

Hawksworths are NOT ancestral Research Report

Copyright 7 May 2012 by LaRae Free Kerr M ED Spanish Fork, UT

On 26 Jun 1986, I wrote, "I thought my Thomas Wilkinson chr 7 Dec 1711 at Ardley, Darfield, Yorkshire son of Samuel Wilkinson and Elizabeth Binns married Elizabeth Haxworth 2 Nov 1732 in Darfield. But he didn't!" **The Thomas Wilkinson who married Elizabeth Haxworth is NOT ANCESTRAL.**

One of the eight essential steps in genealogical research [See Find Your Actual, Factual Ancestors: A Genealogy Journey in 8 Steps <http://www.freefamilyhistorybook.com>] is to publish your findings in some way – in a terrific book as we did in 1983 or on the Internet or just by sending family group records to relatives. There are many reasons for publishing, mainly the blessing of family members. And publishing in some format preserves all the hard work the researcher has done, so it does not have to be repeated. Yet one of the greatest benefits of publishing is that previously unknown relatives may contact researchers with information totally and completely unavailable to them otherwise. In several cases, this has occurred in the Wadsworth family since 1983.

Next you will find a column describing this need for publishing from my more than five years worth of genealogy columns for the Logan Herald-Journal, The Daily Herald, The Desert Saints and two ezines.[1]

Publish or all your research may perish.

Step seven of the research cycle is to publish the research you have done in any of a number of formats.

Copyright Aug 2004 by LaRae Free Kerr

London. 1984. We lunched with the Duke of Norfolk at the Savoy along with nine others whose family histories were finalists in the Institute of Heraldic and Genealogic Studies' once-a-century contest. The family history I wrote, with the fabulous help of many, many family members, was the only American entry chosen as a finalist.

While in England, we spent time in Sheffield and Pilley, the places I wrote about in the book. Before leaving Yorkshire, I placed a copy of the history in the Sheffield library. And that made all the difference.

During the writing of the history, I didn't make up a single event; I didn't fictionalize. Every item had a source outside myself. Yet, sometime after leaving that book in the local English library, I received a letter from a man claiming Thomas Wilkinson had not married Mrs. Elizabeth Haxworth as stated in the book.

I wrote back asking for proof. He sent it in the form of an old family letter that proved beyond a doubt he was right. Now, if you were to go to the parish registers as I did, you would feel confident that Thomas did marry this particular Elizabeth. But a family document in Sheffield, England absolutely disproved it, a document totally unknown and unavailable to me. If I had not published this book and

left a copy in England, I would still believe Thomas married Elizabeth. This is one reason responsible genealogists publish their findings in one form or another, to correct information.

There are additional reasons. By publishing, you save others from duplicating your efforts. People who are not the least interested in doing research may be very interested in knowing more about their families, and they may donate money to help you continue. In addition, by publishing, especially on the web, long-lost relatives will contact you with new information.

The truth is, if you're going to do the work, you might as well publish it. Publishing is Step 7 of the Research Cycle. There are several ways of doing it.

Probably the most effective way to publish your research in this day and age is to put it up on a website. That way, when someone does an Internet search for a name on your pedigree, your site will come up and new history can be made. Richard Wilson has done a comparison of genealogy web pages. Go to his site at <http://rwilson.us/compare.htm> . After studying his examples, you can decide whether web publishing is right for you, and if so, which format fits your needs best.

If you have lots of history to go with your pedigree, you may want to type your information into a book format. Then you can go to <http://www.lulu.com> or to Amazon.com where you can print and sell on demand. Every time one of your books sells, you will get a commission. The benefit of selling your family history through sites such as these is that you don't have to print a gazillion copies of your books and keep them in your garage.

Finally and at last, an accredited university is offering a Ph. D. for writing a family history. Like all Ph. D.s it takes much work and at least four years. Go to <http://www.tui.edu> for more information

Historians still publish books with frequency. Gateway Press, Inc. in Baltimore, Maryland published the family history that took us to the Savoy. Ask for Ann Hughes who helped us bring our history to fruition so many years ago. Write Gateway Press, 1001 N Calvert St. Baltimore, MD 21202.

Another company specializing in local and family histories is Anundsen Publishing Co, at <http://www.anundsenpubl.com> . To find others, simply purchase a genealogy magazine at your nearest book store and look at the ads.

At the very least, gather your hard won information into some kind of format, burned onto a CD or typed onto paper, and donate a copy of all of it to the Family History Library in Salt Lake City – no matter where you live or what your subject. If you want to make connections with others working on the same lines, your research must appear in the Family History catalog. I also recommend presenting copies to your local and state historical societies.

So many times, when researchers die, their research dies with them, destroyed by those who have no idea of its value. Don't let this happen to your good work: Publish!

Step 7 in the research cycle is this: if it's worth doing, it's worth sharing. Publish!

Hawksworths are not ancestral

As a result of the letter mentioned in the above column, please make these two changes in the original George Allen Wadsworth – Pilley to Panaca book: on page 280, cross off Elizabeth's surname of Haxworth which means the Hawksworth and Ronksley people should also be crossed off. [Remember that standardized spelling did not exist until late in the 1800s, so always read surnames phonetically. Therefore, Hawksworth can be spelled Haxwort, Haysworth, Hickswyrth, etc.]; on page 297, write "wrong wife" beside the name Elizabeth Haxworth.

Anyone interested in pursuing this line has my blessing, and I will provide what information I can to aid in the search. Contact me at itsallrelatives@sfcn.org.

My report on the Thomas Wilkinson/Elizabeth Hawksworth problem is in a research report dated 30 Jan 1984: "Over the past 20-30 years 3 different professional researchers worked on this line for us. Before I accepted this Elizabeth Haxworth as ours - because there was a question raised regarding her marriage to Thomas Wilkinson, was it 1st or 2nd – I double- checked all the information in my possession from those researchers. One, who had actually been in the records in England, left a little note saying he felt this particular Elizabeth Haxworth had NOT been married before.

"We know there was a Thomas Wilkinson having children from 1728-1750/1. We do NOT know his wife's name, but all of these children [3 of which were seemingly arbitrarily left off our family group sheet by the researcher] were born to Tho Wilkinson of Great Haughton, Darfield, Yorkshire. It seems reasonable that they could all have the same mother. If that is so, then there are TWO Thomas Wilsons in or near Darfield at this time, and we see evidence of one, the Thomas whose daughter Sarah was chr 1735 and who is from Darfield. Another is the father of Martha chr 1733 from Upper Haughton. Our researcher obviously assumed that Upper Haughton and Greater Haughton were the same place."

Though the letter referred to in the column was not in Box 43, other letters are in the green file folder marked Hawksworth. One is quoted in its entirety below; salient parts of another follow it.

Letter from FW Haxworth dated 12 Dec 1983 from Brock Cottage, The Steep, Chobham, Working, Surrey, GU24 8SZ. Chobham 8370.

Dear Mrs. VanderBeek,

I was delighted to hear from another Hawksworth, especially as I have only just retired from farming and am determined to carry on with my sporadic efforts at discovering my ancestors. Will you please note my change of address – 250 yards up the lane!

Only a week ago I wrote to another John Hawksworth asking if he could help. This is the now famous producer of an excellent film concerning the Civil War 'By the Sword Sword' [sic] currently being shown on BBC!

The John Hawksworth you mention must be of Ewell, Surrey, 10-15 miles from here who also searches in our area and with whom I had a good discussion.

Now for a brief background of our line and I think I can tell you confidently that I know or know of all Haxworths now living and can trace clearly back to early 1700s when we altered the spelling thus simplifying my task.

The broad Boomsley [Barnsley?] accent would make all the spellings sound similar so I still can't decide quite why we changed ours. Our upmanship I would guess but more of that later.

I am 72 born in London and my father was the first to come South from Ardsley near Darfield on the sudden and unexplained death of his father 1887. My father John died in 1962. The linen manufacturing business which had been the family business for 87 years approx in Barnsley 2 or 3 miles from Darfield collapsed as did all the others then active gradually.

General. You will know that Bradfield on the Pennines is our chief center for a large 'clutch' of Hawksworths and of course the Hawksworth of Hawksworth near Otley and Barton [Baildon?] which is well written up in 3 large volumes privately subscribed [Victorian] and traces back to Anglo Saxon times. I fall between two schools as I have not yet discovered from which main body we stem.

Darfield. As regards Haxworths from 1717 this place seemed much beloved of this family and the area had Haxworths christening, marrying and burying until my grandfather's death 1887. My uncle William Dickins Haxworth married Grace Smith USA and lived the rest of his life in the States. I believe he achieved the secretaryship or close to of the United Fruit Co. I should certainly be interested in the Mormon microfilms if obtainable but you may know that some of their records are confusing and in error. Not that I wish to deprecate their outstanding efforts! I have then Elizabeth and T Wilkinson. [his underlining]

This was a second marriage for both and both had a previous family and no children jointly so it seems to me you are misled here.

Elizabeth's first husband was John Haxworth. I call him John the 'elusive.' Born in Badsworth 1689 approx 12 miles from Darfield. He married Elizabeth Wager [the wa and er are very clear; the g could be a j or even an f. It does look like other gs in the letter. LFK] at

Doncaster. I have seen the marriage bond 1712. They produced John and Thomas at Badsworth Margaret Christopher Samuel Elizabeth William – my ancestor and Robert all at Darfield. Died at 41. She married Wilkinson and being over 40 produced no more children!

Now as regards the names you quote I suspect some at least can be Hawksworth Joseph Benjamin Hannah Susannah not 'our' names. Haxworth William and his wife Martha – a grocer, butcher whose will [1784] refers to the oak tallboy and grandfather clock situated behind me and still ticking accurately as I write!

The only James I can help with and he sometimes is referred to as John son of Christopher [c1719] c 1751 married Ann Ope 1796. Bur 1797 Felkirk nr Darfield – my daughter fell over his gravestone on entering the churchyard!

Now for my own troubles. Back at Badsworth a white calfbound Parish Accounts 1702 tells me that John the elusive's father John a church warden was signing the annual account Hacksworth and one item was payment of 3.3-0.8 to John Hawksworth for annually sweeping out the church and churchyard. A multiplicity of Hawksworths in one small village 17 or 18 entries in about 25 years.

John the elusive was described as yeoman so any land records may not have seemed worthy of interest.

The only two possibilities I have would be definite marriage of John and Mary, John elusive's parents in say 1660.

The only possible are at Conusborough or Worsborough but no very conclusive evidence of removal to Badsworth.

You no doubt realize how Cromwell's soldiers destroyed so many parish books just of the satswe [?] regime!

Thank you for sending postage but please no more as it is solely pleasure for me to correspond about such things. Yours sincerely, FW Haxworth

Letter from Bill dated 14 Feb 1984 from Brock Cottage, The Steep, Chobham, Woking, Surrey, GU24 8SZ.

Dear Helen,

...Now to Wilkinsons. Below is an extract from our male line which shows where T. Wilkinson came in:

John Hawksworth	Elizabeth Wager
1689 c Badsworth [Upton]	c Felkirk 1690
M 1712 Doncaster	
1731 bur Darfield	1732 2nd marriage
	T Wilkinson b 1765
	Elizabeth b 1768

John and Elizabeth wed at Badsworth 1712-1715 where they had 2 children John and Thomas 1713-1714. They moved to Darfield as Haxworths and produced Margaret 1717, Christopher 1719, Samuel 1722, Elizabeth 1725, William 1728 [direct ancestor] Robert 1730. I cannot imagine our Elizabeth bore any other children to T W after all those. The only possibility according to your list might be christening of Sarah 19.6.1735. However, it seems to me that one child Sarah born to TW of Houghton died and so the next child but one was named Sarah and Christened at Darfield.

Let me explain that Houghton is not a parish in its own right. There is a very old chapel there now closed but all the entries have always been in Darfield entries. Maybe sometimes the clerk put Houghton sometimes to distinguish between the 2 Wilkinson families but not always alas!

Our John's grave contains his widow Elizabeth and T Wilkinson a very nice old headstone.

The Mormons have got John his ancestry and marriage etc quite wrong as I can prove so you must be careful of their sorting out of Wilkinsons.

I would be very interested when you are in Salt Lake City to see a copy of the two books about Hawksworths which you mentioned in your letter.

I have seen T Wilkinsons will and the inventory with it which gives a good picture of the farmhouse and farm equipment in Darfield and Elizabeth's simply refers to the trusts for her step-children under Thomas' will and then her own children. The executors of his will being William my great ancestor and John Kenyon was Margaret H's husband.

...I am pretty sure we are not connected with the Bradfield H's since the Christian names don't seem to fit with ours!

I suspect there were Wilkinsons in Barnsley [St Mary's] near Darfield... Yours sincerely, Bill

[A note regarding the "Mormons having it wrong" quote above: I discovered while teaching a genealogy course that many people really do believe the Family History Library is full of researchers who sit there creating pedigrees [magic elves? Even some members believe this]. They do not understand how the pedigrees used to create the huge databases by the Family History Library as well as by Ancestry.com and all other big sites get their names. Those names were submitted by people like us. In fact, some time around 1980, I received a letter asking if Family History Library personnel could use our pedigree as part of this database. Of course, I said yes. But I had no idea that information would end up in so many databases. And, of course, we have found many more names, made many changes which are not, right now, on the web at all. LFK]

To whoever undertakes the finding of Thomas Wilkinson's actual, factual wife: The above letter clarifies the Thomas Wilkinson who is NOT our ancestor which means the other one may be.

[1] Kerr, LaRae Free. Its All Relatives Columns. itsallrelatives.org

This report can be found in GEORGE ALLEN WADSWORTH - PILLEY TO PANACA 30TH ANNIVERSARY EDITION. The Hawksworth report starts on p 108 of the new part of that book.