

Dunham Singletary

FAMILY CONNECTIONS

Issue 3

July 15, 2005

Volume 2

President's Message

This is a very patriotic time for us. While we are celebrating the birth of our country we are also celebrating the beginnings of the Dunham/Singletary Family Connections. We are a year old this summer. There is so much pride in what our founding Dunham ancestors did in this country. Now, we invite you to send in your family's stories about their efforts to carve out a life for their families in this New Land. Do they have some War Stories you have preserved? Let us hear from you.

Jan Erwin Dunham, *President*

Editor's Corner

This Issue Number 4 completes a full year's complement of quarterly Dunham-Singletary Family Connections Newsletter. That is a milestone and one I hope will be repeated many times. As Editor, my thanks to all of you who have contributed articles and material during the past year. I hope that the Newsletter is on its way to becoming established as a regular, periodic bond between us that gives our association cohesion and staying power.

Since the first issue, which was posted on Paul's website, we have been distributing the Newsletter to an email distribution list of paid up members only. We need to give Dunham-Singletary family members who have not yet joined our association a reason for doing so. But we also wish to continue recruiting new members and expanding our membership. That is so far our greatest operational shortcoming: we are not growing fast enough. We must during this next year redouble our efforts. Donna Jones cannot do it all alone. She needs help, and suggestions have been made on how to organize our efforts more effectively. All of us have family members who are not members, and all of us know other Dunhams, perhaps Singletarys, too, whom we can urge to join. I know that I do. So, with Donna's leadership, let's set our sights on a much expanded membership for the coming year, 2005-6. All of us, including me, needs to grab an oar in recruiting new members. In that connection, do not hesitate to use your current copy of the distributed Newsletter as an incentive. If you know a potentially interested family member, send them an email with this Newsletter attached. We're not going to add anyone to the automatic distribution list who's not joined. But don't hesitate to send them a single sample copy to help recruit them, either this Newsletter

or a previous one you think might interest them.

Speaking of other Singletarys, let me relay an interesting personal story to you. My family and I moved to Austin in the summer of 1960. I was still working on a doctorate in philosophy from The University of Chicago, but had completed all my course work there. The prospect of another Chicago winter with three small children in a small South Side Chicago apartment was grim. So we decided to move back to sunny Texas, to Austin, where I would complete my doctoral work. Shortly after moving here, I met John Silber, a professor in The University of Texas/Austin philosophy department. He had another professor friend named Otis Singletary, whom I may have met once but never knew well. Silber and I became good friends, but he and Otis Singletary both left UT/Austin about 1970. Silber became President of Boston University and Singletary, unbeknownst to me, later became President of The University of Kentucky.

About a year ago, Silber and I were visiting in Texas and I was telling him about my genealogy interest and our DNA studies, mentioning our discovery of the Singletary connection. "Are you related to Otis Singletary?" he asked, about whom I'd forgotten. "Beats me," I replied, "but I'll follow that up." A couple of months passed but then the reminder jogged me. I looked him up on Google. He'd died about two years ago but there was an extended biographical sketch, including data on his family. He had two daughters and a son. I managed to get in touch with his son, Scot Singletary, and told him of my interest. We were able to determine from comparing records that he was indeed descended from Richard Singletary—something he and his father had never been able to confirm. That

cinched our distant family connection, but I urged him to get tested, which, by this time he was ready to do. He was tested, then extended to 25 markers. He matches Jerry Singletary exactly in 25 of 25 markers. He and I match 12 for 12 in the 12-marker test, as I do with Jerry, and, as with Jerry, we have three mismatches in markers #13-25. Scot is thus the second Singletary to be tested in our Dunham-Singletary DNA tests, and reinforces the connection first confirmed in Jerry's test. Scot's test results emphasize that we need to get more Singletarys tested. I'm personally going to work on that. If any of you know any Singletarys, here's a story you can pass along.

This Issue

The issue features two articles and, for a welcome change, one Letter to the Editor. The first article is an article I have written on an article/report by Paul Dunham on our DNA tests. Paul is Administrator of our testing project. We have so far, in looking at the results of these tests, drawn what seem like some straightforward conclusions about family groups and relationships. Studying the results of the 38 individuals thus far tested (actually, 39 now), and using Family Tree DNA's interpretations of what constitutes evidence of relationship, Paul reaches some conclusions about "regrouping our groups" that are somewhat surprising. In general, we would introduce more groups and sub-groups. Probably something like that is in order. But there are some salient questions, I think, that need answers before we do that. Paul's article/report is somewhat on the technical side for some readers. I have tried to convey his most important conclusions and evidence for the more general reader. Paul's full article is avail-

able at _____ for those who wish to consult it—and I recommend that unless studying tables and numbers is not to your taste.

The second article is yet another in Gratia Mahony's series that follow the lives and geographic dispersion of Deacon John Dunham's children and grandchildren. Her contribution in this issue is on Jonathan Dunham and his heirs (out to the fifth generation), who was the second child of Deacon John and Abigail Dunham (not be confused with Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary). He was born in Leyden, Holland, and thus was technically an "immigrant child" when he arrived in America at Plymouth about 1630. Gratia's article will be of particular interest to readers who are Deacon John descendants, and, we hope, help some of them tie their family branches into their earliest American forebears. Gratia will continue this series in future issues.

Finally, we have a Letter to The Editor contributed by Patricia Junkin (our first! which delights me). Pat has some issues concerning the account of Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary that appeared in Audrey Shields Hancock's article (with me) in the third (last) Newsletter: *Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary: A Paradoxical Figure*. I've called Pat before "a defender of Jonathan's virtue" and she may well be that at some final, deeper level. But she is very knowledgeable about this man, his association with Mary Ross, and about many details of his life, as well as about the religious convictions and practices of this time in early America. Her criticisms and questions remind us that in genealogy we are always dealing with a species of history—"history in the microcosm," we might call it. Individuals and families are the "atoms" and "molecules" of larger

movements and events in history. They are the *individual actors* who, in the final analysis, collectively "make history." Like larger history, we can know the past only by the evidence of documents and records that we still possess *today*, and perhaps by some artifacts, too. They are *all* we have to go on. It is the historian's, or genealogist's, interpretation of today's remaining evidence that determines what we believe today were "the facts" of the past then. Whenever the evidence is ambiguous, incomplete, or unclear, we have to go with the most plausible interpretations. Pat has some different interpretations than that offered in Audrey's article (with me). Her opinions and reasons deserve careful weighing and consideration. This makes her Letter interesting and relevant. Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary *was* a complex and paradoxical man, and our records of him and his deeds are woefully incomplete and fragmentary. He is a very important historical figure, as founder (by his name change) of a very large family group who have kept the name Dunham. There will be many more articles about him or involving him in this Newsletter. Pat's opinion and voice is one we need to hear and carefully consider.

SOME SURPRISING AND INFORMATIVE CONCLUSIONS ABOUT OUR DNA TESTING PROGRAM

And Suggestions For Further Testing

by Sam E. Dunnam

Our able Administrator-in-Chief, Paul Dunham, submitted a very informative—

but rather technical—article for July’s issue on our Dunham-Singleton DNA Surname Testing Project¹. It seemed to me that Paul’s valuable analysis might be a bit too technical for some of our readers: it requires close reading of—and studying with some care—a number of comparative tables that Paul has developed and presents. So what I shall attempt to do in what follows is present some of Paul’s most interesting conclusions for the general reader. For those more analytically inclined, I recommend that you read Paul’s article in full; he has posted the full text with tables on his website at [_____](#). Also, his website article makes use of a number of colors to highlight “markers” that vary from “control” individuals² and to designate the different family groups themselves. We don’t yet use colors in this newsletter, so Paul’s article and tables are best viewed and studied online. We can’t do them justice here.

The most interesting and informative conclusions in Paul’s article pertain to the *probability of relationship* between tested individuals in terms of how closely in times past are *they likely to find a common mutual ancestor (CMA)*. *The results of DNA tests must always be expressed in terms of probabilities*.

The second conclusion (that bears directly on the first) is the gain we get in terms of a *more accurate and discriminating estimate of probability* if we extend the tests of two

¹Since a number of distinct and unrelated Dunham family groups have been identified in our testing program, we are not a single family testing group (where all members would be related). We are rather a “surname testing group,” who, with an important exception, share the same surname. This is very useful, since it sorts out clearly the different family groups and avoids confusions that might otherwise occur in standard records research. The important exception is the Singleton family group, from whom one large Dunham family group derives (hence our name). We report a new Singleton test in this issue.

related individuals from 12 markers to 25 markers. An exact or close match of 12 markers between two individuals indicates that a relationship probably exists, but doesn’t pin down very closely (i.e., with sufficiently high probability) how far back those two might expect to find their common mutual ancestor. The 25-marker test gives a more confident, useful set of numbers in terms of increased or diminished probabilities.

The third very interesting conclusion is *the increasing degree of probability of relationship* we get as we *extend back in time* the prospect of finding a common mutual ancestor. Paul, following Family Tree DNA (our testing agency), uses receding 100-year time periods, starting at 100 years back and going all the way back to 600 years. It is more meaningful for genealogists to think of these receding 100-year periods in terms of generations. If we use an estimate of generations for human beings at 20 to 25 years, then each 100-year period represents 4 to 5 generations. Thus 100 years represents 4 to 5 generations (say, to great grandfathers or great, great grandfathers), 200 years represents 8 to 10 generations, and so on. Note that the probabilities increase dramatically as we go farther back in time. This says simply that if two individuals have an unspecified genetic relation, the farther back they go, the higher the probability of their finding their common mutual ancestor.

With these introductory remarks about Paul’s conclusions, it is appropriate now to present his illustrative tables on actual 12 and 25 marker tests for three sets of

²“Control” individuals are those used within distinct family groups, with respect to whom some “markers” in others tested may vary, indicating a mutation and therefore perhaps a greater “genetic distance” from the “control,” whose earliest known ancestor (for a given family group) has been verified by records.

two actual individuals, chosen from our Dunham-Singletary DNA test results so far. I am leaving in Paul’s own table numbers, so that any of you who read his full article can refer to them directly in that document.

The first table (5a) compares the probable

closeness of relationship between Paul C. Dunham and Carl A. Dunham, both in the Deacon John Dunham family group. They match exactly—that is, they have a “genetic distance” of 0—in both their 12-marker and 25-marker tests³. It can readily be seen that the 25-marker test improves significantly the estimate of the closeness of their relationship.

Table 5-a. Probability of a Common Ancestor

#Markers	100 years	200 years	300 years	400 years	500 years	600 years
12	33.57%	55.88%	70.69%	80.53%	87.07%	91.41%
25	61.7%	84.92%	94.15%	97.73%	99.12%	99.66%

The second table (5b) compares the probability of a common ancestor between Lloyd E. Dunham and Jerry Singletary, who have a genetic distance of 2 in the 12-marker test and of 3 in the 25-marker test. What these results show is that there is a slim to somewhat improbable chance of their finding a common ancestor within the first 400 years of their respective family

histories. That chance is very slight in the first 100 years by both tests: only .82% (less than 1%) in the 12-marker test, increasing to only 1.48% in the 25-marker test. Still, the 25-marker test gives more definitive results. It shows that the probabilities increase to “somewhat likely” (60.84%) within a 500-year period, to “somewhat more likely” (74.03%)

Table 5-b. Probability of a Common Ancestor

# Markers	100 years	200 years	300 years	400 years	500 years	600 years
12	0.82%	4.27%	10.51%	18.80%	28.21%	37.91%
25	1.48%	10.15%	25.93%	44.17%	60.84%	74.03%

³“Genetic distance” expresses whether any mutations are evident in comparing their strings of 12 and 25 markers, and if so, how many. This measure is always against an “index individual” or “control” whose relationship to the earliest known ancestor in a family group is known by way of records.

within a 600-year period. The 25-marker test is decidedly more useful and definitive. The 12-marker test leaves significant doubt of finding a common ancestor even within a 600-year history (37.91% or less than 4 out of 10), whereas the 25-marker test says *there is* a reasonable chance of finding a common ancestor within the period 400-600 years. Where we know from records that *there is* a relationship (as between Lloyd and Jerry), the results of the tests show that 3 mutations have nevertheless occurred in their separate lines of descent from their distant common ancestor as known by records—in this case, Richard Singletary.

The third table (5c) compares the probab

ity of relationship between Sam E. Dunnam (me) and Jerry Singletary as measured by their 12 and 25-marker tests.

This comparison is interesting because it suggests, by the 12-marker test, that Sam and Jerry very probably have a distant relation (in the 300 to 600 year time frame). They match exactly, 12 of 12, in that test. But when both of their 12-marker tests were extended to 25 markers, *three* mismatches turned up in markers #13-25. This evidence substantially reduces the probability that they are related. If they are, it would be a distant relationship, occurring probably in the 500 to 600 year deep past.

Table 5-c. Probability of a Common Ancestor

# Markers	100 years	200 years	300 years	400 years	500 years	600 years
12	33.57%	55.88%	70.69%	80.53%	87.07%	91.41%
25	1.81%	11.95%	29.58%	48.95%	65.76%	78.38%

There is strong (but not certain) evidence *by records* that Jerry and Sam *are* related.⁴ And this evidence, if valid, puts their relation at nine generations back—to Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary’s name change, where Jonathan’s sons kept his adopted Dunham name but his brothers’ sons continued to use the Singletary name. This was a historic, pivotal branching in our family research and indeed occurred about 350+

years ago.

Now, let’s try to get a better understanding of what these predicted probabilities mean. For the male Y-chromosome DNA test, which the Dunham-Singletary testing project uses, we are told that a mutation in a single marker occurs rarely, *on average* only once every 500 years. So, in looking at strings of markers for either the 12 or 25- marker tests, *each* marker in the string (of either length) has a probability of undergoing a mutation only once in 500 years. This means that *the string as a whole* is very likely to “hold its pattern” over long periods of time, and that changes

⁴The relation of Sam and indeed all the “southern” Dunham families to Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary is an interesting story in itself. This story will be the subject of an article in a future issue by Sam Dunnam and Gratia Mahony.

in individual markers each represent (on average) one in 500-year events. Thus, in considering the *whole* string (either 12, 25 or more markers) we are dealing with a complex set of *compounded probabilities* that only sophisticated probability analysts (mathematical statisticians) can calculate. The probabilities reflected in Paul's tables above for the receding 100-year periods are the results of such complex compound probability calculations (courtesy of Family Tree DNA). This is why it is not such a simple matter to say in DNA testing that, for example, two individuals with largely matching test results are related, say, *definitely* within the past ten generations. Such a statement can only be expressed in terms of probabilities.

Where there is *any* positive probability whatsoever that a common mutual ancestor might be found for two tested individuals within a given 100-year time frame, the meaning is that, even where unlikely, that probability *is not zero*. There is *some* chance, though perhaps not very great at all. But we can't rule it out. This is why traditional records research continues to be so important. Records data is sometimes in error; but when it is right, it fixes the relationship exactly. DNA testing can never give such definitive, unambiguous answers.

Thus in table 5c in the 12-marker test for Sam and Jerry, they match exactly in 12 of 12. This result says there is a 1 in 3 chance of their finding a common mutual ancestor within the past 100 years. At 200 years, the chances improve to a little better than 1 out of 2. At 300 years, they exceed 7 out of 10. At 400 years, they increase to better than 8 out of 10. At 500 years, they are almost 9 out of 10. At 600 years, they rise to better than 9 out of 10. So, in table 5c for Sam and Jerry, they find a quite *reasonable* chance of finding a common mutual an-

cestor any time after 200 years— according to the 12-marker test.

But when we compare them in the 25-marker test, wherein they exhibit a genetic distance of 3 (that is, three mutations out of 25), their probabilities of finding a common mutual ancestor within a recent time period (the past 400 years) diminish decidedly. It remains slightly less than 1 out of 2 at 400 years. It doesn't become nearly 2 out of 3 until 500 years. Only at 600 years does it become almost 8 out of 10. So we can say that, on balance, it does not become *probable*, in the customary, ordinary language sense, that Sam and Jerry can find a common mutual ancestor until the deep past, at 500 to 600 years ago. At least this is what the bare *genetic distance* probabilities of DNA testing say, measured in terms of the number of mutations (gene changes) exhibited when their separate strings of markers in the 12 and 25 marker tests are compared. What Sam and Jerry's tests in table 5c show dramatically is that the 25-marker test *can change significantly* our estimate of how probable it is that two tested individuals are related. It is a much improved, more sensitive discriminator than the basic 12-marker test.

This fact has a number of important ramifications for the future conduct of our Dunham-Singletary testing program. It says that the basic 12-marker test is best used *only* as a threshold indicator of relationship. If a "new Dunham" is getting a first test, it will place him in one generic family or another. It will indicate whether or not two given individuals *are* related. But once basic relationship is determined, everyone should extend their 12-marker test to 25 markers. This will give a substantially improved estimate of how close the newly tested individual is to others already tested. It gives a much improved estimate of how distant the relationship likely is between any two or more individuals. This could be important in estimating where and when divergent branching may have occurred in generic family lines. If individuals decide to get tested who already know (or strongly suspect) they are related to one of the generic Dunham families, they should opt for the 25-marker test first thing.

Further Tests

We have had so far little experience with the 37-marker tests, the next step beyond 25 markers. Only two individuals—one from each of the two major family groups (the Deacon John and

Dunham-Singletary generic families). In these two tests neither case showed a dramatic further increase in discrimination. On that evidence, it would appear there is little to be gained in extending from 25 markers to 37 for most people. However, 37-marker tests will add *some* additional discrimination. In Paul's view, it is therefore important for individuals used as "controls" to extend from 25 markers to 37. "Controls" are the index individuals for different family groups from whom deviations (mutations) are measured. In the Deacon John family group, the "control" is George Dunham. Paul urges that it is important for George to upgrade from 12 markers (where he is now) to 37. In the Dunham-Singletary family group, the "control" is Jerry Singletary. Jerry is at 25 markers currently; he needs to upgrade to 37. Or, since they match exactly in 25 of 25, Scot Singletary could upgrade to 37.

Regrouping The Family Groups

Paul believes that on the basis of the 25 marker tests, to which he believes all of us should upgrade, there will be need to rethink our family groupings. For the 25-marker tests will show some individuals whom the 12-marker tests indicate are related, perhaps closely, to be in fact "probably not related" (as in table 5c in the case of Jerry Singletary and me). I had, in my article in the first newsletter (Oct '04), suggested that the DNA tests had indicated so far *five* family groups: two major ones and three minor ones (at least in terms of our testing thus far). Paul thinks we may well need to create more distinct family groups; these would formed from individuals whom the 25-marker tests indicate are "probably related." Individuals whom the 25-marker tests indicate are "probably not related" would be taken out of groups of others who are all "probably related." The end result would be a regrouping of the groups in which individuals in each distinct group are all "probably related" and no group would contain any individual whom the 25-marker tests indicate is "probably not related" to others in the group. Some such regrouping may well be indicated when each tested person in our total group of 39 tested individuals has upgraded to 25 markers.

Our overall interest, as a surname testing group, is to determine how many generic families there are among people whose surname is Dunham or a close variant thereof (e.g., Donham). After a sufficiently large and diverse number of individuals are tested, any new individual tested should fall into one of these generic groups. Paul's article suggests finer discrimination is indicated in establishing generic

groups.

I have, however, some reservations about regrouping just now. I agree with Paul that everyone who has not done so already should upgrade to 25 markers. But I have some reservations about regrouping solely on the standard Family Tree DNA gross calculated probabilities of determining "probably related" and "probably not related."

I did a quick comparative analysis between five individuals who include Jerry and Scot Singletary, and myself, James T. Dunnam, and Lloyd E. Dunham. Each of us have 25-marker tests. We are an interesting group. Jerry and Scot match exactly in 25 of 25 markers; thus either could be the "control" for whole Dunham-Singletary family group. Both can trace back directly to Richard Singletary by records. James and I mismatch in only 1 marker out of 25 (#12 on the 12-marker test); we match exactly on #13-25. We know also that we are related by records, both being descendants of a common mutual ancestor in South Carolina about 1700. Lloyd and I mismatch on 6 markers out of 25—by 2 markers in the first 12 (12-marker test), and by 4 more in markers #13-25. We are thus definitely "not related" by all FTDNA's standards.

FTDNA's interpretation of the 12-marker test is: (a) genetic distance of 0 is related; (b) of 1 is "possibly related;" (c) of 2 is "probably not related;" (d) of 3 or greater is "not related." FTDNA's interpretation of the 25-marker test is a genetic distance: (a) of 0 or 1 "is related;" (b) of 2, "is probably related;" (c) of 3, "is probably not related;" (d) of 4 or more "is not related."

And yet, when I analyzed the patterns of mismatches between us, they were not random. They had a systematic pattern between them in all but two cases, each of those belonging to Lloyd, where single markers deviated from all the other 4 of us, and bore interesting relationships to Jerry and Scot, the "controls." I am not sure what this means yet. Paul and I have yet to discuss it and probably will not have an opportunity to do so until after the publication of this issue. We may have to fall back on FTDNA to give us further guidance in interpreting these results.

Also, I have a couple of basic important questions. First, *what is* signified when two individuals match in 22 out of 25 markers but are still interpreted by FTDNA to be “probably not related?” That preponderant pattern of matching is certainly not random. Do FTDNA’s interpretive criteria mean “probably not related” *in a meaningful time frame*? Second, when we compare the DNA markers of the Deacon John family group with the Singletary family group, there are many more mismatches than matches. Same for some of the “minor” family groups identified. These different generic family groups show very distinctly different marker patterns. Surely there has to be a generic relationship within each of these clearly distinct and different family groups.

These are interesting questions, and they underscore that all of us have much more to learn about DNA testing. We shall follow with answers to these questions in subsequent issues. There is no question that DNA testing is an extremely interesting and powerful tool of genealogical research. But these interesting and curious results underscore also that traditional records research is also very important, should be diligently pursued, and that it is from a *combination* of the two together that we shall learn the most.

Finally, if wishes were horses, we would all prefer that DNA testing could give us those exact, familiar kinds of answers that traditional records research gives: for example, that so-and-so is a second cousin or a third. What it gives us instead is just a few certainties (e.g., a 25 of 25 match is “definitely related”) and all the rest is in the language and probability percentages. We shall just have to learn more about this new language and learn how to become comfortable and familiar with it.

Jonathan² Dunham Second Son of Deacon John and Abigail (Ballou) Dunham

by Gratia Dunham Mahony

This is the fourth article of four that I began in the first newsletter, tracing and enumerating the children of Deacon John Dunham. My goal is to track the succession of all of Deacon John Dunham’s children and their descendants through the first five or six generations, and to follow their geographic dispersion in America.

The people covered in this article begin with Deacon John and Abigail (Ballou) Dunham’s son Jonathan who was born in Leyden Holland, raised in Plymouth Colony, and died in Martha’s Vineyard Massachusetts. Some of his children remained on the Vineyard, while others moved to towns in Connecticut, Franklin County Massachusetts, and Dutchess County New York.

A further article, scheduled to appear in the next issue, will follow the fifth generation sons of Daniel-4 (Daniel-3, Jonathan-2, John-1) Dunham whose children moved to Marietta, Washington County Ohio.

Jonathan² Dunham was born in Leyden about 1625, the second child of John and his second wife Abigail Ballou. He may not have remembered a great deal about life in Holland, but at age 4 or 5 he was surely aware of the sea voyage to the new world. Accompanying him on that voyage were his parents, his older half brothers John and Thomas, his 6 year old brother Samuel and his baby sister Abigail.

Jonathan grew up in New Plymouth and married there 29 November 1655 Mary Delano*. There was grief in Jonathan’s life when his young wife died not long after their marriage. They had no children. As was the custom of the time, Jonathan soon married a second time. On 15 October 1657 he married Mary Cobb, the daughter of Henry and Patience (Hurst) Cobb of Scituate. Mary was born at Scituate 24 March 1636/7.

The first child of Jonathan² and Mary (Cobb) Dunham was a son, Jonathan³ born in Plymouth about 1658-9. He was followed several years later by another son Eleazer³, and in 1664-5 by another son, Gershom³.

The period in the early 1660s showed evidence that the second generation sons of Plymouth families were beginning to look to new areas where they could settle and raise their families. In the Plymouth Town Meeting Records dated 27 Oct. 1662, Jonathan Dunham is mentioned as being

*This Delano family were ancestors of the same family from which Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s middle name was taken. See *Ancestors of American Presidents*, Gary Boyd Roberts, 1995.

granted land at Sampson's Country (Lakeville); and again on 22 March 1663 as being granted lot #17 Puncatesset Neck (Little Compton) jointly with John Dunham, Sr. In the Plymouth Colony Land Records dated 7 June 1665 he was granted 30 acres in Majors Purchase (Middleborough).

The grant of land at Majors Purchase is interesting because Jonathan actually built a house and settled there. His fourth and fifth children were born in Middleborough: Hannah in 1666-7, and Samuel in 1668. Jonathan appears on several records in "Middleberry" (Middleborough); as constable in 1673, selectman in 1675, and deputy to the General Court representing Middleborough in 1679.

It is hard to say how much warning Jonathan and his family had before the Indian unrest which would explode into the uprising we call King Philip's War in 1676. We do know that Jonathan and his family had enough time to flee back to Plymouth before their home was torched by the Indians. The family probably remained in Plymouth for a while, probably living with relatives. Their sixth child, Daniel, was born in Plymouth about 1677.

Jonathan and his family never returned to Middleborough to live. Instead Jonathan went to Sucknesset (Falmouth) where he was a lay preacher for the next seven years. He served as a lay preacher in Falmouth even though he was not officially ordained. That town reserved a "20 acre lot left void for the minister" and on 23 July 1677 the town record states "Jonathan Dunham should have 10 acres and all the skirts of marsh or meadow about Bass Pond, and all marsh on North West side of Quanamut". He was also given the use of 40 acres of upland in the 20 acre lots and half a share of marsh-meadow at Great Seperwisset, a dwelling house and about 2 acres of upland adjoining it. Jonathan and his family remained in Falmouth until late 1684 when they moved to the island of Martha's Vineyard.

Jonathan Dunham had served the community at Falmouth as a lay preacher when the settlers of Martha's Vineyard asked Matthew Mayhew, as agent for the town, to prevail upon Mr. Dunham to come there as pastor. After some delay, Jonathan Dunham accepted the offer of 35 pounds a year and moved to Edgartown, Martha's Vineyard. He served there as teacher and lay preacher for ten years until on 11 October 1694 he was ordained. He continued as pastor in Edgartown for another twenty-three years until his death 18 December

1717.

Children of Jonathan ² and Mary (Cobb) Dunham:**

- 2 i. Jonathan ³ Dunham b. ca. 1658-9
- ii. Eleazer ³ Dunham b. ca. 1662-3, d. near 10 Oct. 1710, unmarried
- 3 iii. Gershom ³ Dunham b. ca. 1664-5
- 4 iv. Hannah ³ Dunham b. ca. 1666-7
- v. Samuel ³ Dunham b. ca. 1668, d. later part of 1701, unmarried
- 5 vi. Daniel ³ Dunham b. ca. 1677-8

THIRD GENERATION

2. Jonathan ³ Dunham (Jonathan ² John ¹) was born in Plymouth ca. 1658-9, and died at Edgartown before 5 October 1711. There is no Dukes County probate record for this Jonathan. Jonathan married first, probably while the family resided in Falmouth, a wife whose identity has not been established. Jonathan moved to Edgartown about 1684 with his father and family. His first wife died after March 6, 1686/7 when her son Gideon was born. Jonathan married a second time in Edgartown shortly after 8 June 1690 **Esther (Norton) Huxford**, daughter of Nicholas and Elizabeth (--) Norton, and widow of Samuel Huxford. She was born ca. 1662, and died shortly before 8 April 1724 when inventory of her estate was taken by her son Samuel Huxford.

In an article by Mrs. John E. Barclay, F.A.S.G. *Five Jonathan Dunhams Untangled*, published in *The American Genealogist* Vol. 44 pages 218-223 with reference to Jonathan ³ she states "...he had two sons named Jonathan. It was not uncommon where there were two wives for each to name a son after his father, even if the first was still living." Mrs. Barclay further states "It is not clear how many children Jonathan had by his second wife, none being recorded, but certainly Jonathan, Hezekiah, Solomon and Cornelius."

Children of Jonathan ³ Dunham and unknown first wife:

**All of the descendants of Jonathan Dunham will be enumerated as they are named in this article with the Arabic numbers to the left of the small Roman numbers listing the children of a particular marriage. In all, 146 descendants are listed in this article. Also, the superscripts indicating footnotes, as for this reference, should not be confused with those, similar in appearance, denoting the "generation number" from the founder—in this case, Deacon John Dunham.

Children of Jonathan Dunham and unknown first wife:

- i. Rebecca ⁴Dunham b. say 1682, d. after 1702
6. ii. Jonathan ⁴Dunham b. say 1684
7. iii. Gideon ⁴Dunham b. 6 March 1686/7

Children of Jonathan ³ and Esther (Norton) (Huxford) Dunham:

8. iv. Jonathan ⁴Dunham second of the name, b. 1691-2, Edgartown
9. v. Hezekiah ⁴Dunham b. abt. 1693, Edgartown
10. vi. Solomon ⁴Dunham b. ca. 1695-6
11. vii. Cornelius ⁴Dunham b. ca. 1702-3

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)

3. **Gershom³ Dunham** (Jonathan² John¹) was born probably in Plymouth ca. 1664-5, and died in Edgartown between 3 March 1738/9 and 2 November 1739 the dates on which his will was written and probated. Gershom married ca. 1692 in Nantucket **Mary Clark**.

In his will dated 3 March 1737/8 Gershom Dunham of Edgartown names "Mary Dunham, my wife...sons Gershom, Jethro, Seth, Paul, daughters Mary, Deborah, Zerviah, and son David (I have already given him his share)..."

Children of Gershom and Mary (Clark) Dunham:

14. i. Mary⁴ Dunham b. say 1693
15. ii. Deborah⁴ Dunham b. say 1695
16. iii. Gershom⁴ Dunham b. say 1697
17. iv. David⁴ Dunham b. say 1699
18. v. Jethro⁴ Dunham b. say 1702
19. vi. Zerviah⁴ Dunham b. say 1705
m. 16 July 1741 William Rogers
20. vii. Seth⁴ Dunham b. say 1714
21. viii. Paul⁴ Dunham b. say 1716

4. **Hannah³ Dunham** (Jonathan² John¹) was born say 1666-7 in Middleboro, and died November 1722 in Edgartown. Hannah married first ca. 1685 **James Pease**, who died in 1717. She married second 2 July 1717 **Elisha Parker** of Barnstable, by whom she had no issue. Hannah names children Nathan, Hannah and Mehitable in her will. She may have had a fourth child, Simon⁴ b. say 1695, who died 31 March 1769. The Simon Pease who married Martha Willett was possibly a son of James and Hannah (Dunham) Pease. Simon and Martha (Willett) Pease moved to Rhode Island in 1718.

Children of James and Hannah (Dunham) Pease:

22. i. Nathan⁴ Pease b. say 1686 , m. 15 June 1711 Sarah Vincent and remained in Martha's Vineyard
23. ii. Hannah⁴ Pease b. say 1688
24. iii. Mehitable⁴ Pease b. 1690, married in Martha's Vineyard 20 January 1716/17 Reuben Vincent
- 24.1 iv. Poss. Simon⁴ Pease b. say 1695

5. **Daniel³ Dunham** (Jonathan² John¹) was born say 1677-8, and died at Edgartown between 1 August 1741 and 5 March 1741/2 the dates on which his will was written and probated. Daniel married ca. 1701-2 **Rebecca** (--). Her surname is sometimes given as Norton, but proof has not been found. Col. Banks says there was no Norton woman of that name at that time. However a land deed dated 14 January 1724 showing the purchase of 60 acres of land by Nicholas Norton and Daniel Dunham may be for a joint purchase by Nicholas Norton and his son-in-law.

Rebecca is probably the woman who died at Easthampton, Connecticut 3 Feb. 1783, age 99 years. If so; she was either moving with her family who went to Conway, Massachusetts, or she was living with her son, Silas⁴ Dunham, who may have been living there.

In his will, dated 1 Aug. 1741 Daniel names wife Rebecca, sons Jacob, Daniel “my right in the fishing creek in Edgartown, to be equally divided amongst my three sons Zephaniah, Daniel and Jacob”, and he also names sons Silas, Eleazer, and Samuel, and daughters, Matilda Vinson, Rebecca Pease, Dinah Dunham, Sarah Pease, Persis Dunham, and Mary Curtis.

Children of Daniel ³ and Rebecca (prob. Norton) Dunham:

25. i. Matilda ⁴ Dunham b. say 1703, m. Joseph Vincent
26. ii. Zephaniah ⁴ Dunham b. say 1705, m. 6 Sept. 1733 Sarah Smith, no issue
27. iii. Rebecca ⁴ Dunham b. say 1707, m. 5 December 1725 Benjamin Pease
28. iv. Sarah ⁴ Dunham b. say 1709, m. 5 July 1739 David Pease
29. v. Daniel ⁴ Dunham b. 20 November 1711
30. vi. Persis ⁴ Dunham b. say 1713, m. 10 Nov. 1739 William ⁵ Dunham (see #41)
31. vii. Mary ⁴ Dunham b. say 1715, m¹ Caleb Parmalee, m² Jacob Curtis of Colchester
32. viii. Eleazer ⁴ Dunham b. say 1717
33. ix. Samuel ⁴ Dunham b. say 1719
34. x. Dinah ⁴ Dunham b. say 1721 (no further information, but living in August 1741)
35. xi. Silas ⁴ Dunham bp. 27 October 1723
36. xii. Jacob ⁴ Dunham bp. 9 April 1727

FOURTH GENERATION

6. Jonathan ⁴ Dunham (Jonathan ^{3,2} John ¹) [first son of Jonathan ³ named Jonathan] born probably at Falmouth, Plymouth County Massachusetts before his father went to Martha’s Vineyard say 1684, died in Sharon, Litchfield Co. Connecticut, 28 February 1744/5 in 59th year. He is buried in the Sharon Burying Ground and his stone is the oldest in the churchyard. Jonathan married ca. 1707 **Mary Spencer**, daughter of William and Sarah (Ackley) Spencer of East Haddam, CT. She was born in East Haddam CT 1 September 1687, died in Dutchess Co. NY after 17 April 1750. On 17 April 1750 she was called “of Nine Partners”, when Mary Dunham and her son Daniel, acting as administrators of her husband’s estate, sold some land.

It is unclear just when Jonathan Dunham left Martha’s Vineyard but the first record of Jonathan in Connecticut is when he bought land in Colchester [Colchester Deed 1:387, dated 12 December 1707] and was called “now resident in East Haddam”. Jonathan Dunham was in the records of the town meetings held in Colchester in 1725 and 1726.

The *History of Litchfield County* regarding the Town of Sharon, p. 577 says, “Capt. Jonathan Dunham was from Colchester, and was a leading man in the first settlement of the town. He lived opposite Richard Smith’s and there kept the first tavern in the town. He was the agent to the Assembly to procure the incorporation of the township, and was appointed to call the first town meeting.”

Children of Jonathan ⁴ and Mary (Spencer) Dunham:

37. i. Mary ⁵ Dunham b. say 1708 (m. 6 Aug. 1729 to Samuel Brown, remained in Colches

36 ter CT)

38. ii. Jonathan⁵ Dunham b. say 1709-10 (he d. 29 Oct. 1740 in Sharon CT)
39. iii. Samuel⁵ Dunham b. 1711 (went to Amenia, Dutchess Co. NY) *
40. iv. Daniel⁵ Dunham b. say 1713 (went to Amenia, Dutchess Co. NY) *
41. v. William⁵ Dunham b. say 1715 (remained in Colchester CT), m. his first cousin, once removed, Persis⁴ Dunham (my #30 above)
42. vi. Hannah⁵ Dunham b. say 1718 (m. John Pettit in Sharon CT)
43. vii. Martha⁵ Dunham b. say 1725 (m. John Gillett in Sharon CT)
44. viii. Abigail⁵ Dunham b. April 1727 (m. Samuel Hitchcock in Sharon CT)

* The lines of Samuel⁵ and Daniel⁵ will be discussed in greater detail in the next issue.

7. Gideon⁴ Dunham (Jonathan^{3,2} John¹) was born in Edgartown 6 March 1686/7, and died in Southington, Hartford Co. Ct. 27 April 1762. Gideon married first ca. 1718 **Desire Case**, daughter of John and Desire (Manter) Case. She was born in 1690 and she died in 1728. Gideon married second in 1728 **Mary Lewes/Lewis**. She was born 16 August 1700, and died in Southington, Hartford Co. CT 26 August 1762.

Children of Gideon and Desire (Case) Dunham:

45. i. James⁵ Dunham b. say 1720
46. ii. Elizabeth⁵ Dunham b. say 1723

Children of Gideon and Mary (Lewis) Dunham:

47. iii. Desire⁵ Dunham b. 1738 (no further information about her).
48. iv. Mary⁵ Dunham b. 1732
49. v. Sarah⁵ Dunham bp. 14 April 1734
50. vi. Gideon⁵ Dunham bp. 28 December 1735
51. vii. Barnabas⁵ Dunham b. 1736
- viii. Desire⁵ Dunham b. 1738
52. ix. Cornelius⁵ Dunham b. 1740
53. x. Sylvanus⁵ Dunham b. 1742
54. xi. Salathiel⁵ Dunham b. say 1744

8. Jonathan⁴ Dunham (Jonathan^{3,2} John¹) [second son of Jonathan³ named Jonathan] born in Edgartown 1691-2, died in Edgartown near 13 February 1745/6. Jonathan married in Edgartown 11 February 1718/19 **Judith Luce**, daughter of Robert and Desire (--) Luce. She was born 22 July 1689, died before 1745/6.

Children of Jonathan⁴ and Judith (Luce) Dunham:

55. i. Ruth⁵ Dunham b. say 1720, m. Gideon Cartwright
56. ii. Jonathan⁵ Dunham Jr., b. between 1721-1724, as he must have been 21 to administer his father's estate in 1747
57. iii. Esther⁵ Dunham b. say 1726

9. Hezekiah⁴ Dunham (Jonathan^{3,2} John¹) was born in Edgartown say 1693, and died in Tisbury, Dukes County Massachusetts between 13 June 1738 and 11 July 1738 the dates on
".....36"

which his will was written and probated. Hezekiah married in Martha's Vineyard probably in 1718 **Jane Pease**, daughter of Matthew and Mary (Green) Pease. She was born 28 November (1699), died before 1738. Hezekiah was called "Pilot". He resided in Edgartown & Chilmark and Tisbury.

The will of Hezekiah does not mention his wife who must have died before 1738. His will names "my only daughter Jemima" but does not mention his son or sons. Litchfield Co. CT probate file 1:36, dated 3 May 1750 contains a guardianship for son Cornelius, as "Jacob Dunham of Salisbury is named guardian of Cornelius, minor son of Hezekiah late of Martha's Vineyard deceased". The wording of the will provides a hint that there were two or more sons as it states "to each of my children, my only daughter Jemima excepted..."

Children of Hezekiah and Jane (Pease) Dunham: Births not recorded, order given is probable: From my research I believe that there were six children of Hezekiah and Jane (Pease) Dunham: Please note that this is based on circumstantial evidence (except Jemima) and that should be so stated in any discussion of this line. There may be further discussion of this group in a later issue of this newsletter.

- i. Jacob⁵ Dunham b. say 1719-20
- ii. Samuel⁵ Dunham b say 1722/23, bp. 3 Feb. 1723, m. 20 March 1745 in Sharon, CT Eliza beth Dunham, however; she may not have been a Dunham by birth. She may have been a widow of a Dunham.
- iii. Jemima⁵ Dunham b. say 1724 (named in father's will)
- iv. Jonathan⁵ Dunham b. say 1726
- v. Matthew⁵ Dunham b. say 1729-31
- vi. Cornelius⁵ Dunham b. 1734

10. Solomon⁴ Dunham (Jonathan^{3,2} John¹) was born in Edgartown say 1695-6, and died in Wethersfield, Hartford Co. CT about 25 April 1760. Solomon married first ca. 1724 **Mary Warner**, daughter of William and Mary (Crane) Warner. She was born 2 December 1698, died after 16 October 1726 when she is mentioned in the will of her father. Solomon married second after 2 February 1738/9 **Elizabeth** (--)

Children of Solomon⁴ and Mary (Warner) Dunham:

65. i. Elishama⁵ Dunham b. before 16 October 1726, mentioned in the will of his grandfather, Capt. William Warner, written on that date; d. bef. 1760
66. ii. Solomon⁵ Dunham b. 20 Sept. 1732, m. 2 March 1758 Elizabeth Ives
67. iii. Mary⁵ Dunham b. say 1733, m. 1760 Ephraim Fuller
68. iv. Sarah⁵ Dunham b.
69. v. Abigail⁵ Dunham b., m. 11 Oct. 1753 Jacob Brandeges
70. vi. Esther⁵ Dunham b, m. 12 Feb. 1755 David Dewey
71. vii. Hannah⁵ Dunham .b., m. 3 June 1757 David Mather

11. Cornelius⁴ Dunham (Jonathan^{3,2} John¹) was born in Edgartown ca. 1702-3, and died in Edgartown before 30 October 1737 when his wife is called "widow". Cornelius married in Edgartown ca. 1723 **Jemima Norton**, daughter of John and Mary (Torrey) Norton of Weymouth

Ma. She was born in 1702, died in Tisbury 3 April 1794, in her 92nd year.

Banks says he resided in Edgartown, was a sloopmaster, and called "Esquire".

Children of Cornelius ⁴ and Jemima (Norton) Dunham:

72. i. Shubel ⁵ Dunham b. 14 Nov. 1723

73. ii. Jemima ⁵ Dunham b. 5 July 1726

14. Mary ⁴ Dunham (Gershom ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born say 1693, and died 5 April 1779. Mary married in Edgartown 22 July 1713 **James Covell**, son of James and Abigail (--)
Covell. He was born in Edgartown say 1687, and died in Martha's Vineyard about 1762.

Children of James and Mary (Dunham) Covell (all born Edgartown, Dukes Co. MA):

74. i. James ⁵ Covell b. 16 August 1714

75. ii. Mary ⁵ Covell b. 30 November 1715

76. iii. Elizabeth ⁵ Covell b. 1 January 1718

77. iv. Hannah ⁵ Covell b. 10 April 1720

78. v. Micajah ⁵ Covell b. 18 June 1722

79. vi. Jethro ⁵ Covell b. 13 September 1724

80. vii. Phillip ⁵ Covell b. 24 December 1726

81. viii. Eliphalet ⁵ Covell b. 5 April 1728

82. ix. Timothy ⁵ Covell b. 16 July 1730

82.1 x. Matthew ⁵ Covell b. 1732

83. xi. Joseph ⁵ Covell b. 30 December 1735

15. Deborah ⁴ Dunham (Gershom ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born say 1695, and died in December 1790. She married **Thomas Pease**, son of Thomas and Bathsheba (Merry) Pease. He was born 25 August 1694, and died in January 1765. He was a weaver, resided in Edgartown.

Children of Thomas and Deborah (Dunham) Pease:

83.1 i. Bathsheba ⁵ Pease b. say 1725

83.2 ii. Deborah ⁵ Pease b. say 1727, m. ¹ James Instance, m. ² Samuel Smith

83.3 iii. Thomas ⁵ Pease b. say 1729

83.4 iv. Reliance ⁵ Pease b. say 1731, m. Timothy Smith

16. Gershom ⁴ Dunham (Gershom ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born say 1697, and died between 31 December 1746 and 11 June 1747 the dates on which his will was written and probated. Gershom moved to Lebanon CT and we do not know whether he married in Edgartown or in Lebanon CT. His wife's name was **Martha** (--).

The will of Gershom Dunham of Lebanon mentions wife Martha, and gives "to son George all his land at Edgartown,...and half his land at Lebanon and Stafford CT." The will also mentions daughter Jemima Hutchinson.

Children of Gershom ⁴ and Martha (--) Dunham:

- 84. i. Jemima⁵ Dunham b. say 1720
- 85. ii. George⁵ Dunham b. say 1723

17. David⁴ Dunham (Gershom³ Jonathan² John¹) was born say 1699, and died in Edgartown 27 February 1746/7. David was a farmer. He married first in Chilmark 11 April 1723 **Sarah Clifford**, daughter of Jacob and Elizabeth (Mayhew) Clifford. Jacob Clifford was born 7 April 1679 in Hampton Rockingham Co. NH, and he died 9 May 1715 in Chilmark, Dukes Co. MA. Elizabeth Mayhew was of Chilmark, Dukes Co. MA. Sarah Clifford was born in Hampton Rockingham Co. NH 4 March 1704/5, and died in 1737. David married second 30 October 1738 **Mary (Ripley) (Mackelroy)**, daughter of Joseph and Sarah (Jenkins) Ripley, and widow of William Mackelroy.

Children of David⁴ and Sarah (Clifford) Dunham:

- 86. i. Mary⁵ Dunham b. say 1723
- 87. ii. David⁵ Dunham b. say 1724
- 88. iii. John⁵ Dunham b. say 1729
- 89. iv. Abishai⁵ Dunham b. say 1731
- 90. v. Sarah⁵ Dunham b. November 1733
- 91. iv. Gershom⁵ Dunham b. 1736

18. Jethro⁴ Dunham (Gershom³ Jonathan² John¹) was born say 1702, and died in Edgartown in 1789. Jethro married before 1731 **Mehitabel Vincent**, daughter of Thomas and Sarah (Post) Vincent. Sarah Post was of Norwich CT. She was born 1701, died in Edgartown 4 October 1789.

Jethro Dunham served in the French and Indian War as evidenced by the following list of persons released from captivity published in an article in *NEHGR* 70:260-262, *The Redeemed Captives of 1747*, “arrived from Quebec...171 persons who had been taken by the French and Indian Enemy, at divers times, and carried there as prisoners. Taken June 24th 1746, Jethro Dunham of Martha’s Vineyard.”

Children of Jethro⁴ and Mehitabel (Vincent) Dunham born in Edgartown:

- 92. i. Anna⁵ Dunham b. 1731
- 93. ii. Hezekiah⁵ Dunham b. say 1734
- 94. iii. Mehitabel⁵ Dunham b. say 1737
- 95. iv. Mary⁵ Dunham b. say 1741
- 96. v. Deborah⁵ Dunham baptized 11 March 1744

20. Seth⁴ Dunham (Gershom³ Jonathan² John¹) was born say 1714, and died in Edgartown 23 August 1799. He was a cooper, and resided in Edgartown. Seth married **Naomi Marchant**, daughter of John and Hepsibah (Huxford) Marchant. Naomi was born in 1715, died in December 1785 “with a pain in her breast, age 70.”

Plymouth Co. LR 29:115 is interesting because it mentions land transferred through four generations of this Dunham family. It contains reference to a power of attorney granted by Gershom³ to his son Seth⁴ for the sale of a small parcel of land in Plimpton.

To all people to whom these presents shall come--greeting. Know ye that I Seth Donham of Edgartown in ye County of Dukes [seafaring man], being thereunto lawfully impowered by my father Gershom Donham of Edgartown aforesaid husbandman, to make sale of any of ye real estate of ye said Gershom lying in the County of Plymouth as a power of Attorney dated ye 25 day of Dec. 1734...For and in consideration of the sum of four pounds five shillings money to me in hand before the ensealing hereof well and truly paid by Timothy Morton of Plymouth in the County of Plymouth, Cooper, ...about two acres of fresh meadow or meadowland ground lying in the Township of Plimpton at a place commonly called Swan Hold and is the same that John Donham Senior gave to his son Jonathan Donham by his last will and testament duly proved and dated ye fourth of June 1668...

*dated 23 January 1734
Seth Donham*

Witness: Thomas Wetherell

Children of Seth ⁴ and Naomi (Marchant) Dunham (all born in Edgartown):

97. i. Elijah ⁵ Dunham b. January 1734
98. ii. Seth ⁵ Dunham b. 17 June 1742
99. iii. Naomi ⁵ Dunham b. 26 August 1743
100. iv. Ethannah ⁵ Dunham b. 9 July 1745
101. v. Elisha ⁵ Dunham b. 3 May 1747
102. vi. Ruth ⁵ Dunham b. 6 June 1751
103. vii. Phebe ⁵ Dunham b. 26 September 1753
104. viii. Jerusha ⁵ Dunham bp. 1754
105. ix. Persis ⁵ Dunham bp. 1756

21. Paul ⁴ Dunham (Gershom ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born say 1716. Paul married before 1744 **Sarah Hillman**, daughter of Samuel and Deborah (Dexter) Hillman. She was born in 1722, died May 1790. Paul was church warden in 1739, called a yeoman, and resided in Edgartown.

Children of Paul ⁴ and Sarah (Hillman) Dunham:

106. i. Martha ⁵ Dunham b. 1747
107. ii. Paul ⁵ Dunham b. say 1750
108. iii. Uriah ⁵ Dunham b. say 1753, d. 11 Mar. 1835, Edgartown, age 82. Probably m. Hannah Paddock of Dartmouth on 9 October 1776;
109. iv. Peter b. say 1757.

29. Daniel ⁴ Dunham (Daniel ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born 20 November 1711, and died in Conway, Hampshire Co. MA 27 June 1797, at age 86. Daniel married in Edgartown 20 November 1739 **Sarah Huxford**, daughter of Samuel and Mary (Harlock) Huxford. She was born 17 November 1719, and died in Conway MA 18 December 1788, at age 69. Both are buried in South Part Cemetery, Conway MA. Daniel and Mary resided in Edgartown until about 1774 when they moved to Conway MA.

Dukes Co. LR 7:179, dated 26 November 1744 is an interesting deed in which Daniel and Sarah sell a part of their dwelling house, and Daniel's mother Rebecca conveys her right to the same.

I, Daniel Dunham of Edgartown, in consideration of 58 pounds 3 shillings 9 pence paid by Matthew Norton of Edgartown. . . all my right, title and interest to and in the north easterly part being the New end of a dwelling house in Edgartown wherein I now dwell, also one small barn standing near said dwelling house and also a certain tract or parcel of land whereon said new end of dwelling house and barn stand containing 21 acres . . . bounded as follows, beginning near the corner of a swamp and running south-westerly by land of Zephaniah Dunham to a heap of stones, thence running east south-erly through the said dwelling house between the new and old end to heap of stones by a highway. . . by land of Mary Pease. . . which land formerly belonged to my honored grandfather the Reverend Mr. Jonathan Dunham...

*Signed: Daniel Dunham
Sarah (X) Dunham*

On day and year above said Rebecca Dunham, widow do sell and convey all my right in above to Matthew Norton.

Signed: Rebecca (X) Dunham

Children of Daniel ⁴ and Sarah (Huxford) Dunham, all born in Edgartown:

- 132. i. Thankful ⁵ Dunham b. 10 September 1741
- 132.1 ii. Eleazer ⁵ Dunham b. 18 December 1743
- 133. iii. Daniel ⁵ Dunham b. 6 March 1746 * (moved to Conway, Franklin Co. MA)
- 134. iv. Cornelius ⁵ Dunham b. 10 May 1748 * (moved to Conway, Franklin Co. MA)
- 135. v. Jonathan ⁵ Dunham b. 23 March 1751 * (moved to Conway, Franklin Co. MA)
- 136. iv. Sarah ⁵ Dunham b. 26 February 1753-4
- 137. v. Marah ⁵ Dunham b. 31 March 1756
- 138.vi. Rebecca ⁵ Dunham b. say 1758

* These three, Daniel ⁵, Cornelius ⁵ and Jonathan⁵, will be discussed more fully in a future issue.

30. Persis ⁴ Dunham (Daniel ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born probably in Edgartown say 1713. She married in Colchester Connecticut 10 November 1739 her first cousin once removed **William ⁵ Dunham**. He is called Lt. William Dunham on his gravestone and is buried in the Westchester Center Cemetery, Colchester, New London Co. CT.

Children of William⁵ and Persis⁴ (Dunham) Dunham (These children would be numbered sequentially and continued under the line of William Dunham, who is number 41.):

- i. William ⁶ b. 6 September 1740
- ii. Eleazer ⁶ b. 15 Dec. 1742
- iii. Esther ⁶ b. 8 May 1743, d. soon
- iv. Jonathan ⁶ b. 20 Jan. 1745
- v. Persis ⁶ b. 20 May 1747, d. 10 November 1772 in 25th year. Buried in Westchester Center Cemetery, Colchester, New London Co. CT
- vi. Esther ⁶ b. 2 May 1748 or 1749
- vii. Samuel ⁶ b. 10 Oct. 1751
- viii. Mary ⁶ b. 17 Mar. 1754; d. 13 May 1755

32. Eleazer ⁴ Dunham (Daniel ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born say 1717, and died before July 1753. Eleazer married 1 December 1740 **Hannah Clements** of Boston, daughter of Jeremiah

and Anna (Jones) Clements. He was a mariner and resided in Edgartown.

Child of Eleazer ⁴ and Hannah (Clements) Dunham:

139. i. Rebecca ⁵ Dunham b. 1741

33. Samuel ⁴ Dunham (Daniel ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born say 1719, and died in Lebanon CT 9 December 1779 in 62nd year. Samuel married in Lebanon CT. 13 November 1740 **Esther Lyman**.

Esther was probably the daughter of Josiah Lyman as there is a stone in the Old Cemetery in Columbia CT, "Lyman, Josiah d. 6 February 1760 age 70". She remarried and there is a will dated 10 November 1799 "*I Esther Buckingham of Lebanon, County of Windham, CT, being advanced in years. . .she gives and bequeaths to my son Daniel Dunham the one half of all my real and personal estate to him and his heirs forever. . .the other half of my real and personal estate I give and bequeath to the heirs of my daughter Anna Woodward deceased to be equally divided between them. . .and I do hereby appoint James Pinneo Esq. to be my soul and only executor. . .She signed her name. . .*

Witnesses were:

Elisha Bissal

Benoni Loomis

John Williams"

Will proved 27 Nov. 1799. .and there is an inventory of 185 pounds. 5. 7

Children of Samuel ⁴ and Esther (Lyman) Dunham: born in Lebanon CT.

140. i. Daniel ⁵ Dunham b. 2 Feb. 1743/44

141. ii. Anna ⁵ Dunham b. 23 May 1745, m. (--) Woodward and had heirs

141.1 iii. Josiah ⁵ Dunham b. 8 March 1748; d. 19 Oct. 1768, buried in the Old Cemetery in Columbia CT

35. Silas ⁴ Dunham (Daniel ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born ca. 1723, and baptized 27 October 1723, and died probably in Columbia County, New York after 1800 when he appears on the census. Silas married first at Westchester 17 November 1754 **Deborah** (--). She died at Easthampton Ct. 21 January 1780. He married second 18 January 1781 Mrs. **Sarah (Clark) Johnson**, daughter of John and Sarah (White) Clark, and widow of James Johnson. She was born 24 February 1747, died at Claverack, Columbia Co. NY in 1799.

Silas resided at Edgartown and probably moved to Easthampton, CT.

Children of Silas ⁴ and Sarah (Clark) (Johnson) Dunham:

142. i. Gershom ⁵ Dunham b. 25 Nov. 1781

ii. Silas ⁵ Dunham b. 12 Jan. 1786, d.y.

143. iii. Silas ⁵ Dunham b. 8 Mar. 1787

36. Jacob ⁴ Dunham (Daniel ³ Jonathan ² John ¹) was born ca. 1727, baptized 9 April 1727, and died at Mayfield, NY [murdered by Indians] 11 April 1779. Jacob married in Sharon CT. 29 October 1754 **Elizabeth Pettee/Pettit**, daughter of Jonathan Pettit.

Jacob Dunham had moved to Lebanon by 1748 as Dukes Co. LR 7:487, dated 23 January 1748, is for the sale of his house in Edgartown.

“I Jacob Dunham of Lebanon in ye County of Windham in ye colony of Connecticut, Joyner, in consideration of sum of 12 pounds paid by Daniel Donham of Chillmard. . . have given, granted, released and quit claimed all my rights, title to a certain dwelling house lately belonging to my late honored father, Daniel Dunham of Edgartown, deceased, wherein my late honored father dwelled together with the homestead, as also all the other lands in ye old purchase both divided and undivided on this side and on Chap-paquidick, part of which said dwelling house and lands were given to me said Jacob Donham by my late honored father in his last will and testament. . .

Signed: Jacob Dunham

Children of Jacob ⁴ and Elizabeth (Pettit) Dunham:

144. i. Rebecca ⁵ Dunham b. 12 Jan. 1755
- ii. John ⁵ Dunham bp. 1759, killed in Rev. War, “fell with Capt. Woodworth, in Fair field,”
- iii. Samuel ⁵ Dunham, killed in Indian Massacre 1780
- iv. Silas ⁵ Dunham
145. v. Zebulon ⁵ Dunham
146. vi. Ebenezer ⁵ Dunham b. 1759 at Sharon Ct

Sources used for this article include:

1. *The History of Martha’s Vineyard*, by Charles Edward Banks, M. D., pub. 1966, Vol. II p.150-152 contains a brief description of the Ministry of Jonathan Dunham. *The History of Martha’s Vineyard*, by C. E. Banks Vol. III p. 152-168 contains a family genealogy of the Dunham family who lived on the Vineyard. There are discrepancies in the estimated birth dates given by Banks and some dates given above.
2. *The Great Migration Begins*, by Robert Charles Anderson 1:602; (states that Jonathan was on a Plymouth voters list about 1646).
3. *The American Genealogist* 30:145; 36:244-5; 44:218-221
4. *Scituate MA Town Records* p. 24.
5. *Dukes Co. Probate* 1:48.
6. *Plymouth Town Records*
7. *Plymouth Colony Records* 4:94
8. *Dukes Co. Court Record* Vol. VI:156.
9. *Sharon Ct. VR* p. 37;
10. L. Van Alstyne, “*Burying Grounds of Sharon, CT, Amenia and North East, NY*, pub. 1903.
11. *Charles F. Sedgewick’s History of Sharon* (1842)
12. “*The Four Spencer Brothers*” by Donald Lines Jacobus
13. *Records of Colchester Ct. transcribed by C. M. Taintor, Hartford, 1864, p. 28, 32.*
14. *Southington Genealogies, (Dunham Family) p. 34-37.*
15. *Stiles, Wethersfield Connecticut Families, 2:729*
16. *Deaths in Edgartown, NEHGR* 53:10;70:260-262.
17. *Colchester Vital Records, pub. by GPC, 1996, p.81- 82.*

Letter to the from Patricia Junkin

To The Editor:

I read with interest the article,³ *Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary: A Paradoxical Figure*.² While I am in general agreement with the content, I would like to comment on several points with which I have disagreement.

Acknowledging that each individual draws conclusions based on research and methodology, from the deductive and inductive to causal, my layman's methods and research material suggest the following.

1. Since the Dunham-Donham DNA studies are limited to direct male descendants, I do not think it prudent at this time to determine that there was ³no such link² between the families of Deacon John Dunham and Jonathan Singletary alias Dunham. If Jonathan were descended from a female Dunham, we could not conclude a connection or lack thereof within the parameters of this DNA study.
2. The birth of Richard Singletary remains a question. Three sources give differing dates. The parish records of Surfleet-Gosberton-Spalding, England do reflect events for the family of Francis Syngletarye but do not indicate a birth date for Richard. He was an adult by 1637 and marriage was nearly mandatory in this community. "Goodwife Singletary," who died in either 1638 or 1639, was almost certainly his first wife. We do not know the month of her death and the transcriber in the source I have seen wrote ³1638 or 1639² not 1638/9. As researchers, we must leave open the possibility that she may have died in childbirth on or near 17: 11m: 1639/40. Therefore, I disagree that Jonathan was the first child of Richard and Susannah Cooke Singletary.
3. I find no evidence that Jonathan was in New Jersey before ca. 1669/70 when a ³grant of land made to Jonathan Dunham alias Singletary in Woodbridge if he is to build a grist mill² and, almost immediately, Jonathan became a leading citizen, and more often than not, was referred to as Mr. Jonathan DUNHAM or Jonathan DUNHAM alias Singletary, not Singletary alias Dunham.
4. The evidence of Mary Ross's relationship with Jonathan and Mary Bloomfield comes from her own testimony and not the revisionist pen of a religious elitist, attempting to justify his own complicit actions in a hysterical pogrom intent on ridding the earth of the blasphemers during the witch hunts of the 17th century. Controversial New England writer, Cotton Mather, vilified Jonathan Dunham and probably embroidered his tales to effect a favorable outcome. He prefaces his writings with a disclaimer, ³Author's Defence,² in which he attempts to not only convince his readers but himself of the imprimatur God had placed on his work.
5. Mary Ross¹ testimony makes clear ³the protective nature² of her relationship with the Dunhams. I find no support for bigamy in the Quaker tenets and I doubt ³ that "Christian care²" meant ³ "you can bed my daughter."² Quaker practices provide reason for some of the actions we now find ³strange.² Colonial governments did not recognize Quaker marriages. Conclusions should be reached in the context of time and place.

Respectfully,
Patricia Junkin