "Jonathan Dunham *alias Singletary*," the surname change can hardly have been to conceal his identity or hide his Singletary roots and ties.

In 1671, Jonathan (now Jonathan Dunham) built a house for his family, which was said to be constructed of bricks, planks, and beams used as ballasts and supports on ships from Holland. Earlier, in 1670, Jonathan had erected a grist mill, and for a considerable while appears to have led a quite respectable life. (12) A mill in Woodbridge would bring prosperity and growth to Woodbridge as farmers from the surrounding area would now be drawn there to grind their grain. Jonathan as proprietor took a sixteenth part of all ground grain as payment and came

to be one of Woodbridge's more prosperous and influential citizens. An old millstone from the mill and a memorial plaque honoring him are situated today near the house once inhabited by the Dunham family. The house still stands and now (probably after many remodelings) serves as the rectory for Trinity Episcopal Church. The church was first erected in 1712, was rebuilt in 1754, and, after a fire that destroyed it in 1858, was rebuilt a third time in 1860 in the configuration in which it stands today.

In 1671 records show Jonathan as having been selected foreman of a jury, and he was chosen about the same time to be an overseer of Highways. In 1672 he officiated as Clerk of the township court. In June of 1673 Jonathan and his father-in-law, Thomas Bloomfield, were elected Representatives to the General Assembly of Woodbridge. In 1674 an acrimonious boundary dispute developed between Piscataway, New Jersey, and Woodbridge, which came to trial in July of 1674 in Elizabethtown. Jonathan Dunham, Capt. John Pike, and Samuel Moore were appointed by the Magistrates (of Woodbridge) to be the attorneys for Woodbridge, defending its interests at the trial. His economic accomplishment and these civic posts and honors make it clear that Jonathan became a citizen of consequence in Woodbridge and that he was during these years well respected by his peers.

Jonathan and Mary had in all ten children (though two of the girls died relatively young), which they bore between the years 1661 (Mary the eldest) and 1681 (Benjamin the youngest).

His career in Woodbridge notwithstanding, Jonathan's unpredictable nature surfaced again and landed him in trouble in 1677. He and a man named Robert Lapriere were arrested for removing items from Gov-

ernor Phillip Carteret's home. (14) He was ordered to pay a fine and was punished. Some time thereafter he left Woodbridge, separating himself from his wife and family. To the displeasure of the Plymouth Colony elders, Jonathan took up residence there and sometime around 1682-83 was found in the company of one Mary Ross, a young woman. The nature of their involvement is not altogether clear. It seems to have involved shared religious convictions (probably of the Ranter stripe). There is no explicit record of a more intimate relationship, though Mary, perhaps about this time, became pregnant and bore a child (attributed of record to another man). In an account of the more unseemly events involving Jonathan and Mary Ross, Cotton Mather refers to a man who is obviously Jonathan as "a ranting Quaker." He was accused of "deseminating" corrupt principles, of "drawing away" another man's wife and doing as she bade him to do (which is not specified). "Records indicate that John [Jonathan] at Mary Ross's bequest shot and killed a dog of John Irish, at Little Compton, and that John [Jonathan] and Mary made a fire at the house (Irish's), threw the dog upon the fire, and burned other things in the home." Jonathan also was said to have "discharged a gun in the home." The described behavior, if the account is accurate, comes across as bizarre. If true, it was certainly an egregious instance of "disturbing the peace." For these actions, the Court sentenced Jonathan to a public whipping at the post and banished him from the colony. If he returned, he was to be whipped and banished again and each time thereafter. Mary Ross was also sentenced to be whipped and sent home to her parents in Boston.

Having been thus ejected from Plymouth, it is not certain that Jonathan went home at once or that, if he did, he stayed home. Some records have him wandering "frequently abroad in parts remote..." be-

tween 1682/1683 and 1689. He does seem to have been back in Woodbridge by 1689.

Jonathan's relationship with Mary Ross did not end with their earlier misadventures in Plymouth. In Woodbridge in 1689 we find Jonathan and Mary (Bloomfield), his wife, deeding over to Mary Ross a house and lot of six acres in Woodbridge. A record attributed to Mary Ross states that "some years before the Conveyance [of the house] was made & at its makeing, being with them at Woodbridge with childe by one Abraham Albin of Woodbridge..." indicating clearly that Mary was *then* pregnant—that is, prior to 1689. We cannot tell by these words *when* she became pregnant. (This will become an important question in a later article by Sam Dunnam.) What is curious here is that *some* deeper, continuing involvement with Mary Ross is indicated beyond that of merely having been together, for whatever purpose, earlier in Plymouth. One doesn't just deed over a homestead lightly. Even more curious is that four years later, in 1693, Mary Ross deeds back the same property to Jonathan and his wife, Mary. Whatever Jonathan's relationship with Mary Ross was, we must assume that Jonathan's own wife, Mary, knew about it to some considerable extent, since she joined in deeding the property to her originally. There is a great deal here that the records do not disclose that we should like to know.

Whenever Jonathan returned to Woodbridge and was reunited with his family, he appears once again to have assumed his place in the community. His puzzling, bizarre behavior in Massachusetts seems to have done little harm to his reputation in Woodbridge.

A final, curious twist of events follows. In December 1689, Jonathan and his wife, Mary, present one James Seaton with a

deed of trust, which he is to hold in trust for the benefit of Jonathan's and Mary's three sons. Then, about 1691, Mary Ross, who is still around living in Woodbridge, becomes involved in an adulterous affair with Seaton, who is a married man. Seaton's wife, Rebecca, divorces him in 1692 (something not lightly done in those days). In 1693 Mary Ross deeds the homestead previously conveyed to her back to Jonathan and Mary Dunham, and she and Seaton leave Woodbridge and go off to New York together. Thus we are left to puzzle over the enduring fabric of relationship between Jonathan and Mary Ross, of which his wife, Mary, certainly knew. Then we see what must have been a close association and relationship of trust between Jonathan and Mary Dunham and James Seaton; otherwise they would not have named him as trustee for their three sons regarding valuable property. Finally, James Seaton and Mary Ross become involved in a scandalous affair, Seaton's wife divorces him, and Mary and Seaton go off together to New York, she as his common-law wife. All the makings of a steamy soap-opera here in 17<sup>th</sup> century, Puritan New England, and though our interest is piqued, we can trace only fragmentary pieces of it in extant records.

On 16 April 1702, Jonathan is given a Power of Attorney by his wife and living children to dispose of lands held in Haverhill, Massachusetts, doubtless the same property earlier given to Mary (Bloomfield) Dunham by Jonathan's parents, Richard and Susannah Singletary. All Jonathan's sons sign: "xxxx Donham *alias Singletary*;" one daughter signs: "Mary Ellison." and Jonathan's wife, Mary, signs: "Mary Donham, [her mark] *alias Singletary*." (18) This document gives final testament to the transition, effected in this generation by Jonathan and his family, between the Singletary and Dunham surnames. One wonders if Jonathan



could have imagined then that, upon his decision to take Dunham as his new surname, he was founding a whole new Dunham family in America, whose numbers three hundred years later would be in the tens of thousands? We can be grateful for the fact (whatever the reason) that he and his family continued at least in their generation to attach the *alias Singletary* to their new name. That has clearly flagged for all of us, his descendants, the surname change that ties us, genetically, back to the Singletary family, with no need for further confusion in supposing that we might be related to Deacon John and Abigail Dunham of Plymouth.

Mary (Bloomfield) Dunham *alias Singletary* died in 1705. She was probably buried near the family homestead, close to or on the grounds of Trinity Episcopal Church Cemetery, located near her husband. Jonathan died about a year later, some time before 6 September 1706, as that was the date his son, Jonathan, probated his will.

Jonathan Dunham *alias Singletary* was certainly an interesting and paradoxical man. He was obviously a man of energy and intelligence, as his accomplishments attest. Doubtless, too, he was a man of strong passions, subject to what appear today irrational, impulsive detours from the normal, respectable life he led during other years—what we should call his *stable* years. He was bold in the sense he had little fear of departing from the conventional norms of his fellow citizens if he was so inclined; and like most unconventional, sometimes offensive, characters today, he paid a price—sometimes a steep one—for his errant behavior. Perhaps the concluding comment that is a key to his paradoxical character, but also to the esteem and respect he nevertheless earned, is that of Mr. Dally, a Woodbridge historian: “*this Dunham was a man of great energy. When he determined*

Samuel<sup>2</sup> Dunham, oldest son of John

*upon an enterprise he pushed it forward to success with indomitable perseverance.*” That is a quality that will carry a man far and cause his would-be critics to overlook or forgive his flaws.

(1) HOYT, David W., *The Old Families of Salisbury and Amebury, Massachusetts*, Picton Press; Camden, Maine, pp. 317-318: SINGLETARY FAMILY

(2) *Newbury Vital Records*, Volume 2, p. 721

(3) *The Vital Records of Haverhill*, Pub. Topsfield Historical Society. 1911

(4) *Vital Records of Salisbury, Massachusetts To the End of the Year 1849*, Topsfield Historical Society, Topsfield, Massachusetts, 1915, p. 218: "Salisbury Births"

(5) Shields, David M., Date Interpretation: Time of the Julian Calendar resulting in double dating for that time period

(6) HOYT, David W., *The Old Families of Salisbury and Amebury, Massachusetts*, Picton Press; Camden, Maine; Vital Record (7) Vital Record

(8) Internet, 2004: [English Dissenters: RANTERS](http://www.exlibris.org/nonconform/engdis/ranters.html) at <http://www.exlibris.org/nonconform/engdis/ranters.html>

(9) Upham's Salem Witchcraft, Vol. I, pp. 343-346; Monnette, Pt. 4, p. 501

(10) MONNETTE, Orra Eugene, *FIRST SETTLERS of YE PLANTATIONS of PISCATAWAY and WOODBRIDGE, OLDE EAST NEW JERSEY, 1664-1714*, The Leroy Carman Press, Los Angeles, CA, 1930, Part 4: p. 500

(11) HOYT, David W., *The Old Families of Salisbury and Amebury, Massachusetts*, Picton Press; Camden, Maine, p. 317

(12) MONNETTE, Orra Eugene, *FIRST SETTLERS of YE PLANTATIONS of PISCATAWAY and WOODBRIDGE, OLDE EAST NEW JERSEY, 1664-1714*, The Leroy Carman Press, Los Angeles, CA, 1930, p. 194: Genealogical Notes of the Dunham

- Family: Dunhams of Woodbridge  
 (13) As observed and photographed by Audrey (Shields) Hancock in October of 2000.  
 (14) DUNHAM, Isaac Watson, *DUNHAM GENEALOGY, Deacon John Dunham of Plymouth, Massachusetts 1589-1669 and His Descendants*, Bulletin Print, Norwich, Conn., 1907, pp.42-43  
 (15) Transcription of Gratia Dunham Mahony, 19 April 2004: Shurtleff, Nathaniel B., M.D., *Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England, 1678-1691, Boston, 1856, pp. 113-114: COURT ORDER: Jonathan Dunham*  
 (16) DUNHAM, Isaac Watson, *DUNHAM GENEALOGY, Deacon John Dunham of Plymouth, Massachusetts 1589-1669 and His Descendants*, Bulletin Print, Norwich, Conn., 1907, pp.43-44: "JONATHAN DUNHAM to MARY ROSS"  
 (17) JUNKIN, Patricia, 6 April 2004: Singletary-Dunham@yahoo.com: Research & Transcription  
 (18) MONNETTE, Orra Eugene, *FIRST SETTLERS of YE PLANTATIONS of PISCATAWAY and WOODBRIDGE, OLDE EAST NEW JERSEY, 1664-1714*, The Leroy Carman Press, Los Angeles, CA, 1930, p. 501: Essex Deeds 15:202

**Editor's Note 2:** *Somehow in the foregoing article my editor's footnotes got stripped out of the text. So if you missed them, don't worry. They are not there. At this point in the publication process I won't bother to put them back in. Not so much has been lost, and the article probably reads smoother without them.*

**ONE LINE of EARLY DUNHAMS  
 who went from  
 CARVER, MASSACHUSETTS  
 to MAINE**

**by Gratia Dunham Mahony**

Samuel<sup>2</sup> Dunham, oldest son of John and Abigail (Ballou) Dunham, was born in Leyden about 1623. He was still a young child of perhaps six years old when the family sailed to New Plymouth. Samuel probably recalled very little about Leyden, but surely he must have remembered the sea voyage to the New World, which was no small undertaking in those days. Samuel grew up in Plymouth Colony surrounded by the love of family, composed of his two older half brothers and his own younger siblings.

On 29 June 1649 Samuel married Martha (Beal) Falloway, daughter of John Beal of Hingham, and the young widow of William Falloway. Martha was the mother of Samuel's children and she lived to know most of her grandchildren. She died in Plymouth on 26 April 1690. In January of 1693 Samuel married again, this time to the widow Sarah Watson, who shared almost twenty years with him, until January 1711/12 when Samuel died.

Samuel and his family lived a little south of Plymouth in an area called Wellingsly. This was an area situated on Plymouth Harbor (and there is still a Wellingsly Street there today). The Town Meeting of 10 February 1643 made mention of "Goodman Dunhame" who was to help the inhabitants of Wellingsly make a wolf trap.

When Samuel Dunham was about 65 years old he assumed a new position, that of Master of the House of Correction. A record from the Court of General Sessions, Vol.

1:199, Court session of 1688, states: “ordered that the prison in Plimouth shall be improved as a house of correction,” and appointed Samuel Dunham, Sr. “to be Master of the House of Correction to Receive and Punish all persons that shall be sent thither”. Offenders were to pay “for their keeping and punishment” and, if unable to pay, “the charge of it shall be born by the Colony”.

Samuel <sup>2</sup> Dunham and Martha (Beal) Fallo-way had four children:

- i. Sarah <sup>3</sup> Dunham b. 10 April 1650
- ii. twin son b. 29 Dec. 1651
- iii. twin son b. 29 Dec. 1651
- iv. Samuel <sup>3</sup> Dunham b. about 1653

Sarah <sup>3</sup> Dunham married Samuel King, Jr about 1668-9., who was son of Samuel and Anne (Finney) King. Samuel and Sarah (Dunham) King had ten children who grew up, married, and remained in the Plymouth area to raise their families.

### ONLY SURVIVING SON

Samuel <sup>3</sup> Dunham married Mary Harlow in Plymouth on 30 June 1680, who was the daughter of Sergeant William and Mary (Faunce) Harlow. They also lived at Wellingsly. The will of Samuel <sup>2</sup> Dunham shows that he conveyed all property to his “only son Samuel. . .land at Wellingsly or ye Little Town, garden plot or homestead on which my son’s house now standeth. . .and several other parcels of land”. One of these other parcels of land had been granted to Samuel <sup>2</sup> Dunham on 26 January 1663. From Plymouth Town Records Vol. 1:59: “At this meeting the Towne granted unto Samuel Dunham, Joseph Dunham, Abraham Jackson and Jonathan Pratt to each of them six acres of meddow, lying in a meddow near the lower south meddow”. This land is of interest because it is the land on which Ebenezer <sup>4</sup> Dunham choose to settle. The Lower South

Meadows is today the village of Centre Carver.

An interesting question in regard to descendants of this branch of the Dunham family is: when did the change of spelling from DUNHAM to DONHAM occur? Samuel <sup>3</sup> Dunham left no written will, so we cannot see how he spelled his surname. The recorded death of Samuel’s widow shows “widow of y<sup>e</sup> Late Sam<sup>1</sup> Donham deceas<sup>d</sup>”. Whether the change of spelling was a conscious act, or just a scrivener’s error, we will never know. However, some of the children of the fourth generation, and their descendants today, spell their surname DONHAM. I have continued to use the Dunham spelling for this branch of the family in the balance of this article. Anyone doing research on this branch of the family, however, may find search results under either spelling of the surname.

Samuel <sup>3</sup> and Mary (Harlow) Dunham/Donham were the parents of five children:

- i. Samuel <sup>4</sup> Dunham b. 19 July 1681, died 26 March 1761, at age 80. He never married.
- ii. William <sup>4</sup> Dunham b. 2 February 1684
- iii. Mary <sup>4</sup> Dunham b. 13 October 1687, died 8 March 1780, at age 94. She never married.
- iv. Ebenezer <sup>4</sup> Dunham b. 24 February 1691/2
- v. Nathaniel <sup>4</sup> Dunham b. 12 May 1698

Ebenezer <sup>4</sup> Dunham married Abigail Smith on 1 June 1720. Abigail was a sister of Annis Smith, who married Ephraim <sup>4</sup> Dunham (Nathaniel <sup>3</sup> Joseph <sup>2</sup> John <sup>1</sup>). They were daughters of John Smith of Beverly who moved with his wife Mary (Ellenwood) Dunham and children to Middleboro in 1702/3.

Shortly after the death of Samuel <sup>3</sup> Dunham/Donham in 1718, the four brothers of the fourth generation (Samuel, Nathaniel, Ebenezer and William) exchanged and consolidated in a series of deeds the land hold-

ings that had been left to them. From these deeds we can see that Ebenezer <sup>4</sup> focused his choice of location on the area called “Souther’s Marsh”. We can locate this property today lying just to the west of the Plymouth-Carver boundary on the north side of Tremont Road in Carver. Much of this area is now under cultivation by cranberry growers

The homes of the children of Joseph <sup>2</sup>, Persis <sup>2</sup> and Hannah <sup>2</sup> Dunham can be seen on a map that was not available in time for the publication date of this issue but will be published as an addendum in the next issue. These three children of Deacon John <sup>1</sup> Dunham settled in that area just to the north of Carver in the town that is now called Plympton. There were several marriages in the fifth generation between descendants of these four second generation children (Samuel <sup>2</sup>, Joseph <sup>2</sup>, Persis <sup>2</sup>, and Hannah <sup>2</sup> Dunham).

Ebenezer <sup>4</sup> and Abigail (Smith) Dunham were parents of eight children, all of whom were raised on land in Souther’s Marsh in the town of Carver:

- i. Abigail <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. 23 November 1720
- ii. Samuel <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. 9 September 1722
- iii. Ebenezer <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. 21 September 1724
- iv. John <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. 12 July 1726
- v. Moses <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. July 1728, died 11 February 1744/45
- vi. Mary <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. June say 1730, probably died young
- vii. Barnabas <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. June say 1732 baptised 17 March 1733/4
- viii. William <sup>5</sup> Dunham b. June say 1734, baptised 15 August 1736

John <sup>5</sup> Dunham married his third cousin Mary Thomas on 13 November 1755, who was the daughter of John and Abigail (Dunham) Thomas. Abigail <sup>4</sup> (Dunham) Thomas was daughter of Micajah <sup>3</sup>, Joseph <sup>2</sup>, John <sup>1</sup> Dunham. John <sup>5</sup> Dunham served in the Revolutionary war as did also his first

son Moses <sup>6</sup> Dunham, the oldest of the nine children born to John and Mary (Thomas) Dunham. These children were:

- i. Moses <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 23 January 1757
- ii. Mary <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 16 December 1759
- iii. Salome <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 12 April 1762
- iv. John <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 16 November 1764
- v. Thomas <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 2 October 1766
- vi. Elizabeth <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 25 December 1768
- vii. Abigail <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 20 April 1771
- viii. Caleb <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 9 March 1773
- ix. James <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 25 May 1775
- x. Job <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 20 April 1777
- xi. Calvin <sup>6</sup> Dunham b. 11 April 1781

## THE MIGRATION TO MAINE

Of these eleven children in the sixth generation, six migrated to Maine with their families. Moses <sup>6</sup> Dunham was born in Carver on 23 January 1757 and served with the Plymouth County Militia during the years 1777 and 1778. After the fighting had ended he married Margaret Morton of Plymouth. This couple had eight children, born in Carver. But in 1805 the land, now part of southern Maine, beckoned to them. On 22 November 1805 Moses purchased lot #8 in the sixth range of lots in Hartford, Oxford County, Maine. Moses and Margaret and their eight children moved to Maine shortly thereafter, and they appear on the 1810 census in Hartford.

Moses <sup>6</sup> was not alone in the migration to Maine. Several of his brothers and sisters also moved to Oxford County, Maine and settled in nearby towns. Thomas <sup>6</sup> Dunham, born in Carver on 2 October 1766, married Silvina (Brattles) Shurtleff in 1798 as his second wife. This young couple moved to Hebron, Oxford County, Maine soon after their marriage and their eight children were born there.

Elizabeth <sup>6</sup> Dunham, born in Carver on 25 December 1768, married Lemuel Cole, Jr. in

1788, and this family too migrated to Hartford, Maine. Abigail <sup>6</sup> Dunham, b. in Carver 20 April 1771, and her husband Seth Gurney went to Hebron Maine, where their five children were born. James <sup>6</sup> Dunham, born in Carver on 25 May 1775, and his wife, Cynthia Packard, had nine children born in Hebron, Maine. And finally Job <sup>6</sup> Dunham married Abigail Vaughan in Carver 1 November 1801, and joined the pilgrimage to Maine. Job and Abigail are buried in Buckfield, Maine as are some of their children. The adjoining towns of Hartford, Hebron and Buckfield must have been a very friendly place with all the Dunham cousins, plus the collateral families, who also came to Maine from the old town of Carver, Massachusetts.

---

## THE PRESERVATION OF OBITUARY INFORMATION

by Paul C. Dunham

Newspaper obituaries contain information that, while not always 100% accurate, is useful to genealogical researchers. Unfortunately, this information is seldom captured for later use. There are searchable obituary databases such as *Obituary Times*. These are useful in a limited way. In a project to computerize death indexes in Montana prior to 1954, we found that the data were useful, but again limited. The following describes our effort to capture and preserve this valuable data in a standardized, database format and make it available online to genealogical researchers.

Obituaries contain much genealogically relevant data such as birth dates and places, marriage dates and places, spouses and marriage status, relatives and perhaps their geographi-

cal location and maybe the cause of death.

I initiated this project in Montana. A description of how we proceeded may be useful to others. Our goal was to capture, index and preserve obituary information from the state's major newspapers. Here's how we went about it.

Our Montana newspapers, like so many others, have on-line editions that for the most part accurately portray what is in the printed edition. What we sought to do was to capture the obituaries from these online editions, preserve them, and extract selected data into a computerized database that would be more useful to genealogical researchers.

Capturing the obituaries involved downloading an image of the obituary from the on-line newspaper edition, indexing it for use in retrieving the information for the database, and then preserving the image for later retrieval. Obituaries are generally copyrighted; therefore it was necessary to obtain agreement from the newspapers.

Obituaries are generally presented in one of two formats: some newspapers create individual files for each obituary; others may include all obituaries for a particular date in a single file. In some instances there may be from time to time a combination of both.

At the start of the project we scanned pages from the newspapers and captured them as MS Word documents. Unfortunately, the quality of the capture left much to be desired for a variety of reasons. When scanning was abandoned in favor of direct download from the internet, the quality substantially improved.

We reduced the name of each newspaper to an acronym. If the obituaries were contained in individual files, they were identified by

alphabetic letters from A to Z. If there were more than 26 obituaries on a particular day, I would start over, using double alphabetic letters: e.g. AA, BB. If obituaries for a single day were contained in a single file, each obituary would be identified by a number. If an item in a newspaper that generally uses single files actually contained multiple obituaries, a combination of both means of identification was used. In either case, the date of publication was used as an identifier.

A newspaper with separate files might be identified as follows if there were 3 obituaries: BG-11-12-2004-A; BG-11-12-2004-B; and BG-11-12-2004-C. Obituaries in a newspaper that placed all obituaries in a single file would be identified as follows: MS-11-12-2004-1/1, MS-11-12-2004-1/2, MS-11-12-2004-1/3, etc. If an obituary in a newspaper that normally used separate files contained more than a single obituary, it would be identified as MST-11-12-2004-A-1/1, MST-11-12-2004-A-1/2, etc.

Note that there can be multiple copies of the same person's obituary because it might appear in several newspapers. However, I discovered that presentations are not necessarily the same in various newspapers. Some newspapers apparently edit the obituary when it is from outside their area of circulation.

The obituaries were downloaded from the internet as files. Either Internet Explorer or Netscape can be used. I discovered that Netscape works best. In Netscape, text in the file can be downloaded rather easily without having to contend with all the other material on the page. In Internet Explorer, one generally ends up with multiple files in a folder, which are not particularly easy to use.

The following data, if present, was extracted from the obituary: **Last name, first name,**

**middle name or initial, source (newspaper), source date, maiden name, sex if discernible, marital status, spouse last name, spouse first name, spouse middle name or initial, spouse status, death date, death place, cause of death** if indicated, **birth date, birth place, marriage date, marriage place, cemetery**, if available, **mortuary, related surnames** and a field for state file information. The purpose of the latter is to provide a link to the state's death index files.

If there are multiple marriages, the data are displayed in the fields from the last to the first, using parentheses to separate the information.

To perform the extract, the computer screen is divided into two halves. In one half the database data entry form is displayed. In the other half the obituary is displayed. The information can then be easily transferred from the obituary into the database. At the end of the article I give an example.

**Appendix 1** is the text of the original obituary as it appeared in the newspaper. **Appendix 2** shows the database screen for the same information as extracted from the obituary. The greater utility of the information in the database for online queries is evident.

The fields in the database are indexed for quicker retrieval and are searchable. Queries can be developed for individual search requests.

At the end of each month, the data accumulated for that month were transferred to a more complete database. The obituaries were preserved in two formats: compressed and non-compressed. The obituaries were then also stored on a CD.

The intent of this procedure is to make the

databases and obituary files available to genealogical societies for genealogical research.

I hope it will be possible to establish a cadre of individuals across the state that will accumulate and index the information so all the newspapers in the state are covered. Of course, not all the newspapers are on line yet, so some might still have to be scanned.

Our procedures in Montana can perhaps serve as a model for similar efforts in other states—ideally in all 50. A national standardized form for organizing online obituary information would be a great, and much needed, resource for genealogical researchers.

**Appendix 1.** Below: the original obituary, as it appeared in the newspaper before the data was extracted for the database format of Appendix 2.

## Lillian Slayman

Posted: 11/03/04

Lillian Slayman left us to be with our Lord on Oct. 30, 2004. She was 83.

Helen Edith Lillian Domney was born on Sept. 13, 1921, in Valjean, Saskatchewan, Canada, to Walter Gideon Domney and Janet Mildred Corbman. She grew up in Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, and moved to Helena in 1954.

She met and married John Slayman in 1954. John passed away in 1972. Her second love was Everett Jensen who shared their lives until 1986 when he passed away.

Lillian worked as a housekeeper for several years at the Harvey Hotel, Jorgenson's and Colonial Inn until she retired.

She had several hobbies which included ceramics and plastic canvas. Some of her pieces were displayed at the Stampede Fair and she always received ribbons. She

also crocheted baby blankets that kept several babies cozy and warm.

She enjoyed camping at Park Lake and riding her Honda motorcycle with her son and Everett. She also enjoyed playing pinochle with her friends and family. She liked to beat the socks off of them.

Lillian was a longtime member of the Ladies of the Moose. She was senior regent in 1998-99 and Mother of the Year also. She loved playing with her great-grandchildren. Family was important to her.

She was preceded in death by her parents, a sister, Ethel, brother, Ted Domney, her husband, John Slayman and Everett Jensen. Survivors include her son: Wally (Inez) Slayman; sister Nancy Tyce of Oshtemo, Ontario; grandchildren: Steffani (Dustin) Delaney, Julie (Corey) Massen, Gale, Scott (Heather) Johnson and Jeffrey Johnson; and great-grandchildren: Brianna, Haley, Leigh Anne, Jacqueline, Dylan, Kayla, Meleha, Caitlyn, Tyler and Shantel.

Lillian was loved by her family and will be missed very much.

Funeral services will be at 11 a.m. Saturday, Nov. 6, from Hagler-Anderson Chapel with the Rev. Thomas C. Banks officiating. A reception will follow services at the Moose Lodge at 4750 No. Montana Ave. Helena. Services arrangements have been entrusted to Hagler-Anderson Funeral Home.

**Appendix 2** - The obituary information as transposed to the database format.

File Number	Last Name	First Name	
IR-11-3-2004-A	SLAYMAN	HELEN	
Initial	Source	Source date	Maiden Name
LILLIAN	Helena Independent Rec	11/3/2004	DOMNEY
Sex	Marital Status	Spouse Surname	
F	W (W)	JENSEN (SLAYMAN)	
Spouse Given Name	Spouse Initial	Spouse status	
EVERETT (JOHN)		Deceased (Deceased)	
Death Date	Death Place	Cause of death	
10/30/2004	Helena, MT		
Birth date	Birth Place	Marriage date	
9/13/1921	Valjean, Saskatchewan,	1954	
Marriage Place	State File information	Cemetery	
Mortuary			
Hagler-Anderson FH, Helena, MT			
Related Surnames			

**TWO ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES**  
from Paul C. Dunham

**1. IRS 501 (c) (3) Exemption Status**

The Board of Directors will seek tax-pt status for the association during the coming year. If we are successful, a number of benefits will accrue. First, Dunham/Singletary Family Connections will be formally exempt from federal income tax during its corporate lifetime. Second, it will make us eligible to receive tax-deductible charitable contributions from members and others, thereby effectively lowering the cost of participation. This status may also enable us to become eligible for reduced postal rates, and it will assure grant-making organizations that they are making grants to a permitted beneficiary. While neither of these latter benefits will significantly affect our finances immediately, they may become important as we enlarge our size and engage in more extensive educational and research activities. To qualify, we must file a

quite extensive application with the IRS for its consideration and pay a filing fee. If we are granted tax-exempt status, we shall then have to operate within established guidelines and prepare reports and make them publicly available. Neither of these obligations should be particularly onerous.

Getting tax-exempt status should significantly aid us in supporting our future activities. I shall keep the membership informed on our progress in future Newsletters. Do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions or advice on this or related issues. I welcome your questions.

**2. Conflict of Interest Policy**

Another matter the Board will pursue this year is establishing a conflict of interest policy. A conflict of interest may arise when a person in authority, such as a director, officer or employee, may benefit per-



sonally from a decision he or she might make. Having a conflict of interest policy is not required for obtaining tax-exempt status. But having such a policy is a recommended organizational safeguard that inspires confidence; it is organizational “good practice.” The policy we have under consideration is available at the following web site: <http://www.pcdunham.ws/ConflictInterest.htm>

Copies may be freely printed, if desired. Comments or questions about the proposed policy may be addressed to any of the directors, including me.

The Board will be addressing this policy at its next board meeting, for which a date is not yet set.