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ABSTRACT

Communities of Kinship: Antebellum Families on the Cotton Frontier
By Carolyn Earle Billingsley

The evidentiary base for this study is the compilation of almost 7,000 individuals connected by kinship to George Keesee, who immigrated to Virginia about 1700. The major focus is Thomas Keesee Sr. (the great grandson of George Keesee) and his descendants, who were mostly of the planter class. This family migrated across the southern cotton frontier, from Virginia, to Tennessee, Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. Studies of various family members and groups demonstrate kinship’s significance as an analytical tool in studying migration, settlement patterns, religion, communication, and political and economic power. Kinship was the most potent factor in the organization of everyday life for antebellum southerners.

Historians have long recognized the importance of family but have failed to articulate an interpretive framework for the systematic study of kinship in southern society. Moreover, they have allowed disdain for genealogy to obscure the effectiveness of genealogical methodology in such studies. First this work mines anthropological kinship theory to construct a workable theory of kinship for historians of the South. Although families and kinship are often discussed, the disciple of history has yet to define and articulate the definition and meaning of kinship or to explicitly recognize kinship ties as broader and more intense than is generally the case in the United States today.

Secondly, I argue for the incorporation of genealogical methodology into standard methods of historical inquiry. This involves using sources generally deemed genealogical
in nature to focus on links of kinship within groups of antebellum southerners, in contrast to the method often used by historians—using surname matching to ascertain kinship links, a method that not only leaves the majority of kinship links hidden, but is also gender-biased.

And third, I argue for the establishment of the study of kinship as a category of analysis on a par with race, class, and gender in the antebellum South. We can lay yet another patina of understanding over topics including migration, settlement patterns, religion, class, politics, and economics by analyzing them vis-à-vis their relationship to kinship. Kinship relationships were a causative factor in virtually all elements of antebellum southern society.
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INTRODUCTION

As historians, our goal is to examine and analyze traces of the past in order to address the present meaningfully by placing it in context. In other words, we hope to understand what humankind and human society have become by comprehending the processes by which we as peoples evolved and constructed our varied cultures. William Shakespeare summed this up succinctly: "What's past is prologue." In the service of this goal, historians employ categories of analysis such as race, class, and gender, but they underutilize, overlook, or even reject a significant piece of the methodological puzzle—kinship.

This dissertation will argue that kinship—particularly in the study of the antebellum South—should be considered a discrete category of analysis complementary to, and potentially as powerful as, race, class, and gender. Using kinship as a category of analysis and incorporating genealogical research methodology into traditional historical modes of inquiry can deepen insights into southern society in fresh and exciting ways. This study will demonstrate concretely the many ways family, defined broadly and comprehensively, made an impact on the public and private lives of antebellum southerners and how genealogical methodology can be used to tease out the underlying nuances of southern society. In the process, however, race, class, and gender are not rendered obsolete; rather, they are part and parcel of kinship although, at times, they are subsumed by kinship as categories of analysis.
Secondarily, I argue that we as a community of scholars need to arrive at a set of definitions of, and an overarching theoretical base for, this study of kinship in order to share our understanding of what kinship meant in the lives of antebellum southerners. Many studies offhandedly refer to the importance of kinship or family, without ever unpacking it as a category. Scholars often present kinship as something we understand intuitively, while leaving an interpretation of the term up in the air. Kinship is just there, we infer, like the oxygen we breathe. But, like other terms, it needs to be defined before we use it with any precision—and, it turns out, kinship is not as simple as it seems. In this study, I will propose definitions and theories as a starting point for what I hope will become an ongoing discussion of the place of kinship in historical inquiry into the antebellum South. Since the discipline of anthropology has spent a great deal of time and effort theorizing about kinship, I see no need to reinvent the wheel. Thus I will integrate some of the insights of anthropology into a historical study of kinship. The acquisition of a common vocabulary and the construction of a theoretical base for kinship studies will enhance historical reinterpretation of the social landscape.

In advancing these views, I am cognizant that voluminous numbers of studies about the South have incorporated kinship in their data and analyses to some extent. What these studies have not done is to incorporate the methods of genealogy into the data and analyses, leaving them incomplete. Seldom do historical studies of kinship go beyond basic surname matching or surveys of local marriage records—and this is not sufficient to study the tangled tapestry of family connections in a typical antebellum southern community or neighborhood. Therefore, the third element in my argument is a call for genealogical methodology to be recognized as a valid tool for historical investigation.
Genealogical methodology is, in reality, not so dissimilar to historical methodology. Students of history mine the past for nuggets of data in order to reconstruct that past—to create a plausible account of events or of the facts of particular lived experiences, based on evidence gleaned preponderantly from primary sources. Along the way, they use secondary sources to take advantage of the accumulated knowledge and insights of previous researchers and thinkers. Students of history with a capital "H" want to know "what really happened," and "why," even though we recognize the futility of thinking our conclusions are perfectly true to the original experiences. In genealogy, the research methodology is virtually the same: the difference lies in a somewhat different emphasis on the subject matter under investigation. Genealogists also want to recreate the facts of particular lives and experiences from the past, but their goal is to establish the kinship links between those lives. The aim of all this research is usually to better understand oneself through the explication of one's ancestors and relatives—the lives being researched have personal significance to the researcher. Historians may study the same lives and even, possibly, the same links of kinship, but their desired modality is disinterested objectivity and their primary goal is explaining the past, making sense of the past, or putting the past in context in order to understand human societies of the present. Their aim has a broader purpose than self-knowledge and the satisfaction derived from a fascinating hobby. Here, I contend that, by adopting genealogical methodology, scholars can facilitate their historical goals, because the exploration of kinship ties often provides the desired explication of the past.

And, moreover, historians can augment their research by taking advantage of genealogical sources rather than eschewing them. No matter what arguments one might
make about the relative value of genealogy versus history, the fact remains that genealogy is the more popular pursuit. One result of this basic fact is that the marketplace of tools and sources for genealogical pursuits outstrips that of history. Unfortunately, students of history too often either are not aware of these genealogical tools and sources or ignore them as irrelevant to their scholarly pursuits. One of my goals in this dissertation is to heighten awareness of the efficacy of genealogical sources for historical inquiry.

All of this is not to say that many historians have not already realized the value of investigating the common person and ordinary communities. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich’s stellar recounting and analysis of Martha Ballard’s life in *A Midwife’s Tale* leaps immediately to mind. Brenda E. Stevenson’s *Life in Black and White*. Orville Vernon Burton’s *In My Father’s House Are Many Mansions*, and Lois Green Carr, Russell R. Menard, and Lorena S. Walsh’s *Robert Cole’s World* are just three of the many other works that illuminate our knowledge of some aspect of the historical past through the lens of personal history. These are all premier examples of the rich patina of understanding that can develop from detailed investigations of single families or communities of ordinary groups of people.¹

For example, Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman recognized the early development of kin networks in the South. They describe the process of increasing kin density over time in *A Place in Time: Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650–1750*:

As late as 1687, more than half the families of the county had neither kin nor affinal ties to any other of the county’s families, 43 percent had ties to between one and four families, and only a handful (4 percent) had ties to five or more. . . . By 1724 more than half of the county’s families would be linked to five or more other families; the average household head would live in a milieu of thirty-one relatives . . . .

Nor is the idea that these networks of kin were significant to antebellum southerners a new idea. Over a half century ago, the inimitable W. J. Cash wrote:

The degree of consanguinity among the population of the old Southern backcountry was very great. . . . Hence by 1800 any given individual was likely to be a cousin, in one degree or another, to practically everybody within a radius of thirty miles about him. And his circle of kin, of course, overlapped more or less with the next, and that in turn with the next beyond, and so on in an endless web, through the whole South.\(^3\)

Cash recognized long ago that "[I]n the isolation of the plantation world the home was necessarily the center of everything; family ties acquired a strength and validity unknown in more closely settled communities . . . ."\(^4\)

In Kinship and Neighborhood in a Southern Community: Orange County, North Carolina, 1849–1881, Richard C. Kenzer’s conclusions are complementary to my own and reinforce many of my arguments. But, although he emphasizes neighborhoods "tied together by an extensive network of kinship," I would relocate the emphasis slightly to contend that neighborhoods were composed of kinship groups. Kenzer studied a

\(^{1}\) Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman, A Place in Time: Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650–1750 (New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company, 1984), pp. 99–100. In Explicatus, Chapter 8: Social Networks, the Rutmans chart the rising percentages of kinship links and the unchanging percentages of friendship links in the years 1687, 1704, and 1724. Marilyn Vos Savant may have summed up this phenomenon in a nutshell: "The problem with relatives—unlike friends—is that, even without the slightest effort on our part, they still multiply with time." From "Ask Marilyn," Parade Magazine, December 14, 1997, p. 20.

community over time, both ante- and postbellum, whereas my study is of a kinship group diffusing through both time and space in the antebellum period. Yet his findings on the influence of kinship on class, economics, and politics are quite similar to the conclusions in this study: "By promoting cohesion and order, the network of kinship... shaped the county's economic, social, administrative, and political structure..."  

In some ways Joan E. Cashin is the historian who most closely reinforces certain of the claims presented here. In "The Structure of Antebellum Planter Families," she postulated a kinship group interaction far beyond the nuclear family or even the extended family. She, too, established that the nuclear family has dominated the traditional portrayal of southern families by historians but stated that the "borders [of the planter family] were permeable and its structure was elastic, including many other relatives—aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews, and cousins [broadly defined]—who were intimate members of the family" and who "fostered the intense bonds that historians associate with the nuclear family."  

Cashin further evidenced the broad scope of kinship when she cited the cases of Susan B. Eppes and J. W. Calvert, who had sixty-one and over sixty first cousins respectively. When cousins to the second and third degree are added to kinship groups already including these first cousins, siblings, and aunts and uncles, the scope of such groups becomes huge and hard to dismiss as a contributory factor in shaping southern

---

history. The sheer size of kinship groups points toward a complex web of family relationships and hints at the impact of those relationships on members of the extended family. Cashin stated forcefully in her conclusion:

Historians should discard assumptions about the nuclear structure of the antebellum planter family and investigate further the nature of relationships among extranuclear kin. The study of such topics as political alliances and inheritance practices will no doubt yield more evidence of the importance of these relationships. Distinctions between nuclear relatives and other kinfolk were much less pronounced than scholars have assumed. Many individuals whom historians have considered to be marginal figures in the larger kinship network were actually significant members of the family.\(^8\)

Other historians have made the case for the incorporation of kinship studies or genealogical methodology into the realm of historical scholarship. For example, in 1968, William Rundell Jr. wrote about the merits of using local sources of the type generally used by genealogists, and, in 1981, Randolph B. Campbell claimed that using family history—"traditionally the province of a few 'little old lady' genealogists"—had "become an accepted way of studying our past."\(^9\) The historical record fails to reflect a revolution in attitudes following these articles. But, although this study is not the first to suggest the significance of kinship to southerners or the utility of genealogical methodology, it should demonstrate the versatility of kinship studies in attacking traditional questions about the antebellum South by probing a variety of issues exclusively through the lens of kinship.

To achieve these goals I have done intensive genealogical research on a particular kinship group as it grows and changes through time and space and then used the

---

\(^8\) Ibid., p. 70.
accumulated data to demonstrate the power of kinship studies and genealogical methodology to answer some of the big questions posed by historians about the antebellum South.\textsuperscript{10} Chapter One introduces this kinship group, explains the methodology employed, and analyzes the database compiled. In addition, an interpretive framework and vocabulary, informed by anthropological kinship theory, are proposed, as well as an argument for incorporating genealogical methodology into historical studies.

Chapter Two demonstrates the intrinsic role of kinship in migration and settlement patterns. The evidence makes it clear that most of the migration in the South was driven by groups of kindred rather than rugged individuals seeking the proverbial elbowroom. Antebellum southerners communicated about new lands, made decisions about moving on or staying put, and settled communities through their engagement in their kinship groups. Marriages were the pivotal element in the formation of kinship groups and, since individuals overwhelmingly married neighbors, these kinship groups were continually being reformed with each move. Without a basic understanding of kinship's role in antebellum southern society, studies of migration and settlement patterns are incomplete.

Chapter Three addresses the issue of religious affiliation for antebellum southerners. Here I argue that the single largest predictor of one's choice of religious affiliation was the religious affiliation of one's parents. The largest nexus of change in religious affiliation was marriage: when two people married, they were often moved to

\textsuperscript{10} Because the family studied here is white, this dissertation does not address black southerners or race in any meaningful way, although I believe many of the theories and methods presented here have relevance to the study of race, as well as to the study of black or mixed race southerners, and to slavery. Similarly, the study of women or of gender is beyond the scope of this dissertation, although those concepts are implicit in any study of kinship and family.
reassess their religious ties, and it was not unusual for one or both to make a change at this time. Moreover, subscribing to the same religious denomination served as part of the glue that bound groups of kin together more tightly, and conversely, when branches of kin were members of differing religious affiliations, the effect was distancing. Rather surprisingly, ministers were also intensely interrelated—not necessarily to the kinship groups to which they ministered, but to each other. The fictive kinship of religious affiliation led a remarkable number of ministers to marry ministers’ daughters and a remarkable number of ministers’ daughters to marry other ministers, resulting in tightly bound castes of clergymen. The itinerant nature of the ministry also created lines of communication filtering back to congregations that facilitated migration into new areas of the South.

Chapter Four looks at the connections between kinship and economic and political power. In the absence of other strong institutions in the antebellum South, the family remained the primary organizing force of southern society. Migration to the frontier offered wide-open opportunities for advancement, both politically and economically. Individual members of a kinship group worked together to facilitate and consolidate their political and economic power by filling available government jobs at the county, state, and federal level. At the same time, by selling more expensive land in established areas and moving to fresh, fertile land on the cotton frontier, which could be acquired cheaply from individuals and from the federal government, these individuals could increase their productivity and profit. Kinship group members used their economic largess as an entree into political hegemony, helped other kin by backing them financially and politically, and
consolidated their power through marriage connections with other well-connected kinship groups.

The Conclusion examines the role and efficacy of kinship studies in questions about migration, settlement patterns, religion, class structure, and economic and political power in the Old South. Here I argue for the value of the processes used in this dissertation—that kinship studies assembled using genealogical methodology, examined through the lens of kinship theory gleaned from the discipline of anthropology, and organized using kinship as a category of analysis much like race, class and gender, can yield valuable insights into antebellum southern society.

The Appendix contains an abbreviated genealogical report for the kinship group upon which this study is based. A full report of all branches with accompanying biographical data would run to hundreds of pages, but the skeleton of the research compiled can serve as an illustration of the intricacies of the genealogical project undertaken and as somewhat of a guide to the individuals discussed within the chapters.

Taken as a whole, this dissertation argues forcefully for the explanatory power of kinship in the study of antebellum southern society. Kinship should be recognized as a category of analysis, alongside race, class, and gender, to which it is complementary. With the incorporation of kinship studies, our analysis of the South becomes full-bodied and truer to that objective reality of the past we so assiduously seek.
CHAPTER ONE: THEORY, METHODOLOGY, AND EVIDENCE

In the fall of 1837 Thomas Keesee Sr., then almost sixty years old and the veteran of at least four previous moves, gathered up his extended family, including their slaves, and left Alabama, his home for the past sixteen years. They formed a wagon train, bound for the newly created state of Arkansas, following the kinsmen and -women who had immigrated there the previous year. By 1840 the kinship group in Saline County, Arkansas, numbered 131, along with their 140 black slaves, out of a total white population of 1,162 whites and 399 slaves. As the years passed, the numbers increased and the lives of Keesee and his children and grandchildren were intricately enmeshed in a web of kinship. These kin relationships factored heavily into the family's social, religious, economic, and political endeavors. But what did that signify, to live as part of such an interconnected network of kin? And who were the Keesees and why are they the focus of this study? What exactly do we mean when we invoke the term "kinship" and how do we reckon these kinship links?

---

1 Carolyn Earle Billingsley, Early Saline County, Arkansas, Records: Transcriptions of the 1840 Federal Census and 1846 Tax Book (1987; rpr. Conway, Ark.: Arkansas Research, 2000), pp. 9-18. The families linked to the Keesees by kinship comprised almost 8% of the white population and owned 35% of the slave population at that time.
Before launching into an exegesis of the efficacy of kinship to explain significant elements of antebellum southern society such as migration, settlement patterns, religion, and economic and political power, it is important to understand the basic elements underlying and informing the discussion. This chapter presents the four main elements that serve as a foundation for the rest of the study—the interpretive framework for kinship studies relying heavily on anthropological kinship theory; the argument for incorporating genealogical methodology into historical studies; a discussion of the origins, compilation, characteristics, and limits of the database that is used as evidence; and an introduction to the very extended family group that comprises the database.

AN INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK FOR KINSHIP STUDIES

Historians of the South write often about kinship without ever defining it and without probing into the meanings of the terms they use. Perhaps this is not so surprising; the analysis of kinship has fallen most frequently within the purview of anthropologists, for whom kinship is central.² When historians use the term, they simply assume that readers have an intuitive understanding of kinship. On the face of it kinship does, indeed, seem like a simple thing, easily grasped, but, as is often the case, it is more fluid and complex that it first appears. Unpacking the term can lead to a deeper understanding of why it is important to the study of southern history. This work will analyze the concept of

kinship, much as other scholars have felt compelled to probe the terms "class," "race," and "gender" in their works.

Kinship is not something concrete that one can sense or touch. It is an abstraction and, as such, is always socially constructed, despite the fact that most people intuitively believe and act as if it were a biological fact. Anthropologists argue about whether or not kinship is a universal phenomenon, and most of their arguments swirl around the problems of constructing a definition capable of the universal applicability they are seeking. There seems little doubt that the notion of blood or shared biogenetic substance is most often at the heart of the meaning of kinship in the modern mind. Yet that is not universally the defining element of kinship—earlier peoples often had little knowledge of the biological facts of sexual union and very little if any conception of genetic inheritance. In some cultures, the biological father is not the socially recognized father or more than one father is recognized. Additionally, many cultures, including our own, consider those adopted as kin, even though biologically they may not be related. Within the American legal system, the father of a child is presumed to be the man married to the mother at the time of the child's birth, no matter who actually fathered the child, and despite the knowledge that a significant percentage of children are not the offspring of

---

1 For South American societies with a belief in "partible paternity"—the conviction that it is possible, even necessary, for a child to have more than one biological father, see "Anthropology. Paternity Test. Economist. January 30, 1999, p. 74. For evidence this belief is not always at variance with modern biology, see "Biology: A Case of Twins With Different Fathers, Washington Post, June 16, 1997, p. A2. Both sources accessed via Lexis®-Nexis® Academic Database (online), October 30, 1999.
their putative fathers.\textsuperscript{4} And, were kinship truly based on shared \textit{blood}, virtually every person would have to recognize their kinship with almost everybody else, for truly we are all one family in that sense. Thus, kinship is not necessarily dependent on a sharing of biogenetic material—"the essence of kinship is \textit{interpretation} of genealogy, rather than genealogy."\textsuperscript{5} In short, although, "consanguinity' [that is, relationship by blood] is sometimes used as an equivalent of 'kinship' . . . . [it] refers properly to a physical relationship, but in kinship we have to deal with a specifically social relationship."\textsuperscript{6}

David M. Schneider, the author of \textit{American Kinship: A Cultural Account}, argues that the act of coitus is the "central symbol of American kinship as a cultural system."

That is to say, in the American cultural system, sexual intercourse is symbolically linked

\textsuperscript{4} Although this presumption of paternity comes out of old English common law, it is still generally upheld as valid and useful even in light of modern DNA testing. See, for example, William C. Smith, "Daddy No More: Ex-husband contests presumption of paternity with DNA results proving he has no biological ties," \textit{85 American Bar Association Journal} 30 (July. 1999). In this case, the ex-husband was proven not to be the biological father of the child born during his marriage. In the lawsuit that followed this discovery, his case went to the state supreme court and he was affirmed as the legal father of the child at each step, even though he was acknowledged not to be the biological father. Temple University law professor Theresa Glennon says the presumption of paternity remains a vital family law doctrine. . . . Focusing on the social role of parenting may be especially important . . . in an age when reproductive technologies undermine tradition biological understandings of parenthood." See also, "Ex-husband seeks visitation for child he helped raise," \textit{The Indianapolis Star}, July 29, 1999, p. N1; "U.S. Supreme Court Upholds California Law on Paternity," \textit{Los Angeles Times}, June 16, 1989, Metro, Part 2, p. 1; and Daniel B. Wood, "Is Love or Biology the Tie That Binds a Dad to Kids?" \textit{The Christian Science Monitor}, United States, June 12, 1997, p. 3. For state law on paternity, see for example, Texas Family Code §151.002 (1999): "A man is presumed to be the biological father of a child if: (a) he and the child's biological mother are or have been married to each other and the child is born during the marriage or not more than 300 days after the date the marriage is terminated by death, annulment, or divorce or by having been declared void;" Arkansas Statute Annotated § 28-9-209 (1997); and Code of Alabama § 26-17-5 (1999). For assertions about the percentage of children who were not fathered by the man who thinks himself the father, often cited as about 10% of births, see "The Seeds of Infidelity," \textit{Washington Post}, December 9, 1996, p. E9; "Mother's dilemma: whose son is he?" (London) \textit{Times}, November 22, 1997; and "Kid looks like the mailman?" \textit{U.S. News and World Report}, January 27, 1997, p. 62 (all accessed via Lexis\textsuperscript{®}-Nexis\textsuperscript{®} Academic Database online, October 30, 1999) and Robert Wright, "Sin in the Global Village. \textit{Time}, October 19, 1998, p. 130, which cites statistics from Liverpool, England, showing "that 1 in 4 kids had a biological father other than the father of record."

\textsuperscript{5} Holy, \textit{Anthropological Perspectives on Kinship}, 15. quoting from R. Wagner, "Incest and Identity: A Critique and Theory on the Subject of Exogamy and Incest Prohibition." \textit{Man} (1972) 7: 611.
with marriage, with love, and with unity; marriage produces children who, with the parents, compose a family; and this family becomes part of networks of relationships linked by each parent to the families into which they were born and to the families their children in turn create. This web of linked relationships, although delimited by socio-emotional distance or degree of (socially perceived) consanguinity, explains in part what Americans mean by the word 'kinship'.

In American cultural conception, kinship is defined as biogenetic. This definition says that kinship is whatever the biogenetic relationship is. If science discovers new facts about biogenetic relationship, then that is what kinship is and was all along, although it may not have been known at the time.

Within this dissertation, since it deals with antebellum southern society, the central element of kinship is considered to be marriage, since identifying acts of coitus is problematic—and unnecessary. For antebellum southerners, marriage produced alliances and was the basis of linking with other families. This is not to say that individuals necessarily married specifically to effect these alliances; these alliances, however, were the result of their marriages, whether or not that was a conscious consideration in their choices of marriage partners.

---


7 David M. Schneider, *American Kinship: A Cultural Account* (1968; rep., Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1980), pp. 114 (quotation), and 37–40 (for the meaning of coitus as the central symbol of the American cultural system). Note that in modern American culture, sexual intercourse is not always equated with marriage, but, although that is not the norm, it is still the cultural ideal.


9 If, however, research into kinship implications regarding race were the focus, coitus would perform be the symbolic center of kinship, as most interracial relationships in the antebellum South were outside of marriage. In these instances, the act of coitus, expressed via the birth of a child, creates the kinship link between black and white individuals and groups.
Suffice it to say that there is no one agreed-upon universal definition of kinship. It is a set of social relations concerned with a group's conception of a commonality of identity based on the categories of biological connections as known or perceived by that group, much like Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities.* It is usually underpinned by such concepts as obligation, constancy, inalienability, and some level of love or affection. In Schneider's words, kinship is a group of social relations characterized by "enduring, diffuse solidarity." Kinship is enduring because family ties are inalienable—friends can be jettisoned if the relationship sours, but one is born with one's relatives and for the most part we are stuck with them for life; it is diffuse throughout the group, rather than being focused exclusively on one or two specific people; and solidarity is an all-purpose word that can mean love, affection, concern, responsibility—it means that "[t]he end to which family relations are conducted is the well-being of the family as a whole and of each of its members."

The American kinship system shares certain elements with other systems and differs in other respects. For example, one of the "basic assumptions" about kinship is "that kinship everywhere is based on attributing social significance to the natural facts of procreation"—and in this way, American kinship is similar to other kinship systems. However, in the United States, kinship connections through both the maternal and paternal lines are valid—which is not always the case in every culture. Although American kinship retains some elements of an emphasis on paternal links such as the

---

woman's assumption of the man's surname at marriage, bilateral kinship—that is, theeckoning of kinship through both the maternal and paternal lineage—is the norm both
socially and legally. In the antebellum South, this was also the case.

The names we append to certain relatives, the roles these relatives play in our
lives, as well as rules about whom one can and cannot marry are also socially
constructed. In some cultures, a boy's maternal uncle plays a more significant role in the
boy's life than his biologically and socially defined father does. There are cases in which
every woman of one's mother's generation is called "mother" and every child of one's
own generation is called the equivalent of "brother" or "sister." In other societies, now
and in the past, marriages are often prescribed or proscribed on the basis of cousinship,
i.e., parallel cousins might be proscribed from marriage to one another, whereas cross
cousins may be prescribed or preferred mates.\(^{15}\) In some eras in the United States, first
cousin marriages and other degrees of consanguinal or affinal marriage, \(\text{viz.,}\) marriage to
those related by blood or marriage, have been socially and/or legally proscribed. There is
no compelling biological or even religious reason why this should be so—the taboo is
purely socially constructed.\(^{16}\) In the antebellum South, cousin marriage was not at all

\(^{15}\) "First cousins whose kinship is through their fathers (who are brothers) or their mothers (who are sisters),
are parallel cousins; if the link is between the mother of one and the father of the other (who are brother and
sister) they are called 'cross cousins' . . . "; Ruth C. Busch, *Family Systems: Comparative Study of the
al.: Peter Lang, 1990), p. 89.
\(^{16}\) The perception of first cousin marriage as always medically or biologically harmful is patently false, as
any animal breeder can attest; it is as apt to be beneficial, biologically, as it is to be detrimental. For a fuller
discussion of the merits and evolution of legal and social sanctions against first cousin marriage, see Martin
Ottenheimer, *Forbidden Relatives: The American Myth of Cousin Marriage* (Urbana and Chicago:
unusual (and, in some families, was preferred), which resulted in an even more tightly linked group of kin.\textsuperscript{17}

Family is recognized as the basic unit of kinship, and kinship is the interconnectedness of a group of families. Before the twentieth century, family and kinship were more important elements in southern social organization than they are today. A partial explanation for this can be found in the low level of institutional organization in past southern society. Anthropologists recognize that in so-called 'primitive' societies, kinship is "one of the irreducible principles on which . . . organized social life depends," . . . in marked contrast to Western societies in which other institutions, particularly the workplace and the state, perform the wide-ranging functions which are performed by kinship groups in 'primitive' societies.\textsuperscript{18}


I do not think even an anthropologist would classify the historical South as a "primitive society." Yet the point is salient to this discussion—the southern family remained the dominant mode of the organization of everyday life in the absence of higher order political institutions,\(^\text{19}\) which, although present, were less developed in the South than in other regions in the United States, especially in the nineteenth century and particularly on the forward edges of expanding cotton cultivation and settlement.\(^\text{20}\) Family groups rather than public institutions served most of the needs of individual citizens, much as they had during the colonial era when the family "was the cornerstone of church and state, the center of all institutional life, and the fundamental unit of society. As Lawrence Cremin has noted, the family 'provided food and clothing, succor and shelter; it conferred social standing, economic possibility, and religious affiliation; and it served from time to time as church, playground, factory, army, and court'."\(^\text{21}\) In southern society, characterized by patriarchy, agriculture, and rurality, the family maintained its power at the top of the social, political, and economic hierarchy well into the nineteenth century. Modes of production remained centered in the household. For the majority of southerners, cash and credit were often available only from friends and family members due to the paucity and

\(^{19}\) The phrasing of this statement is adapted from a statement by James Faubion, professor of anthropology, Rice University, in discussions with this author at various times in 1999.

\(^{20}\) An argument can probably be made that family was the dominant mode of the organization of everyday life in the North as well, at least in the colonial and early republic eras. My contention is that, at some point the two regions diverged in character: the North developed a higher degree of institutionalization, probably related to urbanization and industrialization, while the South remained rural and agricultural; thus family and kinship retained their sway over social organization much longer. This study, however, is not designed to be a comparative one and will leave a fuller discussion of this point for another day.

underdeveloped state of banking institutions. Political power was often contingent on family connections. Only religion might be proffered as an institution rivaling the family in importance; yet, religion served more as a prop to the family and to patriarchal values than as a rival. Moreover, religious institutions were fragmented into a variety of denominations and congregations, which was somewhat of a check on their social authority.

Of course, kinship remained a potent force in the South long past the antebellum period. Eventually, however, as other institutional organizations became as entrenched in the South as they were elsewhere, the importance of extensive kinship groups waned. In *Arkansas and the New South*, Carl H. Moneyhon assesses the role of the family in New South Arkansas; he asserts that for the 97 percent of Arkansans who were considered rural,

three major social institutions became central to life—family, class, and race. Each of these helped define the lives of rural folks. They also sustained the status quo and served as checks to change. Family, often extending beyond the nuclear unit and at times even including servants and laborers, was clearly the most important social organization. It not only filled conventional biological and educational functions, but the


family was also the primary economic unit in the agricultural economy.24

Once Arkansas society became "more intricate with the development of new institutions," the role of the family changed in an increasingly urban environment; although family "remained an important institution, . . . it lost many of its traditional functions." Economic functions were no longer centered in the home; education became more the responsibility of institutions outside the family; and women's work and roles changed, as did the roles of children when their labor became less significant.25 Anthropologists recognize this same concept. in Sex, Gender, and Kinship: A Cross-Cultural Perspective, Burton Pasternak, Carol R. Ember, and Melvin Ember write that "descent groups lose viability in complex state-organized, commercial-industrial societies because non-kin agencies or the state assume many kin functions (e.g., defense, education, welfare, adjudication)."26

Some historians have addressed the changing significance of family and kinship within the context of modernization theory. Joan E. Cashin offers a simple definition of modernization, worth quoting here in its entirety:

[Modernization is] the transformation from a hierarchical, deferential society in which kinship ties largely determine status, to a dynamic, open society, in which status is a function of occupation, achievement, or some other ascriptive trait. This transformation also involves a

25 Ibid., pp. 46 (first quotation), 47 (second quotation), and 48–50. While Moneyhon makes good use of family analysis in furthering his thesis, he fails to accord it the weight even he seems to think it should have—although he places it "clearly" above race and class in importance as a social organization, he devotes more space to addressing issues of race and class. According to a survey of the index, there are five pages about "family," seven pages referring to class, and twelve pages referring to "race relations." Nor does Moneyhon attempt to address any of the issues of black families, but rather leaves his discussion of family undifferentiated by race in any way.
change in outlook on the world, from one that is localistic, religious or mystical, and noncommercial to one that is cosmopolitan, rational, and commercial. Patterns of geographic mobility also change, from circulation in familiar routes near home to movement over vast distances. Finally, modernization involves a change in attitudes toward a change itself: in a premodern society people value stability and see change as threatening, while innovation in all phases of life characterizes a modern society.27

While scholars will no doubt continue their discussion about whether or not the antebellum or postbellum South was a pre-modern society or when, if ever, it became modern, the role of family and kinship plays a key part in any analysis of the merits of the various arguments.

It must be noted that the importance of family and kinship to southern whites was augmented by the antebellum South's peculiar racial ideology. In a society that consigned people to a stigmatized caste based on race, it became important to ensure the proper categorization of people by knowing one's own lineage and the lineages of others. As Barbara J. Fields so aptly argues, it is false to assume "that race is an observable physical fact, a thing, rather than a notion that is profoundly and its very essence ideological."28 Since race is not "an observable physical fact," dividing people into race at times became dependent on social memory. That memory required a working knowledge of one's own pedigree and the pedigree of those in one's social orbit, hence an emphasis on the genealogy of families.

It is crucial to realize that, although kinship in the American South in the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries may have had many similarities to a present-day perception of kinship, there were nuances of difference that are significant. Three points especially that have relevance to this study need to be reiterated here: (1) the socially defined roles of kin beyond the nuclear family were closer or more personal and were qualitatively more intense, and therefore these more distant ties were more meaningful than they are today; (2) the family was a more substantial element in social organization than it is today; and (3) marriage was the nexus of change and the locus of kinship alliances.

To insure a common vocabulary in the discussion of kinship in the antebellum South, a discussion of some of the important terms critical to my arguments is germane.

The evidence for this dissertation comes from the Keesee Family descent group, that is, a group of people who share a common ancestor, and who are, therefore, descended from the same individual. In reality, the entire human species might be considered a part of one very large descent group; however, anthropologists use the term to refer "to groups of kin that behave or function collectively, as groups." This study primarily focuses on the descent group(s) of Thomas Keesee Sr. and secondarily on the descent group(s) of his great grandfather, George Keesee (designated, George Keesee I to identify him as the original immigrant), by examining the ways in which various offshoots of descendants group together and function at diverse levels of interaction.

Family refers, in some instances, to the nuclear family, i.e., parents with their children; but in the antebellum South, the degree of relationships which might be
included in the term "family" were often more distant and might include any range of kinship—biological, legal, or fictive. Within this study it refers to the entire group of people who considered themselves kin, and I use the word to denote the larger meaning except where nuclear or natal family is specifically invoked.

**Kinship** refers to a structure of family connections, either by blood, marriage, adoption, or social fiction. It comes with the understanding that kinship is socially constructed and that, without a doubt, was more widely constructed in the antebellum South than it is today. It was the primary influence on day-to-day life for antebellum southerners. Kinship groups are aggregate groups of people who share kinship to any degree, even distantly. In this study, the main kinship group is all the descendants and spouses of descendants of Thomas Keesee Sr. in particular, and of George Keesee I, in general. “But family structures are not self-contained institutions; rather, they are imperfect, ramshackle adaptations of the human psyche to the culture and ecology of a particular area”—a kinship group’s parameters are not static; they adapt to circumstances over time and space.32

**Cousins** are those related through mutual descent from siblings. Although in modern society only first cousins (that is, the children of siblings) and, less often, second

---

30 Casey describes family "as one part of the hierarchical ordering of pre-industrial communities" in his *The History of the Family*, p. 17, within a discussion of the theories of Emile Durkheim’s 1893 work, *The Division of Labor in Society*.
31 This surname is spelled many ways in various records, e.g., Kazee, Kizbee, Keessee, Keezee, Kisse, Kozeet, and is pronounced kuh-ZEE. For the purposes of this study, however, the spelling is standardized as per the modern spelling in my branch of the family, while references to specific records reflect the spelling contained in that record. Before the twentieth century, spelling was a creative art form, particularly in the South—there was virtually no "right" way to spell a name and, even if the individual himself had a particular way of spelling his name, it was no guarantee that county clerks, tax assessors, or census enumerators would style the name thus. A phonetic rendering of names (and other words) was the standard.
cousins (that is, the children of first cousins), are generally acknowledged as or considered to be kin, to antebellum southerners cousins of both blood and marriage of a greater range and degree were acknowledged as kin and more integrated into a effective kinship group.③ When siblings of one family marry siblings of another family, their children are not only first cousins, but double first cousins, i.e., first cousins through both parents. "Double" also refers to any other degree of cousinry, i.e., second cousins, third cousins, and so forth, where the cousin relationship exists through both parents, rather than through only one parent. This closer relationship in double first cousins is almost as close as if they were siblings rather than cousins, and genetically, these double cousins are more alike than cousins but less similar than siblings. This double cousinry was unexceptional in the antebellum South and is not uncommon even today.④ *Sibling Exchange* occurs when siblings of one family marry siblings of another family, e.g., two brothers marry two sisters, or a brother and a sister from one family marry a sister and a

③ Casey, *The History of the Family*, p. 10
④ Figuring cousin relationship is usually confusing, especially when relationships veer into the "removed" category. Succinctly, parallel generations are counted as first cousins, second cousins, third cousins, etc., with third cousins, for example, being of the same generation, all being the great great grandchildren of a common ancestor and the great grandchildren of siblings. When the generations are not parallel, then the term "removed" comes into play. If Mary and Tom are second cousins, then the relationship of Tom's children to Mary's children is that of third cousins, but Tom's children's relationship to Mary herself is that of second cousin, once removed—that is, the nearest parallel relationship is second cousin (between Tom and Mary) and Tom's children are one generation removed from that relationship vis-à-vis their relationship with Mary. A term used in the South to denote a familial relationship that acknowledges a kinship tie, but in all probability the exact nature of which is too distant to reconstruct, is "kissing cousins." The connotation is that, since these two people are somehow kin, they would greet one another affectionately with a kiss, rather than the more formal greeting given a stranger or acquaintance. There are times this appellation is used when, in fact, there is no actual kin relationship, but the two people know that a relationship of some warmth has existed between their families for some time, and the line between kinship and friendship has been blurred over time. A similar term is "shirttail cousins"—meaning a kinship tie is acknowledged but just barely.

④ My mother and her sister, for example, were double first cousins to another pair of sisters; each pair of cousins had fathers who were brothers and mothers who were sisters. The four have always been almost as close as sisters and resemble each other as much as if they were, indeed, all sisters. These cousins were closer to each other than they were to other first cousins, no doubt because their parents had double the impetus to interact socially.
brother from another family, creating even closer ties of kinship between two families. The result is a larger aggregate group of grandchildren shared between the two families and a group of children who are double first cousins. Sibling exchange, at times, extends to three or more siblings from each family intermarrying.

In making a case for the significance of kinship in the lives of antebellum southerners, determining the range of effective kinship is a key factor. The range of effective kinship means the extent to which a genealogical connection played a role in the lives of antebellum southerners. If the family connection was not acknowledged or considered or known or did not act as a factor in the decisions or activities of the two related individuals, these individuals, although still kin, do not fall into the range of effective kinship. This is not a clear-cut issue; there are varying degrees and shades of importance. Second or third cousins, though they might not play an important role in everyday life, might still exert influence to some degree, and thus, they would be included in the effective range of kinship. The most salient point is that the range of effective kinship was fluid: as members of the kinship group died, were born, married, or relocated, the boundaries of effective kinship flexed or constricted with the changing circumstances. To look at kinship as a whole tells us little since every person is technically related to every other person; only by studying the range of effective kinship can we delimit family relationships in a meaningful way.

Fictive kin refers to those whose kinship ties are not biologically or legally based, but who, for a variety of reasons, are treated and named as kin. Slave kinship group members often fell into this category. When slaves were sold away from their families, they usually found a place within a family unit in their new home that functioned as a
kinship group. Slaves who were called "Uncle," "Aunt," or "Mammy" by whites might also conceivably be examples of fictive kin, but generally one would have to believe that the white person using these titles felt some tie of kinship, rather than what was probably the case in general, that these appellations were a social fiction to avoid giving African American slaves the respect that "Mr." or "Mrs." would bestow. Church members can be another form of fictive kin; people often genuinely feel as though they are brothers and sisters in the church, all children of God. Another example of fictive kin is an unrelated person taken into a family because of circumstance: an unattached woman who becomes part of a family group and functions as, and earns the title of, a grandmother or aunt to the children she helps raise; an older man who becomes part of an unrelated family group and has a relationship and title as if he were truly kin; a child who is taken into an unrelated family group and, although not legally adopted, becomes indistinguishable from the other biological children of the family. Sometimes it can even refer to a close friend or neighbor, whose relationship with another individual becomes so close that they consider themselves as if they were actually biologically kin. Although these categories are labeled "fictive," the individuals included can, and do, fall within the range of effective kinship.

In summary, scholars often use kinship in their historical analyses, but they lack a defined theoretical interpretive framework. An understanding of the meaning of the terms "kinship" and "family" are usually taken for granted. It is assumed that we all inherently know exactly what these referents symbolize—that they need no definition. And yet, one has to but examine the panoply of ways in which these words are used and the meanings they transmit in thousands of different cultures all over the world, as well as within a
single culture, to realize how slippery and fluid they really are. Ponder the many nuances within the various word symbols for kinship: we speak of the family of man; members of a church call one another brother and sister; our colleagues at work and school are often referred to as our second family; people refer to God as the father and we are all God's children; nuns are sisters and the head of the order is the mother superior; gang members regard the group as their family; some African Americans call each other "brother" or "sister" to denote their shared racial identity; feminists evoke gender by referring to their "sisterhood"; we talk about Father Time and Mother Nature.

Yet, even so, most people, called upon to provide a definition of kinship, would instinctively assert that kinship was based upon a "blood" relationship, biologically determined. The many exceptions to that widely held view, however, render it virtually unusable as a true definition. In short, if we are to be able to engage in a communal discourse about family and kinship, it is imperative to discuss and define the parameters of these culturally constructed concepts. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly, we must discuss and define the parameters of these culturally constructed concepts within the context of the past rather than embedded in a modern perspective. This study attempts to reconstruct antebellum southerners' understanding of the referents "family" and "kinship" by looking at the tangible effects of family and kinship on their lives, i.e., performativity. Only then can we begin to fully comprehend the impact of kinship on this particular society.

This is not to say that kinship does not exist in the world as an actual phenomenal thing, insofar as it is the concrete relationship of people to one another—relationships defined by ties of blood or marriage, or created in a legal sense. There are explicit
referents matching terms of kinship; when the term "aunt" is invoked, for instance, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the word and a specific person. Yet, we cannot afford to forget that, in a more abstract sense, kinship only exists in a noumenal way, somehow implicit instead of explicit, in the way it is played out in the lives of human beings. In this sense, it is performatively constructed based on the needs and desire of the individual. These can consist of, but are not limited to, the need or desire for being part of a group, for approval, for love, for support, for friendship, for economic facilitation, or for political support. During the lifetimes of antebellum southerners, they constructed their concepts of kinship and family through their actions—by showing concern for, by being responsible for, by living close to, and by being involved in the social, religious, economic, and legal lives of their families. As this study will demonstrate, it is apparent that for antebellum southerners, the definition of kinship was deep and broad indeed and constituted the most important single factor in their daily lives.

So although kinship has not been overlooked nor genealogy totally scorned as a relevant methodology, my primary goal in this study is to put kinship under the microscope, bringing its every aspect into clear relief, in order to hammer home its potential for redefining some aspects of historical inquiry into antebellum southern society. The discussion in each chapter will demonstrate the importance of kinship studies to historians of the South. The connections forged in the name of kinship and the social, economic, and political power it engendered in that place and time are worthy subjects for scholarly investigation. I hope it will become obvious that we as a community of scholars need to begin a process of collective reflection on this topic in a more meaningful way than has thus far been done. In doing so, we may find that kinship
is the link forging a connection between the somewhat disparate fields of social history, economic history, and political history. Furthermore, race, class, and gender lose none of their status as analytical categories \textit{par excellence}—indeed they are enhanced and complemented by the addition of kinship as a category of analysis.

**Determining the Range of Effective Kinship**

Merely proving kinship connections adds little to our understanding of antebellum southern society. To reveal the significance of kinship, we must be able to identify the realm of meaningful or effective kinship. With written records, such as letters or diaries, that task is fairly simple; visiting patterns, social activities, mentions of names in a diary on a regular basis, business records, gossip about certain people in a letter to one’s sister—these types of writings speak to us clearly about who was important in an individual’s life. Few documents of this sort exist within the Keesee kinship group, and the range of effective kinship must be ascertained in more indirect ways. People’s actions have to substitute for words to reveal the significant ties in their lives.

The most evident way people expressed their ties to specific groups of kin was by living close to each another. When one family moved to a new location and another related family moved with them, then settled within hailing distance despite having thousands of acres to choose from, the two families obviously had a meaningful relationship. Similarly, county records indicating a pattern of business or legal activity between two or more men are evidence of instrumental ties, as is the witnessing of deeds for a relative, or posting of a security bond for him when he applies for letters of administration on an estate or runs for sheriff. Joining the same church, changing
religious affiliation at the same time, or receiving a letter of dismissal from their church at the same time can also serve as indicators.

Naming patterns are particularly significant manifestations of close personal ties and can be used to delimit the parameters of effective kinship. "Naming—perhaps the primal act of culture—is a conceptual act that is central to the mapping of people into kinship relationships. ... [It is] an important dimension of power." 35 When choosing a name for their children, parents seek names that are meaningful to them in some context. Jane Turner Censer also notes the pattern of naming children for close relatives within families and states that "naming could strengthen ties among family members ... by the esteem it signified." By bestowing family names upon them, "children could also carry memories of the past into the future." Even more importantly, "naming practices firmly placed the infant in the conjugal family by identifying it with an important relative from a parent’s family of origin." 36 In Lorri Glover’s All Our Relations: Blood Ties and Emotional Bonds among the Early South Carolina Gentry, she found that "[t]o repay the debt owed relatives and symbolize the importance of the kinship network, parents

honored their most valued living kin by naming children after them.  
Study of the Keesee kinship groups demonstrates how naming patterns situated children within a web of familial relationships and thereby constantly reinforced and extended the bonds of kinship.

Sometimes the context of naming a child was religious: there were a plentitude of eighteenth and nineteenth century males, for example, whose given names are "Finis Ewing," "Francis Asbury," or "Martin Luther"—each a prominent religious figure. In another context, parents honored the founders of the country by choosing names for their sons such as "George Washington," "Thomas Jefferson," and "Benjamin Franklin," or political and military figures they admired—"Andrew Jackson" and "Oliver Hazard Perry" became quite common given names after these men rose to prominence, and in virtually all eras, biblical and classical names like "Moses," "James," "John," and "Marcus Aurelius" were popular. For girls, family and Bible names were most common, but many daughters were named for states—"Virginia" and "Alabama" were quite popular. When Thomas Keesee Sr. named his last daughter Virginia, he was no doubt honoring his fondly remembered natal state.

In their detailed study of colonial Middlesex County, Virginia, Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman point out that "analyses of naming patterns . . . can highlight differences and similarities, secular trends and, potentially, human constants [in different

37 Glover, All Our Relations, p. 29. Glover, however, found that South Carolina lowcountry parents of the gentry preferred naming children after siblings or close kin rather than after themselves or their parents. Glover does not take a stand on the debate about whether southern society considered children more as individuals or whether the overall family as a group was given greater emphasis, stating merely that her data "complicates both these interpretations." She also frames the naming of a child after kin as a strategy to ensure the child's welfare. not only "to ensure [the child] was connected to an array of kin," but also to invoke "a specific interest" in the namesake by the honored relative; All Our Relations, p. 30.
cultures and in different time periods]." They found an overwhelming tendency to name children for family members. Their data indicate 90 percent of first and second sons named for fathers, grandfathers, and uncles, and 80 percent of first and second daughters named for mothers, grandmothers, and aunts. "Instances of shared names are highly suggestive of a familial rather than individual view of children," the authors conclude, although "not definitive[ly]." Furthermore, the naming patterns found in Middlesex County, Virginia, are indicative of "the strong family orientation of the society in question." When the Rutmans investigated whether or not there was a "proscriptive rule" for male cousins—meaning that two sons would not both give their own sons the name of their father—they found no such rule in effect. In contrast, Daniel Scott Smith's data on Hingham, Massachusetts, indicated such a proscription, indicating that children were seen as distinct individuals. In Middlesex County, two or more coexisting male cousins often carried the name of their paternal grandfather. The Rutmans reiterate that the duplication of names for first cousins was a further indication that children were seen less as individuals and more as parts of a family group. Although the Keesee kinship group
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38 Finis Ewing was one of the founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church; Francis Asbury was a prominent Methodist; and Martin Luther is significant to Protestants in general.
41 Rutman and Rutman, *A Place in Time, Explicatus*. p. 88. Almost 6 percent of all sons and daughters were named for kin other than parents, grandparents, aunts or uncles. 14 percent of sons and 22 percent of daughters were named for "no one" that could be ascertained to be a family member. This data is from Table 16, p. 88, covering the years 1650 to 1750. The data also show a pattern: first sons named for paternal grandfathers, second sons named for fathers, and a similar pattern for daughters, grandmothers, and mothers. p. 90.
examined here lived in an era considerably later than the Rutmans' study, this tendency to
duplicate names for first cousins was still prevalent.\textsuperscript{43}

Examining naming patterns can provide insights into the interior lives of people
by revealing what or who they found significant. And when parents named their children
for kin, we can assume that those kin were emotionally important to the name-givers.
Whether parents give their children the names of biblical figures, grandparents, or famous
figures tells us the signified person is in some respect relevant to the name-giver; and
determining whether namesakes are grandparents, siblings, or more distant kin can locate
the boundaries of effective kinship. In this study, I have used naming patterns, as well as
residential propinquity, migration patterns, economic and political interactions, and
religious affiliations to identify the family members who were part of the Keesee Family
kinship groups.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., pp. 89 (quotation), and 90. The Rutmans iterate that, although the data is "suggestive" of a familiar
rather than an individualistic view of children, there is no way of knowing for certain what parents had in
mind when they named their children.

\textsuperscript{43} In a test group, the Rutmans found 63 percent of sets of patrilineally related male cousins shared the
name of their paternal grandfather, and 53 percent of sets of female cousins shared names. This high
percentage of cousins with the same names is one of the many factors that make southern family history
research so difficult. Note too that real differences existed between Virginia and Massachusetts, at least
insofar as naming patterns and their implications are concerned: Daniel Scott Smith argues for a higher
degree of child individualization and the Rutmans "for a higher degree of familialization [in the
Chesapeake]." Stated simply in Smith's terms, colonial New England culture seems to reflect latent but
developing modern attitudes toward family, while southern family culture retained its pre-modern
caracter. Glover does not take a stand on the debate about whether southern society considered children
more as individuals or whether the overall family as a group was given greater emphasis. stating merely
that her data "complicates both these interpretations." She also frames the naming of a child after kin as a
strategy to ensure the child's welfare, not only "to ensure [the child] was connected to an array of kin," but
also to invoke "a specific interest" in the namesake by the honored relative; All Our Relations, p. 30.
The Rutmans also briefly discuss a pattern comparison of both New England and the Chesapeake with the
originating culture—England. The given data supports the idea that Middlesex patterns were more
conforming to the mother culture and New England the variant. But the data is much too skimpy to support
such a broad assertion, as the authors readily admit; Rutman and Rutman, A Place in Time: Explicatus 93–
95. For a comparison of New England and English patterns, see also Smith, "Child-Naming Practices," 541–
554; and Smith, "All in Some Degree Related to Each Other: A Demographic and Comparative Resolution
**THE CASE FOR GENEALOGICALLY ORIENTED KINSHIP STUDIES**

My life experiences and academic qualifications allow me to observe the gulf between academic history and genealogy with some authority and, I hope, with some objectivity. I have been researching my own family history for over twenty years and, for many of those years, worked as a professional genealogist, doing client research in both history and genealogy.\(^{44}\) Then, in 1990, I enrolled in college for the first time, largely in pursuit of the chiaroscuro shadings that historical context could provide for my ancestral portraiture. For the past eleven and a half years, I have studied history, particularly southern history, as a member of the Academy. Like the mother of two feuding siblings, my aim is to settle the differences between history with a capital "H" and genealogy. My goal is to reconcile the two and, in doing so, to midwife a more fruitful synergy for both.

So, having viewed the issues between historians and genealogists from both sides of the metaphorical fence, I understand the myriad reasons why professional historians tend to ignore and often disdain family history research, i.e., genealogy.\(^{45}\) Professionals

---

\(^{44}\) When I was professionally active, I conducted workshops and seminars, lectured, and made presentations at the local, regional, and state level. I helped found my local county's genealogical and historical society and established the publication for that organization, which I edited for five years. I individually authored or compiled seven genealogical works and, with my business partner Desmond Walls Allen founded Professional Genealogists of Arkansas, the quarterly publication for which we co-edited. She and I also established our own imprint, Research Associates, through which we wrote, published, and sold six methodology handbooks, including *Beginner's Guide to Family History Research*.

\(^{45}\) Although they are used interchangeably, "family history," rather than "genealogy," has gradually become the more preferred term in genealogical circles. Many leaders in the genealogical field recognize the stigma attached to the word "genealogy": for some it carries the taint of a type of elitism and pride of family in an era where family historians are increasingly taught to look beyond the litany of names, dates, and honors to learn the full context of their ancestors' lives. However, in academic circles, "family history" has another connotation: the term is used for the study of the history of "the family." See, for example, Jane Turner Censer, "What Ever Happened to Family History? A Review Article," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol. 33, No. 3 (July 1991): 528–538, for an overview of the ways in which "family history" is generally studied. For this reason, I will use the term "genealogy" rather than "family history" when I am referring to detailed research into the relationships between families.
are often intolerant towards those they consider amateurs and dilettantes, and genealogists often strike "real" historians as incompetent researchers with only an antiquarian interest in the past and a hagiographic mindset. And, as in most things, there is at least a grain of truth to this opinion: there are still, and will probably always be, a significant number of genealogists who have sloppy research techniques—those who surf the Internet, for example, trolling for somebody (anybody) with the same name and date of birth as their great grandfather so they can plug this data into their own family tree without ever setting foot in a library or archive to confirm the unsubstantiated facts they have grabbed so greedily, literally out of thin air. There are also old-style local historians in small towns all over America who gather the oral lore of kith and kin, add a little dash of information from tombstones and from county courthouses, and are then content never to think beyond how “interesting” it all is. Family-proud individuals who whitewash the sins of their foreparents in order to glorify their antecedents will always be with us. And, truth be told, there is nothing wrong with what these genealogists or local historians are doing or how they do it as long as it meets their own needs. The problem, of course, comes when their flawed or incomplete work misleads others—or when it turns others away from a useful interpretive tool.46

But let us not tar the whole bunch with the same brush. Not every work produced by bona fide academics turns out to be something the historical community points to with pride. It should be noted that there are incredibly meticulous genealogical researchers and
local historians working today who would put a historian's most stringent standards to the blush. These are the students of the craft of genealogical research of whom historians should take note. A true scholar learns to be discerning, to examine and analyze critically, to sift through the evidence presented, and to embrace or dismiss the theses argued in tomes published by the university presses. So must one critically examine genealogical works with the potential to aid the quest for "real" history. Just as we do not throw the baby out with the bathwater when confronted with bad history, we cannot ignore the work of all genealogists merely because the work of some is less than stellar.

Although by no means universal, the trend in genealogy during the past couple of decades has been toward delight in the full range of human nature enacted in the lives of one's ancestors and away from hagiography. There are even genealogy web sites dedicated to flaunting families' less reputable members. A society called the International Black Sheep Society of Genealogists (IBSSH)—

includes all those who have a dastardly, infamous individual of public knowledge and ill-repute in their family... within 1 degree of consanguinity of their direct lines. This individual must have been pilloried in disgrace for acts of a significantly anti-social nature.

More and more often, individual researchers are thrilled to find something a bit interestingly naughty in an ancestor's background and, when they do, they do not mind writing about it for the general public. As a genealogist, I was often an advocate for humanizing our ancestors. Living up to a legacy of family sainthood is impossible, and to

---

46 See Walter Rundell Jr., "Southern History from Local Sources: A Survey of Graduate History Training," Journal of Southern History, Vol. 34, No. 2 (May 1968): 214-226, for the "disparagement" of genealogists' work by historians due to the "quality of much genealogical work and the unfortunate impressions created by those who pursue genealogy to qualify for membership in exclusive patriotic and hereditary
construe past lives as perfect renders genealogy empty of meaning; narratives of real but imperfect lives speak to our own humanity. The very fact that our great great grandparents persevered and overcame obstacles despite personal flaws and imperfections can make their stories all the more grand and awe-inspiring—or at least instructive. This new attitude is obviously indicative of the broadening of genealogists' focus to achieve an understanding of flesh and blood people of the past, rather than a glorification of themselves in the reflective glow from saintly and illustrative ancestors.47

At any rate, even if there are those who continue to assert that the practitioners of genealogy can or should be dismissed, in whole or in part, the soundness of the discipline's methodology remains. In general, genealogical theory is much less fixated on lineage to the exclusion of all else. The modern standard is to construct a historical context for each ancestor, much as a historian might do, and to go beyond mere names and dates. Any mainstream genealogical methodology book hammers home the

organizations," in addition to the "Brahmin attitudes" displayed by some genealogists; quotations pp. 217–218. My thanks to colleague Bethany Leigh Johnson for bringing this article to my attention.

47 The site at http://www.geocities.com/Heartland/Pointe/5043/blksheep.html is one example of an individual's proudly acknowledging the flawed "black sheep" in his family tree. For the International Black Sheep Society of Genealogists (IBSSG), see http://homepages.rootsweb.com/~blksheep. For the trend toward acknowledging the imperfections of ancestors, see Elizabeth Stone, Black Sheep and Kissing Cousins: How Our Family Stories Shape Us (New York: Times Books, 1988); and "The Latest Tips," July 31, 2000, from Genealogy.com, accessed October 6, 2000: "As your research progresses, you will encounter a family scandal, or at least a story you are not particularly proud of. If learning these things about your ancestors will upset you, then consider another hobby. In one hundred years, our descendants may learn unpleasant things about us. It's important to remember that virtually all families have these stories and your ancestors' actions can have no direct bearing on your behavior."
importance of fleshing out the skeletons of names and dates to create whole and actualized people.⁴⁸

Moreover, the standards for documentation in genealogy are, in some regards, even more stringent than those for scholars. Genealogists, for example, are expected to document each statement of fact as it occurs in the text rather than providing a blanket citation at the end of a paragraph. In genealogical research, it is considered critical to provide a source for each unique fact, as well as to note alternate facts, because genealogical conclusions rely so heavily on a weighing of conflicting evidence from a variety of sources unequal in reliability. Genealogists are also encouraged to use footnotes rather than endnotes so photocopies of an individual page cannot be severed from the appropriate source citation. According to the basic precepts of the discipline, facts divorced from source documentation are all but worthless.⁴⁹

---

⁴⁸ See for example, Patricia Law Hatcher. _Producing a Quality Family History_ (Salt Lake City: Ancestry Incorporated, 1996). In enumerating the eight major elements that make "a quality family history," Hatcher includes going "beyond records, placing people in context"; p. 3; and she devotes an entire chapter to "Turning Paper into People." In Desmond Walls Allen and Carolyn Earle Billingsley, _Beginner's Guide to Family History Research_ (3rd edition; Conway, Ark.: Research Associates, 1997), p. 3, readers are exhorted to add "an historical touch to your research, an understanding of the times in which your ancestors lived." and, p. 62, "[t]o get the full picture [by framing] your family within historical context." Bookstores catering to genealogists often stock a wide variety of historical works from university presses. See, for example, Frontier Press Bookstore, Karen Mauer Green, Proprietor, at http://www.frontierpress.com (accessed 9 April 2001). Note also the considerable numbers of genealogists who attend historical conferences and lectures, obviously in search of context rather than particular names and dates.

⁴⁹ For instance, if a combined citation to a family Bible and to a county marriage record is placed at the end of a paragraph about the life of a woman, distinguishing which source provided the name of the wife and which source provided the date of the marriage is more difficult. In this case, the reader needs specific information about which source provided which fact in order to assess the information properly—we would give greater credence to the spelling of a daughter's name as recorded by her mother in the family Bible than in a public record written by a clerk, but we would expect that the clerk's recording of the actual date of the marriage might tend to be more accurate than a date recorded in a Bible by someone other than the principals involved and, perhaps, at a date long after the event. The standard reference work for genealogical documentation is Elizabeth Shown Mills, _Evidence! Citation and Analysis for the Family Historian_ (Baltimore, Maryland: Genealogical Publishing Company, 1997), see especially pp. 24-27 for the advantages to footnotes versus endnotes, and for specific source citations of individual statements of fact.
Hopefully by this point, I have presented a convincing argument that serious scholars should not routinely discount any and everything bearing the label of genealogy. But another reason historians tend to reject genealogy is because some still do not see the value in personal histories of ordinary people. While true that the story of one individual does not the scope of southern history embrace, the aggregate compilations and analyses of individual and group stories can and does layer our understanding of the past. While there seems to be little question among historical scholars about the value of a deep reading of the lives and activities of Jefferson Davis and his circle, for example, there are still a few who may be more dubious about the lives and activities of an undistinguished yeoman farmer and his family in the antebellum South. I would argue that, although Davis’s actions may have affected more people and put the scholar’s finger on the pulse of momentous events, the lives of that ordinary farmer and his family are more revelatory of the realities of the past for the majority of people and equally as valid to the discipline of historical inquiry. Moreover, when a kinship group is defined as broadly as I have construed it in this study, arguments about genealogical research being narrow, personal, or anecdotal lose their relevance. The utility of genealogical methodology is illustrated in this study by the insights into southern society provided by the Keesee family research.50

Although genealogy can be used to justify privilege, it can also be used to impart values. While in certain eras it has appeared to be the preserver of society's elites, its universal application bespeaks the importance of origins for all humanity. It can be used to divide, yet the myriad relationships it uncovers imply the interconnectedness of the human race. 

The Database

A comprehensive database of information on the Keesee extended family kinship group is the keystone of this study. The illustrative vignettes, the examples, the narrative, the assertions, and the arguments—in short, the evidentiary data and derived conclusions—rest on this considerable assemblage of data. This fact alone creates a compelling reason for a full discussion and clarification of this important body of evidence. Moreover, the multitudinous family ties and intertwined family trees are not easily accessible to the reader, not only because of its inherent complexity, but also because the reader may not be familiar with the genealogical format in which the compiled data is provided. For all these reasons, it seems both sensible and prudent to begin with a full explication of the background and scope of this database and to provide here a discussion of its strengths and weaknesses.

The first incarnation of this study was as an undergraduate honors-program senior project. When I began college at the age of forty-one, I had an extensive background in genealogy, i.e., family history research. I had investigated my own family history but had

---


52 See Appendices for Keesee Family Genealogical Reports.

53 Donaghey Scholars Program, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, 1994.
also worked several years as a professional genealogist, doing client research, lecturing, editing a county genealogical and historical society quarterly, and publishing genealogical works. Throughout my college career, as I took more and more history classes on my way to a history major and a minor in Arkansas Studies, I was puzzled by the dismissal of and the antipathy toward genealogy among many historians because, so often. I found useful insights into significant elements of American history stemming from my experience with family history. Genealogy, it seemed to me, was not per se a bastardization or trivialization of history, but rather, it could often function as a complement to history as practiced by academia. This feeling was so strong, I choose to blend history and genealogy in my senior honors project.

In that study, the precursor to this one, I decided to situate my study in the antebellum South because that was the area in which I had the most interest and experience. A primary concern was choosing an extended kinship group to serve as a database of evidence providing the underpinning for my arguments. My first inclination was to choose a family for which there was a wealth of primary sources—but that seemed too much like stacking the deck. I wanted to prove that genealogical research had a broad application to the issues of southern history, but handpicking a family with unusually rich documentation would only prove my thesis in a restricted and narrower range of cases.

For a brief time I toyed with the idea of randomly picking a family group. That, however, seemed like folly. Not only would I be forced to start from ground zero, but there was a distinct possibility I would strike out completely and be forced to start over if this randomly chosen family turned out to originate in the North or to have recently
immigrated to America.\footnote{I still vividly recall the research I did for one client who mailed me the names of her four grandparents and hired me to find an ancestor, any ancestor, who would qualify her to join her friends in the Colonial Dames in Virginia. Many, many hours and dollars later, after wandering around the extensive landscape of the past and of the entire country, I found such an ancestor, but he was very nearly the last hope. Yet, she was extraordinarily lucky: one rarely knows where an explication of the average American’s family might lead after countless hours of research.} Or, by a total fluke, I might end up with a kinship group that was, for some reason, inherently difficult to reconstruct or essentially unrepresentative of the South as a whole—for example, the group might be descended from Native Americans or tri-racial isolate groups,\footnote{That is, intermarried groups of African Americans, whites, and Native Americans, the members of which, because of their ill-defined and contested racial identities, often seem to be invisible on the southern landscape. Members of such groups generally married within the group or within similar groups.} thereby rendering productive research into early history improbable and complicating a thesis striving to achieve relevance for a broader range of southerners.

The solution seemed apparent. I had case files on hundreds of families at hand, from research into my own family origins as well as from client files; and from among these files, I felt, I could find an appropriately representative family, one without particular distinction or sources of unusual depth.\footnote{Genealogical research for a client is considered to be a “work for hire,” and is therefore the property of the client. Often, however, it was my practice to include a clause in the contract granting permission for me to make use of any information resulting from my work for the client. When there was no contract, I often sought usage permission in a letter if the material looked promising for further development. In more than one case, I used the results of research done for a client in a research paper or a published article. Virtually overwhelmingly, family genealogists are more than happy to have their family histories publicized.} There were several considerations to be weighed in the final decision. The family chosen should, of course, not by any means have been previously or completely researched throughout the collateral lines—the scope of the investigation I foresaw for this study was beyond what I had done delving into my
own or clients' families.\textsuperscript{57} Yet enough of the bare bones of the family should be apparent to ensure representation of general southern society—a family group that was unique and yet, if not typical, then not atypical.

I decided to pass on several promising client families because of the potential difficulties of being so involved in, and possibly compromised by, digging into someone else’s family. While poking around in family history, it would not be altogether surprising to find skeletons in the closet that a former client might not want exposed.\textsuperscript{58} Moreover, the involvement of someone else in the process had the distinct potential for unforeseen complications and influences. Turning my eye toward my own genealogical background, I considered, then rejected, several interesting family lines. The Boones, for example, are one of my maternal lines but are too famous and too well researched; another maternal line, the Wittenburgs, were Germans who only came to the South in the late nineteenth century and were a part of an atypical (for the South) immigrant community.

\textsuperscript{57} Although genealogical standards stress broad horizontal (collateral) as well as vertical (lineal) ascent of the family tree, the majority of hobby genealogists confine their investigations to direct ancestors and their siblings, only rarely following all lines of descent from a common ancestor. Indeed, this would be a daunting task: there is more than one lifetime’s work to be done merely learning about the lives of two parents, four grandparents, eight great-grandparents, sixteen great-great-grandparents, thirty-two great-great-great-grandparents, and so forth in a geometrical progression.

\textsuperscript{58} Among the things I've uncovered during genealogical research, in my own and in others’ families, are illegitimate births, forgery in a family Bible, children born previous to or too early after a marriage, bootleggers sentenced to prison, horse thievery, and (gasp) a presumably respected southern grandfather who served in the Union Army during the Civil War. In some of these cases (and before the advent of “black sheep” genealogy), descendants were ashamed of the behavior of ancestors and often preferred keeping it hidden. Any “taint” of an interracial relationship, whether Indian or African American, is widely disavowed by many in the older generation and occasionally by those of a younger generation. And those fondly regarded family links to famous personages embedded in family tradition are not given up without a struggle, even in the face of overwhelming evidence. In short, I decided, if I were going to defame or embarrass family members, it seemed most prudent to make sure they belonged to my family rather than to a stranger’s family—at least my family is used to this sort of thing and thus less likely to threaten a lawsuit.
I finally settled on one of my paternal lines—the Keesee family. I knew them to be a virtually all-southern group; the immigrant ancestor arrived in Virginia about 1700, and his children and their descendants fanned out across the upper and lower South. As my research into the kinship group expanded, I discovered several members of the extended family group who were somewhat wealthy or somewhat distinctive, although no one could be considered famous or unusual on much more than a local level. As far as I know, there are no manuscript collections, diaries, plantation records, or elaborate biographies of anyone in the Keesee kinship group. Yet, because of their membership in the wealthier class (in the aggregate), wills and probate records, deeds, tax records, and biographical sketches are somewhat more abundant than is often the case for antebellum southerners, making it easier to flesh out the life histories of the individuals studied.

The genealogical database of this extended Keesee Family forms the bedrock of my analysis of kinship in the antebellum South. This database has grown to over 7,000 individuals—virtually all white—who lived from the early 1700s through the present. Although perforce the database contains nearly equal numbers of men and women, the

---

59 My paternal great-grandmother was Sarah Jane Elizabeth Keesee, who married Jesse Augustus Haywood Earle. She was the great-great granddaughter of Thomas Keesee Sr., the principle focus of this study.
60 The data was entered into Family Tree Maker 8.0 (FTM) by Broederbund, a widely used genealogical record keeping program, which allows the user to create and link family groups, to make source citations for each fact, and to sort and compile the data in a variety of formats. Moreover, the database can be converted into a GEDCOM file ("GEnealogical Data COMMunication, created by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints [Mormons]," Rootsw eb Review: Rootsw eb’s Genealogy News, Vol. 3, No. 3, 19 January 2000, rootsw eb-review@rootsw eb.com). GEDCOM is the genealogical standard, which creates a text file that can be exchanged with others, on disk or via e-mail attachment. The recipients of GEDCOM files can open or merge them with their own data in most other genealogy software programs. All data that is merged into an existing database in FTM automatically cites the received file as the source of each piece of acquired information.
data for the men overwhelmingly predominates. Almost all of the pre-twentieth century individuals were southerners; some of the later generations spread into other areas of the country. The families in this database are neither wholly typical nor wholly unique.

Based on my experience in doing genealogical research on a wide variety of southern families, I find the Keesee kinship group to have a higher than average incidence of wealth and slave-ownership, and of education and literacy. They are more typical of the planter classes and cotton farmers engaged in a market economy than of the yeomen and common classes engaged in subsistence agriculture or of southerners on average. But the scope of the study is large and contains some branches composed of those who were not wealthy and who did not own any slaves or who owned only a handful of slaves. Nevertheless, the main thrust of this study pertains to planter and slave-owing families, especially to ones who kept moving to the cotton frontier.

The database itself has been and continues to be compiled from a variety of sources. Much of the data comes from my own research in archives, libraries, and courthouses, that is—deeds, probate, wills, marriage records, court documents, tax records, census, federal land records, biographical sketches, family Bibles, family papers,

---

61 I did not set out to create an all-white database. Unfortunately I have not yet located any records that tie named non-white individuals to the extended Keesee kinship group in any meaningful way during the antebellum period. When I discovered black families with the kinship groups' surnames who lived near the Keesee kinship group, I added them to the database as unlinked individuals, hoping that I would be able at some point to link them. As yet, that hope has been unrealized. On the other hand, uncovering these connections has not been one of the principle goals of my research. Moreover, neither the dissertation nor the database focuses on women except peripherally, by their association with men, and inherently as members and propagators of families.
62 The South is defined in this study as the Confederate South.
63 Although "frontier" can be a highly contested term, in this dissertation the idea of the "cotton frontier" refers to areas of the South where planters took advantage of cheap land and fertile soils previously untouched by cotton cultivation, usually in areas recently vacated by Native Americans and opened to white settlers, where they could maximize their assets to produce cotton though plantation slavery—in a generally westward migration pattern.
birth and death records, Social Security records, newspapers, manuscript collections, and other traditional types of both primary and secondary sources.

A good portion of the data has been collected from other researchers. For the most part these are genealogists researching their own families, using many of the sources mentioned above to supplement private sources and personal knowledge within the family. Data from these researchers are uneven in quality: although most of their work seems to be accurate based on spot-checks, it is often undocumented or documented improperly.\(^{64}\) In cases where no documentation has been provided, I have cited the individual providing the information as the source and evaluated the accuracy of that data before incorporating it into my database. However, the major portions of the dissertation—those based on case studies of individuals—are almost fully derived from verified documentation.

When I refer to the Keesee extended kinship group, I am speaking generally of the individuals who descend from George Keesee I—the immigrant ancestor who arrived in Virginia about 1700, possibly as an indentured servant. He was reputedly Huguenot and possibly a Quaker. No evidence of his marriage or of his wife's name has surfaced, but four sons can be tied to him. He died in King George County, Virginia, in 1741. Each

---

\(^{64}\) Often, the data from family genealogists supplied information that allowed my own investigations to progress by providing clues to the location and names of groups of people. In general, the genealogical work by hobbyists seems to be most accurate when it concerns the generations closest in time to the researcher. That is, more confidence can be placed in data personally gathered from relatives and from cemeteries and courthouses close to home. And, it must be remembered, the past is with us longer than we think—many of the older people with whom I corresponded remembered grandparents and great-grandparents who were born in the antebellum South. The further the research goes into the past, the more its accuracy depends on research skills with complicated and unfamiliar data. Thus, the less it can be trusted, particularly since inaccurate data, once published, can be passed back and forth for decades between genealogists who don't verify the accuracy of the printed word. The explosion in Internet sources has magnified the problem, as more people rely on gleanings from websites without ever setting foot in an actual archive.
individual in the database either descended from George Keesee I, or married a
descendant, or, in some cases, were the ancestors of those who married one of George's
descendants. More specifically, this database concentrates on George's great-grandson
Thomas Keesee Sr. and his descendants.

Not every descendant has been tracked. Indeed, this would be virtually
impossible. If one couple, as George Keesee and his unknown wife did, had four
children, and if each of those children grew to adulthood and had four children of their
own who survived to adulthood, and, if this continued in each succeeding generation, the
resulting geometric progression produces an amazing number of descendants in just
twelve generations (300 years). Employing a calculator, one finds that, theoretically at
least (but by no means impossibly), this one couple would have 4,194,304 descendants in
the twelfth generation. When the descendants in each of those twelve generations is
tallied, the total descendants of the original couple numbers a staggering 5,592,404.

---

65 The database, however, is not confined to the eighteenth and nineteenth century: many of the lines are
brought down to the present and/or go back into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This was an
important part of the data-gathering process, since I could gather data more effectively from descendants
who had already done research on their particular lines, rather than through personally researching all the
records myself to recover the family connections. For the immigrant ancestor, see Vincent A. Keesee,:
"Origins of the Keesee Family in Virginia," chap. in A History of the Keesee Family, rev. ed. (Tifton, Ga.: by
66 If you consider the average generation to cover twenty-five years, then there would be twelve generations
of descendants in 300 years.
67 The first generation is the man and wife; the second generation consists of their four children grown to
adulthood; the third generation—each of the four adults in the second generation having had four
children—numbers sixteen; 4th generation=64; 5th generation=256; 6th generation=1024; 7th
generation=4096; 8th generation=16,384; 9th generation=65,536; 10th generation=262,144; 11th
generation=1,048,576; and the 12th generation would number 4,194,304. When the numbers from each of
the twelve generations are added together, the total number of descendants (not all alive at one time) is
5,592,404.
Of course, real life doesn't operate in the neat and objective world of mathematics: there were wars and epidemics, and not every couple raised four children to adulthood. Yet, prior to the twentieth century, many couples raised more than four children to adulthood, and many of those who died in wartime or of disease were already adults who left their full complement of offspring. Nevertheless, the end result is seemingly incomprehensible—if there had been only 1000 married couples in the entirety of this country in 1700, by the year 2000 the descendants of those couples alone theoretically would account for a population in the United States of over four billion.

There are, no doubt, many reasons why those numbers don’t hold up. For one thing, when two people have offspring, those children combine the two separate ancestral lines into one. Another reason, of interest in the context of this study, is intermarriage: simply stated, when cousins married, they reduced the number of potential descendants in later generations significantly. For example, if two first cousins among the sixteen first cousins in the third generation marry each other instead of marrying out of the family, the final tally in the year 2000 is reduced by over a quarter of a million descendants even with no further intermarriage. And significant numbers of southerners have the same ancestors showing up more than once in their pedigrees. It is not uncommon for southerners (and probably those from other regions) to be virtually related to themselves in a manner of speaking—often in more than one way.  

---

68 A recent posting to an E-mail list was written by a man who sought help with the “bug” in his genealogy program—when he produced a personal kinship report (that is, invoked the program that lists all the individuals in the database and labels them as to their relationship to the indicated person), he had the following labels beside his own name: self, 6th cousin, and 7th cousin. Quite a few list responders wrote to tell him there was no bug and that this situation was quite common; many of us are quite literally related to ourselves due to cousin marriages in our ancestry. See Bob Niesse <JagXKE69@aol.com> to Family Tree Maker Discussion List <ftmtech-l@lyrics.genealogy.com>, 28 November 2000, Subject: New to List-Kinship Report Errors; and subsequent replies on list on that and following dates.
Conversely, looking backwards over that same 300 years, each person alive today has 2048 direct ancestors just in that twelfth generation of the past. That is, in the second generation back, there are two direct ancestors—one's parents; in the third generation, each person had four direct ancestors, their grandparents; in the fourth generation, each person had eight great-grandparents; and so forth back to 2048 ninth-great-grandparents. Obviously, the population 300 years ago was not 2048 times larger than today. On one hand, the answer to this conundrum can be explained by factoring in siblings. In other words, not every single person has a distinct set of ancestors—most people share ancestors with one or more siblings. On the other hand, that still leaves us with a posited greater population in the past than we have today. The explanation is, of course, that most of us shared the same ancestors; at some point in the past, we were closer kin, but over the years, the relationship became so distant, it ceased to be relevant in any meaningful way.

Even with the lessened numbers of descendants that are the result of intermarriage, it is apparent from the numbers that the Keesee database is far from a complete accounting of all branches. Furthermore, it is important to remember that even where some information is provided about a particular person or groups of individuals, rarely have all the life events or all the documents pertaining to those people been gathered. In other words, this is a broad base of data that is not consistently deep.

In considering the merits of the overall data, it should also be pointed out that the realities of historical research lead to more data being gathered on the most prominent and the wealthiest. Those who did not hold political office, those who owned little in the way of land or slaves, those without descendants to reminisce about the activities of their
family in manuscript or print, those who preferred not to preserve the scandals of their forebears, and those without public voices in a white patriarchal society are inevitably less visible in a work such as this one, despite the compiler’s best efforts to tease out the voices of those who were underrepresented in the records.

Nevertheless, the data for the Keesees are complete enough to more than hint at the complexities of kinship ties in the antebellum South. The family entanglements, ranging widely over social, political, economic, and religious spheres, are quite clear even within this limited reconstruction of a kinship group. The large size of the database creates a more diverse view than could be accomplished by focusing on a single individual or a single nuclear family group. An overarching view of the Keesee kinship group reveals non-slaveholders as well as slaveholders, the wealthy planter and the cash-poor subsistence farmer, the public-minded officeholder as well as the less prominent ordinary citizen, the bonds of kinship in the private sphere of women as well as that of men, and the Baptists as well as the Presbyterians. In short, the overall group in its totality can be seen as typical of antebellum southerners at large.

This study recreates the meaningful bonds of kinship that existed in the antebellum South and demonstrates the effect of that kinship on the everyday lives of southerners. For the most part, we tend to take our understanding of kinship from its meaning in our own lives. But the lives of antebellum southerners were demonstrably different from our lives today: in a less mobile and smaller population of people who had little institutional support systems other than the family, kinship was a deeper and more meaningful concept.
THE KINSHIP GROUP

For the purposes of this dissertation, investigations focus most intently on George Keesee I's great-grandson Thomas Keesee Sr., his kinship group and his descendants. Thomas Keesee began life during the war that led to the founding of his nation and ended as the war that threatened to fracture the bonds of that nation began. He was born in 1778 in Pittsylvania County, Virginia and he died in Ashley County, Arkansas, in December 1861.

During the eighty-three years of his life, he moved many times and lived out the archetype of the southern planter on the cotton frontier. As a young man, he and much of his nuclear family left Virginia in the waning years of the eighteenth century to relocate in Spartanburgh District, South Carolina. He probably married there and his first children were born there. Less than a decade later, the bulk of the kinship group picked up stakes and migrated to Sumner County, Tennessee. Little is known of Thomas's life during these years, but his father became a prosperous planter and slave owner who distributed his wealth to his children at his death in 1825. By that time, Thomas had joined other kin in yet another relocation to Franklin County, Tennessee. During his stay there in the 1810s and early 1820s, his oldest son married and presented him with his first grandson. And, although no official record of service has been found, his grandchildren later claimed he had been a soldier with Andrew Jackson during the War of 1812 and had fought at the Battle of New Orleans.

Perhaps during this service he first glimpsed the lands of Alabama. At any rate, by 1821 he and his extended kinship group were living in the newly opened lands along the Black Warrior River near the boundary between Tuscaloosa and Bibb Counties.
Alabama. Presumably he fetched the six slaves his father willed him in 1825 to add to his own growing group of slaves who were an integral factor in growing his cotton crops. Thomas bought tracts of government land, became an overseer of the poor in his district, and watched his children marry and have children of their own.

By 1837, however, fifteen years of cotton crops had no doubt worn out the land that was needed to produce wealth for him and his ever-expanding family. The Panic of 1837 hit everyone in Alabama hard and the fertile, cheap lands of the new state of Arkansas beckoned. His son Milton and son-in-law Robert Calvert picked up and moved to central Arkansas in 1836 and must have relayed a "thumbs up" message back to Alabama—the following year, the extended kinship group and other neighbors and members of the same church congregations formed a wagon train to join their kinsmen in Saline County, Arkansas. Once in Arkansas, Thomas Keese, a ruling elder in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, knit together the threads of his religious life once again. One of the first things he did, along with others who were mostly relatives, was to found a new Cumberland Presbyterian church in Saline County. One of his sons, a staunch Baptist, helped establish a Baptist congregation in the newly settled area.

Thomas Keese's wife apparently died before or shortly after the move to Arkansas, possibly after giving birth to her last child. In 1840, the sixty-two-year-old Thomas married the twenty-year-old daughter of a fellow planter and, before another two years had gone by, had added two more children to his family. And he and the extended family prospered: in 1840, he was the largest slaveowner in the county with thirty-one slaves. He and seven other members of the kinship group—eight men out of a total white population of 2061—held over 30 percent of the slave population of Saline County. As
befitting their financial prominence, many of the men in the family held positions of responsibility in local affairs: among the offices they held were road overseer, captain of the slave patrol, sheriff, county judge, and state legislator.

Yet again, however, once fertile lands lost their ability to grow cotton after a decade of use. By 1848 much of the kinship group had moved south into Union County, Arkansas, where they engaged in the familiar processes of involvement in county affairs, buying land from the federal government, and growing cotton. At the time of the 1850 census, Thomas Keesee was seventy-two and still prospering: he owned forty slaves. Before the decade was out, he moved one last time to the adjacent county of Ashley.

Thomas was eighty in 1858 and, being "in a low state of health" although "in perfect mind and memory," felt moved to write his will. In this will, having already given assets to many of his children, he distributed the rest of his worldly accumulations acquired during a lifetime as a southern planter: 636 acres of land, eleven slaves, $37,000 in cash, a carriage, a bay horse, and household and kitchen furniture. Three years later, age eighty-two, Thomas died on the first day of December 1861. In the following years, the Civil War wreaked havoc on his family as it did on the remainder of the nation. Sons and grandsons served and died in the war, crops suffered, slaves were emancipated, and much of the kinship groups' basis for wealth and social standing was dissipated. But a level of family solidarity endured. There were pockets of Thomas Keesee's descendants in Ellis, Washington, and Robertson Counties, Texas; in Columbia and Union County,

---

69 "Last Will and Testament of Thomas Keesee, Sr."
written 16 December 1858; proved 1861, Ashley County, Arkansas, Abstract Office Volume. pp. 157-159 (a fire having destroyed the original will records).
Arkansas, and across the state line in Union Parish, Louisiana; as well as a group who choose not to leave Saline County, Arkansas when the others moved on.

This, in short, is the narrative of Thomas Keesee’s life. But in the larger study here, I propose to enhance the story of a southern small planter by exploring the lives of him and his kin as a group. This genealogical investigation will, I believe, flesh out the story of one individual’s life and, by extension, expand our understanding of kin relations among southerners in the social, political, economic, and religious aspects of their lives. Keesee was part of a copious assemblage of kin, and a large proportion of his kin remained an integral part of his long life as he moved from the time of the Revolution to the time of the Civil War, from Virginia, to South Carolina, to Tennessee, to Alabama, and, finally, to Arkansas. As John Donne wrote, "No man is an Island, entire of itself."70 Thomas Keesee and his fellow antebellum southerners were not, and did not attempt to be, "islands," and thus cannot be separated from the context of their kin groups if the broader story of antebellum southerners is to be told and understood.

Human beings look separate because you see them walking about separately. But then we are so made that we can see only the present moment. If we could see the past, then of course it would look different. For there was a time when every man was part of his mother, and (earlier still) part of his father as well, and when they were part of his grand parents. If you could see humanity spread out in time, as God sees it, it would look like one single growing thing—rather like a very complicated tree. Every individual would appear connected with every other.

—— C. S. Lewis, 1898-1963

70 Meditation XVII.
CHAPTER TWO:
KINSHIP, MIGRATION, AND SETTLEMENT PATTERNS

When Thomas Keesee Sr. arrived in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama in 1821, he was a mature man of about forty-three, with a passel of children just entering adulthood.¹ Although his status as a planter and slave owner is unclear in the proceeding years, he is plainly a slave-owing small planter during his years in Alabama. Seeking economic opportunity, he was drawn to the newly opened area by the fertile lands in the Black Warrior River Valley. He, like many others, might have become acquainted with Alabama during the War of 1812 campaigns against the Creeks.² The Creeks and the Choctaws were forced to cede their lands between 1814 and 1816, the Territory of Alabama was created in 1817, both Tuscaloosa and Bibb Counties were formed in 1818, and Alabama became a state in 1819.³ Tuscaloosa became a principal market for cotton because of convenient steamboat transportation via the river to Mobile Bay. Cotton prices were extremely high after the War of 1812, reaching their peak about 1819. This

¹ It is possible, even probable, that Keesee arrived in Alabama in company with a wider range of kin that is presented here. I have chosen, however, to begin the narrative with the formation of new ties of kin in Alabama in order to illustrate the evolution of kinship groups in a clearer and more complete way. Keesee's residence in Tennessee during parts of the first two decades of the 1800s is difficult to flesh out due to the paucity of records in Tennessee for this time period and to the lack of emphasis in my research. One thing that seems clear, however, is he apparently did not come to Alabama in company with any of his siblings, which is fairly unusual.
propelled many planters like Thomas Keesee toward the fresh soils of the
newly opened territory of Alabama, especially with land available for purchase from the
federal government at low prices.4

The story of the antebellum South is incomplete without an understandable
narrative of migrations like Thomas Keesee's. What became known as "the South" began
with sparse settlements of Europeans and Africans along the eastern seaboard and, over
the course of almost two hundred and fifty years, diffused to include Texas, the
westernmost reaches of the region as usually defined. During the course of this
population redistribution and growth, Europeans, African Americans, and native
Americans blended and interacted to create a distinctive southern culture. Scholars of the
South continue to debate the merits of the various causative factors behind, and the
effects of, the westward migration of whites, often accompanied by their black and
mulatto slaves.5 This study asserts that kinship strongly shaped migratory and settlement

---

Indian Cessions); and The Handy Book for Genealogists: United States of America, 8th ed. (Logan, Utah:

4 Tuscaloosa sat at the head of the Black Warrior River, a major transportation route from upper Alabama
to the Alabama-Tombigbee Rivers, which drain into Mobile Bay on the Gulf of Mexico. Thomas Perkins
Abernethy, The Formative Period in Alabama, 1815–1828 (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press,

5 For the effects of Afro American culture on the South, see John Michael Vlach, "African Influence," in
Charles Reagan Wilson and William Ferris, eds., Encyclopedia of Southern Culture (Chappell Hill:
and Ferris, eds., Encyclopedia of Southern Culture, Vol. 1, pp. 221–395, passim. For the development and
influence of black cultural life, see John B. Boles, Black Southerners: 1619-1869 (Lexington: University
Press of Kentucky, 1984). Chapter 6, and pp. 232–233. For the blending of ethnic cultural influences,
including Afro American, Native American, and "Celtic," see George E. Pozzetta's introduction to "Ethnic
in American history, one of the earliest and most significant works is Frederick Jackson Turner. The
patterns in the antebellum South and that, therefore, we must include kinship
when debating these issues. Moreover, by adding genealogical methodology as a research
tool, scholars will be able to unveil the power of kinship as one of the primary forces
shaping migration and settlement, and thus reveal the social scaffolding of antebellum
southern communities more completely and precisely.

The main issues in migration boil down to motive: What combinations of push-pull factors affected some individuals', families', and groups' decisions to remain where they were and others to relocate? What factors affected their choices of destinations? But although the issues can be stated relatively simply, migration is nevertheless quite complex, encompassing a myriad of questions about economics, demographics, geography, agriculture, religion, politics, family dynamics, slavery, race, class, and gender. Unfortunately, scholars cannot read the minds of these antebellum southerners to discover their reasons for moving, nor did the majority of migrants leave written evidence addressing these issues comprehensively. And, even were we able to interrogate them, antebellum southerners, like most humans, were probably not fully conscious of all the subtle thought processes involved in evaluating the factors pushing them to leave one location and pulling them to a new location. In this dissertation, however, I have used the

information from the Keesee kinship group database to examine the actions of a representative group of southerners on the move, in the belief that actions truly speak louder than words. Scrutiny of their actions over time and throughout the South indicates that kin relations were a driving factor in choices about migration and settlement, and a key element in establishing a community. This study draws on an anthropological approach to families, which regards "[a] system of kinship and marriage . . . as an arrangement which enables persons to live together and co-operate with one another in an orderly social life."* And, finally, this chapter reveals the efficacy of using genealogical methodology to investigate the ante-bellum South.

Naturally, kinship was not the only force effecting migration. The study of the Keesee kinship groups reveals that economic advancement was the motivation for most moves, particularly for the segment of the group classified as planters.7 This is not a new idea—many historians have presented effective cases for economic motivation. Scholars have expressed this in a number of ways: a desire to exchange worn-out soils for fertile new lands; a lack of available land for sons coming of age; the desire to exploit profitable crops such as indigo, tobacco, cotton and sugar; or a desire to move west to newly opened

---

7 The definition of a planter is almost universally understood to be someone engaged in plantation agriculture and owing twenty or more slaves. See, for example, Joan E. Cashin, A Family Venture: Men and Women on the Southern Frontier (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 7.
lands where land ownership was possible for very little investment. The most significant factor in migration into Arkansas, declares Robert Bradshaw Walz in his dissertation on the subject, was "the desire for cheap, fresh land." "Migration was a prerequisite to success," according to James Oakes, and many southerners like Thomas Keesee were desirous of a chance at that success. Robert Hughes writes that "[t]he metaphor of all wealth production is gambling." Similarly, Ray Allen Billington asserts that, "in every pioneer there was a touch of the gambler," and the ones who chose to stay put were "the contented, the cautious, and the secure." The Keeeses and kin were a mixture of those seeking something more and those comfortable with what they had: in every generation there were some who moved on and some who remained behind.

But whatever the motivation—whether an individual was pushed out of an established area by escalating land prices or the poverty of the soil or by a need to provide a maturing family of children with land of their own, or whether he was pulled to the borderlands by a hunger for fertile and cheaper land, or by the chance to make his fortune—when an individual moved, it was virtually always in the company of a host of

---

kin. In a world where political and economic power frequently was contingent on a network of kin, where having a baby was a dangerous business, and where a trip by wagon to a new territory was a long and arduous venture, and, in a society where family was the main organization of everyday life, kin groups stuck together. In the antebellum South, society was institutionally less complex than it was in the North (or than it is in the United States today) and thus more dependent on kinship groups:

In complex societies, it is individuals (not families or larger kin groups) who take advantage of economic or occupational opportunities; [today] when someone moves to a new job, parents and siblings are not likely to go along (and cousins and aunts and uncles even less likely).\textsuperscript{12}

Conversely, in less institutionally complex societies, like the antebellum South, individuals aligned with kin groups were the ones who were able to take advantage of economic opportunities. The road to success was traveled by groups of related families, and their cohesiveness was often the basis of that success. Social capital was the surest route to prosperity—if not survival—and kinship groups were the source of the greatest social capital in the antebellum South. Thomas Keesee's six relocations, from Virginia, to Tennessee, to Alabama, to central Arkansas, to southern Arkansas, and to southeastern Arkansas, along with the fluctuating formations of his kinship groups that ebbed and flowed in conjunction with these moves, are illustrative of some of the common migration experiences of antebellum southerners.

After his migration to Alabama, Thomas Keesee took full advantage of federal land offerings—over a period from 1825 to 1837 he bought a total of 1,161.805 acres of federal land (see Figure 2.1 for a complete list of the parcels of land Keesee acquired from the federal government, all cash purchases; Figure 2.2 is reproduction of one of the actual land patents Keesee received). If Keesee had been a simple farmer engaged in diversified agriculture, he would not have needed this much land, nor would he have had the financial wherewithal to pay for it. Although the number of slaves he owned at this time cannot be verified from any record yet found, Thomas Keesee would have had to own quite a few slaves to make use of even a part of this amount of land (although his purchase of at least part of the land might have been speculative in nature). What is known is that Keesee owned no slaves in 1800; that in 1825 he acquired six slaves—Booker, Big Isram, Clock, Minnie, Gabriel, and China (part of his inheritance from the estate of his father George, who died in Sumner County, Tennessee); and that he had clearly moved into the planter class later in life—in 1840, he owned thirty-one slaves.¹³

¹³ Nor did Thomas's father George own slaves in 1790. George Keesee, 1790 U.S. Census, Greenville District, South Carolina, p. 69; Thomas Kizze, 1800 U.S. Census, Spartanburgh District, South Carolina, p. 179; Government Land Office Records, U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, http://www.glorecords.blm.gov/, hereinafter GLO; “Will of George F. Keesee,” Sumner County, Tennessee, Will Book 2, pp. 36–37, which distributed to his heirs: 50 slaves, land and a “plantation” (total 570 acres, in Sumner County), a cotton gin, livestock of every description, farming equipment, a riding carriage, furniture, 100 barrels of corn, 100 pounds of picked cotton, 10 bushels of wheat, and a crop of tobacco; and, for Thomas Keesee's slave numbers, see Carolyn Earle Billingsley, Early Saline County, Arkansas, Records: Transcriptions of the 1840 Federal Census and 1846 Tax Book, 2nd ed. (Conway, Ark.: Arkansas Research, 2000), p. 15. At that time, Keesee was the largest slaveowner in the county, ibid., p. 6.
Figure 2.1: Thomas Keesee's U.S. Land Patents in Alabama\textsuperscript{14}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATENTEE NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE DATE</th>
<th>DOCUMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>LAND LOCATION NUMBER OF ACRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>Sec. 6, T22S, R6W 80.01 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3905</td>
<td>Sec. 7, T22S, R6W 79.91 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3922</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3923</td>
<td>Sec. 2, T22S, R7W 80.07 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3924</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3925</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3926</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3928</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>07/15/1825</td>
<td>3929</td>
<td>Sec. 2, T22S, R7W 80.07 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>09/01/1825</td>
<td>4323</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>09/01/1825</td>
<td>4379</td>
<td>Sec. 2, T22S, R7W 80.07 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>10/01/1835</td>
<td>10804</td>
<td>Sec. 3, T22S, R7W 40.035 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>04/01/1837</td>
<td>14407</td>
<td>Sec. 1, T22S, R7W 80.19 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEESEE, THOMAS</td>
<td>04/01/1837</td>
<td>14408</td>
<td>Sec. 3, T22S, R7W 80.12 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} GLO. The chart shows the Alabama lands Thomas Keesee Sr. acquired from the federal government.
The United States of America.

To all to whom these presents shall come, Greeting:

Whereas, certain persons of mature intelligence having appeared in the General Land Office of the United States, a register of the Secretary of the Interior in the State of Alabama, had claim to a certain tract of land in the 4th section of the 12th range west of the 1st principal meridian, in the State of Alabama, containing about 640 acres, &c., that the said tract of land has been patented to said persons, as appears from the records of said office, and that the same is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States of America.

NOW KNOW YE, That the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, in consideration of the premises, and in conformity with the several acts of Congress, do, by and with the consent of the same, and by these presents, in public form, in the year 1837, do grant, patent, and confirm to the said persons, all and singular, forever.

In testimony whereof, I, J. Q. ADAMS, President of the United States of America, have caused this patent to be made patent, and the same to be recorded in the General Land Office to be kept forever.

Done under my hand, at the City of Washington, the 30th day of June, 1837, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-seventh, and of the Independence of the United States the sixty-second.

J. Q. Adams
President of the United States of America.

Confirminf of the General Land Office.

15 GLO.
The two decades previous to Thomas Keesee's move to Alabama are hazy due to the paucity of records in Tennessee during this period.\(^{16}\) He was probably in Sumner County with his parents and siblings, but he has not been found on any records placing him there.\(^{17}\) He emerged in Franklin County in 1811, where he entered a Tennessee land grant of 300 acres that year.\(^{18}\) During the ten years he remained in Franklin County, he participated in the War of 1812 and his children grew up. His oldest child, named George for Thomas's father, married in that county, and presented Thomas with his first grandchild in 1817.\(^{19}\)

Thomas Keesee's life begins to unfold more clearly after his removal to Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, in 1821. There his network of kin evolved. Although his oldest son married in Tennessee, Thomas's other children married during their residence in Alabama and formed alliances with many local families. These marriages are the tangible evidence of the creation of a new kinship group, or, perhaps, more precisely, the natural development of Thomas Keesee Sr.'s kinship group. A study of the reconstruction of Thomas Keesee Sr.'s neighborhood (see Figure 2.3) along the Tuscaloosa-Bibb county

\(^{16}\) The 1810 U.S. Census is not extant for Tennessee except for two counties and many of the courthouses burned or were destroyed and lost many of their earliest records.

\(^{17}\) That he was in Tennessee is confirmed by later census records of his children, stating they were born in Tennessee during these years.

\(^{18}\) Thomas Kisse, Tennessee General Land Grant #3154, Bedford County, G District, Book I, p. 499, listed in Barbara, Byron, and Samuel Sistler, *Tennessee Land Grants: Surnames I-K* (Nashville: Byron Sistler & Associates, 1997), p. 52. Although this grant was recorded as being in Bedford County, Franklin and Bedford Counties were both created in 1807 and were adjacent until 1871: my surmise is that, when boundary lines between them shifted during the early years, the land fell into Franklin County. When Thomas Keesee sold the land in 1821, it was in Franklin County. For the evolution of counties, see *The Handy Book for Genealogists: United States of America*, 9th ed. (Logan, UT: Everton Publishers, Inc., 1999).
line illustrates a prime tenet of marriage connections in the antebellum South:
people must meet to marry and, given the narrow range of everyday mobility in this era,
chances are that the persons of the opposite sex whom an antebellum southerner would
meet would be neighbors, relatives, and fellow church members. Propinquity was the key
factor in selecting a mate.

The area in which the Keesees settled came to be called Hill's Settlement or Mars,
and it was located near the Tuscaloosa-Bibb County line. In Bibb County, Alabama: The
First Hundred Years, 1818-1918, Rhonda Coleman Ellison discusses the origins and
location of the community and the fluctuating county lines that affected it during the
early years of settlement. The inhabitants of this area as named by Ellison have a high
correspondence to the names of men shown on the neighborhood map compiled in Figure
2.3. This is the center of the neighborhood where the Keesee kinship group was residing
during the period when a new kinship grouping was being formed.

Throughout the years, the exact position of the line between this county
[Bibb] and Tuscaloosa has often been debated. An act approved by the
state legislature on January 15, 1828, ordered the boundary to be
established so as to leave Captain James Hill in Tuscaloosa County, but
three years later, a new law reversed this decision: Edward Calvert, Grief
Ragsdale [married a Hill], Benjamin Hubbert [was married to a
Calvert], John A. Bagby [married a Hill], Robert Hill, Hamilton Kile
[married a Hill], and James Hill, at their present residences, or as many of
them as can be so included, without taking any others, shall, by this act, be
taken from the county of Tuscaloosa and be added to the county of Bibb. .
.

19The marriage records for Franklin County are not extant for this period, but the Keesees were in this
county at the time George married and his daughter Elizabeth was born there November 4, 1817, according
to her tombstone in Magnolia City Cemetery, Columbia County, Arkansas.
Hill's Settlement, which grew up at the headwaters of Hill's and Schultz creeks near the Tuscaloosa line, not far from Johtown today. In 1825, John (Jake) Hill received a patent to an entire section (around 640 acres). Farmlands of this large settlement were cleared not only by the Hill family but also by others, including John Goodson, William Calvert, Jackson Caffee, Robert Woods, and Thomas and Milton Keesee. In the Hill-Oldham Cemetery, the oldest marked grave is that of William Green Hill, the two-year-old son of James and Jane Calvert Hill, who died in 1823. The early importance of Hill's Settlement is documented by the establishment of the Mars post office in 1823; James Hill was the first postmaster. 20

Many of the families in this neighborhood would come to have family ties to Thomas Keesee Sr. though the marriages his children made. There were also, however, families listed in the neighborhood description above and the reconstructed neighborhood in Figure 2.3 with no kin ties to the Keesees, making it clear that there were choices for marriage partners, as well as for those with whom the Keesee kinship group interacted socially and legally. Although there was a limited selection available, there was a selection.

---

20 Ellison, Bibb County, Alabama, pp. 3, and 20–21. Bold type added to denote the Keesee's kinship connections.
Figure 2.3 Thomas Keesee’s Neighborhood
Tuscaloosa/Bibb Counties, Alabama\textsuperscript{21}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Surveyor</th>
<th>Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1,T22S,R7W</td>
<td>S1,T22S,R7W Thos. Keesee Edward Sims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{21} This neighborhood is reconstructed from records at GLO. These landowners are drawn from government land records only and do not reflect private land purchases. The individuals charted are ones who patented land during the years of Thomas Keesee’s residence in the area. Names in bold type are those who were, or became, part of the Keesee kinship group. For those unfamiliar with the rectangular survey system used in public land states, a section is one mile square and contains 640 acres; there are 36 sections in a township. Thus the grid above represents and area five miles wide and five miles long.
Viewing Keesee's children's marriages in the context of proximity and settlement patterns is enlightening: 22

1. **George Polk Keesee** married Elizabeth (Harrison?) in Tennessee, probably in Franklin County where their oldest child was born, but marriage data for that county is not extant. George owned land in the neighborhood23 after his marriage.

2. **Milton Keesee** married William and Lucy Calvert's daughter Mary, known as "Polly," on August 4, 1823; Milton was just short of twenty-four at the time of his marriage to his seventeen-year-old wife. His sister Mary, also known as "Polly," married his wife's brother Robert Calvert (Mary Calvert became Mary Keesee; Mary Keesee became Mary Calvert)—a classic case of sibling exchange. The Calverts were neighbors and were closely related to the Hills, also of the neighborhood. Milton owned land nearby.

3. **Agnes Keesee** married Benjamin Clardy III; they owned land in the neighborhood. Oral history from descendants states that, before he married Agnes, Benjamin Clardy worked for her father Thomas Keesee Sr. on Keesee's farm. Some of Clardy's family lived near Keesee in Bedford and Franklin Counties, Tennessee, so the story is plausible.

4. **Thomas Keesee Jr.** married Jane Caroline Green, July 7, 1826, when he was twenty-two and she was fifteen. There is no proof the Greens lived in the neighborhood but her parents, Jonathan E. and Jane (Kerr) Green did live in Bibb County; Jonathan Green died

---

there in 1837, and Jane died there in 1855. In 1839, Thomas Keesee Sr.’s
granddaughter Mary Ann Clardy married Jane Caroline (Green) Keesee’s brother George
Sidney Green.

5. Mary Keesee married William and Lucy Calvert's son Robert on August 27, 1823;
Robert Calvert, who had just become her brother-in-law earlier in the month, was twenty-
one when he married Mary, who was fifteen. The families lived within one mile of each
other at the time the two couples married. Both Robert and his mother owned land in the
neighborhood.

6. William Keesee married Mary Jane Chappell, daughter of Robert Wooding Chappell,
August 14, 1828, when he was nineteen and she was seventeen. The Chappells lived less
than two miles northwest of Thomas Keesee Sr.’s land shown on neighborhood grid in
Figure 2.3.24

7. Jane Keesee married Elias Jenkins December 20, 1831, when she was in her late teens
and he was twenty-nine. He had no known connection to the neighborhood, but he was
the sheriff of Tuscaloosa County when they married and had been involved in legal
transactions with the Hill family in the neighborhood, thus making it probable that he was
well known to the Keesees.

8. Gideon Keesee, youngest child of Thomas and Mary, married Martha Wooding
Hargrove. Although Martha's brother's autobiography states the couple was married in
Alabama, no marriage record has yet been located. Her family is not known to be of the

24 “Neighborhood” indicates the area within the five-mile square grid illustrated in Figure 2-3.
neighborhood but she was the niece of Gideon's sister-in-law Mary Jane
(Chappell) Keesee.25

So without question, propinquity was a strong factor in choosing a spouse, and
this proved true in the Alabama neighborhood in which the Keesees resided in the 1820s
and 1830s; for the most part, Thomas Keesee Sr.'s children married neighbors. The larger
question, however, is whether or not the kinship connections forged by these marriages
translated to something of significance—in other words, did the marriage of two people
create an effective bond of kinship between the two families thus united? As
anthropologists A. R. Radcliffe-Brown and Daryll Forde phrase it: "The first determining
factor of a kinship system is provided by the range over which these relationships are
effectively recognized for social purposes of all kinds."26 To determine the strength of the
effective bonds or of the extent of social recognition, we can examine the local records
for evidence of instrumental ties between the Keesees and the families into which their
children married.

Tuscaloosa County records are not complete for the early years but nevertheless
provide some evidence of ties between the families. In 1825, when Milton Keesee got
into trouble with the law—"for committing an affray on the County of Tuscaloosa
aforesaid against the peace and dignity of the State"—he was hauled into circuit court
and required to post a $200 appearance bond. His security on that bond was Pharough

24 Robert Wooding Chappell patented land in Section 28, Township 21 South, Range 14 West in 1823. See
25 Mary Jane Chappell was the daughter of Robert Wooding Chappell, and Martha Wooding Hargrove was
the granddaughter of Robert Wooding Chappell.
Hill. Pledging security on a bond was not something taken lightly. The financial penalty would fall on the person acting as security if the principal failed to perform the act guaranteed in the bond. Hill also pledged security on an appearance bond at the same time for his younger brother George W. Hill. Although Pharough Hill was not related to Keesee by blood, the wife of one of Hill's brothers was Keesee's wife's aunt and the wife of another of his brothers was Keesee's wife's sister.  

Few things demonstrate strong bonds between individuals as well as the willingness to risk a rather large amount of money together. In 1826 and 1827, a group of men from the extended kinship group were willing to post a security bond in the amount of $5,122.07 for Claibourn Harris, who had a judgment against him in the Tuscaloosa County Circuit Court that he was appealing to the Alabama Supreme Court. Among those involved in the transaction were Robert Hill, John Hill, Claibourn Hill, Milton Keesee, Jesse Hill, Thomas Keesee, John Hill, Robert Calvert, and James Moore (who married

---

27 "The State of Alabama v. Harris Mitchell and George Hill Jr." and "The State of Alabama v. Harris Mitchell and Milton Keesee," Minutes of the Circuit Court, Tuscaloosa County, Alabama [unlabeled ledger], pp. 398–401. 8 January 1825. Justice of the Peace Jesse Hill witnessed these bonds. The cases were "continued from day to day and from term to term" until finally a Nolle Prosequi was entered. There is no further information on the nature of the crime.
Robert Calvert's mother after she was widowed). All of these men, except the principal, had close ties of kinship. The neighborhood construction makes it clear that there were other families nearby outside of the kin group but that these men chose to bind themselves legally with kin instead of with men who were merely neighbors, possibly friends, or even fellow church members.

Another type of legal record that demonstrates the effective ties of kinship between these families is probate. As with marriage, probate is a civil matter, with laws designed to designate legal heirs for the protection and orderly transference of property, and the role of guardianship was created for the purpose of protecting the property rights of minor heirs. In fact, guardianship had little or nothing to do with physical custody of minors—a mother often remained the main caregiver of her children who were minor heirs, while a trusted relative or close friend held legal guardianship over the child or children. Guardians were chosen with care because a guardian's malfeasance could have serious financial consequences for the minor heir and, by extension, for the family. The man chosen administrator or executor of the estate of a deceased person was also a

---

28 Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, Deed Record Book E, pp. 241–246, and Deed Record Book F, pp. 205–208; and "Harris v. Purdy," in *Cases Determined in the Supreme Court of Alabama, Embracing the Years 1827 and 1828*, George N. Stewart, Reporter, Vol. I (Atlanta, GA: Constitution Job Office, 1891), pp. 210–213, a copy of which is to be found at the Law Library of the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa. John L. Purdy sued Harris for slander perpetrated during a previous lawsuit between them in which Harris accused Purdy of lying. In order to appeal, Harris had to post a bond and to have securities for that bond. To protect his securities against a potentially huge financial loss, Harris executed a deed of trust, conveying several tracts of land along with appurtenances, eight slaves (and their increase), a wagon and harness, four geldings, 23 head of cattle, 28 sheep, 100 hogs, and all his household goods to his securities if he failed to satisfy the judgment against him. The judgment against Harris was affirmed, but apparently he paid his debt, relieving his securities of their obligation. If there was a kin relationship between Harris and the men serving as his securities, it is not known at this time.
trusted family member or friend for the same reason. On the 23rd of August 1823, William Calvert, father of Robert and Mary, died; his death began a series of interactions, played out in the Tuscaloosa County Orphans Court (the court that handled probate matters in Alabama) between relatives and family connections. William Calvert's probate is an exemplar of the role of family in legal matters of property and the range of family involved.

Calvert was about forty-eight years of age when he died and left a widow Lucy and seven children, two of them already married—Jane who had married George Hill the previous year and Mary who had married Milton Keesee less than three weeks before her father's death. Within days of William Calvert's death, his eldest son Robert married his recently acquired sister-in-law Mary Keesee. Since William Calvert left property, an estate to be probated, and no will, his remaining children, still minors, needed guardians to safeguard their interests. At first, their mother Lucy applied for and was granted status as the guardian of William, Nancy, and Paulina (Polina), while son-in-law George Hill

---

29 The executor was the man named by the person who died testate (with a will) to oversee the execution of the directions in his or her will. The person who oversaw the distribution of the estate of a deceased person who died intestate (without a will) was an administrator, and was appointed by the court. A female can be the executrix or administratrix, but women seldom fulfilled these roles in this era. Although the court appointed the administrator, the appointee was clearly the person favored by the surviving family members. See Henry Campbell Moore, *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th ed. (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Company, 1979), s.v. "Administrator," "Administratrix," "Executor," "Executrix," "Guardian," "Intestate," "Testate." Although a guardian is technically charged with the "general care and control" of his ward, minor heirs usually continued to live with their surviving parent or were at school.

30 All of the guardianship information for this and the following paragraphs is taken from Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, Orphan's Court Records, pp. 39, 46–47, 56, 59, 63–64, 215, 220, 300, 392–393, 445, 447, 453, and 521; and Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, Minutes, Orphans Court, Volume 3: "Report, Milton Keesee, Guardian of Polinia Calvert," 5 April 1830, pp. 4–5; "Final Settlement of Robert Calvert, Guardian of William Calvert," 6 September 1830, p. 11; and "Citation to Robert Calvert, Guardian of the Minor Heirs of William Calvert, decd.," 10 August 1846, p. 372.
served as guardian for James Calvert, who, at fifteen, was the oldest of the
children left at home.

On the January 6, 1825, (about sixteen months after her husband's death), the
widow remarried and lost her briefly held status as a femme sole.31 Perhaps believing a
stepfather would not make the best of guardians for her offspring—or perhaps following
the wishes of her sons who might dislike having her new husband control family assets—
she went to court the following month and asked to be released from her guardianship. At
the same session of the court, her son Robert Calvert applied for appointment as guardian
of his brother William, posting a $2500 bond to ensure proper performance of his duties;
Jesse and John Hill were his securities on the bond. At the same time, Milton Keesee was
appointed guardian of his sister-in-law Paulina and posted a similar bond, with the same
securities.

Less than a month later, Nancy Calvert, now fourteen, was legally able to choose
her guardian and in testimony before the local justices of the peace, Jesse Hill, choose her
brother-in-law Robert Calvert. This time, James and Jesse Hill were his securities. Her
mother Lucy Calvert, now Lucy Moore, formally turned over Nancy's assets—$100 from
the hire of a slave (or slaves) the previous year—to the new guardian. At the same time,
she turned over $50 to Milton Keesee, as Paulina's share in the hiring out of "property"

31 For women's legal status and rights, see Marylynn Salmon, Women and the Law of Property in Early
the previous year: $109.50 to Robert Calvert for William Calvert (Jr.)
representing "the Bond Executed by George Keesee for . . . the hire of [William's]
property for the current year: $111 to Robert Calvert as Nancy's share; and $93 to Milton
Keesee (presumably for Paulina), representing "the bond of Lucy Calvert for which the
property of Polina Calvert hired for the Year 1825."

Meanwhile, the estate of the deceased William Calvert was being administered by
James Hill, who held a sale of property from the estate as part of his duties. In February
1827, the court ordered Robert Calvert to pay Robert Hill, who had recently married
Calvert's ward Nancy, her share of her deceased father's estate. Although part of the entry
in the court minute book is marked out, it appears that Calvert turned over to Hill $832
"and two negroes named Henry & Violet." Robert Calvert continued as William Calvert's
guardian, George Hill continued as James Calvert's guardian, and Milton Keesee
continued as Paulina Calvert's guardian.

At the January session of the county court in 1830, Jessee E. Hill and John Hill
petitioned the orphan's court to release them as securities on both Robert Calvert's and
Milton Keesee's guardianship bonds. They claimed to be "fearful" that Calvert and
Keesee would "mismanage" the estates of their wards. The court issued an order for
Calvert and Keesee to appear and, on August 30 and October 4, 1830, respectively, they
did so. Both released Jessee E. and John Hill and filed new bonds; Calvert's new
securities were James Hill and Blake Falkner, and Keesee's were his father, Thomas Keesee Sr., and his brother-in-law, James Calvert.\textsuperscript{32}

It is important to reiterate that, during all the actions in probating William Calvert's estate and in creating guardianships for his minor heirs, the bottom line was not physical custody of the minor heirs but, rather, was all about the protection of property. The guardian's job was to protect the financial interests of the minor children and, to some extent, to protect the financial interests of the family.\textsuperscript{33} Thus, the men involved in the administration of the estate were always drawn from within the family or very close friends so as to safeguard the property. The appointment of James Hill as administrator of the estate is an indication he was included within the range of effective kinship for the Calvert family—not surprising since he was married to the deceased's sister. The widow's new husband was apparently not deemed part of the range of effective kinship at that point in time, possibly because it was not uncommon for a new husband, who upon the marriage controlled his wife's assets, to fritter away or mismanage the property. The details of Calvert's probate are evidence of a family's use of the legal framework to conserve the assets of the family and to protect them from being siphoned away from the

\textsuperscript{32} The underlying reason for the Hills' concerns about the guardians is unknown, but was probably a disagreement over some element concerning the disposition of property. Although the closeness of kinship groups was often a benefit, this may be an example of the sometimes bitter disagreements that can erupt within families.

\textsuperscript{33} Guardians, administrators, and executors also personally benefited from their appointments—partially from fees paid to such agents out of an estate, but also from their temporary control of the property and their elevation in social status. See, Christopher Morris, \textit{Becoming Southern: The Evolution of a Way of Life, Warren County and Vicksburg, Mississippi, 1770–1860} (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1995), pp. 91–92.
family. Every person involved in the estate but one (Blake Falkner, security on a guardianship bond) was related to William Calvert's family; their service in the probating of his estate demonstrates their membership within the range of effective kinship. In other words, they were not just kin, but were kin in a meaningful way.

Naming patterns are another significant manifestation of close personal ties and can be used to locate the boundaries of effective kinship. There is no question that naming children for grandparents, parents, and aunts and uncles was the predominant pattern in the antebellum South—and in the Keesee kinship group. Milton and Mary (Calvert) Keesee, for instance, named their first son Thomas, presumably for Milton's father, and their second son William Calvert Keesee for Mary's father. Other names given their children were: Jane Hill Keesee (probably for Mary's paternal aunt); Lucy Rogers Keesee (for Mary's mother); and Mary McKnight Keesee (for Milton's mother). Thus there is evidence that the parents' nuclear families of origin were of primary importance, but that other kin (or family connections) also fell within the range of effective kinship for them.

Thomas Keesee Jr. and his wife Jane Caroline Green named their oldest son Robert C. Keesee (presumably Robert Calvert Keesee, for Thomas's brother-in-law); and

---

34 When Elizabeth R. Craft of Amite County, Mississippi, wrote her will in 1853, she named her brother guardian of her son, rather than appointing either her second husband (the son's stepfather) or any of the son's paternal relatives. She apparently put more trust in blood kin than in her husband or ex-in-laws when it came to protecting her son's inheritance. See Jennifer M. Payne, "Independent Minds and Shared Community: Married Women's Wills in Amite County, Mississippi, 1840–1919" (M.A. thesis, Rice University, 1996), pp. 35–41.
among their other children were Milton Keesee (for Thomas's brother), Thomas J. Keesee (his father and grandfather's name), William Fortenberry Keesee, John Hill Keesee (for one of the many John Hills who were neighbors and family connections of the Keesees in Alabama and in Arkansas), and George Keesee (for Thomas's brother George, although with a different middle name). Analyzing the names, Thomas and Jane evidently felt especially strong ties to their brother-in-law Robert Calvert and to his brothers Milton and George. But outside of Thomas's immediate family, we can infer an emotional bond with John Hill. Although it is not clear who William Fortenberry Keesee was named for, Absolom Fortenberry was a Cumberland Presbyterian minister who lived near the kinship group members in Saline County and Union County, Arkansas, in 1840 and 1850, respectively. Perhaps Thomas and Jane combined his brother's given name with a respected minister's surname or perhaps there was a William Fortenberry known and respected by the Keesees. Thomas and Jane had other children, but their names cannot be tied to specific namesakes at this time.

Mary (Keesee) Calvert and her husband Robert had the following children for whom namesakes can be ascertained with reasonable certainty: Mary M. (for her mother and grandmother, and/or for Robert's sister; her middle name might have been McKnight), Lucy (for Robert's mother), William (for Robert's father), Paulina (for Robert's sister), and Sarah Agnes (the "Agnes" might have been for Mary's paternal

35 Their other children were named Franklin, Nancy Caroline, and Louise Virginia Keesee. If these names were patterned on kin, I have yet to uncover their namesakes; Franklin may have been Benjamin Franklin and Virginia may have been in honor of the Keesees' state of origin, as it was not uncommon to name girls for states, e.g., Tennessee, Alabama, and Louisiana.
grandmother, the mother of Thomas Keesee Sr. or for Mary's sister Agnes).

Each of their known children was apparently named for close kin.

An examination of naming patterns throughout the kinship group would yield similar results. Although the most explicit message derived from these naming patterns is that parents, siblings, and grandparents had the tightest of bonds with an individual, there is evidence that other more distant kin were often significant in their lives—significant enough to name a child after. Furthermore, there are occasional clues that individuals who would not seem to be that close, based on the available evidence, must have maintained meaningful ties. For example, William Keesee Sr. (son of Thomas Keesee Sr.) and his sister Jane, married to Elias Jenkins, had not lived in the same state since about 1836, and yet, when William had another son in 1848, he named him "Elias Jenkins Keesee." Benjamin and Agnes (Keesee) Clardy named a son Smith Clardy, after the maiden name of his maternal grandmother. This and other such occurrences raise the question of how much contact family members maintained when they lived far apart and leads to the possibility that communication and possibly even visits were more frequent than previously believed—or it could merely indicate an affection and fond remembrance for certain relatives who were no longer part of parents' everyday lives.

Another interesting facet of names given to children in this era is the widespread custom of incorporating the given name and surname of the namesake into the names for both males and females. George West Murphy and his wife Mary Elizabeth (Clardy) Murphy named their first son "Robert Calvert Murphy," born in 1842, after Elizabeth's uncle by marriage, Robert Calvert. They did not merely name him "Robert," but, rather,
gave him the full name of his great-uncle. Similarly, when James Moore and
his wife Saryan (Clardy) Moore had a son born about 1851, they named him "Thomas
Keesee Moore" for Saryan's grandfather. Daughters, too, received full names as given
names: William Dudley Hargrove and his wife Charlotte (Chappell) Hargrove named a
daughter "Martha Wooding Hargrove" in 1821, for Charlotte's father's mother, whose
maiden name was Martha Wooding; Caleb Frayer and Elizabeth (Keesee) Frayer
named their daughter "Martha Burton Frayer" after Elizabeth's mother's mother, whose
maiden name was "Martha Burton;" and Etta Murphy Harrell was given not only her
mother's given name, but also her maiden name. This custom makes it crystal clear that
the names given to children were in honor of a specific person in the family and that the
honored name was not merely chosen for its harmonious sound. This usage was probably
even more extensive than can be shown here due to the difficulty of ascertaining a full
name for each member of the kinship group.¹⁶

These legal documents and naming patterns illustrate the intricate ways in which
the lives of these kinfolk were intertwined, even in the nascent phase of the kinship
network studied here. When it came time to post a bond, to choose a guardian, to
administer an estate, or even to get in trouble (as was the case with Milton Keesee and
George W. Hill), relations and connections were preferred. Although there were others
living in the same neighborhood, as illustrated by the plat of the area in Figure 2.3, the
important roles were almost exclusively filled by those within the family as
defined by antebellum southerners.

FROM ALABAMA TO ARKANSAS:

After a fifteen-year residence in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, the Keesees were
ready to move again. Arkansas had just become a state in 1836 and the federal
government was offering land cheaply. The combination of worn out cotton lands in their
present location, the availability of cheap fertile land, and the Panic of 1837 were no
doubt determining factors in the Keesees' and others' decision to relocate. During this
time, Thomas Keesee's son Milton and his son-in-law Robert Calvert headed to Arkansas
to scout out conditions there. They apparently found what they wanted in Saline County.
It had just been cut from Pulaski County the year before, was located just west of the
capital city of Little Rock on the Old Southwest Trail (also known as the Military Road),
necessitating only a short haul to ship cotton down the Arkansas River to the Mississippi
and thence to New Orleans, and it had plenty of good, well-watered bottomland along the
Saline River. It was just the type of land they seemed to prefer for growing cotton and,
perhaps, most importantly, was much like the soil, topography, and climate in Tuscaloosa

36 There is not sufficient evidence for me to claim this as a distinctly southern naming pattern, although
at least it is perceived so by some; when NBC reporter Campbell Brown explained the origin of her name,
she replied, "My full name is Alma Dale Campbell Brown. . . . Alma Dale was my great-grandmother's
name, and Campbell is my mother's maiden name. It's all very Southern." "Walter Scott's Personality
County, Alabama. Antebellum southerners showed a marked propensity for moving to areas quite similar to their previous area of residence.37

Milton Keesee and Robert Calvert either sent word or traveled back to the rest of the family in Tuscaloosa to let them know about the promise of this new area. By 1838, Thomas Keesee Sr. had arrived in Saline County, Arkansas, along with much of his extended family, many of his Alabama neighbors, and his Cumberland Presbyterian minister. Many other Tuscaloosa and Bibb Countians followed in two large wagon trains in 1841 and 1843 after economic conditions worsened, and they settled in Saline County among their former neighbors.

At the same time Thomas Keesee and most of his family were migrating to Saline County, Arkansas, son William Keesee migrated to Texas with the Chappells and Hargroves (his wife's family), and Thomas's daughter remained behind in Alabama with her husband Elias Jenkins, then later migrated to Mississippi. This split in the Keesee family provides us with clear corroboration of the essential nature of kinship groups— their boundaries are fluid, expanding and contracting depending upon time and circumstance, and upon the strength of emotional ties between the members. Determining causality for the splitting of the kinship group is difficult without personal testimony from the family members, but some speculation can be proffered. If one element was decisive, religion was probably that element. From the time William married

into the Chappell-Hargrove family, he resided among his wife's kin rather than his own. Although his family group was, for the most part, strongly Cumberland Presbyterian, it seems likely that William became a Methodist at the time or near the time of his marriage into that intensely Methodist family. Religion was often a major influence in the lives of antebellum southerners like William Keesee and as his wife's kin converged with the fictive kin group of his religious affiliation, the bond with them intensified, simultaneously loosening his ties to his birth family.

That is not to say William Keesee never again had contact with his own family. After he moved to Washington County, Texas, he had fairly frequent interaction with some of his brothers. When brother Milton Keesee died in 1860, for example, his death occurred in Washington County, presumably amongst his kin, although his wife and children were living at that time in Falls County and Milton's probate was administered in Robertson County, Texas, by his brother-in-law Robert Calvert. And William's brother Gideon murdered a man in Washington County in 1871, was sought out in Ellis County, Texas (where his brother Thomas lived), and returned to Washington County to serve his prison term.38

38 For date and place of death and for probate, see Loose Probate Packet, Milton Keesee, Robertson County, Texas; gives date of death as 10 March 1860, and states that Milton had no fixed domicile or residence; and, for alternate date of death, Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson; “Milton Keesee departed this life 12 March 1860;” and 1860 U.S. Census, Falls County, Texas (Population Schedule), National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) M653, R1293, Dwelling 202.
39 Texas State Police Files and Texas Penitentiary Files, Texas State Archives, Austin, Texas.
In Saline County, Arkansas, a major contingent of the kinship group settled and began to establish themselves. But even so, the Keesees and their kindred spread out over the landscape in several groups. George Polk Keesee settled in Davis Township with some of his Alabama neighbors and they established a Baptist church. Edward Calvert also settled in this neighborhood; although he was clearly related closely to Robert Calvert, George P. Keesee's brother-in-law, the exact relationship has not yet been established. In Saline Township, the 1840 U. S. Manuscript Census lists Benjamin Clardy; Milton Keesee; James Moore; Thomas Keesee, Jr.; James Hicks; Robert Calvert, and William Wharton, the Cumberland Presbyterian minister who migrated to Arkansas from Alabama with the Keesees and Calverts. Thomas Keesee Sr. was living in Owen Township, next door to his granddaughter Maryann Clardy and her new husband George S. Green. Earlier that same year, Thomas, a 62-year-old widower, married Malinda Bond, age twenty, the daughter of Richard Bond, a neighbor of Thomas's relatives in Saline Township. The next year, Thomas and Malinda had a daughter they named Virginia, and the following year, a son Benton. Gideon Keesee, Thomas's youngest son by his first wife, along with Gideon's wife and baby daughter, was living with Thomas and Malinda at the time of the 1840 census. 

[40 Billingsley, *Early Saline County, Arkansas, Records*, pp. 10, 12–15. Although the 1840 census only provided the names of the head of the household, the ages and genders of the additional people in Thomas Keesee Sr.'s household match those of his son Gideon's family. Moreover, Gideon does not appear elsewhere in this census as a head of household, although he definitely came to Saline County. He was listed as a captain of the 2nd Battalion, 18th Regiment, Saline County, Arkansas State Militia, in November 1842, with a notation that he had "removed from county"; *The Saline*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Sept. 1991): 114.]
Another method of determining the Saline County Keesee kinship
group's pattern of settlement across the landscape is by making use of county and federal
land records. Figure 2.4 illustrates where some of the major figures in the kinship group
owned land purchased in their early years of settlement in Saline County, Arkansas.
Many families belonging to the kinship group moved about 400 miles distant from their
former homes in Alabama and then settled within a few miles of one another in Arkansas.
And, just as they had in Alabama, they settled on the fertile lands near rivers and creeks
where cotton could be grown profitably.
Figure 2.4: Settlement Locations, Saline County, Arkansas: 1837–1843

Scale: Each square represents a section, i.e., 640 acres or 1 square mile.

Map Symbols: TK=Thomas Keesee; GK=George Keesee; Gid.K=Gideon Keesee; MK=Milton Keesee; EC=Edward Calvert; RC=Robert Calvert; WC=William Calvert; GSG=George S. Green; GWM=George West Murphy

---

41 This is a portion of the Saline County map from Blaisdell's 1919 Atlas of Arkansas (Little Rock, Ark.: F. L. Blaisdell, 1919), from a copy at the Arkansas History Commission, Little Rock. The locations indicated are approximate within each section of land; the owner did not necessarily own the entire section. The data are drawn from Saline County, Arkansas, Deed Record indexes, transcribed by Pauline Brown, Benton, Arkansas, and from Desmond Walls Allen and Bobbie Jones McLane's Arkansas Land Patents: Grant and Saline Counties (Conway, Ark.: Arkansas Research, 1991).
On the Move Again—to Union County, Arkansas and Texas

Over the decade of the 1840s, the Saline County kinship group's boundaries continued to grow and change—established groups lost members and new clusters of kin were created; there were births and deaths; marriages created new alliances. During this decade, some members of the kinship group began to look for new frontiers, and their gazes were drawn southward, to Union County, Arkansas. They had passed through this area in the 1830s, on their way to Saline County, and, moreover, their kinspeople and neighbors who followed them to Saline County in the early 1840s had also passed through the territory. They had seen the potential of the fertile soils and the river access. At that time, however, the county had been too undeveloped and under-populated to facilitate their success.

Besides their own experience and the experience of their neighbors, there was another significant line of communication at work in acquainting kinship groups with new areas—the network of religious communities. We tend to think of people in the antebellum era as cut off from knowledge of the wider world, especially in contrast to modern methods of communication, but antebellum southerners had access to significant lines of information through ministers and elders, as well as through social and political leaders. These groups, particularly ministers and elders, traveled more than we might think and brought home to their communities information about potential areas of settlement at the periphery. The Keesee's experiences in relocating to Union County, Arkansas, are a good example of the many potential lines of communication.
Many of the kinship group attended church together at Saline Congregation, a Cumberland Presbyterian church where William Wharton was the minister. In fact, the church was on Elder Robert Calvert's land, and presbytery meetings were occasionally held at his house. In the organizational structure of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, churches were under the direction of presbyteries, presbyteries were grouped into synods, and synods met in the General Assembly of the entire church.

Wharton first appears in Cumberland Presbyterian church records in 1840, when he appeared at the Arkansas Presbytery, held at Van Buren in Crawford County, Arkansas (about 150 miles northwest of Saline County); his ministerial credentials were accepted and Saline Congregation was brought into the presbytery. Over the next few years, Wharton attended meetings of the presbytery in Hempstead County (1842, 1844, and 1848), Hot Spring County (twice in 1843), Sevier County (1845), Ouachita County (1846, 1847, and 1848), and Union County (1847). Moreover, Wharton, like most ministers, held camp meetings over a large area, and he was appointed commissioner to the General Assembly in Lebanon, Ohio in 1847. Calvert attended a meeting of the presbytery in Dallas County, Arkansas (1845), as an elder representing his congregation and was appointed as an alternate to the 1848 General Assembly in Memphis, Tennessee.

---

42 Thomas S. Hickman, transcriber, "Minutes of the Mound Prairie Presbytery of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church 1842-1910," accessed on microfilm at the Historical Foundation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Memphis, Tennessee (hereinafter HFCPA), pp. 26 (February 1844), and 34–35 (February 1846).

This small sample from the records of one presbytery demonstrates how widely traveled some antebellum southerners were.\textsuperscript{44}

In much the same way, Masons visited other lodges and Masonic gatherings, while legislators and politicians traveled far and wide in fulfilling their duties. Ministers and lay leaders, members of fraternal organizations, and politicians were able to bring knowledge of other areas gained from their travels—and from their conversations with other travelers—back home to the community, where word of mouth distributed it far and wide. Whenever a group migrated, you can be sure they had gathered intelligence about their planned destination from a variety of sources.

Gideon Keesee might have been the first to move with his family to Union County in southern Arkansas, and many of his siblings and other kin followed him there. And, although the Hills did not migrate to Saline County, Arkansas, when the Keesees did in 1836–1837, they were once again neighbors of the Keesees and the Calverts in Union County, Arkansas, in 1850 and in Ashley County, Arkansas, in 1860.\textsuperscript{45} The families were apparently still closely associated as Thomas Keesee and John Hill posted a $20,000 bond together when they were co-securities for Union County Sheriff S. D.

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., pp. 19, 21, 23, 27, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, and 45. 
\textsuperscript{45} Bobbie Jones McLane and Desmond Walls Allen. \textit{1850 Census of Southern Arkansas}, (Conway, AR: Arkansas Research, 1995), pp. 100–101. For example, in Johnson Township, Union County, there were Hills enumerated in Dwellings 404, 416, 417, 429, and 495; Keesees and kin were enumerated in Dwellings 419, 425, 496, and 500. 1860 U. S. Census, Ashley County, Arkansas (Population Schedule), M653, R37, pp. 149 (John Hill, John L. Hill, James Hill). 152 (Gideon Keesee, John Hill). 155 (Thomas Keesee), and 156 (Ira Hill).
Drennan in 1850." It seems unlikely that the Keesees, Calverts, and Hills appeared simultaneously in a new area totally by coincidence; it seems more likely they were in contact and mutually considered this move. In Figure 2.5 below, taken from the 1850 census of Union County, Arkansas, members of the kinship group are listed. Their co-residence in the same county cannot be ascribed to a fluke; through more than thirty years and at least three moves, these families maintained their connections because these connections were important to them and because they were a significant component of their quality of life, both emotionally and socially.

46 "Union County Probate Records (1845–1855), Officers Bonds and Wills, Book A," Tracks and Traces, Vol. 9, No. 2 (November 1987): 67; Recorded October 27, 1850 in Will Book A, p. 198. This was probably Thomas Keese Jr. and John Hill Jr. since Thomas Keese Sr. generally appended the "Sr." to his name.
Figure 2.5: Union County, Arkansas, Kin

The following families were enumerated in Union County, Arkansas, in 1850. Each listing states the names and ages of each person in the household, the birth state of the first two individuals listed, the dwelling number, and the name of the township where they resided. In general, dwelling numbers that are consecutive or close together indicate the families lived near one another. The total white population of Union County in 1850 was 5,526, with five free blacks and 4,767 slaves. Following each entry are my comments about their relationship to the Keesees kinship group.\footnote{McLane and Allen. 1850 Census of Southern Arkansas. My thanks to McLane and Allen for supplying me with the book’s data file, from which these listings were copied. Note that there were other families not listed who were neighbors or the Keeses and/or Calverts in Alabama and in Saline County, Arkansas, but for whom I could not state a family relationship with any authority. For the population figures, see J. D. DeBow, Superintendent of the United States Census. The Seventh Census of the United State (1853: rpr. New York: Arno Press). p. 545.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{s/o=son of; d/o=daughter of; gs/o=grandson of; gd/o=granddaughter of; w/o=wife of}
\item \textbf{dwg = dwelling number (from the census)}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{QUARLES, Peter L. 24, Mary A. 18, Saml. F. 2, NEALE, Jack 26 AL/AL dwg 143, El Dorado twp}

Probably related to Samuel Washington Quarles, who was married to Paulina Calvert, the sister of Robert Calvert; and also to Lucy Elberta Quarles, the d/o Samuel Washington and Paulina (Calvert) Quarles, who m. James Montgomery Hill, s/o James and Nancy (McMath) Hill, and gs/o of James Jones and Jane (Calvert) Hill; this Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert’s paternal aunt.

\textbf{HILL, Wm. W. 25, Sarah A. 25, Mary 3, Margaret 1 LA/AL dwg 146, El Dorado twp}

Cannot identify but probably related to other Hills.

\textbf{HILL, Abel 36, Martha 17, Jno. 11 LA/TN dwg 147, El Dorado twp}

Cannot identify but probably related to other Hills.

\textbf{KESEE, Gideon 34, Martha W. 27, Mary C. 10, Wm. H. 9, Permelia A. 7, Pauline J. 6, George R. 4, Robert H. 2, SMITH, George 22, BRYANT, Wm. 25 TN/AL dwg 173, El Dorado twp}

Son of Thomas Keese Sr.

\textbf{HILL, Jesse 31, Cynthia 31, Rachel 20, Jno. W. 2 AL/AL dwg 204, Cornie twp}

Jesse Hill was the s/o Jesse and Nancy (Barnett) Hill; gs/o John and Elizabeth (Kyle) Hill; his aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert’s sister; his other aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert’s paternal aunt.
FORTENBERRY, A. 42, Mary 31, Henry C. 16, Elisha C. 13, Catherine 11, Mary 9, Wm. H.
6. D.C.R. 7/12 MO/IL dwg 327, Van Buren twp
Absolom Fortenberry was a Cumberland Presbyterian minister at churches attended by Keesees and Calverts; moved here from Saline County at the same time.

HILL, Jno. 40, Sarah A. 27, Alex 20, William 17, Jesse 11, Jno. 2 TN/MS dwg 404, Johnson twp
Cannot identify but probably related to Ira and John W. Hill, below.

QUARLES, H. G. 25, Eliza 20, Whitt 3, Cora 11/12, MILLER, James 30 AL/AL dwg 411, Johnson twp
Probably related to Samuel Washington Quarles, who was married to Paulina Calvert, the sister of Robert Calvert; and also to Lucy Elberta Quarles, the d/o Samuel Washington and Paulina (Calvert) Quarles, who m. James Montgomery Hill, s/o James and Nancy (McMath) Hill, and gs/o of James Jones and Jane (Calvert) Hill; this Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's paternal aunt.

QUARLES, W. W. 20, COOK, Ephraim 28, Tharmintha 22, Isabella 4, Susan 2, Clarissa 1 AL/AL dwg 415, Johnson twp
Probably related to H. G. Quarles, above.

HILL, Ira 31, Mary F. 27, Sarah A. 8, John E. 5, Wm. C. 3, Columbus 1 AL/SC dwg 416, Johnson twp
Cannot identify but probably related to John W. Hill who lives "next door"

HILL, John W. 32, Martha 32, Eliza J. 12, Jesse W. 10, William 8, Mary E. 5, Buenavista 3, Josephine 1 AL/SC dwg 417, Johnson twp
John W. Hill is the s/o Jesse and Nancy (Barnett) Hill; gs/o John and Elizabeth (Kyle) Hill; his aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's sister; his other aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's paternal aunt.

CALVERT, William 24, Alabama C. [m 19 Jul 1849, d/o Charles Cottingham, Bk A p 95] 17 AL/AL dwg 419, Johnson twp
S/o Robert and Mary (Keesee) Calvert; gs/o of Thomas Keesee Sr.

RUTHERFORD, George 31, Lucy E. 22, Robert C. 6, William T. 4, Mary 2, CALVERT, William Sr. 32.
FIRTH, Saml. 26, ELLIS, John 22 TN/AL dwg 425, Johnson twp
Lucy Ellen Rutherford is the d/o Robert and Mary (Keesee) Calvert; gd/o Thomas Keesee Sr.

HILL, Alex 26, Malinda [Greenwood, m 27 Mar 1845, Talladega Co. AL - PJG] 22, Virginia 4, Alabama 2 AL/AL dwg 429, Johnson twp
Alexander Hill was the above Jesse Hill's half-brother; the s/o Jesse and Malinda Hill; gs/o John and Elizabeth (Kyle) Hill; his aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's sister; his other aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's paternal aunt.

HILL, Jno. 46, Rachel 45 TN/GA dwg 495, Johnson twp
John Hill was probably the John who was a s/o John and Margaret (Stover) Hill; gs/o John and Elizabeth (Kyle) Hill; his aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's sister; his other aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's paternal aunt.

KEESEE, Thos. 44, Jane [Caroline Green m 1826 Tuscaloosa Co. AL - PJG] 43, Milton 13, Thos. 11, Louisa 9, Elenor 7, Wm. 5, Jno. 2, Patience 9/12, MORRISON, Wm. 28, WALKER, Joseph 35 TN/SC dwg 496, Johnson twp
S/o Thomas Keesee Sr.
KINARD, Martin L. 31, Sylva 29, William D. 8, Rebecca A. 6, Lorina A. 4, George 3, Charles
2, LIGHTSEY, Adam 25, Jno. 23 SC/SC dwg 499, Johnson twp
Probably related to C[harles] W. Kinard below; Martin Kinard, like the Keesees and Calvert, was
from the Tuscaloosa/Bibb County, Alabama area previous to his residence here.

HAMMONS, E. A. 28, Ann S. 18, T. F. 21 TN/AL dwg 500, Johnson twp
Annastasia S. (Keesee) Hammond was the d/o Thomas Keesee Jr.; gd/o Thomas Keesee Sr.

KINARD, C. W. 33, Elizabeth P. 26, Sarah F. 7, George W. 5, Jno. M. 2, Mary E. 7/12 GA/AL dwg 505,
Johnston twp
Elizabeth P. (Hill) Kinard was the d/o John and Margaret (Stover) Hill; g/so John and Elizabeth
(Kyle) Hill; her aunt Jane (Calvert) Hill was Robert Calvert's sister; her other aunt Jane (Calvert)
Hill was Robert Calvert's paternal aunt.

KEESEE, Thos. D. 23, Martha 20, Wm. G. 2 AL/AL dwg 550, Lapile twp
S/o Milton Keesee; gs/o Thomas Keesee Sr.

BENNET, Henry L. 43, Jane M. 43, Albert L. 15 TN/KY dwg 555, Lapile twp
Henry L. Bennett and Jane M. (Logan) were the parents of Mary E., who m. William Calvert
Keesee ca. 1848. William Calvert Keesee was the s/o Milton Keesee; g/so Thomas Keesee Sr.

QUARLES, Mary 49, Carl M. 6, Nancy 81 GA/GA dwg 579, Harrison twp
Probably related to the Quarles above.

KEESEE, Thos. 72, Malinda 30, Va. 9, Benton 8, BOND, George A. 21 VA/AR dwg 596, Harrison twp
Thomas Keesee Sr. with second wife, son Benton, and b-i-l George Bond

GREEN, George S. 37, Mary 25, Francis P. 9, Jno. E. 7, Elias D. 5, Benj. C. 3, George W. 2, ALLEN, Jno.
18 SC/AL dwg 598, Harrison twp
Mary Green is the d/o Benjamin and Agnes (Keesee) Clardy; gd/o Thomas Keesee Sr.

HAMMON, Richard 64, Sarah 60, Woodson N. 21 VA/NC dwg 686, Wilmington twp
The parents of E. H. Hammond above, the husband of Anastasia Keesee.

HAMMON, James M. 35, Caroline 24, Alemeda J. 3, Benj. F. 1 TN/MS dwg 688, Wilmington twp
Probably related to Richard and Sarah Hammond, above, and to E. H. Hammond, above, the
husband of Anastasia Keesee.

COTTINGHAM, Charles 50, Elmira 30, Alfred 21, Elvira 17, Walter 12, Elizabeth 10, William 1 TN/AL
dwg 691, Wilmington twp
Father of Alabama (Cottingham) Calvert, w/o William Calvert

PUMPHREY, J[ohn] R. [s/o Jesse - PJG] 46, Martha [Dorrough] 45, Jno. 16, Mary A. 13, Louis 11,
Dennis 7 GA/KY dwg 840, Franklin twp
Distantly related to the Keesees by marriage; they were neighbors in Alabama and in Saline
County, Arkansas. There were other also related Pumphreys, not listed here, in this county.
But not all members of the overall Keesee kinship group went to Union County, Arkansas. Evidently George Polk Keesee was happy where he was and remained in Saline County, Arkansas. His father Thomas Keesee Sr. sold his son his 1,520 acres of land when he left the county. George died in 1864, intestate, with a large estate to be settled. Thomas Keesee's son-in-law and daughter, Benjamin Clardy and his wife Agnes (Keesee), moved a few miles southwest of Saline County, into Hot Spring County, Arkansas, and never again migrated. George Polk Keesee's daughter Elizabeth, who had married James A. Hicks in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, then migrated to Saline County, Arkansas with the rest of the family, moved south into Columbia County, Arkansas ( contiguous to Union County), as did her sister Emelia Manda Keesee, who had married Daniel Leech in 1840 in Saline County.

George West Murphy and his wife Mary Elizabeth Clardy, who was Thomas Keesee Sr.'s granddaughter, briefly moved to Union County, Arkansas, with the kinship group, but then settled across the state line in Union Parish, Louisiana, as did his brother-in-law James Moore, who was married to Mary's sister Saryan Clardy. They maintained ties with the larger family, however, naming their children for family members: Murphy's first child, a son, was named Robert Calvert Murphy, and Moore named sons Thomas Keesee Moore and William Calvert Moore. George West Murphy joined the Union

---

48 The part of Saline County where George Polk Keesee lived became part of the new county of Grant in 1869.
49 "Thomas Keesee Sr. to George Keesee Deed." (Acknowledged in Union County, Arkansas, November 6, 1854) Saline County Deed Book D, pp. 421–422, Office of the Saline County Clerk, Benton, Arkansas.
County Masonic Lodge with his relatives, Hamilton G. Quarles, George W. Rutherford, Gideon Keesee, George S. Green, Milton Keesee, and William Calvert.50

William Calvert, a young man not yet of age, the son of Robert and Mary (Keesee) Calvert, went to Union County, in company with many of his relatives, taking a group of his father’s slaves with him to help him establish himself. There, in 1849, he married Alabama Cottingham, the sixteen-year-old daughter of a local small planter. His parents, however, moved directly to the Brazos River bottoms in Robertson County, Texas, from Saline County, Arkansas, about 1852, and their son William along with his young family soon joined them there. Also accompanying the Calverts to Robertson County were their son-in-law George Washington Rutherford and his four young children (the Calvert’s daughter Lucy Ellen died in Saline County in 1851); their daughter Paulina Jane, her husband Joseph Tom Garrett, and their young children; and their daughter Mary M. with her husband Dr. Peter H. Smith and their first child. The Calvert kin group settled just up the river from Mary (Keesee) Calvert’s brother William Keesee, who had been in Washington County, Texas, since 1837. Brother Milton Keesee and his wife, Mary (Calvert) Keesee, along with their children moved to Robertson County also, leaving Union County, Arkansas behind. Before long, Milton bought land on the west side of the Brazos, across from his brother-in-law, in Milam County. The Cumberland Presbyterian minister William H. Wharton, who had ministered to the family since their residence in Alabama, also moved with Robert Calvert to Robertson County, where he

preached at a church built by Calvert's slaves on Calvert's land. A portion of the Saline County kinship group had separated from the main body, but by the mid-1850s in Robertson County, Texas, had formed a good-sized group of kin centered around Robert Calvert.

In 1864, toward the end of the Civil War, another of Thomas Keesee Sr.'s sons, Thomas Keesee Jr., moved his entire family to Robertson County, Texas, joining his brother-in-law and sister (Robert and Mary Calvert) there. Family lore describes how Thomas Jr.'s sixteen-year-old son John Hill Keesee, in order to escape conscription into the Confederate Army, hid under a big washpot artfully placed upside down at the top of goods stowed in the wagon. In part, the move was probably an effort to protect their

---

51 After Robert Calvert died, the railroad finally came though Robertson County, but passed a few miles from the town of Sterling where Calvert's lands and the church were located. Sterling was abandoned in favor of the new town on the railroad (named "Calvert" in honor of Robert Calvert) and the Cumberland Presbyterian church was deeded to church trustees and physically moved to Calvert, where it remains today. See Texas Official Historical Medallion on church, photograph in possession of author; "Calvert Grave Site" at http://www.rits.com/reg/calvert/cagrave.htm; and "Heirs of Robert Calvert to Cumberland Presbyterian Church," Robertson County, Texas, Deed Book O. pp. 498–499, dated 31 January 1868.

52 John Hill Keesee's great-granddaughter Barbara Scott Wyche of Richmond, Texas related this piece of oral history to me in conversation with her November 1, 2000. Evidently he was hidden because of his young age rather than any antipathy towards the Confederacy; his father Thomas Keesee Jr. was a private in the Johnson Township [Union County, Arkansas] Home Guard (see Jamie Rhyan Armour, comp., "From Union County, Arkansas Court Record Book E, 1853-1866," Tracks and Traces, Vol. 5, No. 1: 38); and according to the Confederate Pension Application of John Hill Keesee's brother Thomas J. Keesee (Texas #2915), both Thomas J. and brother Milton S. Keesee served in the same company, i.e., Company G, 1st Arkansas Mounted Rifles, CSA, during the Civil War (see affidavit in file by brother G. S. Keesee). The washpot is still in the family.
slave property. After two years, when the war was over, they moved northward into Ellis County, Texas.\textsuperscript{13}

Robert Calvert’s daughter Mary M. (Calvert) Smith was widowed in 1861 and married again in 1864 to the Reverend W. G. L. Quaite, a Cumberland Presbyterian minister. After the death of Robert Calvert, her father, in 1867, she, along with her new husband and children, went with her maternal uncle Thomas Keesee Jr. to Ellis County, even though her mother remained in Robertson County and lived out her life among her other children and grandchildren. Mary M. and Quaite had one child, then divorced; she married a third and final time in Ellis County and died there in Waxahachie in 1889. During the almost sixty-five years she lived, through three marriages, Mary M. was never far from close kin.\textsuperscript{14}

Thomas Keesee Sr.’s youngest child from his first marriage, Gideon, born about 1816, had begun life in Tennessee, came to adulthood and marriage in Alabama, and followed his family to Saline County, Arkansas. By 1842, he had migrated to Union County, Arkansas, with his family and his slaves. After his wife died in 1859, he and his

\textsuperscript{13} See Shiloh Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Navarro and Dallas County, Texas, 1847–1872: Ovilla Community, Midlothian, Texas, Ellis County [transcribed Shiloh Cumberland Presbyterian Church minutes] (Lawrenceburg, Tenn.: Buffalo River Chapter NSDAR, 1978–79), p. 42: 2\textsuperscript{nd} Sabbath [14\textsuperscript{th}], July 1867: “Received into cong. Bro. Thomas Keesee [sic] and his wife sister Keesee by Recomm. C.P.C. Texas.” This transcription was examined at the Historical Foundation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Memphis, Tennessee.

\textsuperscript{14} At about the same time the Thomas Keesee Jr. family moved into Ellis County, Texas, Jesse Ellis Clardy and family also moved there. He was the first cousin twice removed of Thomas Keesee Jr.’s sister’s husband, Benjamin Clardy III. Jesse Ellis Clardy had taken a completely different migration path: from South Carolina (where the Keesees and Clardys lived before moving to Tennessee, Alabama, and Arkansas), Jesse had moved to Florida. There is not adequate evidence at this time, one way or another, to ascertain whether or not Jesse Ellis Clardy had contact with family and family connections that prompted him to choose Ellis County, Texas.
children all joined their relatives in Washington County, Texas—Gideon's brother William and his family were living there, as were his deceased wife's Hargrove and Chappell relatives. In 1874, Gideon was imprisoned for murder; the trial took place in Washington County although he was arrested in Ellis County, where his brother Thomas Keesee Jr. lived. Each move or event in Gideon's life took place alongside or in the vicinity of kin; although he had a wide-open field of choices, he always chose to live his life within (and even to "hide out" with, when he was in trouble with the law) the kinship group.

---

55 Due to "the ill health and extreme age of the convict, and doubts existing as to the correctness of his conviction . . . ." Gideon Keesee was pardoned by Governor Coke and discharged on 5 May 1875. In his record, it is also noted that his left arm was paralyzed. Nothing is known of his whereabouts after his release but he probably died shortly thereafter. Letter dated 29 Aug 1871 to TSP officer, Lt. Clayburn Johnson, Texas State Police Papers, and Giddeon [sic] Keesee, Texas Penitentiary Files, both at Texas State Archives, Austin.
Figure 2.6: Gideon Keesee, born ca. 1816, died after 1875
Son of Thomas Keesee Sr. and Mary [McKnight?]
Figure 2.7: Keesee Kinship Group Migrations, 1778–1870
SUMMATION:

The county and federal records, the patterns of migration and settlement, and the naming patterns demonstrate some of the ties of kinship at work in the lives of the Keesee Family and demarcate the shifting borders of effective kinship. Moreover, these instrumental ties of kinship multiplied exponentially to include the families whose children married into the families into which the Keesees married. The Hills, for example, who were related to the Calverts several different ways, had no direct ties of kinship to the Keesees in any record yet found, yet the two families' actions were those of members in a common kinship group because both the Hills and the Keesees shared a mutual kinship with the Calverts. The Hills were bound tightly to the Calverts, and the Calverts were bound tightly to the Keesees—the result was a co-mingling of all three families in their everyday lives. For antebellum southerners, the range of effective kinship was broad enough to encompass family connections beyond those defined merely by blood or by marriage relationships.16

When this study opens, Thomas Keesee Sr. and his children moved into the Tuscaloosa/Bibb County, Alabama, area and the kinship group can be fairly well defined as it developed in the neighborhood where they settled and lived for almost two decades. As they migrated and as Thomas Keesee Sr.'s children married and had children and

---

16 Throughout this study, "connection" is used to denote a non-blood relationship in opposition to "kinship," which denotes a blood relationship, directly or through a spouse. Based on present knowledge of these families, no relationship through blood kin can be traced between the Hills and the Keesees; only through a mutual blood relationship with the Calverts did the Keesees and the Hills become bound—thus, the Hills and Keesees were "connections" rather than true kin. Nevertheless, antebellum southerners often honored connections as true kin relationships as is demonstrated here.
grandchildren of their own, the boundaries of the kinship group proved permeable and flexible. As his children married and formed their own nuclear families, more connections were forged with other kinship groups—some of these connections proved meaningful while others less so. At the same time, some portions of the group remained in place as other parts moved on, sometimes breaking the bonds of kinship, but, more often, attenuating them somewhat. Some members of the group choose a different religious affiliation and moved away from segments of their previous kinship group as they formed closer bonds with other groups.

But although the Alabama kinship group split and reformed over time and space, none of their moves or changes took place outside of a group of kindred. Their lives virtually always played out within the context of a kinship group. The boundaries of each group were affected by proximity, by interdependence within the group, by births, deaths, and marriages, and by religious and economic choices. These metamorphosing boundaries were not always obvious or entirely clear or entirely discernable, either to the present-day researcher or to the contemporary members. As the needs of the individuals comprising the group shifted, so too did the perimeters of each group—and, for each individual, the perimeter was erected according to the needs of that particular individual. Clearly, the identity of each member of the kinship group had its foundation in a kin group membership.

The conclusions drawn by this study clearly oppose those of Jane Turner Censer in her study of antebellum southern migration. She posited that the primary impediment to western migration by elite North Carolinians tempted by the "almost unparalleled
economic opportunities" to be found in the West, "was the threat to an
institution they highly prized—the family, especially the extended family. Generally they
decried the attenuation of kinship ties that migration would cause." It seems evident that
the family was just as important to the Keesee kinship group studied here as it was to
Censer's North Carolina planters; rather than eschewing emigration, however, the
Calvert-Keesee group demonstrates that many planters kept the family largely intact by
migrating as a group. On the other hand, Censer found that when migrations did take
place, although economics rather than family might have been the motivation, the
migrations were "built upon a network of friends and family already established in the
West."\textsuperscript{57} The Calvert-Keesee kinship group certainly can serve as a prime exemplar of
that insight.

However, although Censer never actually defined what she considered "family,"
she mentioned only parents, children, and siblings, with an occasional reference to "other
kin."\textsuperscript{58} The Calvert-Keesee kinship group demonstrates an interest and involvement in
family beyond parents, children, and siblings.

Similarly, Joan E. Cashin misses the mark in her book, \textit{A Family Venture: Men
and Women on the Southern Frontier}. Billed as a work that is "[s]ensitive to questions of
gender, race, and class," Cashin could have deepened her insights considerably had she
chosen to incorporate kinship into her categories of analysis. Instead she investigates
family roles and argues that young men redefined "the male sex role, . . . [to emphasize]\
\textsuperscript{57} Censer, "Southwestern Migration among North Carolina Planters." 418.
\textsuperscript{58}Ibid., 410.
the fulfillment of a man's personal goals at the expense of his obligations to
other human beings," and thus they "ensure[d] their independence" by escaping the
family rather than by being "submerged in it." She found the "kinship networks of the
Southwest [to be] . . . imperfect and incomplete," and "nuclear households became the
norm." "In contrast to seashore families who lived surrounded by kinfolk, Southwestern
families lived near a few relatives or non at all. The planter family was reduced to its
nuclear core."59

Although families might very well, indeed, have been living in nuclear
households in the antebellum South, the spin Cashin puts on this fact fails to hold up in
the face of the large numbers of kin who were neighbors on the southern frontier, no
matter how far or how often a family moved. Cashin writes of the distances households
on the frontier were from one another and backs this up with evidence showing an
Alabama's planter's neighbors "lived at least a mile from their new plantation." A mile is
not a significant distance at all—a short 5,280 feet; it can be walked in less than fifteen
minutes and, with a horse or mile, ridden in far less time.60 The neighborhood studies
presented above, in conjunction with analyses of the records, demonstrate the close ties
maintained by members of the kinship group even while living dispersed across a
neighborhood in predominately nuclear family units. This chapter and subsequent

University Press, 1991), jacket blurb by Catherine Clinton, (first quotation), 32 (second, third, and fourth
quotations), 79 (fifth and sixth quotations), and 80 (seventh quotation).
60 On a good day, if the wind is just right, a strong-voiced person can just about hollar loud enough to be
heard a mile away; and, if the ground is fairly open, covered perhaps by cotton fields, a person can see
another house a mile away—or at least, the smoke from the chimney of that house.
chapters subvert Cashin's thesis conclusively; the evidence proves quite forcefully that, while the men described in this dissertation "saw migration as a shortcut to wealth," they obviously were not "try[ing] to escape the intricate kinship networks of the seaboard." To the contrary, they recognized that their success was dependent on their inclusion within a group of kin.

Nor were young men the only heads of families migrating to the cotton frontier. As this study shows, Thomas Keesee Sr. was about forty-three when he moved to Alabama, fifty-nine when he moved to Saline County, Arkansas, seventy when he moved to Union County, Arkansas, and almost eighty when he moved to Ashley County, Arkansas. Similarly, Robert Calvert was a fairly young man of thirty-four when he blazed the migration trail from Alabama to Saline County, and fifty when he moved to Robertson County, Texas. And Thomas Keesee Jr. was sixty-three when he made his final move from Robertson County, Texas to Ellis County, Texas. Many more examples could be proffered to show that migration was not exclusively, or even mostly, a young man's venture.

The complicated pattern of migration for the kinship group as a whole is difficult to comprehend in its entirety. A "splinter" group might move away from the main congregation of kin, from location "A" to location "B"; ten years later, another splinter from the main group in location "A" might join the original splinter group in location "B"; and at the same time, or a few years later, yet another splinter group might join with

---

61 *ibid.*, pp. 34 (first quotation), and 4 (second quotation).
members of the first splinter group in location "C". This constant splintering and reformation occurred many times while, concomitantly, births, deaths, and marriages were continuing to change the contours of the overall kinship group. While most of a kinship group eventually migrated to another location, there was usually a part of the family that chose to stay behind. 

The boundaries of subgroups expanded and contracted, formed and reformed according to a myriad of factors, including migration and resettlement. This complexity is the main factor in obscuring the underlying kin relationships from researchers of the antebellum South. Without reconstructing the genealogy of neighbors in a particular area for previous generations, it is all but impossible to comprehend that so many permutations, migrations, and marriages from decades (or even a century or more) in the past have all but obscured the fundamental ties between apparently unrelated people. By

---

62 The story of such a family can be found in Edward Ball's Slaves in the Family, which gives an excellent sense of the grand sweep of the ebb and flow of the Ball family kinship group—the group that stayed in one location as other segments moved on. The Ball family of South Carolina are descendants of an Elias Ball, who emigrated from England in 1698 and became the progenitor of a large family of prosperous rice planters, who persisted as a kinship group, many remaining in the same area, well into the twentieth century. They intermarried (with a distinct preference for first cousins), which tightened the bonds between many members of the family; as some were born, others died. Some groups moved away, particularly at the time of the American Revolution when the Tory members of the family fled to England after residence in American became untenable for them; but there was always a group that remained. As the cast of characters changed over the generations, the essential element—the kinship group—remained, self-conscious of their Ball identity and reinforcing it through intermarriage as well as stories, letters, documents, and family portraits passed down through the generations. At the same time, as the author reveals, the black slaves on those Ball family rice plantations formed kinship groups that fluctuated over time, subject not only to births and deaths, but to forced relocation—and, as the title of Ball's book makes clear, to mingling with the white kinship group. The entire narrative sweep of the book reveals the changing composition of the kinship group vis-à-vis its persisting nature over centuries in a striking fashion. Edward Ball, Slaves in the Family (New York: Ballantine Books, 1998). Although I have little doubt that there is at least the possibility that some members of the Keesee kinship group were little different from members of other planter groups in siring children with slaves, I have not been able to uncover any explicit evidence pointing to a mingling of the black and white families.
connecting only those who share a surname, historians are missing the bulk of the kinship group. Once those obscured ties are revealed, migration as well as settlement patterns can be examined in a new light.

Just as kinship groups were not static entities, nor were they deterministic—members of kinship groups were not passive participants. They had agency in their choice of a marriage partner, in their decisions about where to live, in their options for religious affiliation, and in their political and economic arrangements. When Thomas Keesee Sr.’s son William became a Methodist and married into the Chappell family, he choose a closer relationship with his wife’s family over his own. He demonstrated this by migrating and settling close to his in-laws, even though his blood kin made a migration move at about the same time to similar land. And, although he still had contact with his own kin, he lived among and attended church with the kinship group to which he’d shifted his loyalty. The various decisions made by antebellum southerners determined the parameters of their own group of effective kin, but life decisions were virtually always affected by their membership in a group of kin.

And, conversely, the kinship group was not a collective enterprise. The emphasis of the members was, for the most part, on individual success or gain, not on the needs of the whole as if it were some type of socialist collective. In his seminal work *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, Claude Lévi-Strauss extended M. Mauss’s theories of reciprocity. In "The Gift" ["Essai sur le don: Forme et raison de l’échange dans les sociétés archaïques," Mauss theorized that the basis of human society was an absence of
war and, to maintain that state, groups exchanged goods and services (gifts) in a system of reciprocity. Lévi-Strauss extended that theory to include marriage as the exchange of women between groups as a way of cementing alliances. Although marriage in the antebellum South certainly was not as ritualized as in the societies Lévi-Strauss used as illustrations, the basic principle still holds—once two families have exchanged children via marriage between the two offspring, an alliance is perforce created between those two families. Since most families had more than one child, the result of the marriages of all their children is an interconnected grid of kinship between groups of families, i.e., a kinship group.63 That does not mean, however, that the needs of the group take precedence over individual members of the group; it means that members of the alliance, i.e., the kinship group, privilege insiders over outsiders in many ways.

Given the membership of antebellum southerners in these kinship groups, it is impossible to truly examine either migration or settlement patterns without taking kinship into account. Even that intrepid individualist Daniel Boone, "the embodiment of American possibility." was accompanied by kin on his initial foray into the wilderness of Kentucky, and brought his wife and children, members of his kinship group, and even members of his wife's kinship group to settle on the new lands. His most esteemed

---

63 Claude Lévi-Strauss. The Elementary Structures of Kinship [Les Structures élémentaires de la Parenté], ed. Rodney Needham, trans. James Harle Bell and John Richard von Sturmer (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), Chapter V: The Principle of Reciprocity. Note that antebellum southerners did not "exchange" women in ritualized ceremonies fraught with social implications in quite the same manner as did, for example, the Nambikware Indians of western Brazil described by Lévi-Strauss.
biographer describes Boone's life as "enmeshed in relationships of extended family." The story of southern migration and the resultant settlement patterns is the story of groups rather than individuals, and telling the story completely calls for using genealogical methodology to identify groups whose dynamics were based on kinship, the locus of which, at least in antebellum southern society, was marriage—the exchange of children between families. These bonds between families formed the social capital that facilitated successful migration, settlement, prosperity, and even at times, survival.

---

64 John Mack Faragher, Daniel Boone: The Life and Legend of an American Pioneer (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1992), pp. 71, 90–91 (migration with family), 341 (first quotation), and 73 (second quotation). In the service of full disclosure, Daniel Boone is my first cousin, six times removed, i.e., his father and my great-great-great-great-grandfather were brothers. My ancestor, however, did not go to Kentucky with Boone.
CHAPTER THREE: KINSHIP AND RELIGION

The incorporation of religion into studies of the antebellum South has always been essential. Religion and church membership were major influences on individuals, on families, on communities, and on southern society as a whole. The Great Revival, which swept through the South between 1800 and 1805, launched "[a]n evangelical pietism [that] came to characterize southern religion and as such contributed significantly to that perhaps amorphous outlook labeled 'the southern mind'."1 Combining kinship studies with investigations of religion can bolster our understanding of antebellum southern society by complicating and enriching our comprehension of religion, its intrinsic meaning in the lives of individuals, and its effects on southern culture. Kinship played a causative role in the religious lives of antebellum southerners.

Churches challenged the family as the leading organizational factor in the lives of antebellum southerners.2 Yet, in many ways church and family were often so interwoven to be all but indistinguishable and, therefore, reinforced one another rather than vied

for control of society. Churches were most often neighborhood-oriented, and these neighborhoods were composed of a tangled array of kinspeople; the result was that the local congregation and the local kinship group had an overlapping constituency. Moreover, an individual's choice of religious affiliation was often based on the religious affiliation of his or her family, perpetuating the admixture and co-mingling of congregation and family group. A more surprising situation revealed by my research is that the ministry of the various Protestant denominations was also tremendously interconnected by family ties, which increased the blurring of the lines between the sacred family and the secular family.

Church membership can be seen, in fact, as yet another type of kinship. The individual members of a congregation consider themselves fictive kin—brothers and sisters through the shared paternity of a common God. This fictive kinship is further demonstrated through religious terminology: by nuns, who become the "brides" of Christ and are called "sisters," led by a "mother superior," monks called "brother," and priests called "father." Baptists call their ministers "brother," as in "Brother Jones"; and southern evangelical denominations often refer to fellow congregants as "brother" and "sister." Religious groups often refer to themselves as "children of God" and God is referred to as "Our Father, who art in Heaven."

This sacred kinship, acting in combination with the secular kinship of the biological and social family, adds another overlay of connection in some instances, and, in others, supplants family kinship. And because family ties and church ties are often congruent, overlapping groups, it is sometimes difficult to separate the two. In

---

2 As argued in greater depth elsewhere, most of the elements of everyday life fell under the dominion of the
ante bellum southern society, the tapestry of kinship was woven throughout virtually
every sphere—economics, politics, and community composition—but perhaps nowhere
was it integrated as completely as in the realm of religion because of the synergy between
sacred and secular kinship.

Based on my study of the Keesee kinship group, the denominational affiliation of
a person’s family is one of the most significant determinants of that individual’s choice of
denomination; that is, for ante bellum southerners, an individual’s choice of
denominational affiliation is most often predicated on his or her parents’ denominational
affiliation. It is ironic that what seems to be one of the most personal of decisions might,
in reality, be somewhat predetermined. Yet common sense dictates that the
denominational beliefs and form of worship introduced to people as children and
reinforced throughout their adolescence, would become the denomination most
transparent and comfortable for the adult.\(^3\) The family unit powerfully combines the two
most significant influences in the development of an individual—genetic predispositions
and environmental influences, or, in the shorthand of modern psychology, nature and
nurture.

But although ante bellum southerners had a tendency to retain the religious
affiliation of their nuclear families, it was not at all unusual for some catalyst to
intervene, effecting a change. A clergyman’s powerful preaching at a camp meeting, for

\(^3\) I am trying to avoid the more polemical term “indoctrination” here, but the fact of the matter is that most
of the “choices” in one’s life are dictated to a certain degree by culture and environment, rather than
rational, conscious thought. This is not to say, however, that many people did not, and do not, break out of
these molds to make their own individual choices. If you grow up eating southern cooking, more than likely
that is the type of food you will continue to eat and are most comfortable with but does not mean you will
never try Chinese or Mexican food or that you will not make a conscious choice to find another style of
cooking as your default mode.
example, was often a fomenter of change. An individual who was Methodist might move to an area where the only organized church was Baptist and, thus, might join the church at hand. Marriage, however, was probably the most common catalyst. Two people of different religious affiliations marrying created an intersection of change. In keeping with the general paternalistic environment of the antebellum South, we would perhaps expect to find that the wife was more likely to follow her husband's lead, even in such a profoundly personal issue as religion. Cornelia Pond Jones, a woman of the planter aristocracy and the subject of Lucinda H. MacKethan's *Recollections of a Southern Daughter: A Memoir by Cornelia Pond Jones*, changed her lifelong affiliation with the Presbyterian Church to the Episcopal Church when her husband converted. In recounting the events of her life to her daughter, she explained her own conversion: "Your father having decided to leave the Presbyterian Church, I thought it best to go with him by Dr. Axson's advice. . . . This was a most important step in our life, and we have always been glad we took it, and that we had the opportunity of bringing up our children in the Church."\(^4\) Although it's fairly clear that Pond was willing to entrust the status of her immortal soul to her husband's judgment (after consulting her kinsman and minister)—despite the fact that the church she was leaving had been her family's church for quite some time—we do not know what prompted her husband's change of churches. It seems

\(^4\) Lucinda H. MacKethan, ed., *Recollections of a Southern Daughter: A Memoir by Cornelia Pond Jones of Liberty County* (Athen, Ga. And London: University of Georgia Press, 1998), pp. xxxii, and 60 (quotation). Dr. Axson was Cornelia's former minister, officiated at Pond's wedding to her husband about seven years previously, and was related to her by marriage; pp. 115–116.
evident that Pond placed great weight on a unified front for the sake of her marriage and for her children.

In another example, Methodist preacher John Haynie was baptized in 1786, as an infant, in the Virginia Episcopal Church of his parents. His family moved to Tennessee when he was a boy,

and subsequently his parents united with the Methodist Church. In his twentieth year he was married to Elizabeth Brooks. "On the 9th of August, 1809 [at the age of 23]." Haynie says, "I rode out to the field to shoot some squirrels, and while trying to get a shot at one suddenly this thought struck me with force—There is one who watches all your actions with more care than you watch that squirrel.' Instantly all my sins passed in review before me. I had at the same moment such a view of the holiness of God as I never had before. My limbs trembled; immediately I clasped my hands together and cried for mercy." He returned home in such great distress of mind that a fever ensued which threatened to cut short his life. He was at one time tempted to commit suicide. Soon thereafter while in the field on his knees in an agony of prayer he was gloriously converted. In the same year while attending church he joined and had his wife's name put down, "as we always go the same way," he said. He went home and told her what he had done. She was struck with conviction and about a week later was converted while the family were [sic] at prayer. In June, 1811, Haynie was licensed to preach.5

Husband and wives who "always [went] the same way" in matters of religion were no doubt common, but it was not always the wife who followed the husband's lead.

Charles Lewis Bullock, an Arkansas planter, "was a strong Presbyterian but [his wife Sara Jane Shepard] was a great Methodist . . . . [Bullock] attended the Methodist church regularly while he lived in Tennessee and when he reached Arkansas, joined Manchester Church of that denomination until he could 'do better,' as he said." Later Bullock helped build a new Methodist church that he attended with his family. Although seemingly

content to attend a church of a different denomination than his chosen one, which might indicate his religious views were not that strongly held, he was, in fact, a very religious man—his daughter recalls him having "family prayers" for the family and slaves every morning and night. Obviously there were cases where circumstances influenced a man to join his wife's denomination rather than the other way around.⁶

Then, to complete the pattern of possible permutations is the example of the marriage of John H. Vincent and Mary Raser, discussed in Anson West’s *A History of Methodism in Alabama*. Vincent, a descendant of a French Huguenot family, was born in 1798 in Pennsylvania and came to Alabama as a teenager with his family. Mary Raser was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the daughter of a sea captain who died in the West Indies when she was only two and of a mother who died when Mary was but ten. Orphaned, she came south with her two brothers and met Vincent through one of her brothers. Although Vincent was raised a Presbyterian and Mary a Lutheran, they married in 1821 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, and then both joined the Methodist Episcopal Church of Tuscaloosa, where they were involved members for many years. In 1837 they returned to Pennsylvania, where their son, also named John H. Vincent, was first licensed by the Methodist church to exhort in 1849, and, in 1850, was licensed to preach, eventually becoming a Methodist bishop. Another son, B. F. Vincent, also became a Methodist preacher in Pueblo, Colorado. For some reason, John H. and Mary (Raser)

---

⁶ Margaret Jones Bolsterli, ed., *A Remembrance of Eden: Harriet Bailey Bullock Daniel’s Memories of a Frontier Plantation in Arkansas, 1849–1872* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1993). pp. 11–12 (for information about the Bullocks), and 37 (quotations). See pp. 27–28 for Charles L. Bullock’s religious upbringing. His parents were not members of any church although his mother had been baptized in the Episcopal Church, but two cousins with whom he had a close relationship were Presbyterians, and perhaps this influence led Bullock to join the Presbyterian Church.
Vincent both surrendered the denominations of their childhoods and together became committed Methodists, launching two sons into the Methodist ministry.7

Drawing from the Keesee kinship group data, we find a situation similar to that of Cornelia Pond Jones's. Martha Wooding Hargrove was born in December 21, 1821, in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, the daughter of William Hargrove and Charlotte Chappell, both resolute Methodists, and she was the granddaughter of the Reverend Dudley Hargrove, a Methodist minister. According to Martha's obituary, she became a member of the Methodist church of her family when she was sixteen; but when she married, she "joined her husband in the Cumberland Presbyterian church."8 Martha's family background in Methodism could not have been more pronounced, and yet she switched denominations upon her marriage, to "go the same way" as her husband and to form a united family unit.

Martha's husband, Gideon Keesee, was the youngest son of Thomas Keesee Sr. and his first wife Mary, and he was probably raised in the Cumberland Presbyterian faith of his parents. The first evidence of the Keesee family's religious affiliations are records pertaining to their arrival in Saline County, Arkansas, between 1836 and 1838.

after the kinship group left Tuscaloosa and Bibb Counties, Alabama:

---


The Presbyterians began church work [in Saline County] in 1838, and in that year founded an organization four miles south of Benton. Rev. William Harland [sic, Wharton] was pastor, and Robert Calvert, Thomas Keesee, Jr., and Gideon Keesee, ruling elders. The society was called "Saline Congregation," and for a time flourished, but finally went down. It was reorganized at Benton, in 1851, by Rev. John F. King, pastor, and F. Leech, Robert Calvert and John Lindsey, ruling elders.9

Thomas Keesee Jr. and Gideon Keesee were brothers, both sons of Thomas Keesee Sr., and Robert Calvert was their brother-in-law, married to their sister Mary "Polly" Keesee; Finis Leech was a brother of George Polk Keesee's second wife. The ruling elders at the time of the church's first organization were all close kin—not surprising since it was an in-migrating group of kin that prompted the creation of the new Cumberland Presbyterian church—an example of the frequent overlapping of kinship group and church memberships.

9 Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Pulaski, Jefferson, Lonoke, Faulkner, Grant, Saline, Perry, Garland, and Hot Spring Counties, Arkansas: A Condenses History of the State, a Number of Biographies of Distinguished Citizens of the Same: a Brief Descriptive History of Each of the Counties Above Named, and Numerous Biographical Sketches of Their Prominent Citizens (Chicago: Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1889; rpr. ed., Easley, S.C.: Southern Historical Press, 1978), p. 240 (hereinafter Goodspeed, Central Arkansas). Although this source names Harland as pastor, there is no trace of anyone with this name. William Wharton, on the other hand, is known to have been a Presbyterian minister in this community and is mentioned often in the records between 1839 and 1850. See, for example, the marriages Wharton performed in George Akins and Leon Rowland Moore, transcribers, Saline County, Arkansas, Marriage Records, Books A-B-C-D-E. 1836–1885. (Benton, Ark.: Saline County History and Heritage Society, Inc. [hereinafter SCHHS], 1999), pp. 1–11, and 13–14. For more information about early Saline County churches, see Opal Cloud, "Early Devotion in Saline County," Arkansas Democrat (Little Rock), September 17, 1961, Magazine, p. 9.
William Wharton, the Cumberland Presbyterian minister mentioned above, is not known to be related to the Keesees, but his spiritual kinship with Robert Calvert was evidently as strong as if it were a "blood" relationship. Wharton was in Bibb County, Alabama, with the Keesees and Calverts, traveled to Saline County, Arkansas, with them, pastored their church and ended up with Robert Calvert and kin in Robertson County, Texas. Wharton wrote his will in 1861, "commend[ing] his soul to the great Architect of the Universe, and [his] body to the hope of a glorious resurrection," and he appointed his lifelong "friend," his fellow Mason, and member of his congregation Robert Calvert as his executor. His tertiary choice for executor was "some responsible brother" selected by their church, and ended up with Robert Calvert and kin in Robertson County, "the three principal officers of the Masonic lodge nearest to the place of [his] domicile at the time of [his] death." Wharton's decision, choosing a person to carry out the important duties for his family at the time of his death, makes it clear that Robert Calvert was within Wharton's range of effective kinship, although Calvert was not a "real" relative. Wharton and Calvert's lifelong association as friends, leaders of their church, and Masons created a kinship among them and, although it was a form of fictive kinship, its effects were real to the two men.

The Masonic ties educed from Wharton's will are indicative of yet another type of fictive kinship at work in the lives of antebellum southerners—fraternal organizations. In almost every case, the men of the Keesees kinship group belonged to Masonic groups.

---

usually the same lodge, and often were the founders of lodges in their new residences. In Union County, Arkansas, for example:

Polk Lodge, A.F.&A.M., located at Hillsboro, was organized November 7, 1849, with the following roster of officers and charter members: The list includes Hamilton G. Quarles, J.W.; G.W. Rutherford, Sec.; Gideon Reese [sic Keesee], Treas.; H. C. Pratt, G. S. Green, M. Reese [sic Keesee], W. Calvert, G. W. Murphy.11

Milton and Gideon Keesee were brothers; William Calvert was their nephew by blood, George W. Rutherford and George West Murphy were their nephews by marriage. Their exact relationship to Hamilton G. Quarles is unknown, but one of William Calvert's aunts was a Quarles. The Pratts and the Greens were two families that were with the Keeeses and Calverts in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, moved also to Saline County, and then moved into Union County, Arkansas, with them as well. Joab Pratt was the Baptist minister who brought most of his congregation to Arkansas with him and pastored the church of which George Polk Keesee was a member. Hillary Cole Pratt—the H. C. Pratt above—was the grandfather of Mary Cole Pratt who married one of George West Murphy's sons in 1903 in this same county. George S. Green—the G. S. Green above—was married to a granddaughter of Thomas Keesee Sr., who was also a niece to Milton and Gideon Keesee and a cousin of William Calvert's. Eight men with seven different surnames founded the Masonic lodge in Union County, but all were united by ties of kinship. Without the genealogical background research, any student of fraternal organizations (or churches) misses the rich texture of connections among the members.

Too often, historians rely on mapping relationships based only on the sharing of last

11 Goodspeed's Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Southern Arkansas, p. 825.
names. By incorporating genealogical methodology into the toolbox of history, we can
mine a deeper layer of relationships in the Old South.

Some of the Keesee kinship group were Baptists. In December of 1837, shortly
after their arrival in Saline County, James A. Hicks and his wife Elizabeth (Keesee)
Hicks joined Spring Creek Baptist Church, and seven months later, Elizabeth's father
George Polk Keesee (a son of Thomas Keesee Sr.), along with three of his other children
and one of his daughters' fathers-in-law, joined the same church. In 1841 a huge wagon
train composed of many of the Keesees' kin and former neighbors from Alabama arrived
in Saline County, Arkansas, along with their pastor Joab B. Pratt, a Baptist minister. They
settled near the Keesees and founded Philadelphia Baptist Church. In 1842 George
Keesee and his family moved their membership from Spring Creek Baptist Church to join
their old friends and neighbors (and, often, kin) in the new church in their neighborhood.
Descendants of George Keesee were still being buried in the Philadelphia Baptist Church
Cemetery into the 1990s.¹²

Benjamin Clardy III was also part of the Keesee kinship group.¹³ He was born
about 1797 in Pendleton District, South Carolina, and married Thomas Keesee Sr.'s
daughter Agnes about 1822 in Alabama.¹⁴ The Clardys and the Keesees might have
known each other since the colonial era. Both families have a tradition of immigrant
ancestors who were Hugenots, both lived in the same vicinity in Virginia, then moved to

---

Association, 1974 Minutes and Yearbook* (Little Rock, Ark.: Pine Bluff Missionary Baptist Association,
1975), pp. 20–25; and Cloud, "Early Devotion in Saline County."

¹³ Clardy is pronounced CLAIR-a-dee. The designations "I," "II," and "III" were not used by the men
named Benjamin Clardys, but were adopted by researchers in order to differentiate the three generations.

¹⁴ They probably married in Pickens County, which was cut from Tuscaloosa County about the time of
Clardy's marriage. Marriage records for this time period are not extant.
South Carolina shortly before 1790—George Faris Keesee, along with his son Thomas to Greenville and Spartanburgh Counties and Benjamin Clardy II's family to adjacent Pendleton County (all three counties were in the Ninety-Six District of South Carolina).\(^{15}\)

By 1817 Thomas Keesee Sr. lived on property adjacent to Richard Smith Clardy, one of Benjamin Clardy III's brothers, in Franklin County, Tennessee. Family tradition says Benjamin worked for Keesee as a farm laborer before marrying Keesee's daughter Agnes about 1822. When Thomas Keesee's family moved to Tuscaloosa and Bibb Counties, Alabama, he and Benjamin patented adjacent tracts of land at the same time. Clardy continued to follow his father-in-law when the kinship group moved to Saline County, Arkansas, about 1837. But about 1838, Benjamin Clardy—now a mature man in his 40s—parted ways with his father-in-law; the Clardys relocated to Hot Spring County, just a few miles southwest of Saline, and in the 1840s, Keesee moved into south Arkansas.

Now a resident of Hot Spring County, Arkansas, Benjamin Clardy donated land to establish a Baptist church in his new location.

According to research and reference given by descendants, Francois Baptist Church is . . . about five (5) miles north of Malvern. The land was owned by Benjamin Clardy and upon request of his young daughter, Jennie Clardy who asked her father to have a Baptist Church erected and a Cemetery site given, he carried out her wishes by taking his slaves and clearing four (4) acres for this purpose. Jennie passed away in 1843 and

\(^{15}\) For Clardy family presence in South Carolina, see Pendleton County, South Carolina. Deed Book B, pp. 178–180, and 269–270, Ge Lee Corley Hendrix, comp., *Pendleton County, S.C., Deed Books A & B* (Greenville, S.C.: 1980). These deeds, dated 1793, indicate Benjamin Clardy II owned land on the Saluda River as early as 1789. Benjamin Clardy II was also enumerated in Pendleton District, S.C., in 1790. George Faris Keesee was in Greenville District, S.C., in 1790, and his son Thomas Keesee, Sr., now married and in his own household, was enumerated in Spartanburgh District, S.C. in 1800. Note that the county lines were changing during this period—Thomas Keesee was living on his father's farm, which he bought when his father moved to Tennessee, but the land which was in Greenville County in 1790 was in Spartanburgh County in 1800. For the evolution of counties in South Carolina, see William Thorndale and William Dollarhide, *Map Guide to the U. S. Federal Censuses, 1790–1920* (1987; reprint, Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1988), pp. 297–305.
was buried in this, then new, cemetery. The slaves later on were buried in here too. Her father, Benjamin died 1875. He is also buried there.

The cemetery was given the same name as the Church, and has been kept through the church from the beginning to the present time.

With a presbytery of three men, Samuel T. Cobb, William G. Frost, and Davidson Cunningham and thirteen (13) members, they gave the Church the name Sardis. In 1859 the name was changed to Franceway, later on was spelled Francois [pronounced Franceway]. . . .

Clardy’s separation from the Keesee kinship group provides yet another example of how the boundaries of kinship groups constantly changed. If every individual related by kinship remained closely bound to all the other relatives, kinship groups would become unwieldy and too large to be meaningful. Instead the boundaries were delimited by the needs and desires of individual members—they maintained connections with those who fell within their range of effective kinship or created new offshoots as circumstances changed. For whatever reasons, Clardy split from the main kinship groups followed here. The most likely reason is his religious affiliation: since Clardy was Baptist, he might have become closer to the fictive kin of his Baptist congregation than to his wife’s true kin, who were mostly Cumberland Presbyterian. The decision of George Polk Keesee, eldest son of Thomas Keesee Sr. and Clardy’s brother-in-law, to remain in Saline County when other kin left might have also been motivated, at least in part, by the difference in religious affiliation. Like Clardy, Keesee was Baptist and formed a close association with other Tuscaloosa-Bibb County Baptists who moved into Saline County, especially after his children intermarried with fellow congregants. A secondary reason for both Clardy
and Keesee might have been a conscious decision to abandon the life of planters on the make. Unlike other members of the kinship group who constantly moved to the cotton frontier, seeking wealth through cotton and slavery, both Clardy and Keesee choose to remain in the same area when their relatives moved on. Although they were both slave owners, they were evidently content with their status as yeoman farmers raising cotton and other crops with only a few slaves.

Clardy's brother-in-law William Keesee, the sixth of eight children born to Thomas Keesee Sr. and his wife Mary, was—or became—Methodist. He was probably raised in the Cumberland Presbyterian faith of his parents and converted at the time of his marriage. Born in 1809 in Tennessee, he moved as a boy with his family to Tuscaloosa County, Alabama. In 1828, in Tuscaloosa County, he married Mary Jane Chappell, born in 1810 in Tennessee, the daughter of Robert Wooding Chappell and Mary Tittle. The Chappells, like the Keesees, were in Halifax County, Virginia, in the colonial and early republic eras and migrated to Tennessee in the early 1800s. By the 1820s, they too were in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, where Mary Jane married William Keesee. Her sister Charlotte "Lottie" Chappell married William Dudley Hargrove¹⁷ in 1820, probably in Pickens County, carved out of Tuscaloosa that same year, and William and Lottie Chappell's daughter Martha Wooding Chappell married William Keesee's brother

---

¹⁶ "History of Francois Missionary Baptist Church," Headstone History: Cemetery Inscriptions, Hot Spring County, Arkansas, Vol. III. (Malvern, Ark.: Hot Spring County Historical Society, 1979), p. 77. William G. Frost was, or became, a Baptist minister. See Bobbie Jones McLane, Hot Springs County, Arkansas, 1860 United States Census (Hot Springs. Ark.: Arkansas Ancestors, 1989), p. 54, which lists Frost's occupation as Baptist Clergyman, born about 1795 in South Carolina, living in Dwelling 357, Ouachita Township, Hot Spring County.

¹⁷ William Dudley Hargrove's father, Dudley Hargrove, was a Methodist minister. See West, A History of Methodism in Alabama, pp. 154–158.
Gideon, mentioned above. In other words, Gideon Keesee married his brother William's niece by marriage, the niece of Gideon's sister-in-law.

But whereas Gideon's Methodist wife converted to Cumberland Presbyterianism when she married him, William Keesee became Methodist, probably when he married into the Methodist Chappells and Hargroves. And, in 1837, when his own family moved to Arkansas, William instead migrated with his wife's family to Washington County in the Republic of Texas. It could be argued that the religious ties William and Mary (Chappell) Keesee had in common with her family trumped his ties to his own family, none of whom were Methodist.

During the early years, when Texas was part of Mexico, Anglo settlers were technically forbidden to practice Protestant religions, although there were sporadic incursions by ministers of Protestant denominations. Macum Phelan, in his A History of Early Methodism in Texas, 1817–1866, claims that William Stevenson, a Methodist minister, was "the first preacher to enter Texas." In 1837, just after Texas Independence, a host of members of the Keesee kinship group—more properly, perhaps, members of the Chappell kinship group which included an offshoot of the Keesee kinship group—moved to Washington and Austin Counties, Texas (part of the original Austin Colony), led by Robert Wooding Chappell, whose daughter was married to William

---

18 The early marriage records for Pickens County, Alabama, are not extant. For county formation and availability of county records, see The Handy Book for Genealogists, 8th ed. (Logan, Utah: Everton Publishers, Inc., 1991), p. 9. For the marriage date in Pickens County, see Winfield Notebook, citation to Mrs. Irma Haynie Haynes, Beaumont, Texas.

19 Phelan, A History of Early Methodism in Texas, p. 15, and passim for background on the restrictions on religion in Texas during Mexican rule and the development of the Methodist denomination in Texas during republic and early statehood eras.
Keesee, son of Thomas Keesee Sr.\textsuperscript{20} Chappell entered a claim for land in the new republic as did Keesee.\textsuperscript{21} Of little relevance but of interest is the fact that William Keesee transacted the business of buying land on Christmas Day, which might mean the antebellum southerners' sensibility about the holiday differed from our modern sensibilities in some ways.

And despite the assertions of some southern historians that those who migrated to the cotton frontier were usually younger men escaping the tight bonds of family, that "individual nuclear families became isolated on the frontier," and that "women were left without the sustenance of their female kinfolk," here is yet another example of a family patriarch leading the move of a large kinship group, replete with female kinsfolk, which my study shows to be the norm. Robert Wooding Chappell was about 55 when he moved

\textsuperscript{20} For proof of the various kinsmen's early presence in Texas, see the following records: William Keesee bought 1034 acres (part of the Lawrence League) for $2058 from David Gilleland, 25 December 1837 and one of the witnesses was Keesee's brother-in-law James Chappell, Deed Book B, p. 15; William Keesee bought 300 acres (partly in Austin County and on Caney Creek) for $900 from James Stephens, also on 25 December 1837, and also witnessed by his brother-in-law, Deed Book B, p. 275; Robert Chappell was the witness to his son James's purchase of 200 acres (part of Miller's League) for $600, February 9, 1838, Deed Book D, p. 166; and Robert Chappell purchased 100 acres (part of the Kuykendall League), for $400, February 13, 1840, Deed Book D, p. 208—all in Joyce Martin Murray, \textit{Washington County, Texas, Deed Abstracts, 1834–1841, Republic of Texas and State of Coahuila and Texas (Mexico)} (Dallas, Tex.: by the author, 1986), pp. 39, 58, 103, and 105.

\textsuperscript{21} For Keesee's land, see Joyce Martin Murray, \textit{Austin County, Texas, Deed Abstracts, 1837–1852, Republic of Texas and State of Texas} (n.p., 1987), p. 25, Certificate #124, for 320 acres, entered December 5, 1838, at the Land Office of Austin, Texas. See also Texas General Land Office, File Houston-255. Certificate #68, issued to William Keesee July 5, 1838, stating that Keesee "appeared before us the board of land commissioners, for [Washington County], and proved to our satisfaction that he arrived in this Republic, subsequent to the Declaration of independence, and previous to the 1\textsuperscript{st} October 1837, that he is a married man and entitled to twelve hundred and eighty acres of land to be surveyed after the first day of August 1838." Copy of papers in possession of author. For more information (although not reliably accurate), see Worth S. Ray, \textit{Austin Colony Pioneers, Including History of Bastrop, Fayette, Grimes, Montgomery and Washington Counties, Texas} (1949; rpr. Austin and New York: Pemberton Press, 1970), pp. 43–45 (Chappell Hill), 77 (Robert W. Chappell), 43, 137 (Keesee), 114, and 118 (Hargrove).
to Texas with his large extended family—and he even brought his elderly widowed mother with him.22

There was activity by Methodists in this area even before the kinship group arrived but they participated in religious life from their earliest years of settlement in Washington County. An Austin County deed dated April 26, 1839, records the purchase of some land on the "[north] bank of Piney Creek below the campground" to the "Trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church (John Wesley, Henry James Stephison, Robert W. Chappell, Henry Mathews, Ralph Graves, Junr., Josiah Crosby, Wm. Gant, Edward S. Coblee, and Madison M. Davis."23

In 1843 there was "a great camp-meeting" at Cedar Creek, probably on Robert Wooding Chappell's land. This meeting marked the beginning of the rise of the church there, which was destined soon to become one of the most important appointments in Texas. Among the first settlers of that community were the families of Stevenson, Hubert, Chappell, Hargrove, Kesee [sic], Reavill, King, and others. all Methodists. The great camp-meeting of 1843 commenced at Cedar Creek, the then name of the place [near what would later be the town of Chappell Hill], on October 19. There were eleven preachers present, among whom were Clark, presiding elder, [John Wesley] Kenney, [Chauncey] Richardson, [Robert] Alexander, [John] Haynie, [Orceneth] Fisher, [Josiah W.] Whipple, [John W.] DeVilbiss and [Homer S.] Thrall. Nearly all of the giants of that day were there, and of the preaching 'we have never heard it excelled,' says Thrall.24

Cedar Hill, later supplanted by the nearby town of Chappell Hill when it came into existence, was often referred to as a "center" of Methodism for the area. When the eighth session of the Texas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church met from December 29, 1847, through January 3, 1848, "[t]he sessions were held in the second story of Father Chappell's new house, three miles distant from Cedar Creek."^25

The kinship group continued to worship in the Methodist faith and along with others set up the Chappell Hill Male and Female Institute in 1850, on land donated by Jacob and Mary Elizabeth (Hargrove) Haller (a granddaughter of Robert Wooding Chappell). William Keesee was a member of the first Board of Trustees for the Institute, and, along with nephews Alexander Hargrove and Jacob Haller, was also a trustee of the church. ^26 After the Methodist Church acquired another adjacent lot in 1852, the female students were housed separately in a new building and the school was reorganized as Chappell Hill College. In 1853 a correspondent reported that the school was prospering, with "about ninety pupils" and that "[a] new church [was] expected to be completed before the end of the year."^27 Although the school's original charter stipulated a non-denominational school, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South took control of the school in 1854. Soule University was established in Chappell Hill in 1856, and the female half of the former institute became the Chappell Hill Female College. ^28

---

^26 Winfield and Winfield, All Our Yesterdays, pp. 10.
^27 Phelan, A History of Early Methodism in Texas, p. 352
In 1853 a membership list for Chappell Hill Methodist Church registered fifty-two white male members, fifty-six white female members, and eighty-nine "Coloured Members." Of the fifty-two white male members, nine were close kin:

William Keesee (a widower, who served as Class Leader and Steward)
Son-in-law of Robert Wooding Chappell
George W. [sic, Marion] Keesee
Son of William and Mary Jane (Chappell) Keesee
Grandson of Robert Wooding Chappell
Robert W[ooding] Keesee
Son of William and Mary Jane (Chappell) Keesee
Grandson of Robert Wooding Chappell
Thomas [Milton] Keesee (Probationer)
Son of William and Mary Jane (Chappell) Keesee
Grandson of Robert Wooding Chappell
Gideon Keesee (Probationer)
Son of William and Mary Jane (Chappell) Keesee
Grandson of Robert Wooding Chappell
William Keesee, Jr. (Probationer),
Son of William and Mary Jane (Chappell) Keesee
Grandson of Robert Wooding Chappell
J. A. Hargrove (single and a Steward)
Son of William Dudley and Charlotte (Chappell) Hargrove
Grandson of Robert Wooding Chappell
James Chappell
Son of Robert Wooding Chappell

and six were slaves belonging to William Keesee—Cubit (who "drinks"), Franky, Jimmy, Sarah, Joe, and Missouri (Probationer). The membership list demonstrates the close relationship between religion and kinship—kinship played a huge role in the religious choices made by antebellum southerners. Children habitually followed the lead of their parents and other kin in making decisions about religious affiliation and, in doing so, perpetuated the close linkage between the kinship group and the fictive kinship of churches.

Although Chappell Hill also had Baptist, Episcopal, and Presbyterian churches in the antebellum era, none of the brief histories mention any of the familiar names of the Chappell-Keesee kinship group, except for a mention of Robert W. Hargrove, one of the sons of William Dudley Hargrove and a grandson of Robert Wooding Chappell, who was a trustee of the Episcopal Church in 1851. This reinforces the argument that the secular and the sacred family were often all but indistinguishable from one another because of their synergistic qualities. Moreover, it demonstrates that the Chappells, Keesees, and Hargroves in Washington County, Texas, had choices about which church to attend, but most often were influenced by kinship in their decisions about religion.

This tangled conflation of church and family is wonderfully illustrated in William Oates Ragsdale's *They Sought a Land: A Settlement in the Arkansas River Valley, 1840–1870*. Ragsdale describes the founding of the Pisgah community in Pope County, Arkansas, by two groups of Associate Reformed Presbyterians, most of whom were Scots or Scots-Irish. The families in these groups "were remarkably homogeneous" and were "bound by many ties of family kinship." In fact, "[s]ome of the families had known each other and had ties before they came to America, for the most part in the eighteenth century. Here, their kinship lines became inextricably mixed as a result of the families' long close association on the Carolina and other frontiers." Over a thirty-year period, the church members, who had formed a dissenting sect after 1789, emigrated from the historical center of the ARP Church—adjoining counties on the border of North Carolina and South Carolina—and joined friends, relations, and other members of their church in Arkansas. Although their major motivations centered on acquiring fertile new lands in

---

sufficient quantities to ensure their children's material comfort, their desire to form a community composed of their sacred kin was a strong factor in the communal migration. As Ragsdale puts it, they wanted to "build a community that would foster the temporal and spiritual well-being of their children."\textsuperscript{31}

However, although Ragsdale had centered his analysis on the groups' shared religion, he could just have easily based it on kinship. The shared church denomination was the organizational center of the move and of the resultant new community, but shared kinship was the foundational element in their communal cohesion and was a direct and causative factor in the creation of the clannish congregation. What Ragsdale describes is the prototypical migration pattern of kinship groups, couched as religiously motivated rather than driven by the concerns and priorities of kinship. In this recursive and self-reinforcing process, the sacred family reinforced the secular family while the secular family reinforced the sacred family, making the constituent substances of the group opaque and virtually inseparable. But, whether one regards religion or kinship as the primary motivation, the key here is that group migration provided the support and social capital that enabled migrants to survive and to succeed.

In summary, Thomas Keesee Sr., a committed member of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, had eight children with his first wife. Of those eight, five sons and three daughters, there was one daughter, Jane (Keesee) Jenkins, and one son, Milton Keesee, about whom no information about religious affiliation could be found. Among

the other six children of Thomas Keesee Sr., three followed their father's training to remain Cumberland Presbyterians, two became Baptist, and one became a Methodist.

The example above is about average, based on data compiled for the entire Keesee kinship group: children were inclined to follow their parents' lead in their choice of religious denomination, but a strong religious experience could lead an individual to another denomination. The strongest factor in changing religious affiliation, however, was marriage—marriage served as the most significant nexus of change. And, although there might be a slight tendency for wives to follow their husbands' lead in religious choices, there were as many factors involved in that decision that a reliable prediction cannot be made. Furthermore, since kin tended to stick with kin, even as members of a particular denomination tended to stick together, in most cases, these two tendencies acted together to create a pattern of interconnecting relationships among secular and sacred kin and blur the boundaries between the two.

Another way of examining the contours of connection between the sacred and the secular family in antebellum southern society is to examine the clergy of the various Protestant denominations in the antebellum South. On the one hand, as Christine Leigh Heyrman asserts, the preachers of most denominations

bespoke the evangelical conviction that the obligations to kin must give way before duty to God. No other claim could take precedence over saving oneself and warning others of the wrath to come—to fall under the sway of family attachments was to invite spiritual disaster.32

76. The distinguishing factor in the sect's dissent was "its recognition of the biblical Psalms as the only suitable hymns."
Ministers gave their spiritual mission a higher priority than the importance placed on family commitments by most citizens of their society. Instead of plowing a field or harvesting the crop, a preacher was often riding a circuit or studying his Bible in preparation for a sermon, or spending the Sabbath in service to his congregation instead of with his family, playing the traditional role of southern patriarch.  

On the other hand, bonds of secular kinship within the religious community often connected preachers to each other. An astonishing degree of intermarriage created a separate layer of kinship among the ministry. In much the same way that children grow up with a predisposition to follow the religion of their parents, ministers' sons were often disposed both by temperament and training to follow in their fathers' footsteps and, when they married, it was not at all unusual for them to find a wife from among the daughters of other men of the cloth—women already acclimated to the lifestyle of the ministry.

In her study of Baptist and Methodist clergymen over three generations in 1800s Virginia, Beth Barton Schweiger found and documented this tendency of preachers' sons to follow their fathers into the ministry. She writes:

Many [young Virginians] who entered the antebellum ministry did so with the blessing of their fathers, who were preachers themselves. The tendency of some Virginia clans to become identified with the ministry for several generations increased over the course of the nineteenth century. Where one-third of the men ordained before 1850 were pastors' sons, half were preachers' sons by the end of the century. At least twenty-eight father-son pairs appear among the pastors studied here, in addition to six families in which more than one brother became a pastor. Joseph E. Potts, ordained in

---

33 An investigation of this disjunction between a man's responsibilities as head of a family and as a clergyman would be another way of opening a window of understanding about kinship and about gender relations in the antebellum South. A minister's wife had to take on many of the roles normally assigned to husbands, while husbands were excused, to some degree, in making service to their God a higher priority than their obligations to their families—at least, in theory.
1853, saw all four of his sons ordained into the Methodist ministry. His brother, too was a pastor. . . .

The sons of pastors grew up in homes ruled by piety and the rhythm of the church year. Children observed firsthand the trials of the ministry—calls in the middle of the night, disputes over doctrine and church policy that dissolved into personal quarrels, the often-demeaning dependence on the congregation for a salary. Yet they also knew the peculiar rewards—annual "poundings," when congregations showed their appreciation with barrels of food and clothing. the esteem in which preachers were often held, the security that grew out of pastors' assurance that their work was significant. Preachers' sons grew up with fathers who embodied a masculine piety in a society where religious sentiment was often associated with women. Their fathers also knew, often personally, professors and senior pastors who might smooth the young candidate's path. 34

Samuel King fits the mold of Schweiger's clergymen. He was born in North Carolina in 1775, the son of a Revolutionary War veteran, and became one of the men instrumental in the founding of the Cumberland Presbyterian denomination. His parents were Presbyterian, and King was raised in that faith. He became a Presbyterian minister, and was one of the three ministers who met in Dickson County, Tennessee, February 4, 1810, to form a new presbytery breaking away from the mainstream Presbyterian Church over a disagreement about the educational requirements of ministers and other matters of doctrine. King, along with the Reverend Finis Ewing, the Reverend Samuel McAdow.

34 Beth Barton Schweiger, The Gospel Working Up: Progress and the Pulpit in Nineteenth-Century Virginia (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 20. See also the tables in the Appendix, pp. 197–208, for Schweiger's compiled statistics on topics such as "Father's Profession." Thanks to colleague Charles A. Israel for bringing this work to my attention.
and the newly ordained Ephraim McLean, five licensed preachers, and eight candidates "were the fathers of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church."  

King married Anna Dixon and they had ten children, five of them sons and five daughters. One daughter married the Reverend Daniel Patton, one of the Cumberland Presbyterian ministers who came together to create Barnett Presbytery at Lexington, Missouri, in 1828. Patton first met his future father-in-law when he was eleven years old and he related the story many years later in his history of the C. P. Church in Missouri. He wrote:

[Samuel King] was preaching in my father's house, in Bedford County, Tennessee, to a crowded company, when my father professed faith in the blessed Savior. I saw father passing through the crowd clapping his hands and praising God, and many others doing the same...  

King had three sons who became Cumberland Presbyterian ministers like their father. One was the Reverend Finis Ewing King, named after Finis Ewing, another of the "fathers" of the C. P. Church. Finis E. King came to Texas from Missouri in 1846 and became the minister at Shiloh C. P. Church in Ellis County, Texas—the same church

---

35 For biographical information about King, see the Cumberland Presbyterian Church Historical Society web site at http://www.cumberland.org/hfcp/minister/kingS.htm, accessed December 2, 1999; and for the formation of the CP Church, see E. B. Crisman, Origin and Doctrines of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (St. Louis: Perrin and Smith, 1977), especially p. 43–44 (quotations on p. 44); B. W. McDonnold, History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (Nashville: Board of Publication of Cumberland Presbyterian Church, 1888), and Hill Encyclopedia of Religion in the South, pp. 188–189.  
36 McDonnold, History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, pp. 185–186.
where Thomas Keesee Sr.'s son Thomas Keesee Jr. and his family were members from
the time of their arrival in Ellis County in the 1850s to the present day.\textsuperscript{37}

The Reverend Samuel King had a nephew named Robert McGee King, born in
Sumner County, Tennessee, in 1812, who also became a Cumberland Presbyterian
minister. Robert McGee King was the son of Samuel's brother William King and was
orphaned as a boy. He was raised by his father's sister and her husband, John Bell. Two
of John Bell's daughters married Cumberland Presbyterian ministers. Furthermore, two of
Samuel King's brothers-in-law, James Farr and William McGee, were also C. P.
ministers. When Robert McGee King's first wife died, he married Sarah H. Braly, the
daughter of a C. P. minister.\textsuperscript{38}

In A People Called Cumberland Presbyterian, the authors describe the problems
leading up to the split between the Presbyterian and the Cumberland Presbyterian
Churches. In relating this series of precipitating events, an analysis of the complex
kinship ties among the major players in the religious-political drama is instrumental to a
comprehensive understanding of the fissures and alliances. "The Ewings, McLeans,
Davidsons, and Brevards," all actively engaged in Presbyterian Church matters around
1800 in Tennessee and Kentucky, "were related through a series of intermarriages."

\textsuperscript{37} Thomas H. Campbell, History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Texas: Centennial Volume
(Nashville, Tenn.: Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House, 1936), 69–74. An interesting sidelight is
that Thomas Keesee Jr., a member of Shiloh C. P. Church of Ellis County, was my great-great-great-great
grandfather's brother, while the founders of that church were the Billingsleys, who had lived just north of
the Keesees (at that time in Sumner County, Tennessee) in the Cumberland region of Kentucky at the time
of the Cane Ridge Revival and of the creation of the C. P. Church. These Billingsleys who arrived in Ellis
County via Missouri, along with their kin, the Pattons, were the direct ancestors of James L. Billingsley, the
man I married in 1966, in Arkansas. Over 150 years ago, our kin knew each other, went to church together,
and were buried together. His direct line moved down into Hamilton County, Texas, while my branch of
Keesees never left Arkansas.

\textsuperscript{38} E. B. Crisman, Biographical Sketches of Living Old Men of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Vol. I
(St. Louis, Missouri: Perrin and Smith, 1877), pp. 54–56.
Figure 3.1: "A Genealogical Chart Showing the Intermarriage of the Ewing, McLean, Davidson, and Brevard Families."

---

The genealogical chart accompanying the narrative [Figure 3.1] is incredibly illustrative of the interlocking nature of sacred and secular kinship.⁴⁰

Dudley Hargrove, a member of the Keesee kinship group, was a licensed local preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church when he moved with his family from Georgia to Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, in 1818. One of his first actions was organizing a local Methodist church at or near his new home site. In 1819 his name was submitted to the Tennessee Annual Conference by the Quarterly Conference of the Tuscaloosa Circuit, as a suitable person to be elected and ordained a local deacon. In the order of the regular business of that session of the Tennessee Conference that recommendation from the Tuscaloosa [sic] Circuit was presented, and the questions, "Shall Dudley Hargrove be elected and ordained a deacon?" . . . [Dudley Hargrove] was possessed of an unblemished character so far as his general character was concerned, and [he] had endowments and attainments sufficient to qualify him for the position he sought, but it was a fact, and the fact was made known, that [Hargrove] was a slave-holder. . . From its organization in the latter part of 1812 . . . the Tennessee Conference was pronounced in its position on the subject of slavery as it existed in the United States, and a number of its leading members were bitterly opposed to slave-traders and slave-owners holding office in the Church, or exercising the prerogatives of the ministry. The presentation of [Hargrove and other slave-holding men] for position and office in the Methodist ministry made an issue and inaugurated a conflict. . . The Conference decided by a majority of at least three not to elect Hargrove to deacon's orders . . . because [he was a] slave-holder.

Sixteen men signed a protest denouncing the decision "as oppressively severe in itself and ruinous in its consequences, and [they] disapprove[d] of the principle as contrary to and in violation of the order and discipline of [their] church."⁴¹

---

⁴⁰Burns, Baughn, and Campbell, A People Called Cumberland, Chapter 6, pp. 83–104, and 99 (quotation).
When the Hargroves moved into newly created Pickens County, Alabama, in 1820, Dudley and his son Daniel J. "immediately . . . had a Methodist Society organized," known as Hargrove's Church. Dudley Hargrove died in 1823, never receiving the Tennessee Annual Conference's confirmation. After his father's death, Daniel Hargrove remained in the area and served the church as class leader, steward, and trustee until his death in 1869, and his son, the Reverend Robert Kennon Hargrove, became a Methodist bishop about 1881. Dudley Hargrove was also a cousin of William McKendree, an early bishop in the Methodist Church.⁴² Another of his sons, William Dudley Hargrove married Charlotte "Lottie" Chappell in Pickens County, Alabama, and he and his family moved to Chappell Hill, Washington County, Texas, where they were staunch supporters of the Methodist Church as related above.

All of these examples make the effects of kinship on religion abundantly clear and complicate any analysis of religious history. Kinship was a causative factor in religious choices and, in some ways, religious choices effected kinship alliances. Even a cursory examination of the kin relationships among ministers' families makes a clear and convincing argument that the clergy were bound together as much by ties of secular kinship as they were by ties of sacred kinship. Clergymen might have privileged their religious duties above their earthly families, but at the same time, they recreated bonds of kinship among families of clergy.

Each of these cases is illustrative of the overlapping bonds between sacred and secular kinship. Just as an individual's default choice of religious denomination was strongly influenced by that of his parents' and family's, so was a man's choice of the

⁴² West. A History of Methodism in Alabama, pp. 158, and 552.
ministry for a profession influenced by his father's example. In the antebellum South, where the marketplace of available professions was limited, the ministry was a popular choice for "young men who intended to make a living with their heads, not their hands."\(^{43}\) Moreover, when it came time to marry, these young ministers were predisposed to choose a mate from within their sacred family group and had a great tendency to marry a preacher's daughter who already understood both his role and her role in his chose profession.

Kinship was the foundation of virtually every aspect of antebellum southern society and its entanglement in the Protestant religious denominations that dominated the area was a strong one. Yet the role of kinship is often ignored; it is akin to the oxygen in the air we breathe—essential, always present, but taken for granted and seldom acknowledged or analyzed in discourse. The evidence here amply illuminates the causative role of kinship ties in antebellum southern religious life. Just as kinship groups moved together, they joined churches together, mainly influenced by their families. Moreover, their joint membership in a common denomination reinforced kinship ties, just as kinship ties reinforced joint membership in a common denomination. These connections and insights, however, can be traced and brought to the surface only by understanding the nature of kinship, using the theory of kinship to comprehend how antebellum southerners experienced kinship, and by applying genealogical methodology to reveal the underlying structure of kinship ties. Scholars can add a richer texture to their analyses of southern society if they will only deepen their understanding of religion to include kinship's role.

CHAPTER FOUR: KINSHIP'S ROLE IN ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL POWER

When Robert Calvert was elected county judge in 1846, for the first of two terms, he was forty-four years of age, a successful planter, and close to the pinnacle of his economic and political success—a success largely bolstered and facilitated by his extensive family ties. Moving to Saline County, Arkansas, in 1837, soon after the county and state were created, the Keeseen kinship group built a moderate political and economic power base at the local level. They used their increasing wealth to further political power and their political power to increase their wealth largely by using kinship links to their advantage. Although some of these men may have prospered without those kinship links, the fact remains that the synergistic relationship between kinship and political or economic activity is bountifully evident in their lives; moreover, the connection of kinship to political, economic, and social influence is not unique to the Keesees.¹ Any fully realized comprehension of political and economic power in the antebellum South compels us to incorporate the effects of kinship into our analyses of these topics.

In this chapter I discuss the development of kinship networks in the American South from the colonial through the antebellum era, with particular emphasis on their role in political and economic spheres, and I argue that the scope of that role was undiminished in the South during the antebellum era. A system of plantation agriculture based on slavery in the South encouraged the retention of a rural, agricultural, but

¹ Although I have little doubt that women made contributions to the success of their husbands and to their families, the fact remains that most of their contributions are undocumented and that they had virtually no political or economic power and, thus, the discussion here refers exclusively to men.
market-oriented society in which kinship groups retained their power when other social, political, and economic institutions failed to develop apace. Secondly, a discussion of the roles and ramifications of marriage vis-à-vis family alliances informs the discussion of kin network development. Then, shifting the focus of the Keesee kinship group to Robert Calvert, one of Thomas Keesee’s sons-in-law, I present his experiences as illustrative of the interaction of kinship with politics and economics in the lives of antebellum southerners, particularly among planter families. Moreover, the emphasis on kinship connections demonstrates the efficacy of genealogical methodology in teasing out hidden nuances in antebellum southern society.

**Kinship Networks in the Colonial Era, North and South**

Kinship’s role in shaping political and economic power has long been recognized in the South, dating to the earliest years of the colonial era. However, Bernard Bailyn, in his seminal study, *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of the Revolution*, found that a little less than half of Scottish emigrants and only about 20 percent of English emigrants entered the American colonies as part of any kind of family group. His thesis suggesting kin groups were not a major portion of American

---

2 And because kinship’s role in gaining and holding political, economic, and social control has long been recognized by historians of the South, the historiography on this topic is particularly rich.

3 Although Bailyn was using statistics from a specific interval of time, he considered the figures to be fairly representative of the American emigration experience as a whole. Bernard Bailyn with the assistance of Barbara DeWolfe, *Voyagers to the West: A Passage in the Peopling of America on the Eve of the Revolution* (1986; rpr. New York: Vintage Books, 1988), 137. Bailyn also points out the gender inequalities in the statistics: “Among the English, nine times as many males as females traveled alone; among the Scots, only twice as many.” Also, most of the emigrant family units of any kind were overwhelmingly either nuclear in composition or conjugal (husband and wife), rather than extended family groups, pp. 141–42. Bailyn summarized by stating that “[t]he emigration was largely a movement of isolated individuals, but it included numerous families” although women and children were most often migrating in family units, and that most of the family units were “small” and “uncomplicated in structure,” p. 145.
immigrants is supported in *Robert Cole's World: Agriculture and Society in Early Maryland*, a case study of one English Catholic family that migrated to St. Mary's County in 1652.⁴ Using Cole's plantation account and probate record as a foundation, Lois Green Carr, Russell R. Menard, and Lorena S. Walsh illuminate significant aspects of early colonial life, and, not surprisingly find little evidence of kin networks in the nascent colony, although "[t]his is not to say," the authors assert, "that settlers failed to recognize even quite distant kin links when they were present." And, despite the apparent absence of local kin, the wealthy "cosmopolitan gentry" of the lower Western Shore of Maryland were nevertheless connected via "ties of trade, kin, and friendship extending beyond the limited, parochial environs of southern Maryland."⁵ In other words, in the earliest times of settlement, operational kin networks were present, but they were attenuated and played their part mainly in a trans-colonial and -Atlantic setting rather than being confined to small neighborhoods. New immigrants to the sparsely populated British colonies were geographically separated from their existing kinship groups and had not yet had enough time to build new interlocking affiliations within their new communities. However, ties of kinship were still present in their lives although relatives were often either elsewhere in the colonies or still in Great Britain.


⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 145 (first quotation), and 21 (second quotation). Their study reveals that the absence of nearby kin had its own consequences. One result was more sizable property settlements for widows: they "were accorded an influential role in managing the estate [of the deceased husband] and in bringing up the children" given the general lack of nearby male kin to step into the breach. Another consequence was a greater reliance on non-blood relationships. Robert Cole, for example, arranged for two of his close friends and neighbors to see to his children and his plantation after his death, although a cousin in London was directed to see to his affairs there: *Ibid.*, 146 (quotation), and 147. Carr, Menard, and Walsh point out that Cole was not atypical—given the short life expectancy of early colonials and "[i]n the absence of kin, the burden of supporting, supervising, and educating a good proportion of the first generation of children born in the region fell on friends, neighbors, and local officials": *Ibid.*, p. 150.
But, while I agree with Bailyn, Carr, Menard, and Walsh that kinship groups were not nearly as influential or dense as they later became, the fact that Bailyn found that almost half of Scottish immigrants and even as many as 20 percent of English immigrants traveled as part of family groups nevertheless speaks forcefully to the significance of kinship for immigrants. Moreover, a scrutiny of the demographics of his immigrants, using genealogical methodology and with kinship as its focus, would no doubt reveal more kin links than were apparent from the records he used. Bailyn, like many other historians, was basing his conclusions about family units on the self-reporting of family ties or on the reporting of bureaucrats who had no reason to delve into links beyond the nuclear unit. Whether or not the wife in one family was a first cousin or sister to the husband in a second family was probably seen as irrelevant. Without employing genealogical methodology, the modern researcher has no real insights into extra-nuclear family ties among early immigrants to America.  

Over the course of time, however, society in the colony of Maryland developed, and the initial generation, with its overwhelming proportion of men and high mortality rates, gave way to a longer-lived native-born population with a much more balanced ratio of males and females. “As children born in the colony came of age and formed families of their own, households were bound together through increasingly dense kinship networks.”7 This finding coincides with my assertions in previous chapters: marriage is

---

6 However, the fact that so many of the emigrants were single males is also a significant factor in lower rates of kin numbers among those setting out for the Americas, although it is not beyond possibility that at least some of the single men were kinsmen of other emigrating individuals or family groups.

7 Carr, Menard, and Walsh, Robert Cole’s World, pp. 158–59 (quotation). The authors point out that, in the 1650s, almost 70 percent of the (white) population were adult males but males only constituted 28 percent of the total by 1712; the proportion of children in the population increased over the same period from about 25 percent to about 50 percent; p. 158.
the nexus of kinship, and since people usually married someone nearby (which ultimately included relatives), most areas eventually became saturated with kin. Carr, Menard, and Walsh further argue that the "developments [of kinship networks] had a profound impact on wealth distribution and inheritance, on group consciousness among the great planters, and on public life in the colony."8 This greater cohesion and social consciousness of a gentry class "transformed public life as a small group of 'First Families' assumed the responsibility (and captured the benefit) of government at both the local and provincial levels."9 By the beginning of the 1700s, Maryland, like the rest of colonial America, was a dramatically changed place. The growth of networks of kin played a part in effecting those changes, including the prominence of kinship groups at all levels of economic and

8 Ibid., p. 164.
9 Ibid., p. 164. The creation of kinship connections through marriage was also one of the strategies employed by politically excluded Catholics seeking to strengthen their influence, p. 165. Carr, Menard, and Walsh do not develop this model of political and social transformation further.
political life. This was not a new phenomenon, however, as much as it was a reestablishment of old ways—dense kinship networks had long been a part of the European societies in which the American colonists originated.

In the colonial era, the influence and pervasiveness of kinship networks was not confined to the South. In *The Minutemen and Their World*, Robert A. Gross describes a muster of revolutionary troops in Concord.

The muster was almost a family reunion. Fathers and sons, uncles and nephews, brothers, cousins, and in-laws often enlisted in the same units.

---

10 Daniel Scott Smith employs the “natural history” model of population development, which is one way of explaining the burgeoning of kinship networks. Borrowed from biologists but adopted by historians, it describes a three-part process in the evolution of rural communities: (1) settlement, (2) growth of population and a progression to maximization of agricultural lands, then finally, (3) population stabilization, accompanied by out-migration and lower natural population growth. “Thus kinship density increases.” Smith notes, “as communities pass from the first to the final stage of settlement.” Daniel Scott Smith, “All in Some Degree Related to Each Other: A Demographic and Comparative Resolution of the Anomaly of New England Kinship,” *American Historical Review* 94, Issue I, Supplement to Volume 94 (Feb. 1989): 58. Smith describes this “natural history model” of local population development as one “that lays out a sequence of regular stages that depend on the evolving relationship between numbers of inhabitants and the resources available in the economic environment.” p. 45. He cites as examples of this model’s use in early American studies: Kenneth A. Lockridge, “Land, Population, and the Evolution of New England Society, 1630–1730,” *Past and Present* 39 (1968): 62–80; Darrett B. Rutman, “Assessing the Little Communities of Early America,” *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 43 (1986): 172–78; and others. Smith also notes that the model factors significantly in Allan Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680–1800* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1986); Smith, “All in Some Degree Related,” p. 58n28. This model provides a commonsensical framework for explaining the transition from mostly male and significantly non-family emigration to the “dense kinship networks” that Carr, Menard, and Walsh report. Darrett B. Rutman and Anita H. Rutman describe a similar process of increasing kin density over time in *A Place in Time: Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650–1750* (New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1984), pp. 99–100. Stated simply, the three stages of the natural history model of population density applied to one county in Virginia comprise the narrative of the book — with the addition of the massive effects of large-scale Negro slavery. In *Explicatus*, Chapter 8: Social Networks, the Rutmans chart the rising percentages of kinship links in the years 1687, 1704, and 1724. Marilyn Vos Savant summed up this phenomenon in a nutshell: responding to an inquiry about why it seems one has to buy more and more gifts every year, Vos Savant answered, “It’s this way for everyone who has relatives. The problem with relatives—unlike friends—is that, even without the slightest effort on our part, they still multiply with time.” From “Ask Marilyn,” *Parade Magazine*, December 14, 1997, p. 20.

All were joined together not so much by a chain of command as by a complex network of kinship. When Colonel Barrett issued general orders, they were transmitted through a son and son-in-law, both captains, to a second son and a brother, both ensigns, down to yet another son nephew, both corporals, and ultimately to several other nephews in the ranks. Indeed, the roster of the Minutemen made an intricate genealogical chart. The two companies embraced ten sets of brothers, ten of first cousins, ten of uncles and nephews, and at least four of brothers-in-law. Filial duty and family loyalty thus reinforced a soldier’s obligation to follow orders.\footnote{Robert A. Gross, \textit{The Minutemen and Their World} (1976; rpr. New York: Hill and Wang, 1995), p. 71.}

Even in military life, another example of a political power structure, kinship groups were extraordinarily active. These ties of kinship no doubt contributed to a lessening of friction between the various ranks—a soldier would tend to have a higher degree of trust in, and loyalty to, a superior officer who was also his brother or first cousin. Moreover, family connections also probably enhanced an individual’s ability to attain higher rank.

The impact of kinship on political, social, and economic power was strikingly similar throughout the colonies. Gross also found that in Concord, political leadership was often passed down to sons.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 13: almost half the selectmen were the sons of selectmen. See also p. 212n29: “Between 1750 and 1780, eight Barretts and in-laws held 35 per cent of the available positions as selectmen and representatives.” The age at first election to local office was six years older for men without office-holding fathers than for sons of previous leaders. For intergenerational economic mobility, see pp. 234–235n21. For evidence that ties of blood were not always determining factors in political struggles, see p. 26.} Daniel Scott Smith asserts the same for Hingham, Massachusetts:

During the second half of [the 1700s] . . . stability in the social structure, especially in the tendency for sons to succeed fathers in economic and political position, showed no signs of weakening; indeed, in the decades before the Revolution, these measures of intergenerational continuity were considerably stronger than they had been in the seventeenth century.\footnote{Daniel Scott Smith, “Child-Naming Practices, Kinship Ties, and Change in Family Attitudes in Hingham, Massachusetts, 1641 to 1880.” \textit{Journal of Social History} 18 (Summer 1985): 559.}
Daniel Blake Smith's research uncovered a similar experience in the Chesapeake by the mid-1700s. By then, he argues, "[a]n elaborate cousinry developed, which offered important marital, economic, and—at least among the elite—political opportunities."  

Allan Kulikoff agrees: his research reveals political generational continuity in Maryland and in Virginia in the early eighteenth century. In just one of his examples of the significance of kinship to political power, Kulikoff reports that "[j]ustices, sheriffs, and assemblymen formed an almost hereditary caste by the mid-eighteenth century."

Moreover, he describes the emergence of gentry and yeoman classes and the need, "[o]nce gentlemen won political dominance, . . . [t]o secure legitimacy . . . by establishing an intricate web of social and political relations with poorer yeoman planters." Kinship played a role in those relations. Political dynasties were the norm, and the web of family relationships assuaged interclass conflict, mitigating tensions that might have been expected to arise in unequal power relationships throughout colonial American society.  


16 Kulikoff, Tobacco and Slaves, pp. 9, 10 (second quotation), and 270–275 (first quotation, 275). Like Gross, Kulikoff found a correlation between age at first political office and degree of kinship with related leaders; p. 275. See also, Merrill D. Peterson. Thomas Jefferson and the New Nation (1970; rpr. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1975), passim. Even though Peterson's thrust is intellectually rather than socially oriented, passing remarks make the importance of kinship ties and power explicit. For example: "the structure of politics in Virginia consolidated power in a close-knit gentry class. . . . The House of Burgesses [has been described] as one huge cousinship . . . Jefferso . . . was a member of the club and could always count half a dozen or more blood relations at the Capitol."; p. 37. See also, Jean B. Lee. The Price of Nationhood: The American Revolution in Charles County (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1994), p. 19: "by the third generation, greater longevity and intermarriage among daughters and sons of elite families had created a self-perpetuating squirearchy able to pass its political power, in addition to its status, from one generation to the next." See also, pp. 20, 23, 38, 56, 71, and 73; and for kinship ties among slaves, see pp. 69–73.
planters and poorer yeoman farmers based on their disparate status and political philosophies, that perceived potential for conflict is greatly diminished when one uncovers the family relationships connecting the two groups; instead of conflict, the planter elites were able to assist their poorer relations in a variety of ways, and the less wealthy yeoman offered political support to their wealthier relations. The suspicion and mistrust normally existing between the two economic classes was ameliorated when planter elites were brothers to, or first cousins sharing a common set of grandparents with, the yeoman farmers—especially when the yeomen kinsmen aspired to become elite planters themselves. And, as noted above, military power tensions for Concord's Revolutionary troops were at least partially allayed by the family connections up and down the chain of command.\textsuperscript{17}

In the antebellum period, the South retained its rural, agricultural nature as well as its dependence on kinship networks as the main organizational institution of life.\textsuperscript{18} The bonds of southern families continued to extend well beyond the nuclear family, and their institutions—governmental and economic, as well as social—failed to develop at the

\textsuperscript{17} Gross, The Minutemen and Their World, p. 71.

\textsuperscript{18} See, for example, W. F. Ogburn, “The Family and Its Functions,” in Readings in the Anthropology and Sociology of Family and Kinship, Bryan S. Turner, ed. (London, and New York: Routledge/Thoemmes Press. 1998), p. 288, in which Ogburn discusses the diminishment over time of the status derived from membership in particular families: “Property holdings in land are very likely to help fix family status, especially in small communities where everybody knows everybody else . . . . The growth of large cities, in which the effectiveness of gossip and other forms of non-legal social control is diminished, tends also to diminish family prestige. With few exceptions the personality of the individual family is lost in the crowd.” There is some evidence that in the Northeast, where there was more urbanization and stronger, more organized institutions besides the family, the power of kinship groups diminished in the nineteenth century; see for example, Smith, “‘All in Some Degree Related to Each Other,’” p. 73 (quotation): “The operative kinship mentality of eighteenth-century Yankees . . . was intense and focused nearly exclusively on children. This peculiar, intense, but truncated orientation toward kin before 1800 paved the way for the shift toward individualism during the nineteenth century.” Smith's argument is often obfuscated by his demographic theorizing, confusingly complex statistics, and murky writing; and, yet, it has merit as a mechanism of explanation and offers a contrast of the “truncated orientation toward kin” in the Northeast with the extended and denser kinship ties of the South.
same pace as did institutions in other regions of the county, leaving kinship groups in firm control of most aspects of society.¹⁹ For the slave-holding planters, who used the aggregate power and wealth of kinship groups to advance their own success, living in a slave-based society buttressed that power and wealth through the ownership of human property; the population of southern slaves continued to increase, concomitantly increasing the capital of the planters. Networks of white planter families used their control and ownership of ever-increasing networks of slave families to strengthen their control of southern society. Moreover, these kinship groups, which had been coalescing since the colonial era, burgeoned in a geometric progression as existing networks of kin continued to extend themselves through the intermarriages of their members.

The role of marriage in the creation of kinship groups is one of those concepts, like kinship itself, that seems so self-evident as to be taken for granted, but as scholars of history, we must take care to define and clarify—to deconstruct, if you will—each element in a particular society's development. Throughout this dissertation I have stressed that marriage is the central event in creating kinship for the white antebellum southerners under discussion. An examination of their economic and political lives demonstrates the significance of marriage. Not only did it serve as the basis for the creation of kinship networks by linking groups of families through marriages and producing children who enlarged and perpetuated these linkages, it also linked groups of families to other groups of families through marriages between members of two specific families within each group.

¹⁹ The question of how big a role the "Puritan mentality" or Weber's "Protestant Ethic" and "Spirit of Capitalism" played in differentiating the North from the South is a topic deserving a larger forum than can be presented here. The topic of the immaturity of southern institutions is discussed at more depth in previous chapters.
Within the Keesee kinship group, for example, the marriages of Robert and Mary Calvert to Mary and Milton Keesee respectively, brought the Keesee family a close association with the Hill family, although the Keesees and the Hills were only linked by their mutual kinship to the Calverts rather than through any intermarriage between them or any mutual grandchildren.20

But the most significant effect of marriage within the context of this chapter is that it also enhanced a man's success in the political and economic arenas by his acquisition of his wife's property, status, and connections. Legally a marriage for the most part merged the husband and wife into one civil being. Both Blackstone's *Commentaries* (1766) and James Kent's *Commentaries on American Law* (1826–1830) make this point: "By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law"; and "the legal effects of marriage' were deducible from the common law principle making husband and wife 'one person'." James Wilson further explained that "a wife's 'legal existence' was 'consolidated' into her husband[, and that a]ll most all other legal consequences of marriage depended on this principle."21

What is marriage, after all? There can be little doubt that marriage for antebellum southerners may very well have been about love, affection, security, protection, or any number of private and emotional issues. Legally, however,

---

20 The relationship between the Keesees, the Calverts, and the Hills is discussed fully in Chapter 2. See also, Peter W. Bardaglio, *Reconstructing the Household: Families, Sex, and the Law in the Nineteenth-Century South* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), p. 42: "Marriage . . . was less a personal matter involving the private emotions between two individuals than an event that brought together two families and promoted the ties between them."

marriage was a public matter largely about the protection and transmission of property and was "a political institution, signaled by the public power of husbands." Through the creation of a legal infrastructure, antebellum southerners erected a social scaffolding influenced by an atmosphere of patriarchy and gender bias in complete accord with the beliefs of the dominant society of that time. The codification of laws about marriage and civil identity had the effect of consolidating and passing on wealth to a set of legal heirs. For the most part, the heirs were the socially and officially sanctioned product of legalized, civil marriages.

An excellent example of marriage as a successful strategy to accumulate or to augment wealth (as well as the role of an increasing slave population in solidifying the wealth and power of planters) can be found in Lorena Walsh's *From Calabar to Carter's* 

\[\text{---}\]

\[22\] Hartog writes: "A marriage was both legally constituted and private. Law was not everything in a marriage. Love, lust, hatred, duty, friendship, respect, affection, abandonment, commitment, greed, and self-sacrifice, all the feelings and practices that made up a nineteenth-century marriage, were not primarily legal. But law was always there as well." He also touches on women's rights advocates' view of marriage as being similar to slavery. *Man and Wife in America*, p. 24.

\[23\] As Hartog points out, there was, of course, more to being married than creating heirs and passing on wealth and property. He writes that "we need to remember how important being married was in nineteenth-century America: important in terms of the labor of maintaining a household, important as a public matter of being recognized as a competent (male) adult, important as a defense against the emotional isolation that always threatened in mobile America." *Man and Wife in America*, p. 22. Although he couches this in terms of being married, I would shift his emphasis slightly to assert these as important aspects of being part of a family, which is, naturally, the usual result of marriage. And, since this chapter is directed towards demonstrating the effects of kinship on political and economic affairs, I will leave issues about the construction of male (and female) identity to others.
Grove. In providing background on the slave-owning Burwell family, Walsh exposes kinship as one of the factors that helped propel its members into a level of wealth underlying their vast slaveholdings and their abundant political careers. It was second-generation Lewis Burwell II, Walsh writes, who “established . . . crucial intertwined social and political connections with other leading gentry families,” who “forged instrumental alliances with members of the rich and powerful” families of Virginia, and who thereby “established the political and social connections that enabled his offspring to operate comfortably in the highest circles of power in the colony.”

Most tellingly, Walsh describes Lewis Burwell II’s pattern of wealth consolidation through marriage. His slave property, which was the basis of his financial success, came from four sources, the first of which was a group of twenty inherited from his father. His first wife’s father willed his daughter a group of forty slaves and through Burwell’s rights as the husband, he gained ownership of this second group of slaves. When his first wife died, he married a widow who brought to the marriage a third group of slaves given to her by her father and a fourth group of eight slaves she inherited from her first husband.

---

24 Lorena Walsh. From Calabar to Carter’s Grove: The History of a Virginia Slave Community, Colonial Williamsburg Studies in Chesapeake History and Culture, Cary Carson, series ed. (Charlottesville and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1997). Walsh focuses on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Burwell family slave communities in Virginia. One of Walsh’s major insights about the Burwell slave community is the growth of an interconnected slave kinship network over time. And, although Walsh does not make this point explicitly, the development of the extended slave kinship network that embraced several properties was only possible because of the extended kin network of the white families to whom they belonged. Succeeding generations of the Burwell family consistently established plantations in clusters near other family members. Thus, even when slave family members lived on different estates, they still were proximate enough to others to maintain the degree of regular contact Walsh posits. The impact of kinship in the lives of the white Burwell family manifested itself in the geographical closeness of their residences, which in turn facilitated the growth of kinship networks in the slave community.

When Burwell married her, he gained ownership of both groups of slaves.\textsuperscript{26} To Burwell, then, one element of the meaning of kinship was the opportunity for the enhancement of wealth and status through marriage and inheritance.

So this, then, was the state of antebellum southern society when the Keesee kinship group and others like it were migrating to and fro on the cotton frontier. Political and economic power, as well as status, were intimately connected to ties of kinship in innumerable ways. The following examination of this one very extended family from the perspective of Robert Calvert and through the use of genealogical methodology explicates the pattern of political and economic control by networks of kin in the antebellum South.

\textsuperscript{26} Walsh, \emph{From Calabar to Carter's Grove}, pp. 26–27.
Figure 4.1: Robert Calvert (1802–1867)²⁷

ROBERT CALVERT AND THE KINSHIP GROUP

Robert Calvert was born February 19, 1802, near Wartrace (now Bedford County), Tennessee, the son of William and Lucy (Rogers) Calvert. His paternal grandfather had immigrated to Winchester (now Frederick County), Virginia, from Ireland, and later moved to Tennessee. His mother's family was English. Robert Calvert and his family were Scotch-Irish Cumberland Presbyterian. When Calvert was a boy, his parents moved to the Tuscaloosa-Bibb County area in Alabama, probably drawn by the potential for cotton cultivation in the fertile lands in the Black Warrior River Valley just as his future father-in-law Thomas Keese Sr. had been. Cotton prices were extremely high after the War of 1812, reaching their peak about 1819. This propelled many planters like the Calverts and Keesees toward the virgin soil of the newly opened territory of Alabama.

In Tuscaloosa County on August 28, 1823, Calvert, age twenty-one, married Mary "Polly" Keese, age fifteen. In a classic example of sibling exchange, Robert's

28John Henry Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas (Austin, Tex.: L. E. Daniel, 1880; repr., Easley, S.C.: Southern Historical Press, 1978), pp. 638–639. Other undocumented sources says Robert Calvert was a descendant of Lord Baltimore, although that seems unlikely given presently available evidence; see, for example, Texas State Travel Guide (Austin, Tex.: State Department of Highways and Transportation, n.d., annual publication), p. 95. Tombstone is inscribed: "Hon. Robert Calvert was born in the State of Tenn. Feb. 19, 1802 . . . "—gravesite in Sterling Cemetery, Robertson County, Texas, surveyed by author March 28, 1997. The Cumberland Presbyterians broke off from the Presbyterian Church in 1810; previous to this time, the Calverts were Presbyterian. For a cogent explication of the roots of the Cumberland Presbyterians, see Matthew Harry Gore, A History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in Kentucky to 1988 (n.p.: Joint Heritage Committee of Covenant and Cumberland Presbyteries, 2000), especially pp. 1–33.

sister Mary had married his wife's brother Milton Keesee earlier that same year.30 From that point on, the Calverts and the Keesees operated as parts of a kinship group that included many other families who intermarried with these two families. As each of the siblings married, kinship ties expanded. Robert Calvert married into a family much like his own—land- and slave-owning cotton planters. When Calvert's father died in 1823, not only did Calvert inherit his own share of his father's estate, which partially consisted of slaves, but he also gained control of some of his younger siblings' estate and slaves by serving as their guardian. Although Calvert no doubt saw this as a labor of love on one level, it also provided him with status and profit through his control of a larger pool of economic resources, even if only temporarily. In the same fashion, through marriage to Calvert's sister Mary, Milton Keesee gained control of his wife's inheritance as well as of her sister Paulina's when he was appointed her guardian.31

On January 3, 1825, a year and a half after his marriage, Robert Calvert first purchased land in Tuscaloosa County. The same day, Lucy Calvert, Robert's mother, purchased land nearby; and between 1825 and 1835 his father-in-law Thomas Keesee Sr.,

---

31 "Guardian Record Book, 1830–1842," Orphans Court, Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, pp. 4, 6, 11, 24, 28, 44, 54–55, and 74–75. As an example of the money and property controlled by guardians, on the 1830 Annual Guardian's Report. Milton Keesee as guardian of Polinia [sic] Calvert reported that he was in control of $1522.52 of her estate from her father during the previous year—$1316.43 cash, $105.31 interest on that money, $106 for hire of her slave during 1829, and $42 for the hire of her "two Small boys" (slaves) during 1829; p. 4. Robert Calvert reported that same year that he was in possession of $1613.15 for his ward, his brother William, from a similar list of assets; p. 11. Although no records have been found to show what Robert Calvert or Mary (Calvert) Keesee inherited from their father's estate, it can be extrapolated from their siblings' inheritances, for which records exist because of their minority, that they probably received a cash settlement and a few slaves as their shares.
as well as many of his brothers-in-law, bought government land in the same vicinity.\textsuperscript{32}

During Robert and Mary Calvert's residence in Alabama, most of their children were born amid a host of kin. About 1826, a son William was born and named for his paternal grandfather. About two years later came a daughter Lucy Ellen, named for her paternal grandmother. Next came a daughter Paulina Jane,\textsuperscript{33} and finally, about 1834, another daughter Mary M., most likely named for her mother and for her maternal grandmother.\textsuperscript{34}

During their residence in Alabama, various members of the Keesee kinship group held minor political offices. Robert Calvert was commissioned as a justice of the peace in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, in 1825 and 1826, John Hill in 1826, and Milton Keesee and John Hill in 1829; John Hargrove and Jesse Hill were also justices of the peace in the early years of settlement. John and Pharough Hill both held the office of constable from 1823 through 1826. Thomas Keesee Sr. was appointed overseer of the poor in his district in 1824, 1829, and 1831. Others in the kinship group who were also overseers of the poor in their districts include Jesse Hill in 1820 and 1826; Middleton M. and James Hill in

\begin{itemize}
\item Marilyn Davis Barefield, \textit{Old Tuscaloosa Land Office Records & Military Warrants, 1821–1855} (Easley, S.C.: Southern Historical Press, 1984), pp. 12, 20–22, 44, 68, 69, and 86; and Cash Entry Index Cards, surname Keesee, supplied by the National Archives. copies in possession of author. It is likely that the family had been living on these parcels of land for years before they officially filed to purchase it from the federal government.
\item A Pauline (Poline) Calvert was married to Samuel M. Qualls in Tuscaloosa County, March 26, 1834. It seems likely that she and Robert Calvert were related and that this daughter of Robert's was named for her. The name Pauline is carried down in succeeding generations of the family. See Murray, \textit{Tuscaloosa County, Alabama Marriages}.
\item Richard Denny Parker, \textit{Historical Recollections of Robertson County, Texas, with Biographical and Genealogical Notes on the Pioneers & Their Families} (Salado, Tex.: Anson Jones Press, 1955), pp. 137–38, and 150; and Carolyn Earle Billingsley, \textit{1840 Saline County, Arkansas, Census} (Alexander, Ark.: Saline Research, 1987), p. 12—original census p. 212. Saline Township, age and gender groupings are fairly consistent with the children as given in text. The Calverts had another daughter, born after they moved to Arkansas, but she died as a child; "The Saline," Vol. 6, No. 4 (Dec., 1991): 195, Obituary of Sarah Agnes Calvert, from the Arkansas Gazette (Little Rock), 2 June 1848, p. 3, c. 5: "Departed this life in Saline county, on the 7th inst.—after a few day severe illness, Sarah Agnes, infant daughter of Hon. R. Calvert & Lady. She has left Parents, relations, and friends to mourn her irreparable loss. Although a child of only 2 years old she was a universal favorite of all who knew her, very sprightly, beautiful, and prepossessing, in all her manners, a fond father's delight, a tender Mother's joy..."}
\end{itemize}
1827; John Hill and John Hartgrove [sic] in 1828; Richard Murphy in 1829; Milton Keesee in 1831; and Theophilus Hill in 1832. Thomas Keesee’s daughter married Elias Jenkins, who was the Tuscaloosa County Sheriff from 1828 until 1831. During the time of the nascent kinship group’s residence in Alabama, the members were already developing their small planter status through political leadership in their local community.

By 1836 the Calverts and the Keesees were ready to move on yet again, no doubt driven by an amalgam of some of the same push-pull factors that had effected their earlier move from Tennessee to Alabama—a desire for soil that had not yet been depleted by cotton in the new state of Arkansas, where land was cheap, as well as the impetus provided by the worsening economy. Although there had been an upsurge in cotton prices in 1825, they began a steady decline to about ten cents a pound, which was the borderline between profitability and unprofitability for planters. Prices remained low for several years, creating a depression in Alabama that became nationwide in scope by 1837: this was no doubt a factor in their decision to relocate. However, Edward E. Baptist sums up a variety of motivations in a nutshell: “Planter men moved to the plantation frontier to establish and extend the wealth and power of their kinship networks.”

35 Alton Lambert, History of Tuscaloosa County, Alabama. Vol. 2 (Centre, Ala.: Stewart University Press, 1978) pp. 23–24, and 47; and June O. Reese, transcriber, Overseers of the Poor, 1818–1833, Tuscaloosa County, Alabama (Tuscaloosa, Ala.: n.p., 1982), pp. 1, 8, 11, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, and 28–29. The men listed were all intricately tied together by kinship. Robert Calvert and Milton Keesee were brothers-in-law. John Hill, Jesse Hill, and Pharoah Hill were all brothers, and their brother George was married to Jane Calvert, who was Robert Calvert’s sister; their brother James Jones Hill was married to Jane Calvert, who was Robert Calvert’s maternal aunt; and James Jones Hill and Jane Calvert had a son Robert who married Nancy Calvert, who was Robert Calvert’s sister. John Hargrove was the paternal uncle of Martha Wooding Hargrove who married Gideon Keesee, who was the brother of Milton Keesee and the brother-in-law of Robert Calvert; John Hargrove was also the paternal uncle of Alfred Battle Hargrove who married Milton Keesee’s daughter Lucy Rogers Keesee. Richard Murphy was the name of George West Murphy’s father (although I have no direct evidence this Richard Murphy is the same man), and George West Murphy married Mary Elizabeth Clardy, who was the daughter of Milton Keesee’s sister Agnes.
they did not do so as disembodied, individualistic economic actors. Family and kinship were always at the heart of the decision-making process."36 Not only was the move to Arkansas designed to provide them with more fertile soil and increased cotton production, but there was also an abundance of cheap land that would provide opportunities for sons and daughters who were reaching adulthood. By migrating together, they maximized those opportunities: they were able to pool their resources, including their slaves, to establish themselves quickly in their new home—clearing land for crops and building new homes. If one man fell ill or was injured and unable to work, his brothers were there to fill in for him until he recovered, and if a woman was unable to care for her children due to illness or even death, there were plenty of other female relatives to take over her daily duties.

The very fact that the Keesee kinship group all migrated west at the same time speaks to the coordinated nature of the decision to move. One can imagine the idea of migration percolating through the community of kinship for years as conditions in Alabama worsened, until the proper mixture of push-pull factors instigated action. There must have been a moment when the opinions of family members reached a critical mass, resulting in the decision to migrate to the new state of Arkansas and to abandon their home for the past sixteen years or so. The decision was undoubtedly not without dissention or without sadness: Thomas Keesee Sr.’s son William Keesee realized it was time to move on, but he cast his lot with his wife’s family instead of his own and left for

Texas; and Thomas Keesee Sr.'s daughter Jane remained behind with her husband and his family, later migrating to Mississippi instead of to either Arkansas or Texas where her family had settled. Many of the Hill relations chose not to migrate to central Arkansas at that time with the Keesee kinship group but later joined up with them in southern Arkansas. Most had to have known there would be loved ones they would never see again, yet none either migrated or remained alone. Kinship groups were constantly in a state of flux and at each intersection of change, individuals within the group had to make choices about which branch of the family was most desirable or advantageous for them and for the group. Integration into a kinship group gave them power and status, as well as financial and emotional benefits that they would have lacked as isolated nuclear families.

The Calverts and Keesees were part of a much larger migration to Arkansas and westward in general in this time period. In 1836, the year the kinship group began their relocation, public land sales in Arkansas and in the United States were at their highest point ever, with a million acres and twenty million acres, respectively, moving from the public to the private domain. Despite this land boom, in 1840, only one-third of all taxpayers in Arkansas owned land—and the Calvert-Keesee kinship group were members of this minority. Many of the immigrants, like the Keesee kinship group, were heeding the siren call of the cotton frontier, not the frontier of ordinary men and women who hoped to stake out a few acres, but the frontier for extraordinary men and woman that would allow those with means and

---

37Bolton, *Territorial Ambition*, pp.73–74. See also Robert Bradshaw Walz, “Migration into Arkansas, 1834–1880” (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, 1958) for an exhaustive analysis of black and white emigrants to Arkansas— their states of origins, migration patterns, reasons for coming to Arkansas, and their settlement patterns within the state.
know-how to get the best land and, with the command of slave labor, enrich and empower themselves to the top of society. 38

Especially in a county and state still in the early stages of formation, opportunities abounded above and beyond land and slaves. 39 There were county, state, and federal political offices open to enterprising men of the right sort, especially when they were kin to other wealthy men of status. These offices provided both political and economic advantages, and members of the Keesee kinship group availed themselves of these advantages. 40

Calvert and his brother-in-law Milton Keesee arrived in Saline County, Arkansas, in 1836 and began buying land. They were evidently acting as advance scouts or agents for the rest of the family; the bulk of the kinship and community group followed in 1837, with another wave of settlers from Tuscaloosa and Bibb Counties in 1841. 41 A majority

39 The total population of Arkansas increased from 30,388 in 1830 to 97,574 in 1840; the white population increased 221% in that ten-year period and the black population increased over 332%. The Keesee kinship group was part of the spectacular in-migration during this era. U. S. Census Office, The Seventh Census of the United States, 1850 (Washington, D.C.: 1853. rpr., [n.p.]: Arno Press, 1976), p. 548.
40 McNeilly, The Old South Frontier: McNeilly’s study is an excellent overview of the development of the planter class in Arkansas with great applicability to the Keesee kinship group. Bolton’s Territorial Ambition also argues that the wide-open setting of territorial and early-statehood politics and Arkansas’s natural resources were magnets for ambitious families.
41 Desmond Walls Allen and Bobbie Jones McLane, comps., Arkansas Land Patents: Grant and Saline Counties (granted through 30 June 1908) (Conway, Ark.: Arkansas Research, 1991), 84 (Calvert), 5 (Benjamin Clardy, who was married to Mary (Keesee) Calvert’s sister Agnes), and 101–102 (Keesees); Ronald Vern Jackson, ed., Arkansas Tax Lists: 1830–1839 (Bountiful, Utah: Accelerated Indexing Systems, Inc., 1980), 380; Maggie Hubbard Suddath, Tuscaloosa County, Alabama Records, V. I: 1837 Tax List and Probate Records (Tuscaloosa: by the author, 1988), 4–6; Russell P. Baker, comp., “A List of the Taxable Property of the County of Saline for the Year 1836, As Taken by the Sheriff of Said County,” The Saline I (December 1984): 87–90; and Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Pulaski, Jefferson, Lonoke, Faulkner, Grant, Saline, Perry Garland, and Hot Spring Counties, Arkansas: A Condensed History of the State, a Number of Biographies of Distinguished Citizens of the same, a Brief Descriptive History of Each of the Counties Above Named, and Numerous Biographical Sketches of Their Prominent Citizens (Chicago, The Goodspeed Publishing Company, 1889; repr. Easley, S.C.: Southern Historical Press, 1978), hereinafter Goodspeed: Central Arkansas, 234, which states that ninety families from Tuscaloosa and Bibb Counties, Alabama, “took up their abode” in Saline County in the summer of 1837, and that among the “leaders of this colony were Thomas Keesee, Robert Calvert, . . .” and others. Note that Thomas Keesee Jr.’s biography in History of Ellis County, 476, states that he moved to Saline County, Arkansas, in 1838.
of the original Alabama kinship group settled together in Saline County, and that cohesiveness was a factor in their political and economic success. "Family connections were the most common path to the planter class. Many of the pioneering ventures to Arkansas were diversified family business affairs pursued to gain wealth in a variety of ways, the growing of cotton being the most direct and the most prestigious." 42 Members of the kinship group utilized the labor of their slaves and quickly began producing cotton in their new home as a first step toward ensuring their success; in December of 1839 the *Arkansas Gazette* reported:

Cotton.—We have neglected to notice for a week or two, the sale of a lot of cotton of 12 bales, which was purchased by Mr. J. De Baun, at 11 cents. It was raised by Mr. Thos. Keesee, jun of Saline county, and is the largest lot we recollect of seeing in this place. It was an excellent article, and promises well for the farmers of our neighboring county. The crop of Saline will amount this year to some 250 bales, which is much greater than was ever raised in our neighborhood before. The lands of Saline county were overlooked by planters in making locations, till a few enterprising Alabamians [the Keesee kinship group] settled there, who bid fair to produce crops inferior, in quantity and quality, to none in the south, and as soon as the article will bear a[s] good a price, will make it a source of wealth to themselves and the country." 43

The move from Alabama to Arkansas demonstrates yet again the nature of migration in the antebellum South: it was not the action of individuals but of families and kinship groups. Furthermore, ventures to the cotton frontier were not particularly undertaken by younger sons, but, as was the case with the Keesee kinship group, were led, or at least participated in by the family patriarchs. Thomas Keesee Sr. was about sixty years of age at the time he arrived in Saline County Arkansas, with six of his eight

42 McNeilly, *The Old South Frontier*, p. 68.
43 *Arkansas Gazette* (Little Rock), December 4, 1839, p. 2, c. 1. My deepest appreciation to Tom W. Dillard, Curator, Butler Center for Arkansas Studies, Central Arkansas Library System, 100 Rock Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201, for sending me this article.
adult children, along with their spouses and children. In *A Family Venture: Men and Women on the Southern Frontier*, Joan E. Cashion would have us believe that rebellious and domineering sons of planter patriarchs, trying to escape the heavy bonds of kinship and to make their own marks in the world, dragged their wives off to the frontier where they were left isolated from friends and family. She portrays their settlement of the cotton frontier as the actions of nuclear families, cut off from the old kinship networks. As this study shows, nothing could be further from the truth. Fathers often migrated along with their sons and daughters, kinship groups moved together, and, as often as not, individual families migrated with the women’s families instead with men’s families. When Mary Calvert arrived in Saline County, Arkansas, for example, she was in the company of her father, four of her five brothers, various sisters-in-law, and one of her two sisters, in addition to members of her husband’s family.

In 1840 Robert Calvert—one of those “enterprising Alabamians”—was enumerated on the Saline County census, in Saline Township, with his wife, three daughters, a son, and thirty slaves. He was the second largest slaveowner in the county, after his father-in-law, Thomas Keesee Sr., who owned thirty-one slaves. Many other members of the kinship group were living in the same county and enumerated as heads of household. In fact, of the 397 slaves in Saline County at the time of the 1840 census, members of this kinship group owned 123. Eight men out of a total white population of 2061 owned over 30 percent of the slave population in the county. This dominance of

---

45 1840 Saline County, Arkansas, Census, NAMS 704, Roll 20, pp. 208, 210, 212, and 213; see also, Carolyn Earle Billingsley, *1840 Saline County, Arkansas, Census* (Alexander, Ark.: Saline Research, 1987), 3, for a list of slaveowners.
the slave-owning class gave the kinship group a certain status, particularly at the county level. "The man with the most slaves naturally cut the widest swath, and in gaining the most land at the best location . . . such a man naturally assumed leadership of his community. . . . The most important symbol of wealth was slave-ownership, which, more than land or mercantile success, conferred the greatest prestige."46

During the Keesee kinship group's residence in Saline County, some clearly fit the definition of "planter," but authoritatively categorizing a group of people as "planters" assumes a static social organization. Were all the members of the Keesee kinship group planters? If we accept the usual dividing line between yeoman and planters to be ownership of twenty or more slaves engaged in market-oriented agriculture, then the answer is both yes and no. In 1840, Thomas Keesee Sr., Thomas Keesee Jr., and Robert Calvert fit the definition of planter, owning thirty-one, twenty-one, and thirty slaves, respectively; but Milton Keesee, Benjamin Clardy, and George Polk Keesee, owners of fifteen, five, and no slaves, respectively, did not fall within the definition of planter—at least not at that particular point in time. So, if a man and one or more sons or sons-in-law were of the planter class, did that mean his other sons or sons-in-law were not members of the planter class? By 1860, Benjamin Clardy (one of Thomas Keesee Sr.'s sons-in-law) had finally acquired a total of twenty-one slaves: does that mean he did not consider himself a member of the planter class until some particular year in between 1850 and 1860, when he crossed the magic threshold of owning twenty or more slaves? And, although Thomas Keesee Sr. owned no slaves in 1800 when he was a young married man with three children, he was definitely a member of the planter class by 1840.

46 McNeilly, The Old South Frontier, p. 78.
but then by 1858, he only owned nine slaves; how then should historians classify his status? Obviously planter status was fluid—at least as it is defined by historians. [See Figure 4.2 for the changing slave-owning status of selected members of the Keesee kinship group.]

Another aspect of the slippery-ness of classifying antebellum southerners by class arises from the natural ebb and flow of a man’s fortunes, status, and situation over the span of his life. Young men were naturally not as rich or prominent in the normal course of affairs as they would be later in life as mature men. Furthermore, a part of the natural cycle of life was the divestiture of a man’s wealth and possessions as he aged or upon his death; children matured, married, and had children of their own, inclining fathers to begin the distribution of at least part of their estates that was completed upon their deaths. Like Thomas Keesee Sr., this natural progression would have the effect of moving the father out of the planter class over time and his sons into it. Over the course of his lifetime, as shown in Figure 4.2, Thomas Keesee Sr. went from being a non-slaveholder to planter status, then in his old age, no longer owned sufficient numbers of slaves to qualify for planter status. Nevertheless, the entire narrative of his life places him squarely in the planter class.

The evidence presented in this study indicates that members of a kinship group seemed most likely to derive their status and their class identity from the range of their effective kin as a whole, whether or not a particular individual met the standards for membership in the planter class as modern-day historians have constructed it. At any one given point in time, one or more individuals may not meet the explicit definition of
"planter," but they were still a member of the planter class by virtue of their affiliation with family members who did meet such a definition.

Figure 4.2: Slave Ownership Numbers, 1840–1860
Selected members of the Keesee Kinship Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to Thomas Keesee Sr./Birth Year</th>
<th>Thomas Keesee Sr.</th>
<th>George Polk Keesee</th>
<th>Thomas Keesee Jr.</th>
<th>Gideon Keesee</th>
<th>Robert Calvert</th>
<th>Benjamin Claridy</th>
<th>James A. Hicks</th>
<th>George Washington Rutherford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1840 Census</td>
<td>Same/ ca. 1778</td>
<td>Son/ ca. 1797</td>
<td>Son/ 1804</td>
<td>Son-in-law/ 1802</td>
<td>Son-in-law/ ca. 1797</td>
<td>Son-in-law/ 1812</td>
<td>Grandson-in-law/ ca. 1812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846 Tax List</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850 Census</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860 Census</td>
<td>10 i2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6 i3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

47 Thomas Keesee Sr. did not own any slaves in 1800, according to his census enumeration in Spartanburg County, S.C. that year; National Archives and Records Administration (hereinafter NARA) M32, 50, p. 179.


49 *Ibid.* Some of the men listed in the chart had already moved away from Saline County so there is no tax listing for them. Only slaves who were over eight years of age and under sixty years of age were taxed, so each man owned more slaves than are counted here.

50 1850 U. S. Census, Slave Schedules: Union County, Arkansas; Saline County, Arkansas; Hot Spring County, Arkansas; and Ouachita County, Arkansas—all found on NARA M432, 32.

51 1860 U. S. Census, Slave Schedules: Ashley County, Arkansas (M653, 53); Union County, Arkansas (M653, 54); Robertson County, Texas (M653, 1312), Falls County, Texas (M653, 1309); Hot Spring County, Arkansas (M653, 53); Saline County, Arkansas (M653, 54); and Columbia County, Arkansas (M653, 53).

52 “Will of Thomas Keesee,” (written 1858), Will Record 1, p. 157. Ashley County, Arkansas, lists nine slaves to be distributed to his heirs.
Saline County was created in November of 1835, and Arkansas Territory became a state in June of 1836; the Keesee kinship group began their transferal to Arkansas immediately upon the heels of statehood. They quickly established their status as men of substance in this newly organized region, acquiring a great deal of federal land, supplemented by private purchases of land, and then putting in cotton crops. But they also took advantage of county, state, and federal office-holding to enhance both their prestige and their wealth. Calvert's brother-in-law Benjamin Clardy, who had married Thomas Keesee's daughter Agnes in Alabama, was captain of the township slave patrol in 1837—an organization of men appointed by the county court to keep the slave population under control. The patrol that year also included Clardy's son-in-law James Moore (who was also Robert Calvert's stepfather at one time\textsuperscript{54}), and Moore was also a Saline County Commissioner. On April 9, 1840, Robert Calvert and brothers-in-law Benjamin Clardy and Thomas Keesee Jr. were appointed to the slave patrol for Saline Township. Less than a year later, Calvert was appointed overseer of the third division of the Military Road by the court, and on January 22, 1841, he was re-appointed to the Saline Township company of patrols, along with nephews George West Murphy and

\textsuperscript{53} George W. Rutherford died in October 1858 and his probate papers listed six slaves as part of his estate. "Estate of G. W. Rutherford, dec.\textsuperscript{4}," Loose Probate Files, Robertson County Courthouse, Franklin, Texas. \textsuperscript{54} James Moore is a very common name but I am reasonably certain that the James Moore who married Robert Calvert's widowed mother Lucy (Rogers) Calvert in 1825 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama (ceremony performed by kinsman Jesse Hill) and the James Moore who married Benjamin Clardy's daughter Saryan in 1841 in Saline County, were the same man, even though he was much younger than Lucy and much older than Saryan. James Moore and wife Lucy sold land in Saline County in 1839 and Lucy is probably the oldest female enumerated in Moore's household in 1840. Lucy probably died shortly after the census and Moore, age 41, then married Saryan Clardy, who was not quite 16. For Moore-Calvert marriage, Pauline Jones Gantrud, \textit{Alabama Records}, (Shreveport: J&W Enterprises, 1996), Vol. 8, p. 47; for Lucy and James Moore as husband and wife in Saline County, see Saline County, Arkansas, Deed Book A, pp. 457–460; and for Moore-Clardy marriage, see Saline County, Arkansas, Marriage Book A, p. 35.
James Moore (also his one-time stepfather). It certainly made sense for many of this kinship group to serve as patrollers, since they constituted the largest group of slaveholders in the area; they earned money from the county while protecting their own property and interests.  

55 Calvert was elected Saline County Representative to the Arkansas State Legislature in 1842, serving two years, and in 1846 and 1848 was elected and served as Saline County Judge until shortly before he left the county.  

These and other examples of public service helped establish the family as members of the elite class (by Saline County and early Arkansas standards), which furthered their political careers. Those political careers provided them with fees and salaries that supplemented their cotton profits and also kept their fingers on the pulse of local events, which, in turn, brought other financial opportunities to their attention. It was a self-perpetuating loop, enhanced by felicitous marriages (and, at the same time, enhancing their chances for felicitous marriages).

George Washington Rutherford's marriage to Robert Calvert's oldest daughter Lucy Ellen in 1843 demonstrates the synergistic effects of the alliances created by

55Sybil Crawford, comp., Saline County, Arkansas, County Court Record Book Vol. 1: 1836–1839 (Bryant, Ark.: Saline County History and Heritage Society, Inc., 1988), 18; Crawford, Saline County, Arkansas, County Court Record Book Vol. 2: 1840–1843 (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS., 1988), 12, 30, and 35/original record book 105, 127, and 133. See, for example, Laws of Arkansas Territory (Little Rock, Ark. Terr: J. Steele, Esq., 1833), 520–32 (Slaves), and 530–32 (Patrols)—patrols were appointed by the circuit court in each township as required, "consisting of one discreet person to be called the captain of the patrol, and as many others under his direction as the court may deem necessary, not exceeding four . . . and the said company . . . shall patrol as many hours in each month as the court appointing the same may direct, not to be less than twelve hours in each month within their respective townships, and visit negro quarters, and other suspected places of unlawful assemblies of slaves." The captain and the members of the patrol were to be paid "one dollar for every twelve hours" of patrolling and, unless the patrollers served without compensation, a tax on all slaves over the age of sixteen in that township was to be assessed to pay the costs of the patrol. For the activities of slave patrols in South Carolina, see Theodore Rosegarten, Tombee: Portrait of a Cotton Planter, with the Journal of Thomas B. Chaplin (1822–1890) (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1986), 118–20. For James Moore as Saline County Commissioner, see for example, Saline County, Arkansas, Deed Book A, pp. 295, 299, 302.

marriages because of the tendency of the wealthier, politically involved families of status to marry into similar families. Rutherford was the younger brother of Samuel Morton Rutherford, who was elected sheriff of Pulaski County for the years 1825 through 1830 (three terms of office), was a member of the Seventh and Eighth Arkansas Territorial House of Representatives from Pulaski County (the parent county of Saline) from 1831 through at least 1833, the Territorial Treasurer of Arkansas from 1833 through 1836, and an agent to the Indians.⁵⁷ Another of George's older brothers was Archibald Hamilton Rutherford, who was also extremely active in local, state, and federal (including

---

⁵⁷ Historical Report of the Secretary of State (Little Rock, Ark.: Secretary of State, 1958), pp. 202 (for territorial treasurer service), 248–249 (for legislature service) and p. 615 (for terms as sheriff). The journals for the Ninth Territorial General Assembly of 1835 are not extant and Rutherford was not reported as a member of the First General Assembly after statehood, 1836–1837. See also "Abstract of Payments to Members of the Legislative Assembly [held 1833]," in Clarence Edwin Carter, ed., The Territorial Papers of the United States, vol. XX (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1954), pp. 942–943; Samuel M. Rutherford was paid for 30 days at the rate of $3 per day and received no payment for mileage (indicating he probably lived at that time within the city of Little Rock where the session was held), for a total of $90; and A Memorial & Biographical History of Ellis County, Texas (Ellis County History), (1892, Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1892; rpr., Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Historical Museum & Art Gallery, 1972), p. 285: "after the admission of the State into the Union he was agent for the Choctaws, and then for the Seminoles, after which he was elected county Judge; he was sent to Florida as an agent for the Seminole Indians, and after one year he was successful in making a treaty with them."
Confederate) politics. Given the prominence of his older brothers, it is not surprising that George W. Rutherford was able to secure an appointment as Deputy Marshall of Saline County, District of Arkansas in 1840; was elected to a two-year term as Saline County Sheriff from 1842 to 1844; held an appointment as a major in the 18th Regiment (Saline County) of the Arkansas State Militia in 1843; and was appointed Colonel Commandant of that same unit in 1846. Both his status and his political career were no doubt only enhanced by his marriage to the oldest daughter of Judge Robert Calvert, and

---

58 See Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Southern Arkansas, (Chicago, Nashville, and St. Louis: Goodspeed Publishing Co., 1890: ppr., Easley, SC: Southern Historical Press, 1978), p. 164: "In 1831 [Archibald Hamilton Rutherford] came to Arkansas, whither his brother Samuel had preceded him in the year 1817, resided a year in Little Rock, and then moved to Clark County, where he lived for seven years. While there he engaged in merchandising, and at the same time studied law. In 1833 he was elected county judge of Clark County, and in 1835 he was elected clerk of the circuit court, and re-elected to the same office in 1836. One year later he was elected a member of the Legislature of the State, to fill an unexpired term, and was re-elected in 1838 and again in 1840. He was admitted to the bar in 1838 and in 1841 was appointed deputy clerk of the United States court at Little Rock, which position he held until 1845. Mr. Rutherford was one of the Democratic leaders, and the Democratic organ for the State was the Arkansas Banner. He was selected by his party to control it, and he edited it with marked ability and force during 1845 and 1846. In 1847 he went with his brother, S. M. Rutherford, superintendent of Indian Affairs, Southwestern Territory, to the Territory, and remained there until the fall of 1849, when he returned to Fort Smith, Ark., where he engaged in the practice of law with Ben. T. Duval until 1855. In December of the previous year he was elected treasurer of the State of Arkansas, which position he held until 1857. In 1856 he was appointed by Gov. Conway, superintendent and instructor of the State penitentiary; also private secretary to the governor, and during a portion of the latter's term he was also acting secretary of State. In 1859 he was appointed clerk of the district and circuit courts of the United States for the Eastern District of Arkansas, which office he resigned in 1860. He was a State's Democrat of the Calhoun school, and warmly and ably advocated the election of Breckenridge to the presidency in the memorable contest preceding the war. At this time he was engaged in writing for the Arkansas True Democrat, a paper in which he had an interest, and at that time the ablest and most influential journal in the Southwest, outside of New Orleans, and which had an immense circulation. He took a firm and decided stand for Southern rights and State sovereignty, and was an inveterate foe of Northern aggression. In 1861 he was appointed Confederate States receiver for the Eastern District of Arkansas, an office of great responsibility and trust, which he held until the death of the Confederacy. During the war he removed his family to Texas, but remained himself the greater portion of the time in Arkansas in discharge of his duties as a public functionary. . . ." See also Historical Report of the Secretary of State, p. 202 for service as Treasurer of Arkansas 1855–1857; and Mrs. E. E. [Rutherford] Wall, "Archibald H. Rutherford: An Arkansas Pioneer," Arkansas Historical Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 4 (1946): 388-401.

59 A Memorial & Biographical History of Ellis County, Texas, p. 285; Billingsley, 1840 Saline County, Arkansas, Census, (as A U. S. Deputy Marshall, GWR was the enumerator for the census in this county in 1840); and "Saline County Commissioned Officers [Arkansas State Militia]," The Saline, Vol. 6, No. 3 (Sept. 1991): 115, 113-116.
Calvert’s sphere of influence was also improved by his connection to such a prominent family group. ⁶⁰

Although no explicit evidence exists to indicate that Rutherford's or Calvert's political career was directly assisted by kinship ties, there have been several studies demonstrating the importance of family networks in similar circumstances. In the antebellum South, where public institutions and organizations were relatively weak or lacking, family often served as an economic and political power base. As Edward E. Baptist has so aptly demonstrated in his study of a planter kinship group on Florida's cotton frontier, “kinship enabled these migrant planters to obtain and then control access to scarce political, economic, and cultural resources: kinship was power.” The Calvert-Keesee kinship group, like Baptist’s Florida planters, were able to use their unity to create a faction more powerful than any one of them would have been alone. “They knew,” Baptist argues, “that power came from the collective strength of families, bound together in a web of assistance and kinship.” ⁶¹

In 1850 Calvert was again enumerated in Saline County. The value of his real estate was listed on that census as $7,200. He owned thirty-six slaves in the county and fifteen more were on loan to his son in Union County; two other slaves had died within the past year. He owned 500 acres of improved land and 1,900 acres of unimproved land.

---

⁶⁰ These three Rutherford brothers were the sons of Archibald Hamilton Rutherford (Sr.) and Margaret Massie Parrish, who were first cousins. The Rutherfords' migration pattern was similar to the Keesees: Virginia, to Tennessee, to Arkansas. Interestingly, when Thomas Keesee Jr. and other members of the Keesee kinship group settled in Ellis County, Texas in the late 1860s and 1870s, they were preceded to that county by William Booker Rutherford, who had migrated there during the Civil War. It seems unlikely this was a coincidence, but there is no proof of communication between the two families (connected by the marriage of kin).

⁶¹Edward E. Baptist, “The Migration of Planters to Antebellum Florida: Kinship and Power,” Journal of Southern History LXII (Aug.), 527–54, see especially p. 529 (first quotation), and p. 553 (second quotation). For an expanded version of this article, see Baptist's dissertation, “Creating an Old South.”
He produced seventy-four bales of cotton; that year, only one other man in the county produced as much cotton. He raised 25 bushels of wheat, 15 bushels of rye, 4,000 bushels of corn, and 100 bushels of oats, in addition to hay, peas and beans, potatoes, sweet potatoes, and barley. His plantation also produced wool, butter, and honey, and he had horses, mules, oxen, cattle, sheep, and swine valued at $1,315.\(^2\) Obviously Calvert was one of the county’s wealthiest and most respected planters, and he had ascended to the upper rung of the planter class.

Robert and Mary Calvert’s four children married during their years in Arkansas. First, Lucy married George Washington Rutherford, September 28, 1843. Next, her sister Paulina married Joseph Tom Garrett on December 4, 1845. Mary and Dr. Peter H. Smith married December 26, 1848. Each of the daughters married in Saline County, but William, the only son, married Alabama C. Cottingham, the daughter of a prosperous cotton planter, July 19, 1849, in Union County, Arkansas, where they resided at the time of the 1850 census.\(^3\) Of Robert and Mary Calvert’s four children who survived to adulthood, one daughter married a young man who later became an affluent planter, one

---

\(^2\) Carolyn Earle Billingsley. *1850 Saline County, Arkansas Census, Photocopied From the Original Microfilmed Census: Schedules 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, With Full-Name Index* (Alexander, Ark.: Saline Research, 1988), 9, 72, 187, 189; and Bobbie Jones McLane and Desmond Walls Allen. *1850 Census of Southern Arkansas: Ashley, Bradley, Clark, Dallas, Drew, Hempstead, Lafayette, Ouachita, Pike, Polk, Sevier, and Union Counties* (Conway, Ark.: Arkansas Research, 1995), 110 (slave schedule).

married a doctor, one married a politically well-connected man ensconced in a kinship network of his own, and their only son married the daughter of another slave-owning planter.\textsuperscript{64} Consciously or unconsciously (or a bit of both), the kinship network incorporated other families that increased the overall wealth and status of the group as a whole.

Marriage alliances and kinship also aided the kinship group by diversifying their wealth-producing activities in a way that supported the kinship group's political and economic goals. Robert Calvert, for example, not only bought and sold town lots (apparently a speculative activity), but helped his son William establish some type of entrepreneurial enterprise (Smith and Calvert) and also sent his own slaves with William to Union County to help William establish himself as a planter there. One of his daughters married a physician and another married a politician. Donald P. McNeilly aptly summarized this point: "Family networks of brothers, cousins, and uncles would pool resources—slaves, land, and capital—and pursue a variety of vocations—planting law, medicine, merchandizing—to seek wealth."\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{64} The Calvert children continued the tradition of naming patterns when their children were born. William and Alabama Calvert named their oldest son for William's father (Robert), the oldest daughter for William's mother (Mary), and their second son for Alabama's father (Charles). George and Lucy Rutherford named children for Lucy's father (Robert Calvert Rutherford), for Lucy's paternal grandfather (William), for Lucy's mother (Mary), and for Lucy's sister (Pauline J.). Joseph T. and Pauline Garrett named children John T. (namesake not known), Mary (for Pauline's mother), and Lucy (for Pauline's sister and paternal grandmother). Dr. Peter and Mary Smith named children Margaret (namesake unknown), Peter P. (for father), Sarah F. (namesake unknown), and Robert Calvert Smith (for Mary's father). These naming patterns are quite similar to those in other branches of the kinship group.

\textsuperscript{65} For Robert Calvert's buying and selling of Benton town lots, see Saline County Deed Books A, p. 347; B, pp. 9–10, and 205; C, pp. 214–216, 231, 265; and E, pp. 273–274, and 284; all located at the Saline County Circuit Clerk's office, Benton, Arkansas. For William Calvert's business enterprise, see Saline County Deed Book B, pp. 9–10 wherein James Moore as Saline County Commissioner, along with surviving partner William Calvert of the firm Smith & Calvert, sell two town lots to Robert Calvert after the death of Smith (1839). For Robert Calvert sending some of his slaves to Union County with his son William, see Union County, Arkansas, Slave Schedule (Johnson Township) for 15 slaves under name of Robt. Calvert. For quotation, see McNeilly, \textit{The Old South Frontier}, p. 68.
One of the ways kinship ties and politics went hand in hand is the advantage kinsmen had when one of their relatives served as sheriff or county commissioner. Men in these types of offices were often the first to know of prime land or property that would soon be sold. A sheriff, for example, served warrants on debtors and handled sales of the properties of men with judgments against them, and a commissioner might be appointed to sell the property of someone who had died; thus, they had the inside track on knowledge about the sale property. In a typical case from the Saline County deed records, James Moore, as a Saline County Commissioner appointed by the Circuit Court “to sell the real estate of Joshua W. Smith Dec’d,” along with William Calvert (Smith’s former partner in the firm of Smith & Calvert), “did on the 16th day of June 1838 sell at public auction lots No. One and two in Block or Square Number ten in the town of Benton for twelve hundred dollars and Robert Calvert became the purchaser.”\(^{66}\) This is not to say that this or other records point to any type of illegal or underhanded tactics between family members—in fact, the auctions where these sales took place were public; but having a relative who was a county commissioner or sheriff would, no doubt, have alerted family members to sales well in advance of other citizens. In this particular case, it appears that Robert Calvert was either helping out his son William, who may not have been able to buy out his deceased partner’s share of their jointly held land, or that Robert Calvert was increasing his investment in town lots through this opportunity, or both. The next year, James Moore was one of three petitioners making a formal application to incorporate the town of Benton (the county seat), which would have the ultimate effect of

\(^{66}\) “Saline County Deed Book B.” Saline County Circuit Clerk’s Office, Benton, Arkansas, pp. 9–10.
increasing the value of town lots, many of which were owned by members of the Keesee kinship group.\textsuperscript{67}

Once various men of the kinship group achieved a toehold in county politics, it became a self-reinforcing loop; public service begat more public service and greater responsibility. The results were increased stature in the community as well as the potential for profits for kin. When twenty-seven-year-old James A. Hicks, for example, (who was married to Thomas Keesee Sr.'s granddaughter and was a nephew of Robert Calvert and Milton Keesee) did some blacksmithing for the county and was paid four dollars by the county court in 1839, or when he made some repairs on the county jail and was paid forty-seven dollars that same year, he probably owed those small commissions as much to the influence of his kin, as to his own public service as a road viewer, justice of the peace, and associate justice for a term of the county court.\textsuperscript{68} Although he was a young man, owning no slaves at all and not wealthy in 1840, he was connected by a myriad of links to the biggest slave-owning planter kinship group in the county. His kinship to such prominent people certainly did him no harm when local governmental officials, operating out of the same courthouse where Hicks’ kin worked, were distributing paying jobs.

The late 1840s and early 1850s were a time of transition for most of the kinship group. Milton Keesee, along with many other family and community members, left Saline County sometime in the early 1840s and relocated approximately 100 miles south

\textsuperscript{67} "Saline County Deed Book A," Saline County Circuit Clerk's Office, Benton, Arkansas, p. 349.

\textsuperscript{68} Sybil Crawford, transcriber, \textit{Saline County, Arkansas, County Court Record Book, Volume I: January 26, 1836–December 31, 1839} (Bryant, Ark.: Saline County History and Heritage Society, 1988), pp. 61, 63, 67, 69, 71, and 79–80. Note that in 1839, Saline County paid Hicks $4 for the blacksmithing job, $47 for the repairs to the jail, $1.50 for services as a justice of the peace, and $10 for his duties as associate justice of the county court.
in Union County, Arkansas. Keesee wasted no time becoming involved in political life: in 1848 he was elected and served one term in the Arkansas House of Representatives.\textsuperscript{69} The lands in the Ouachita River bottoms of Union County had been noted as rich and suitable for cotton cultivation a decade previously when the Calverts, Keesees, and others had migrated from Alabama to Saline County, Arkansas.\textsuperscript{70} The planters may also have been influenced by the effect of the Panic of 1837, which only began to affect Arkansas by 1845. Even though the average Arkansas taxpayer's aggregate property (total acres of land, numbers of slaves, and head of livestock) increased between 1840 and 1845, the value of that property declined.\textsuperscript{71} Sometime between 1846 and 1850, Milton's father, Thomas Keesee Sr., also left Saline County for Union County. Other families who relocated to Union County in this same time period include those of two daughters of Benjamin and Agnes (Keesee) Clardy, Robert Calvert's son William and daughter Lucy (Calvert) Rutherford, Robert Calvert's brothers-in-law Gideon Keesee and Thomas Keesee Jr., Thomas Keesee Jr.'s daughter and son-in-law Ann and E. H. Hammond and most of his other grown and minor children, Thomas D. Keesee, William Calvert—and others too numerous to mention.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{69}Milton was enumerated in Saline County in 1840, was on a jury there in August 1841, but was listed as having "left the county" on the 1842 tax list. In 1848, he was nominated for a position in the Arkansas House by Union County Democrats. He was not enumerated there at the time of the 1850 census, however. See Billingsley, \textit{1840 Saline County, Arkansas Census, \textit{10}}; Eddie G. Landreth, \textit{Abstract of the Saline County, Arkansas Circuit Court Common Law Book "A", 1836–1842} (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, 1990), 1 (1837), 14 (1839), 55 (August 1841, defendant in debt case, failed to appear), 56 (August 1841, served on jury); and Sybil Crawford, comp., \textit{Saline County, Arkansas County Court Record Book, Volume 2: 1840–1843} (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, 1988), 62 (MK on delinquent tax list for 1842). For service in Arkansas General Assembly, 1848–1849, see \textit{Historical Report of the Secretary of State, p. 259.}

\textsuperscript{70}"From Alabama to Arkansas," 8–9.

\textsuperscript{71}Bolton, \textit{Territorial Ambition, 54–55.}

\textsuperscript{72}McLane and Allen, \textit{1850 Census of Southern Arkansas, 95–110.}
Shortly after the 1850 census was taken, Robert Calvert, along with his extended family and slaves, relocated to the rich Brazos River bottoms of Robertson County, Texas, following his brother-in-law Milton Keesee, who had once again blazed the trail into new territory for the family after remaining in Union County, Arkansas, for only a few years. Calvert's new plantation was also just up the Brazos River from his brother-in-law William Keesee's residence in Washington County, Texas. William Keesee, who had moved to Washington County about 1837 with a group of his wife's kin, was prospering and may have influenced his brother Milton, his brother-in-law Robert Calvert, and others of the kinship group to come to this area of Texas. When he arrived in the county, Calvert bought 653 acres in 1851 and, in 1852, another parcel of 1307 acres of land for $3,900.73

Calvert's "was the first great plantation in the county and it was the best equipped in all of Texas."74 In 1853, he assessed 2,111 acres of first-class land on the Brazos River (valued at over $6,000), 38 slaves (valued at $19,000), 18 horses, 54 head of cattle, and $525 miscellaneous property, for a total taxable value of $27,618. Seven years later, in 1860, he assessed 3,827 acres (valued at $38,270), 74 slaves (valued at $44,400) 36 horses, 202 head of cattle, and other property, for a total taxable value of $88,800—an increase in wealth of well over 300 percent in just seven years.75

The town of Sterling grew up in the area around Calvert's plantation in Robertson County. It was founded about the same time the Calverts arrived. In addition to all

73 Robertson County, Texas, Deed Books, Book M, 311-312, judgment for Milton Keesee vs. Robt. Calvert as Adm. of Wm. M. Webb, citing to original deed in Book I, pp. 31 & 34; and Robertson County, Texas, Deed Books, Book L, pp. 74-75.
74J. W. Baker, A History of Robertson County, Texas (Waco, Tex.: Texian Press, 1971), 129; and Parker, History of Robertson County, 137-38.
751853 and 1860 Robertson County Tax Lists, Robertson County Courthouse, Franklin, Texas; photocopies in possession of author.
Calvert's children along with their spouses and children, other members of the kinship group who relocated to Robertson County included Milton Keesee, Thomas Keesee Jr., Edward Calvert, James Calvert, and Alexander Calvert. Even Calvert's minister from his time in Arkansas, William Wharton, along with his family, came with him to Robertson County, Texas. Many other members of the kinship group came to Texas and settled in counties nearby; some came with Calvert directly from Saline County, Arkansas, and some had made an intermediate stop in Union County, Arkansas, before following Calvert to Texas.

In the decade before the Civil War, Calvert and his kin prospered and were active on many fronts. According to the 1860 slave schedule, Calvert owned 75 slaves, who lived in 25 slave houses on the plantation. Along with supervising his vast cotton plantation, he bought and sold land and town lots, and, although his daughter Lucy had died in Arkansas, he financed her widower, his son-in-law, George W. Rutherford, in a mercantile business in Sterling. Calvert was elected to and served one term in the Texas State Legislature in 1853. He was also a champion of the benefits of the railroad; along with two other Robertson County men, he contracted with the Houston & Texas Central Railroad to build the grade and cut ties for the railroad in their area. Calvert was also for thirty years a ruling elder in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and was a Knight Templar in the Masonic Order. Also members of Pierce Lodge No. 144, A. F. & A. M. in

---

76 Calvert, in fact, was the executor of Wharton's estate when he died in Robertson County in 1862. For Wharton's residence in Saline County, Arkansas, see Carolyn Earle Billingsley, 1840 Saline County, Arkansas, Census. (Alexander, AR: Saline Research, 1987), p. 9 (census p.; 209, Saline Township). For Wharton's residence in Robertson County, see 1860 U. S. Census, Washington County, Texas, (M653, 1307; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p. 176B, Dwelling 406, Precinct #3, PO Sterling, Texas. For more on the relationship between Wharton and Robert Calvert, see above Chapter Three.

77 Parker, History of Robertson County, 80, 137–138; and Contract—Houston & Texas Central Railway Company to and with Robert Calvert and James S. Hanna, Robertson County Deed Book N, 211–218, Robertson County Courthouse, Franklin, Texas, copy in possession of author.
the town of Sterling were other members of the kinship group, including Calvert's kinsmen H. D. Bennett, J. T. Garrett, and William Calvert.  

Milton Keesee (Robert Calvert's double brother-in-law, so to speak) died in Washington County, Texas, March 10, 1860. Although Milton had a wife, family, and a fairly large estate, Robert Calvert, in applying for letters of administration on Milton's estate, wrote that "Milton Kessee, at the time of his decease, had no fixed domicile or place of residence: but that he died in Washington County, having no property of any importance there; and, being at the time, a non-resident, so far as petitioner is advised, of any county in the state." No explicit evidence has been found to clarify this puzzling statement. It is probable, however, that since Milton's estate consisted mainly of horses and mules and, because he left outstanding notes from a variety of locations in Texas and Louisiana, that he may have been a horse trader who kept on the move, leaving his wife

78 Goodspeed, Central Arkansas., 235; Baker, A History of Robertson County, Texas, 445; and Parker, History of Robertson County, 137–138. Note that his tombstone is adorned with a Masonic symbol; survey of cemetery by author, March 28, 1997. For his selling town lots and land, see, for example Robertson County, Texas, Deed Books, Book O, pp. 480–481. For his business partnership with Rutherford, see Loose Probate File of G. W. Rutherford, Robertson County Courthouse, Franklin, Texas, particularly "J. T. Garrett admr, Petition filed Oct. 31 1859, Succession of G. W. Rutherford."

79 "Amended Petition for Letters of Administration, R. Calvert," Succession of Milton Keesee, Robertson County, Texas, filed June 26, 1860; loose probate packet. Courthouse at Franklin, Texas; copy of document in possession of author. Probate files are composed of the collection of all the original loose papers stemming from the probate of an estate, including but not limited to the original will, letters of administration, vouchers for payments to creditors, vouchers for disbursements to heirs, inventories of estates, sale bills, and petitions to the probate court. Once the probate of the deceased was completed, the papers were gathered into a packet and marked on the outside with the name of the deceased whose estate was being probated and, often, with an identifying number. In most cases, courthouses have thrown out these old papers and have retained only the official books that record the significant filings regarding estates. When extant, however, these loose probate packets are an invaluable window into the family and finances of those who died with enough property to constitute an estate.
and son to manage slaves and cotton. And since he had no set residence, Robert Calvert no doubt found it more convenient to probate the estate in his own home county, although the claim about Keesee’s residence may have been merely a subterfuge on Calvert’s part for the sake of expediency. Calvert’s sons-in-law J. T. Garrett and P. H. Smith posted $40,000 bond as securities for Calvert as administrator of Keesee’s estate. Keesee’s probate files make it clear that his business dealings often involved kin. For example, at time of Milton Keesee’s death, he owed over $300 to James Moore (presumably the husband of Milton’s sister Agnes’ daughter Sarah Ann Clardy). He had also borrowed money and bought a slave on credit from his son William Calvert Keesee in 1859 or 1860; the debt was outstanding at the time of Milton’s death. At the time of the 1860 census, Milton’s wife Mary (Calvert) Keesee was residing in Falls County, Texas, with her son William Calvert Keesee (who died the following year) and his family, along with her unmarried daughter Nannie C. Keesee. Mary had considerable property, indicating perhaps that she, rather than her husband, was the owner of record of the slaves and land.

Milton Keesee’s probate file represents an illustrative portrait of his financial modus vivendi: instead of obtaining money at a bank, antebellum southerners like Keesee acquired needed funds from an informal network of friends, neighbors, kin, and business

---

80 The “Sale Bill” in the Succession of Milton Keesee, filed 29 April 1862, lists only horses and mules, sold mostly to family members at an estate sale held in Sterling, for a total of $3,018.50. An inventory of the estate filed in 1860 also lists “500 Acres of Land on the West Bank of Brazos River in Milam County” at $1.50 an acre for a total valuation of $750. Even if Milton Keesee had “no fixed domicile,” and was “a non-resident . . . of any county in the state,” his account with the merchant J. J. Hodge and Company, paid by his estate, listed only items obviously for his family’s use, e.g., reticule, scissors, garters, beads, ribbon, hose, thimble, silk, gingham, calico, buttons, candy, and swiss muslin. For quotations, see “R. Calvert’s Amended Petition for Letters of Administration,” filed June 26, 1860, Succession of Milton Keesee [sic].
81 Succession of Milton Keesee.
82 1860 U. S. Census, Falls County, Texas, Dwelling 202.
acquaintances. In exchange for loans of cash, Keesee left notes promising payments all across Texas and Louisiana and, when his estate was probated, these notes were presented for payment to the administrator of his estate, Robert Calvert. A typical voucher filed with the estate papers includes a promissory note (which looks much like a modern bank check, complete with an engraved Native American man as decoration), signed by Milton Keesee, for $100. The note promises to pay John J. Cain of Harris County, Texas, "At Sight," is dated October 15, 1859, and was executed in Houston. Another note submitted for payment to the estate is for a cash advance "on wool" in the amount of $200, paid to Milton Keesee in 1859 by the firm of E. B. Nichols and Company of Galveston, Texas. In a notarized document executed in Liberty County, Texas in 1861, Milton Keesee's kinsman by marriage, James Moore, swears that Keesee's estate owes him $330.75 for money Moore paid in Keesee's name in Union Parish, Louisiana, in 1859. The payment was for an amount "paid Jno. L. Barrett as atty [attorney] for Jno [John] Hill [another kinsman by marriage], being amt of Judgment & cost in the case of Jno Hill vs. James Moore et al, which amt I [James Moore] paid as Security for Milton Keesee," and for the cost of "atty fee for defending same." And, in another notarized statement, executed in Nueces County, Texas, Thomas M. Gay stated that "on the 10th of October A.D. 1859, the late col. Kazee [sic] borrowed the said sum of Fifty Dollars from me in cash ['at his special instance and request'], and that it is still due and unpaid to me. So Help me God!" All these claims (and many others) were approved as valid and paid from the estate by Calvert.\textsuperscript{83} Even while traveling and in the absence of a banking system, southerners like Keesee could access cash, borrow money, or pay for

\textsuperscript{83} Various vouchers, Succession of Milton Kesee [sic].
services or property merely by writing out and signing an I.O.U. Many of these transactions were between kinsmen and are hidden unless the researcher employs genealogical methodology to ferret out the entire range of kinship for an individual. These financial transactions demonstrate but one of the many ways that kin provided a wealth of social capital to members of a kinship group: an individual could usually count on a relative to advance him money even when he was traveling or short of cash.

Shortly after Keese died, the Civil War began and Robert Calvert carried on with the administration of Keese's estate amid the turmoil of the war. Calvert was a strong supporter of secession, giving "the cause of the Confederacy very substantial aid, fitting the wagon-trains and supplying the soldiers with horses and equipments." One of his grandsons (probably Robert Calvert Rutherford), aged eighteen, enlisted in the Confederate Army and died in service. Calvert's fortunes were badly damaged by the war—not only did he lose about half his financial capital when his slaves were emancipated but he spent heavily supporting the Confederacy while holding much of his cash in Confederate money that was worthless after the war. Before he could attempt a complete recovery, he died from yellow fever on September 20, 1867, in Robertson County, upon his return from a business trip to Houston.\footnote{Baker, A History of Robertson County, Texas, 480; and Brown, Indian Wars and Pioneers of Texas, 638–39, quotation.} Despite the financial setbacks resulting from the war, during the settlement of his estate, he owned real estate in Robertson, Falls, and Brazos Counties, as well as in Houston, appraised at over $30,000, and the list of claims due the estate totaled over $82,000.\footnote{"Report of Auditor" and "List of Claims," Estate of Robert Calvert, dec'd. March 3, 1869. Loose Probate Packet, Robertson County Courthouse, Franklin, Texas.}
The railroad Calvert had promoted finally came through the area after his death and the new town that arose at the local railroad station, on land he donated, was named in his honor. But as Calvert arose, the town of Sterling died, and Sterling Cemetery—where Robert Calvert and many of his kin were buried—became a muddy pasture where cattle now graze: of all tombstones that once stood there, only tombstones for Robert Calvert, Mary Calvert, and a granddaughter remain, alongside a historic marker in honor of the Sterling Cemetery. By 1871 the town of Calvert had the largest cotton gin in the world. Today the town of Calvert is a National Historic District with a treasure-trove of late-nineteenth-century architecture, but a population of about only 1500.

After Robert Calvert's death, his extensive estate was divided among his wife, his surviving children, and his grandchildren. In a variety of ways, the records of Calvert's estate reveal the intricate nature of family ties. For example, although Calvert named only his spouse, children and grandchildren as heirs, he had property (mostly mules and horses) in the possession of his brother-in-law Thomas Keesee in Ellis County at the time of his death, and he held the mortgage on property owned by Francis Asbury Thompson (Milton Keesee's son-in-law) in Brazos County. But the most striking evidence lies in one of the plats that indicate how Calvert's land was to be partitioned. This plat

---

86 His wife Mary “Polly” (Keesee) Calvert died December 16, 1873, in Robertson County, also of yellow fever during a local epidemic. Baker, A History of Robertson County, Texas, p. 639; and personal survey of Sterling Cemetery, March 28, 1997, photographs of tombstones in possession of author. See also, Sterling Cemetery, Texas Historical Commission Marker, Robertson County, Texas:
Burial place of some 400 Texas pioneers and descendants. On land granted (1835) to A. J. Webb, bought in 1850 by Judge Robert Calvert, a civic leader in Sterling, a town named for empresario Sterling C. Robertson, Calvert dedicated 11.1-acre cemetery and built adjacent Cumberland Presbyterian Church of his own plantation timber.
In 1867, Judge Calvert died and was buried near cemetery gate. The church building was moved by oxen to new town of Calvert (1 mi. E). In 1868, his wife, Mary Keesee Calvert, and their three daughters deeded cemetery site to the Cumberland Presbyterians. [erected 1973]

graphically illustrates representationally on the landscape how a great many people with varying surnames are still all closely related, inheriting property from one man to whom they were all related. [See Figure 4.3] Without using genealogical methodology, a researcher would see little connection between the people owing adjoining plots of land when they had such varied surnames as Garrett, Calvert, Quaite, Fort, and Rutherford.88

---

88 "Estate of Robert Calvert. Robertson County Loose Probate File, County Courthouse, Franklin, Texas."
Figure 4.3: Partition of Lands—Estate of Robert Calvert
Land on the Brazos River in Robertson County, Texas

———

89 Loose Probate File, Robertson County Courthouse, Franklin, Texas. After Calvert’s death, his land had to be divided among his surviving heirs: his widow Mary Calvert, his Rutherford grandchildren (including Mary Fort), his Calvert grandchildren, and his daughters Mary Quaite and Paulina J. Garrett.
The end of the Civil War definitively demarcates the end of an era in the lives of the Keesee-Calvert kinship group. Before the war, the best strategy for planters seeking political and economic success on the cotton frontier was to act in concert with a large group of kin, pooling resources and skills, and enhancing social status through membership in the group. But above all, their financial and economic success, as well as status, was founded on the twin pillars of slavery and cotton: not only did slaves constitute the majority of the planters' financial capital, that same slave property also provided the labor to produce the cotton. After emancipation, the capital previously lodged in the bodies of slaves was lost to the planters and concomitantly the planters had to buy the labor of their ex-slaves. The central paradigm of antebellum southern society shifted, eliminating slavery in a single stroke, decreasing the wealth of the planters, and gradually bringing forth greater institutional complexity, all of which ushered in a decrease in the authority of planters and marking the beginning of a decline in the power of kinship groups.

Robert Calvert and the many family members composing the web of kinship that enfolded him are excellent examples of antebellum southern lives rich with close interactions with family, kinfolk, and community. In Calvert's world people needed the security of a network of relationships—relationships as necessary to their well-being as they were comforting. And the social capital Calvert and other antebellum southerners derived from their membership in a kinship group was just as instrumental to their political and their financial success as was their financial capital. If they had migrated to the cotton frontier in nuclear family units, without a supporting network of kin, their chances of successfully achieving status, wealth, or political power would have been
greatly decreased. Women needed their sisters, cousins, and granddaughters to provide emotional support in a harsh environment, to assist them with childbirth, child-rearing, and sickness; and they also needed their fathers, brothers, and sons to assure their safety, material comforts, and financial security. Men needed their male relatives to loan them money, to share labor (their own and that of their slaves), and to give them a helping hand in political and economic arenas. Although the bonds between fathers and daughter, husbands and wives, mothers and sons is difficult to quantify, it surely played a major role as well in the emotional and social health of family members. United, the kinship group was stronger and more adaptable than individual families acting alone would have been.

Kinship played a significant role in the lives of antebellum southerners—and the extent of kinship ties was much broader than those usually recognized in the present-day United States. In history, as in life, no person exists in a vacuum. Every life is like a tapestry woven of the warp and woof of relationships and events. To trace any of the threads in Robert Calvert’s life tapestry would lead into a complex interplay with the threads of the lives of others, and foremost, with the lives of a community of family. There were many influences—economic, political, religious, and social—shuttling in and out, weaving the structure of Calvert’s life and directing his economic decisions, but none were as embedded in his concerns as the attachments of kinship.

Over his lifetime and through at least three migrations to the cotton frontier, Robert Calvert leveraged his family connections and utilized his network of kin to achieve the planter ideal, much as did planter Stephen Duncan of Natchez, Mississippi, although on a far smaller scale.
the economic, social, and familial networks that comprised the Natchez elite [contributed to his power base]. The overlapping networks were deeply intertwined with one another, and cemented by marriage among the elite. As the nascent networks developed over time, an inner-circle emerged. This privileged group shared membership in all the networks. Through a variety of social and economic connections as well as marriage into prominent Natchez families, Stephen Duncan first positioned and then anchored himself at the center of this inner-circle. The connections Duncan made early in his career helped propel him into the planter elite; later, such connections helped maintain his power. The bond Duncan fostered and maintained were clearly vital to his success.  

Robert Calvert began life as the son of a man who raised cotton with a few slaves, increased his status and wealth through inheritance and through his marriage to the daughter of a planter, then used his own talents to bootstrap himself into the planter class by supplementing plantation agriculture with political officeholding and a bit of land speculation and entrepreneurship. The marriages of his children to those with political and/or economic clout of their own expanded his influence and status, as did the expanding political, social, and economic successes of his extra-nuclear kin. And, in turn, he aided his kin in achieving their own political and financial success. Politics and economic diversity were essential components of his success, but their influences were founded on his position within a kinship group and cannot be thoroughly understood outside of the context of kinship.

The antebellum South had a long history of kinship's co-mingling in the arenas of politics and economics, and although historians of the South have long recognized kinship's role, it has yet to be fully explored or pushed far enough. Although many historians have incorporated some kinship data into their works, few if any have distinguished kinship as a separate and distinct category of analysis. neither have they

analyzed the meanings and ramifications of kinship in the lives of antebellum southerners. The methodologies of genealogical research—that is, using more sources normally viewed as genealogical in nature, prioritizing kinship links as a research goal, and going beyond surname-matching—aid in painting the complete canvas depicting political and economic aspects of southern society and will no doubt prove to be a large factor in proving kinship was at the heart of most elements of southern society in the antebellum period.
CONCLUSION

This study of the Keesee kinship group demonstrates a method and a theoretical framework capable of circumventing many of the difficulties involved in pinning down what antebellum southerners thought, intended, or felt when we have little explicit evidence of their interior motivations. It would be much simpler if Thomas Keesee Sr. had left a diary detailing why he moved so many times, what his aspirations were, exactly how he interacted with his extended family on a daily basis, how significant they were in his life, and what kind of impact they had on his actions. Since he was not so thoughtful as to do so—or perhaps because someone tossed some “worthless old papers” in a burn pile while cleaning out an attic or old trunk—we can only glean and assemble evidence from every possible source to build a plausible record of the many facets of his life and the lives of his kin. Using that evidence and assembling it with kinship links in mind—using genealogical methodology to move beyond superficial surname matching, we can evaluate it through the interpretive framework of kinship theory. And from that, we can make educated guesses about motivations and feelings based on the actions of antebellum southerners whose lives were permeated and framed by kinship. We can bring the hidden contours of their lived experiences into focus by examining the evidentiary minutiae of their lives, elevating kinship to a category of analysis, and using genealogical methodology in concert with anthropological kinship theory to understand their lives as they understood it.
By employing this technique, I have shown that the received wisdom of antebellum southerners migrating westward as rugged individuals or in nuclear families units is patently false—the overwhelming majority migrated as family groups and formed settlements of kin. In a society with weakly organized or non-existent institutions, families remained the main organizing principle in the everyday lives of antebellum southerners. Kinship groups also provided the social capital necessary for success, from shared emotional and physical burdens to financial capital or aid, and even to survival at times. Without the united strength of related groups of families, successful migration and settlement would have been extremely problematic.

Moreover, in contrast to most modern American families, kinship groups acknowledged and honored a much wider range of kin—cousins to almost any degree, for example, were recognized in a meaningful way. After all, since kinship groups were the means of success and survival, the larger the group committed to each other, the more powerful they all were. Sibling exchanges and cousin marriages tightened the interlocking grid of kinship, creating families of children whose relationship to each other was closer than that of cousins and who had grandparents doubly bound to their grandchildren. Even two families who were merely connections, who had no blood ties to each other but who had mutual blood ties to other families, were considered within the effective range of kinship. Genealogical methodology allows one to see networks of kin far larger than simply the people who share the same last name. Many historical studies have failed to go beyond mere surname matching, which not only misses the complexity of kinship, but also is also gender-biased.
Southerners’ affiliation with their kinship group had a strong tendency to manifest itself in their religious preferences. More often than not, individuals followed in the steps of their families when they chose a church to attend. When they changed religious affiliation, it was often at the time of their marriage; their culture deemed it wisest for couples to attend the same church for the sake of the children and to accomplish that, sometimes one or both opted to switch denomination. Since children followed their parents’ religious affiliations, church and family groups were all but merged, especially since church services offered social contacts that often resulted in the marriages of members to one another. Churches also presented opportunities for contacts and communication over wide areas as ministers and elders went to local, state, and regional denominational meetings. They brought information from their travels and contacts back to the community and many times were able to report on lands to which the kinship group soon migrated. The high levels of kinship among ministers and ministers’ families also contributed to the transmission of specific information from and about other regions. Clergymen were highly mobile and tied into kinship networks—both of which enhanced their role as conduits of information.

But perhaps the most important role of kinship groups in the antebellum South, at least among planter families like the Keesees, was their enormous impact on political and economic activity. In a self-perpetuating loop, slave ownership increased wealth and status, while wealth and status facilitated political power, which, in turn, produced financial success and status—especially when a kinship group moved into a virtual power vacuum in a newly created political jurisdiction, as Saline County, Arkansas, was in the late 1830s. Moreover, the kinship group through marriage alliances with families
originally outside the group, continually incorporated new members with other skills, occupations, and connections that enhanced the overall strength of the group through diversity. This tendency, however, highlights one of the perils of trying to study the antebellum South—the difficulty of pinning down the intrinsically fluid nature of that society and of the people who inhabited it. The Keesee kinship group members were essentially planters, even though not all individuals achieved the planter class as defined by historians and even though some who did, failed to maintain that status. Virtually all, however, identified with the planter status of the group as a whole: they became slave owners themselves, they benefited from the status of their planter kinsmen, and they continued to migrate to the cotton frontier seeking wealth through slavery and cotton. If we were to look at the members of the kinship group individually or at any one frozen moment in time, we would be forced to divide them into groups labeled “planters” and “yeomen farmers,” and, although that would be technically accurate, it would be an artificial construct.

George W. Rutherford is a good example of an individual whom we would be forced to label as something other than a planter, and yet, when we view his life over time and space and in the context of his family relationships, his status becomes more complicated. He came from a politically well-connected family of slave owners and married into a similar family group, the Calverts and Keesees, who were planters. Rutherford served as an Assistant U. S. Marshall, then as the Saline County, Arkansas, sheriff as a young man, married Robert Calvert’s daughter, acquired a few slaves, served in the state militia, then moved to the cotton frontier of Union County, Arkansas, with other members of the kinship group and became a slave owner with nineteen slaves by
1850. Shortly afterward, even though his wife died, he followed his former father-in-law to the fertile lands of the Brazos River Valley in Texas, where Calvert financed Rutherford in a mercantile business. Rutherford died in 1858, owning six slaves at the time of his death. Thus, he was never a member of the planter class, since he never achieved ownership of twenty or more slaves. And yet, his class identity was clearly grounded in the planter class and he derived that class identity from his membership in his kinship group. That can only be intuited, however, by looking at his life in the context of that kinship group. In isolation, Rutherford was a politician, a military man, a yeoman farmer with a few slaves, and a merchant. Integrating kinship into the other categories of analysis in our repertoire enhances our understanding of the lives of antebellum southerners like Rutherford and the society in which they lived, and offers fresh insights into issues of class.

Classifying antebellum southerners as planters or yeoman is also problematic because of the ebb and flow of their financial status and amount of slaveholding over the course of their lifetimes. A man might be technically a yeoman farmer at one stage in his life, rise to the planter class, then return to yeoman status later in life. Neither were kinship groups static entities: they shifted and changed, formed and reformed, gained and lost members, as circumstances dictated. When people or a group are examined in place in one community or one state, or are only investigated through a snapshot of one slice of their lives, the very process of trying to freeze and examine them in situ skews the image of antebellum southerners. In this study, by examining an entire kinship group over both time and space, a broader, more complex picture of southern society emerges. By focusing on kinship ties and on the various branches of the kinship group over a span of
time—including the families who migrated and the ones who stayed put—the essence of the totality of the lives of ante-bellum southerners comes into sharper focus. Individual identities were not totally subsumed by the kinship group but were greatly incorporated into it—ante-bellum southerners made decisions about migration, settlement, and religion, as well as political and economic matters, as part of the kinship group, seeking to maximize their own success. When studied as an organic whole and followed through various migrations and permutations, a kinship group comes closer to revealing the essential nature of the ante-bellum South because kinship and group affiliation ultimately shaped individuals’ religious, political, economic, and class identities.

In addition to matters of religion, politics, economics, and class, kinship studies also have the power to illuminate issues of gender. Sally G. McMillen’s *Motherhood in the Old South*, for example, speaks to the issue of women and family. McMillen describes the experiences of elite southern mothers in great detail and argues that their roles and situations were in many ways distinctively different from maternal experiences elsewhere in the United States.

[Southern mothers] perceived [motherhood] as their sacred and singular occupation. For most women, bearing and rearing children brought tangible rewards in a society that offered few alternatives. Despite the risks and demands, mothers took their duty seriously and rarely faltered. They must have found satisfaction in the role. Out of deep affection and the acceptance of their maternal duties, southern mothers devoted their health, energy, and even their lives to bearing and rearing children. The South glorified this occupation, and southern mothers apparently responded.

---

1 I’d like to express my appreciation to Francelle Pruitt, whose input helped me clarify some of these points.
In this study, McMillen makes it clear how fully southern women played out their social role as mothers and that motherhood virtually subsumed their identities as individuals. She presents persuasive evidence that the family was without a doubt the most important institution in these women’s lives. If motherhood and other kin relationships were totally instinctual in nature rather than socially constructed, we should see no difference in the roles of mothers in varied regions. Southern society, via its cultural exaltation of women and mothers, shaped the way women experienced their gender and their family connections. Southern women experienced the meaning of kinship in ways demonstrably different from northern women. Thus, using the methodology and theoretical framework embodied in this work, kinship studies have the potential to open up discussions about gender relationships in the Old South.

Finally, the use of kinship as a category of analysis can expand our understanding of race, while, concomitantly, race as a category of analysis promises to enhance our understanding of kinship. For example, the strongest evidence that kinship is concerned more with social relations than ‘blood’ can be found in the mulatto slave population of the antebellum South. In *New People*, Joel Williamson describes the effects of miscegenation between white men and slave women, i.e., a large population of mulattos, both free and slave. Although Williamson refers to “[t]he deep confusion of kinship across the race line,” in fact, although some men perceived a tie of kinship with mulatto children they
fathered, many more did not. Clearly, social recognition of kinship was determined by factors other than biology.

Legally, morally, and socially, in the Old South, interracial family ties were not usually recognized. A mulatto child born to a slave woman had no recognized father; the child derived status from his mother. Even if one tries to make the argument that white fathers would have freed their slave children more often if it had not been legally difficult begs the question—that very fact that laws were enacted erecting barriers to the emancipation of slaves and ascribing mothers’ status to their children speaks to the fact that, as a whole, society did not acknowledge kinship across race lines even in the face of blood ties. Mulatto slaves of white slaveowners experienced the concept of kinship in a radically different way from their white ‘relatives’.

Williamson also discusses the recurring question of whether or not Thomas Jefferson fathered children by his slave Sally Hemmings. The question of interest for this dissertation is not the possibility of a sexual relationship between Jefferson and Hemmings. Rather, given that there seems to be little doubt in either Jefferson’s contemporaries’ minds or present-day minds that Hemmings was Jefferson’s wife’s half-sister, why wasn’t she treated as kin? In a society almost obsessed with family relationships, why was Hemmings kept in bondage and even assigned to serve her half-niece as a maidservant? Why did Sally carry the surname of her mother instead of that of

---

her acknowledged (white) father? The answer is, once again, that kinship was and is a social relationship constructed by the culture in which it resides—in Hemmings' case, racial slavery was the operative social relation that trumped kinship.

That Sally and her siblings shared blood ties to Jefferson's beloved wife Martha Wayles apparently did not make them accepted kin to Jefferson or their white relatives, even though, to all accounts, Sally was "mighty near white" in appearance. Some might argue that "Jefferson seems to have put all of [Sally Hemming's] children into training for some trade or service," which was an indication of his concern for them, or that Jefferson might have been constrained from freeing Sally by legal restrictions or financial circumstances, or that Jefferson's daughter finally freed Sally after her father's death—but none of these potentially mitigating circumstances overshadows the bald fact that the Wayles and Jefferson families held people who were biologically related in bondage.\(^5\)

Nor were they the only southerners to do so.

Historians routinely clash over race, class, and gender, but kinship can occasionally transcend and subsume all three of these categories of analysis. In the end, family, in the broadest sense, may prove to have as much explanatory power in the narrative of history as the other categories. Kinship shaped virtually every aspect of antebellum southerners' lives and had an impact on how they experienced and made decisions about everyday life, migration, settlement, religion, politics, status and economic success. This study explores the meaning of kinship on a number of levels—by borrowing from the discipline of anthropology to probe at the symbolic definition of kinship as a socially constructed reality, by applying that symbolism to the world of

---

southerners through the study of a large kinship group, and by exploring the pivotal role of the family in southern life using genealogical methodology to focus on kinship links. By adding another tool of investigation to the repertoire of historical scholarship—a more complete reconstruction of the way southerners themselves experienced some aspects of their culture—historians of the antebellum South can develop an even more nuanced and complex representation of the past.

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 44 (first quotation), and 45 (second quotation).
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APPENDIX: THE DESCENDANTS OF THOMAS KEESEE SR.

This appendix contains a small portion of the research contained in the database of almost 7,000 individuals connected to the Keesee kinship group. This database constitutes the primary evidentiary material for the dissertation. The following lays out four generations of the descendants of Thomas Keesee Sr. in what is known as National Genealogical Society or Modified Register Format—a widely used standard numbering system for genealogical reports. Each individual is given an ordinal number (1, 2, 3 . . .). starting with Thomas Keesee Sr. as number 1. After the name of the person being described in a main section, their ancestral Keesee lineage is listed. For example, Thomas Keesee Sr. is the 4th generation of Keesees that have been traced and, in parentheses, are his Keesee ancestors, i.e., (George Faris3, Richard2, George1), which indicates Thomas Keesee Sr.’s father was George Faris Keesee, his grandfather was Richard Keesee, and his great grandfather was George Keesee, who was the original immigrant to America, arriving about 1700 in Virginia.

The children of each couple are listed in birth order (insofar as is known) and are given roman numerals within the list of children for that particular couple. A plus sign (+) is placed on the left margin by the name of each child who is treated more completely below and that child can be found by looking at the ordinal numbers assigned to each person, which are listed in numerical order. Thus, Thomas Keesee Sr.’s daughter Agnes has a plus preceding her name in the list of children which means she has a more complete entry below, a number “4” which is her individual number and is the means of finding her in the material below, and a roman numeral “iii.” indicating her birth order in the list of Thomas Keesee Sr. and his first wife’s children.
This genealogical report was compiled using Family Tree Maker 8.0. The way it handles footnotes might seem awkward to historians in that it assigns a footnote number to each source, rather than lumping all the sources for one piece of data into one footnote, and secondly, it does not use *Ibid.* or short-form citations, resulting in endnotes which are fully given each time and repetitious. Thus, there are entries such as:

5. Thomas⁵ Keesee, Jr. (Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹) was born 05 February 1804 in Sumner County, Tennessee⁶⁶,⁶⁷, and died 26 November 1879 in Residence, Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas⁶⁸,⁶⁹,⁷⁰,⁷¹.

One of the types of sources that may need explanation to non-genealogists is the "ged.com." or "FTW" file. These are two types of computer-generated genealogy files, either provided to me by other individuals on disk, via e-mail attachment, or downloaded from the Internet. An example of this type of endnote source file is:

1758. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.

This indicates that "Bclardy FTM file" is the name of the source of the data, and it was transmitted to me via e-mail by Roy Austin, the originator of the data compiled using Family Tree Maker, on October 12, 1998. A ged.com file is basically the same type of file, but was provided in a generic format by a program other than Family Tree Maker.

My specific family line can be found under William Jefferson Keesee, number 89, and his daughter Sarah Jane Elizabeth, number 296, who is listed as one of William's children by his second marriage. Sarah Jane Elizabeth (Keesee) Earle was my paternal great-grandmother and was the wife of Jesse Augustus Haywood Earle. They were the parents of Haywood Shelton Earle, the father of my father Robert Shelton Earle.
Descendants of Thomas Keesee Sr.: Four Generations

Generation No. 1

1. Thomas⁴ Keesee (George Faris³, Richard², George¹) was born 1778 in Pittsylvania County, Virginia, and died 01 December 1861 in Ashley County, Arkansas. He married (1) Mary (McKnight?)¹ ca. 1796 in Virginia. She was born between 1770–1780², and died before 1840. He married (2) Malinda Bond 10 May 1840 in Saline County, Arkansas⁵. She was born ca. 1820 in Arkansas⁴.

Children of Thomas Keesee and Mary (McKnight?) are:

+ 2 i. George Polk⁵ Keesee, born 1797 in Spartanburgh County, South Carolina; died 01 August 1864 in Saline County, Arkansas.
+ 3 ii. Col. Milton Keesee, born 31 August 1799 in Spartanburgh County, South Carolina; died 10 March 1860 in Washington County, Texas.
+ 4 iii. Agnes Keesee, born ca. 1801 in South Carolina; died before 21 December 1859 in Hot Spring County, Arkansas.
+ 5 iv. Thomas Keesee, Jr., born 05 February 1804 in Sumner County, Tennessee; died 26 November 1879 in Residence, Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas.
+ 6 v. Mary "Polly" Keesee, born 11 October 1807 in Sumner County, Tennessee; died 16 December 1873 in Sterling, Robertson County, Texas.
+ 7 vi. William Keesee, Sr., born 08 April 1809 in Sumner County, Tennessee; died 28 September 1864 in Chappell Hill, Washington County, Texas.
+ 8 vii. Jane Keesee, born between 1811–1815 in (Sumner County?), Tennessee. She married Elias Jenkins⁵ 22 December 1831 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama⁶; born 1802⁶.
+ 9 viii. Gideon Keesee, born ca. 1816 in (Franklin County?), Tennessee; died after 1875.

Children of Thomas Keesee and Malinda Bond are:

+ 10 i. Virginia⁵ Keesee, born ca. 1841 in Saline County, Arkansas.
+ 11 ii. Benton Keesee⁶, born ca. 1842⁶; died 1862 in Antietam, Maryland.

Generation No. 2

2. George Polk⁵ Keesee (Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹)⁸ was born 1797 in Spartanburgh County, South Carolina⁹,¹⁰, and died 01 August 1864 in Saline County, Arkansas. He married (1) (Elizabeth Harrison?) ca. 1817 in Franklin County, Tennessee⁴¹. She was born in Tennessee¹², and died between 1838–1840 in Saline County, Arkansas. He married (2) Unity Leech¹³,¹⁴ 02 November 1840 in Saline County.
Arkansas, daughter of Jacob Leech and Priscilla Morris. She was born 07 May 1810 in Tennessee\textsuperscript{15,16}.

Children of George Keesee and (Elizabeth Harrison?) are:
+ 12 i. Elizabeth\textsuperscript{6} Keesee, born 04 November 1817 in Franklin County, Tennessee; died 17 January 1871 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas.
+ 13 ii. Isaac Newton Keesee, born 18 March 1822 in Alabama; died 19 August 1902 in Grant County, Arkansas.
+ 14 iii. Emelia Manda Keesee, born 20 February 1824 in Tennessee; died 15 June 1860 in Saline County, Arkansas.
+ 15 iv. Thomas J. Keesee, born ca. 1826 in Alabama.
+ 17 vi. Benjamin Franklin Keesee, born ca. 1829 in Tennessee\textsuperscript{17}.
+ 18 vii. William J. Keesee, born ca. 1832 in Tennessee\textsuperscript{17}.
+ 19 viii. Dorothy Keesee, born ca. 1836 in Alabama; died before 01 August 1864 in Saline County, Arkansas.
+ 20 ix. Martha Mary Jane Keesee, born ca. 1838 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{17}.

Children of George Keesee and Unity Leech are:
21 i. Priscilla\textsuperscript{6} Keesee\textsuperscript{17,18}, born ca. 1845 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{19}. She married George W. Owens\textsuperscript{20} 16 October 1871 in Saline County, Arkansas; born 1825.
22 ii. James K. Polk Keesee\textsuperscript{21,22}, born 12 March 1847 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{23}; died 28 May 1917 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{24}. He married (1) Mary\textsuperscript{25}, born 08 January 1851\textsuperscript{25}; died 01 April 1930\textsuperscript{25}. He married (2) Mary\textsuperscript{26}.
+ 23 iii. Milton McKnight Keesee, born 26 May 1850 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 24 January 1927 in River Township, Grant County, Arkansas.

3. Col. Milton\textsuperscript{5} Keesee (Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{27} was born 31 August 1799 in Spartanburgh County, South Carolina\textsuperscript{28}, and died 10 March 1860 in Washington County, Texas\textsuperscript{29,30}. He married Mary "Polly" Calvert\textsuperscript{31} 04 August 1823 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama\textsuperscript{32}, daughter of William Calvert and Lucy Rogers. She was born 26 June 1806 in Tennessee\textsuperscript{33,34,35}, and died 11 October 1873 in Robertson County, Texas\textsuperscript{36,37}.

Children of Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert are:
+ 24 i. Thomas D.\textsuperscript{6} Keesee, born 09 February 1825 in Alabama; died 11 August 1859 in Marlin, Texas.
+ 25 ii. William Calvert Keesee, born 21 September 1826 in Alabama; died 26 June 1861 in Falls County, Texas.
+ 26 iii. Jane Hill Keesee, born 03 April 1829\textsuperscript{38}.
+ 27 iv. Franklin Keesee, born 16 September 1831\textsuperscript{38}; died 17 March 1853\textsuperscript{38}.
4. Agnes Kessee (Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born ca. 1801 in South Carolina, and died before 21 December 1859 in Hot Spring County, Arkansas. She married Benjamin Clardy III in (Pickens County?), Alabama, son of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Booth. He was born ca. 1797 in South Carolina, and died ca. 1875 in Hot Spring County, Arkansas.

Children of Agnes Kessee and Benjamin Clardy are:

+ 33 i. Maryann Kessee, born 06 March 1823 in Pickens County, Alabama; died 10 January 1889 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana.
+ 34 ii. Mary Elizabeth Clardy, born 09 March 1824 in Pickens County, Alabama; died 10 January 1889 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
+ 35 iii. Saryan (Sarah Ann) Clardy, born 14 August 1825 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died 14 July 1908 in Urbana, Union County, Arkansas.
+ 36 iv. Jane "Jennie" Clardy, born 15 September 1826; died 26 July 1843 in Hot Spring County, Arkansas.
+ 37 v. James Clardy, born 23 September 1829 in (Pickens County?), Alabama; died 27 August 1901.
+ 38 vi. William Clardy, born 20 September 1831; died between 1861-1865.
+ 39 vii. Elias Clardy, born 08 January 1835; died 08 October 1863.
+ 40 viii. Smith Clardy, born ca. 1838; died 16 August 1892.
+ 41 ix. Calhoun Clardy, born 01 January 1841 in Saline County, Arkansas; died ca. 1863 in Okolona, Mississippi.
+ 42 x. Robert "Bob" Clardy, born 05 September 1842 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 27 January 1862.

5. Thomas Kessee, Jr. (Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 05 February 1804 in Sumner County, Tennessee, and died 26 November 1879 in Residence, Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas. He married Jane Caroline Green on 27 July 1826 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, daughter of Jonathan Green and Jane Kerr. She was born 10 October 1808 in South Carolina, and died 22 February 1897 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas.

Children of Thomas Kessee and Jane Green are:

ii. Mary Jane Keesees, born 31 January 1829 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died 25 September 1896 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas. She married Gus Franklin before 1892; died before 1892.

iii. Anastasia S. Keesees, born 03 June 1831 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama.

iv. Willis B. Keesees, born 29 June 1833 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died 08 September 1833 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama.

v. Emeline Keesees, born 26 July 1834 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died before 1892 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

vi. Eleanor Keesees, born 08 October 1834 in Saline County, Arkansas; died before 1892. She married (1) B. H. Tucker 29 January 1861 in Union County, Arkansas; born ca. 1834 in Saline County, Arkansas. She married (2) B. H. Tucker 29 January 1861 in Union County, Arkansas; born 1834 in Saline County, Arkansas.

vii. Milton S. Keesees, born 08 March 1837 in Pickens County, Alabama; died 13 June 1883 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas.

viii. Thomas J. Keesees, born 07 July 1839 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 21 July 1909 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas.

ix. Marietta Louisa Keesees, born 16 November 1841 in Saline County, Arkansas; died between 1876–1880 in Texas.

x. William Fortenberry Keesees, born 27 December 1845 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas; died 17 June 1923 in Canyon Diablo, Arizona.

xi. John Hill Keesees, born 22 January 1848 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas; died 16 March 1926 in Midlothian, Ellis County, Texas.

xii. Patience W. Keesees, born 14 March 1850 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas; died 14 June 1852 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas.

xiii. George S. Keesees, born 09 January 1855 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas; died 11 March 1931 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas.

6. Mary "Polly" Keesees (Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 11 October 1807 in Sumner County, Tennessee, and died 16 December 1873 in Sterling, Robertson County, Texas. She married Robert Calvert 28 August 1823 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, son of William Calvert and Lucy Rogers. He was born 09 February 1802 in near Wartrace, Bedford County, Tennessee, and died 20 September 1867 in Sterling, Robertson County, Texas.

Children of Mary Keesees and Robert Calvert are:

i. Lucy Ellen Calvert, born ca. 1828 in Alabama; died 1851 in Saline County, Arkansas.

ii. William Calvert, born ca. 1830 in Alabama; died 1864 in Sterling/Calvert, Robertson, Texas.

iii. Paulina Jane Calvert, born ca. 1832 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama.
+ 59 iv. Mary M. Calvert, born 04 October 1834 in Alabama; died 28 March 1889 in Waxahachie, Ellis County, Texas.

60 v. Charles Calvert109, born ca. 1836110; died Unknown110.

61 vi. Sarah Agnes Calvert, born ca. 1846 in Saline County, Arkansas111; died 07 May 1848 in Saline County, Arkansas112.

7. William5 Keesee, Sr. (Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1)113 was born 08 April 1809 in Sumner County, Tennessee114,115, and died 28 September 1864 in Chappell Hill, Washington County, Texas116. He married (1) Mary Jane Chappell117 14 August 1828 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama118,119,120, daughter of Robert Chappell and Mary Tittle. She was born 02 December 1810 in Wilson County, Tennessee121,122, and died 14 March 1850 in Chappell Hill, Washington County, Texas123,124. He married (2) Emiline Howth125 15 March 1854 in Austin County, Texas125,126. She was born ca. 1820 in New York127,128.

Children of William Keesee and Mary Chappell are:

+ 62 i. George Marion6 Keesee, born 11 October 1830 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died 04 December 1892 in (Wilson County, Texas?).

+ 63 ii. Robert Wooding Keesee, born 08 November 1831 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died 22 November 1858 in Washington County, Texas.

+ 64 iii. William M. Keesee, Jr., born 05 April 1833 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died after 1880.

+ 65 iv. Mary Jane Keesee, born 05 November 1834 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama.

+ 66 v. Thomas Milton Keesee, born 02 March 1836 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama; died before 1880.

+ 67 vi. Gideon Keesee, born 12 November 1837 in Washington County, Texas; died 09 May 1881 in Washington County, Texas.

68 vii. Charlotte Keesee129, born 04 November 1839130; died before 1852130.


+ 70 ix. Walstein H. Keesee, born 11 October 1843 in Washington County, Texas; died after 1908.

71 x. Emeline "Emma" Keesee134, born 02 June 1845 in Washington County, Texas135.

72 xi. James C. Keesee136, born 12 October 1846 in Washington County, Texas137.

+ 73 xii. Elias Jenkins "Jinks" Keesee, born 23 March 1848 in Washington County, Texas; died after 1900.

Child of William Keesee and Emiline Howth is:

74 i. Emma6 Keesee138,139, born ca. 1855 in Washington County, Texas140,141.
9. **Gideon**⁵ Keesee (Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹) was born ca. 1816 in Franklin County?, Tennessee¹⁴², and died after 1875. He married **Martha Wooding Hargrove**¹⁴³,¹⁴⁴,¹⁴⁵, daughter of William Hargrove and Charlotte Chappell. She was born 21 December 1821 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama¹⁴⁶, and died 15 September 1859 in Ashley County, Arkansas¹⁴⁶,¹⁴⁷.

Children of Gideon Keesee and Martha Hargrove are:

75  i. (unknown)⁶ Keesee¹⁴⁸.
76  ii. Mary E. Keesee¹⁴⁹, born ca. 1840¹⁴⁹.
77  iii. William H. Keesee¹⁴⁹, born ca. 1841¹⁴⁹.
78  iv. Permelia A. Keesee¹⁴⁹, born ca. 1843¹⁴⁹.
+  79  v. Pauline J. Keesee, born 09 August 1844; died 12 April 1917 in Bastrop County, Texas.
80  vi. George R. Keesee¹⁴⁹, born ca. 1846¹⁴⁹.

10. **Virginia**⁵ Keesee (Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹)¹⁴⁹ was born ca. 1841 in Saline County, Arkansas¹⁴⁹,¹⁵⁰. She married **David H. Thornton** 18 December 1855 in Union County, Arkansas¹⁵⁰. He was born ca. 1831 in Georgia¹⁵⁰.

Children of Virginia Keesee and David Thornton are:

82  i. Mary L.⁶ Thornton, born ca. 1857.
83  ii. Sarah L. Thornton, born ca. 1859.

*Generation No. 3*

12. **Elizabeth**⁶ Keesee (George Polk⁵, Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹) was born 04 November 1817 in Franklin County, Tennessee¹⁵¹, and died 17 January 1871 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas. She married **James A. Hicks** 15 October 1834 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama¹⁵², son of Francis Hicks and Elizabeth Wood. He was born 15 February 1812 in Lawrence County, Georgia¹⁵³, and died 22 June 1871 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas¹⁵⁴.

Children of Elizabeth Keesee and James Hicks are:

+  84  i. Nancy⁷ Hicks, born ca. 1835 in Alabama.
85  ii. Elizabeth Hicks, born ca. 1837 in Alabama. She married William J. Cross.
86  iii. George F. Hicks, born ca. 1841 in Arkansas. He married Rebecca K. Rose 14 August 1866.

13. **Isaac Newton**⁶ Keesee (George Polk⁵, Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹) was born 18 March 1822 in Alabama¹⁵⁵,¹⁵⁶, and died 19 August 1902 in Grant County, Arkansas¹⁵⁷,¹⁵⁸. He married **Lucinda Evalina Jolly** 24 March 1842 in Saline
County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{159}, daughter of John Jolly and Sarah Appling. She was born 22 August 1824 in Alabama\textsuperscript{160}, and died 09 August 1895 in Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{161}.

Children of Isaac Keesee and Lucinda Jolly are:
+ 87  
  i. Sarah Ann\textsuperscript{7} Keesee, born 03 March 1843 in Arkansas; died 16 January 1920 in Pike County, Arkansas.
+ 88  
  ii. John Jolly Keesee, born 25 November 1844 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 09 February 1909 in Denton, Denton County, Texas.
+ 89  
  iii. William Jefferson Keesee, born 22 October 1846 in Prattsville, Saline County, Arkansas; died 01 December 1913 in Grant County, Arkansas.
+ 90  
  iv. Nancy Elizabeth Keesee, born 06 November 1848 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{162,163}.
+ 91  
  v. Mary Samantha Keesee, born 28 February 1849 in Prattsville, Saline County (now Grant), Arkansas; died 23 June 1918 in Grant County, Arkansas.
+ 92  
  vi. Lucinda Emaeline Keesee, born 04 March 1854 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 29 March 1886 in Grant County, Arkansas.
+ 93  
  vii. Henry Rector Keesee, born 29 January 1856 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 16 August 1926 in River Township, Grant County, Arkansas.
+ 94  
  viii. Margaret Unity Keesee, born 22 October 1858 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 07 June 1898 in Grant County, Arkansas.
+ 95  
  ix. Thomas Milton Keesee, born 09 November 1860; died before 1870 in Saline/Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{164}.
+ 96  
  x. Robert W. Keesee, born ca. 1862 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{165}.
+ 97  
  xi. James Gideon Keesee, born 05 May 1865; died 28 August 1928 in Pulaski County, Arkansas.
+ 98  
  xii. George Washington Keesee, born 07 April 1868; died 18 April 1906.

14. Emelia Manda\textsuperscript{6} Keesee (George Polk\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{166} was born 20 February 1824 in Tennessee\textsuperscript{167,168}, and died 15 June 1860 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{169,170}. She married Daniel Leech\textsuperscript{171} 22 December 1840 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{172}, son of Jacob Leech and Priscilla Morris. He was born 05 October 1820 in Dickson County, Tennessee\textsuperscript{173}, and died 09 December 1895 in Eolian, Stephens County, Texas\textsuperscript{173}.

Children of Emelia Keesee and Daniel Leech are:
  99  
  i. Patterson Bell\textsuperscript{7} Leech\textsuperscript{174}, born 24 October 1841 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{175}; died 17 April 1864 in Mississippi\textsuperscript{175}.
+ 100  
  ii. Priscilla Evaline Leech, born 19 March 1843 in Alabama; died 1920 in Columbia County, Arkansas.
101  
  iii. Mary Catherine Leech\textsuperscript{176}, born 26 December 1844 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{177}. She married (Andrew?) M. Tidwell\textsuperscript{178}.
102  
  iv. Sarah Thompson Leech\textsuperscript{178}, born 29 September 1846 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{179}. She married William "Bill" Holtens\textsuperscript{180,181}.
+ 103  
  v. Finis Ewing Leech, born 18 December 1848 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 21 March 1916 in Bonham, Fannin County, Texas, at his home.
15. Thomas J. Keese (George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born ca. 1826 in Alabama. He married Martha G. Porter on January 1846 in Saline County, Arkansas, daughter of Ridley Porter and Eda. She was born ca. 1824 in Mississippi.

Children of Thomas Keese and Martha Porter are:

108  i. George W. Keese, born ca. 1846.

109  ii. Ridley T. Keese, born ca. 1848.

16. George Washington Keese (George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born ca. 1828 in Tennessee. He married Nancy Montgomery on September 1848 in Saline County, Arkansas. She was born ca. 1826 in Arkansas.

Child of George Keese and Nancy Montgomery is:

110  i. Elizabeth Keese, born 1849.

19. Dorothy Keese (George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born ca. 1836 in Alabama, and died before 01 August 1864 in Saline County, Arkansas. She married Joseph J. Russell on 29 December 1853 in Saline County, Arkansas. He was born between 1820–1823 in Tennessee, and died after 1880.

Children of Dorothy Keese and Joseph Russell are:

+ 111  i. Agnes W. Russell, born between 1855–1858 in Saline County, Arkansas.

112  ii. Robert C. Russell, born ca. 1858 in Saline County, Arkansas.

113  iii. Milly/Marinda Russell, born ca. 1860 in Saline County, Arkansas.

114  iv. Elizabeth Russell, born ca. 1862 in Saline County, Arkansas.

115  v. William Russell, born ca. 1864 in Saline County, Arkansas; died between 1864–1870.
23. Milton McKnight Keese (George Polk, Thomas, George Fars, Richard, George) was born 26 May 1850 in Saline County, Arkansas, and died 24 January 1927 in River Township, Grant County, Arkansas. He married Dicy Emeline Sides on 16 February 1871 in Saline County, Arkansas. She was born 1854 in Arkansas, and died 28 March 1938 in Grant County, Arkansas.

Children of Milton Keese and Dicy Sides are:

116  i. Betty Keese, born 03 October 1874; died 13 June 1947. She married David Lee Elrod 13 August 1892 in Grant County, Arkansas. Marriage Book C, p. 269; born 24 October 1874 in Grant County, Arkansas; died 01 September 1932 in Malvern, Hot Spring County, Arkansas.

117  ii. Martha Keese, born 1875; died 1931.


119  iv. Sarah Elizabeth Keese, born 1879; died ca. 1881, at age 2.

120  v. James K. Polk Keese, born 29 May 1881; died 09 November 1959. He married Winnie V. Bishop; born 31 August 1889; died 07 January 1976.


122  vii. Henry Elbert Keese, born 08 January 1884 in Traskwood, Saline County, Arkansas; died 13 June 1953 in Malvern, Hot Spring County, Arkansas. He married Della May Williams on 14 January 1906 in Prattsville, Grant County, Arkansas; born 25 November 1883 in Big Creek, Grant County, Arkansas; died 18 December 1981 in Malvern, Hot Spring County, Arkansas.

123  viii. Arch Cline Keese, born 21 August 1886; died 29 December 1978 in Arkansas.

124  ix. Lena Keese, born 1889; died 1931. She married Marshall Keedy.

125  x. Zema Keese, born 09 April 1892; died 12 July 1944. She married Harlin Pumphrey.

126  xi. Dorotha "Dora" Droceria Keese, born 27 November 1894; died 02 August 1936.

24. Thomas D. Keese (Milton, Thomas, George Fars, Richard, George) was born 09 February 1825 in Alabama, and died 11 August 1859 in Marlin, Texas. He married Martha Ann Millender on 22 February 1844 in Saline County, Arkansas. She was born ca. 1830 in Alabama, and died after 1859.

Children of Thomas Keese and Martha Millender are:

127  i. William G. Keese, born 1848 in Arkansas; died 1873 in Calvert, Robertson County, Texas.
128 ii. John M. Keesee, born 1851; died 02 June 1870280.

25. William Calvert6 Keesee (Milton5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1) was born 21 September 1826 in Alabama282, and died 26 June 1861 in Falls County, Texas283,284. He married Mary E. Bennett ca. 1848285, daughter of Henry Bennett and Jane Logan. She was born ca. 1830 in Tennessee285, and died 24 October 1867 in Falls County, Texas286.

Children of William Keesee and Mary Bennett are:

129 i. Mary Jane7 Keesee286, born 11 July 1849 in Saline County, Arkansas287,288. She married W. S. Conoly288, died 26 October 1870 in Falls County, Texas288.

130 ii. Milton Keesee288, born 07 September 1853 in Texas288; died 12 November 1878288.


+ 132 iv. Henry Bennett Keesee, born 13 March 1858 in Texas; died 12 August 1940 in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

28. Lucy Rogers6 Keesee (Milton5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1) was born 13 August 1834 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama299,300,301, and died 1921 in Fort Worth, Texas302. She married (1) Alfred/Alfred Battle Hargrove303,304, 21 October 1852 in Robertson County, Texas305, son of William Hargrove and Charlotte Chappell. He was born ca. 1830305, and died in near Calvert, Robertson County, Texas306. She married (2) Francis Asbury Thomson307,308,309, 30 April 1857 in Robertson County, Texas310, son of Alexander Thomson and Elizabeth Dowsing. He was born 20 August 1822 in Giles County, Tennessee311, and died 20 September 1867 in Millican, Brazos County, Texas312. She married (3) Couter after 1867.

Children of Lucy Keesee and Francis Thomson are:

133 i. R. M.7 Thomson313. She married Colgin.

+ 134 ii. Mary Elizabeth Thomson, born ca. 1859; died 18 August 1946 in Gatesville, Coryell County, Texas.

135 iii. Anne Fontaine Thomson314,315, born ca. 1860316; died Unknown316.


29. Mary McKnight6 Keesee (Milton5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1) was born 06 December 1836 in Arkansas324,325, and died 06 December 1931326. She married (1) Tom Garrett327, ca. 1855328. He was born ca. 1835328, and died Unknown328. She married (2) Tom Simms329 after 1856330. He was born ca. 1835330, and died Unknown330. She married (3) William H. Garrett 22 January 1856 in
Robertson County, Texas. He died before September 1870. She married (4) Thomas S. Sims on 07 May 1874 in Calvert, Robertson County, Texas. He died 1917.

Child of Mary Keesee and Tom Garrett is:

137 i. Emma7 Garrett335, born ca. 1857; died Unknown. She married (Unknown) Birt337 ca. 1880; born ca. 1855; died Unknown.

Child of Mary Keesee and William Garrett is:

138 i. Emma Wharton7 Garrett339, born 08 February 1857 in Texas. She married Burt/Birt.

Child of Mary Keesee and Thomas Sims is:

139 i. Nancy "Nannie"7 Sims, born 25 March 1875. She married Willett T. Foster.

33. Maryann6 Clardy (Agnes5 Keesee, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1) was born 06 March 1823 in Pickens County, Alabama, and died 10 January 1889 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana. She married (1) George Sidney Green349 on 01 November 1839 in Saline County, Arkansas, son of Jonathan Green and Jane Kerr. He was born ca. 1813 in South Carolina, and died 10 November 1853 in Union County, Arkansas. She married (2) John J. Etheridge356 on 22 February 1863.

Children of Maryann Clardy and George Green are:

+ 140 i. Sarah "Sallie" Elizabeth7 Green.
+ 141 ii. Francis P. Green357, born ca. 1841.
+ 142 iii. John E. Green, born ca. 1843.
+ 143 iv. Elias D. Green, born ca. 1845.
+ 144 v. Benjamin Calhoun Green, born ca. 1847.
+ 145 vi. George W. Green, born ca. 1848; died 03 August 1919 in New Orleans, Louisiana.

Child of Maryann Clardy and John Etheridge is:

+ 146 i. Will7 Etheridge.

34. Mary Elizabeth6 Clardy (Agnes5 Keesee, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1) was born 09 March 1824 in Pickens County, Alabama, and died 10 January 1889 in Union Parish, Louisiana. She married George West Murphy on 02 July 1840 in Saline County, Arkansas, son of Richard Murphy.
and Susannah West. He was born 29 January 1817 in Lawrence County, Arkansas, and died 20 November 1894 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana.

Children of Mary Clardy and George Murphy are:
+ 147 i. Robert Calvert Murphy, born 16 November 1842 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 16 February 1936 in Cherokee Plantation, Cane River, Nachitoches, Louisiana.
+ 148 ii. Agnes Murphy, born 12 August 1844.
+ 149 iii. Dr. William "Billy" Clardy Murphy, born 05 December 1845; died 14 October 1906 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
+ 150 iv. James Moore Murphy, born 24 March 1847.
+ 151 v. S. Annie Murphy, born 21 February 1849.
+ 152 vi. George E. Murphy, born ca. 1853; died before 14 October 1906.
+ 153 vii. Henrietta "Etta" Murphy, born 28 March 1854.
+ 154 viii. John M. Murphy, born 04 September 1857.
+ 155 ix. Lou C. Murphy, born 25 December 1860 in Union Parish, Louisiana; died 19 July 1908 in Magazine, Logan County, Arkansas.
+ 156 x. Fanny Murphy, born 07 October 1863.
+ 157 xi. Alice McKnight Murphy, born 18 June 1865 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 04 June 1948 in Marion, Union Parish, Louisiana.

35. Saryan (Sarah Ann) Clardy (Agnes Keesee, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 14 August 1825 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, and died 14 July 1908 in Urbana, Union County, Arkansas. She married (1) James Simmons after 1841. She married (2) James Moore 06 July 1841 in Saline County, Arkansas. He was born ca. 1800 in South Carolina, and died before 1870.

Children of Saryan Clardy and James Moore are:
+ 158 i. William C. Moore, born ca. 1844 in Arkansas; died after 1946.
+ 159 ii. John Calhoun C. Moore, born ca. 1842 in Arkansas.
+ 160 iii. Agnes C. Moore, born ca. 1847 in Arkansas.
+ 161 iv. George M. G. R. R. Moore, born 05 September 1849 in Union Parish, Louisiana; died 20 August 1916 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
+ 162 v. Thomas Keesee Moore, born ca. 1851 in Union Parish, Louisiana; died 24 September 1920 in El Dorado, Union County, Arkansas.
+ 163 vi. James Moore, born ca. 1854 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
+ 164 vii. E. E. Moore, born ca. 1858 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
+ 165 viii. Robert G. Moore, born ca. 1860 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

37. James Clardy (Agnes Keesee, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 23 September 1829 in Pickens County, Alabama, and died 27 August 1901. He married Nancy Baker 15 February 1855 in Hot Spring County, Arkansas.
Children of James Clardy and Nancy Baker are:

166  i.  Ellen Clardy. She married (Unknown)Threst.
+ 167  ii.  Mary Clardy.

40. Smith Clardy (Agnes Kessee, Thomas, George Faris, Richard,
George, was born ca. 1838, and died 16 August 1892. He married Perline
Green House 25 December 1868 in Hot Spring County, Arkansas,
daughter of Amond/Amos House and Ann Dennie.

Children of Smith Clardy and Perline House are:

168  i.  Agnes Clardy. She married ? Mabry.
+ 169  ii.  Lula Clardy.
170  iii.  William Clardy.
171  iv.  Richard Clardy.
172  v.  George Clardy.
173  vi.  Ned Clardy.

45. Anastasia S. Kessee (Thomas, Thomas, George Faris, Richard,
George, was born 03 June 1831 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama. She married
Dr. E. H. Hammond, son of Richard Hammond and Sarah. He was born ca. 1820 in
Tennessee.

Children of Anastasia Kessee and E. Hammond are:

174  i.  Thomas R. Hammond, born ca. 1851.
175  ii.  M. E. Hammond, born ca. 1856.
176  iii.  W. S. Hammond, born ca. 1859.

47. Emeline Kessee (Thomas, Thomas, George Faris, Richard,
George, was born 26 July 1834 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, and died before 1892 in
Union Parish, Louisiana. She married Sidney T. Wheelis, He was born
c. 1825 in Georgia, and died in Union Parish, Louisiana.

Children of Emeline Kessee and Sidney Wheelis are:

177  i.  Antoinette Wheelis, born ca. 1851 in Arkansas.
178  ii.  W. Wheelis, born ca. 1853 in Arkansas.
179  iii.  C. Wheelis, born ca. 1854 in Arkansas.
180  iv.  James Wheelis, born ca. 1856 in Arkansas.
181  v.  Agnes Wheelis, born ca. 1858 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
182  vi.  Francis Wheelis, born ca. 1859 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
49. Milton S. Keesee (Thomas^{5}, Thomas^{4}, George Faris^{3}, Richard^{2}, George^{1})^{459,460}
was born 08 March 1837 in Pickens County, Alabama^{461,462}, and died 13 June 1883 in
Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas^{463,464,465}. He married Fanny A. Coburn^{466} 21 February
1856^{466,467}. She was born 20 November 1840 in Missouri^{468,469}, and died 09 August 1880
in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas^{470}.

Children of Milton Keesee and Fanny Coburn are:

183  i. Franklin M.^{7} Keesee^{471,472}, born ca. 1853 in Arkansas^{473}.

+ 184  ii. Charles "Charlie" T. Keesee, born 20 May 1861 in Texarkana, Miller
     County, Arkansas; died 25 February 1909.

185  iii. Doran F. Keesee^{474}, born 1866 in Ellis County, Texas^{474}; died 1869 in
      Ellis County, Texas^{474}.

186  iv. Alice Keesee^{475,476}, born ca. 1869 in Arkansas^{477,478}.

187  v. Troy Hussey Keesee^{479,480}, born between 1870–1871 in Ellis County,
     Texas^{481,482}.

188  vi. Joshua Milton Keesee^{483,484}, born 1872 in Ellis County, Texas^{485,486,487};
     died 1936 in Ellis County, Texas^{488}.

189  vii. Richard F. Keesee^{489}, born 1874 in Ellis County, Texas^{489}; died 1874 in
      Ellis County, Texas^{489}.

190  viii. Jane Callie Keesee^{490,491}, born between 1875–1876 in Ellis County,
        Texas^{492,493}.

191 ix. Emma W. Keesee^{494,495}, born ca. 1878 in Ellis County, Texas^{496,497}.

50. Thomas J.^{6} Keesee (Thomas^{5}, Thomas^{4}, George Faris^{3}, Richard^{2}, George^{1})^{498,499}
was born 07 July 1839 in Saline County, Arkansas^{500,507}, and died 21 July 1909 in Ovilla,
Ellis County, Texas^{502,503,503}. He married Emily Michaux^{504} 02 January 1861 in Union
County, Arkansas^{504}, daughter of Daniel Michaux and Elvira Hall. She was born 22
March 1838 in Gainsville, Alabama^{504,505}, and died 19 December 1924 in Waxahachie,
Ellis County, Texas^{506,507}.

Children of Thomas Keesee and Emily Michaux are:

192  i. Carrie^{7} Keesee^{508} She married J. W. Elliott^{509} 02 November 1893 in Ellis
     County, Texas^{510}.

193  ii. Ella Keesee^{510}.

194  iii. Lillie Keesee^{510}.

195 iv. Tommie Cornelia Keesee^{510}, born 14 November 1862 in Union County,
     Arkansas^{510}; died 03 September 1895 in Ellis County, Texas^{510}. She
     married Charles W. Putman.

196 v. Frank W. Keesee^{510}, born 1868 in Union County, Arkansas^{510}; died
      1933^{510}.


198 vii. Unknown Keesee, died before 1892.

199 viii. Unknown Keesee, died before 1892.

200 ix. Unknown Keesee^{511}, died before 1892.
+ 201 x. Tommie/Thomie Cornelia Keesee, born 14 November 1862 in Union County, Arkansas; died 03 September 1895 in Ellis County, Texas.

202 xi. Francis "Frank" W. Keesee, born 1868; died 1933. He married Willie M.; born 1871; died 1941.

203 xii. Lillie Keesee, born ca. 1871; died before 1892.

204 xiii. Carrie Keesee, born ca. 1874. She married J. W. Elliott 202 02 November 1893 in Ellis County, Texas.

205 xiv. Elvira "Ella" Keesee, born ca. 1877.

206 xv. Unknown Keesee, born ca. 1879; died before 1892.

51. Marietta Louisa Keesee (Thomas, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 16 November 1841 in Saline County, Arkansas, and died between 1876–1880 in Texas. She married Dr. John T. Hussey, October 1858 in Union County, Arkansas. He was born ca. 1837.

Children of Marietta Keesee and John Hussey are:

207 i. James T. Hussey, born 1859 in Union County, Arkansas.

208 ii. Sallie Hussey, born ca. 1863 in Union County, Arkansas.

209 iii. Cornelia "Nellie" Hussey, born 1868 in Louisiana; died 28 September 1882 in Ellis County, Texas.


211 v. Fannie Hussey, born 20 December 1871 in Texas; died 26 September 1889 in Ellis County, Texas.

212 vi. Ettie Hussey, born ca. 1876 in Texas.

52. William Fortenberry Keesee (Thomas, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 27 December 1845 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas, and died 17 June 1923 in Canyon Diablo, Arizona. He married Julia Josephine Suddath. She was born 17 September 1849 in Texas, and died 27 April 1904.

Children of William Keesee and Julia Suddath are:

213 i. Iris Keesee, born ca. 1867 in Dallas County, Texas.

214 ii. J. L. Keesee, born ca. 1870 in Texas.

215 iii. M. H. Keesee, born ca. 1871 in Texas.


53. John Hill Keesee (Thomas, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 22 January 1848 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas, and died 16 March 1926 in Midlothian, Ellis County, Texas. He married Evalina "Lina" Dorman 26 October 1882 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas, daughter of Capt. Dorman.
and Margaret McCue. She was born 01 June 1854 in Princeton, Mercer County, (West) Virginia, and died 30 March 1930 in Fort Worth, Tarrant County, Texas.

Children of John Keesee and Evalina Dorman are:

219  i. **Unnamed** Keesee, born 26 July 1883.
+ 220  ii. Millard Keesee, born 16 July 1884 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas; died 29 September 1959 in Waxahachie, Ellis County, Texas.
+ 221  iii. Bessie Dorman Keesee, born 10 February 1886 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas; died 26 June 1969 in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.
+ 223  v. Lucy Fields Keesee, born 19 November 1892 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas; died ca. 1977 in Fort Worth, Tarrant County, Texas.
224  vi. Evelyn Keesee, born 13 August 1896 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas; died 19 August 1991 in Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma. She married Francis A. Schmidt.

55. **George S.** Keesee (Thomas, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 09 January 1855 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas, and died 11 March 1931 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas. He married **Ida La Clair "Clara" Jenks** 27 November 1877, daughter of Joseph Jenks and Ann Hawkins. She was born 02 January 1862 in Georgia, and died 19 February 1956.

Children of George Keesee and Ida Jenks are:

225  i. Beatrice Keesee, born 21 March 1880; died before 1947. She married Houston Scofield.
226  ii. Nettie Maud Keesee, born 28 June 1882; died 17 October 1883. William Arthur Keesee, born 17 October 1883; died 29 August 1885 in Ellis County, Texas.
227  iii. Robert Sidney Keesee, born 23 September 1888; died 20 October 1922.
228  iv. Henry Jenks Keesee, born 11 August 1891; died 01 February 1902 in Ellis County, Texas.

56. **Lucy Ellen** Calvert (Mary "Polly" Keesee, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born ca. 1828 in Alabama, and died 1851 in Saline County, Arkansas. She married **George Washington Rutherford** 28 September 1843 in Saline County, Arkansas, son of Archibald Rutherford and Margaret Parrish. He was born ca. 1817 in Smith County, Tennessee, and died 16 October 1858 in Robertson County, Texas.

Children of Lucy Calvert and George Rutherford are:
231 i. Robert Calvert⁷ Rutherford⁶²², born ca. 1844 in Saline County, Arkansas⁶²³,⁶²⁴; died before 1867.

232 ii. William T. Rutherford⁶²³, born ca. 1846 in Arkansas⁶²⁵,⁶²⁶.

233 iii. Mary L. Rutherford⁶²⁷, born 02 April 1849 in Arkansas⁶²⁸,⁶²⁹, died before December 1876 in Sterling, Robertson County, Texas⁶³⁰. She married [Unknown] Fort.

234 iv. Paulina J. Rutherford⁶³¹, born ca. 1851 in Arkansas⁶³². She married J. R. Burt 27 September 1877 in Robertson County, Texas⁶³³.

57. William⁶ Calvert (Mary "Polly"⁵ Keesee, Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹)⁶⁴⁴ was born ca. 1830 in Alabama⁶³⁵,⁶³⁶, and died 1864 in Sterling/Calvert, Robertson, Texas⁶³⁷. He married Alabama C. Cottingham 19 July 1849 in Union County, Arkansas⁶³⁸, daughter of Charles Cottingham. She was born ca. 1833 in Alabama, and died after 1874.

Children of William Calvert and Alabama Cottingham are:

235 i. Robert⁷ Calvert⁶³⁹, born ca. 1850 in Arkansas⁶⁴⁰; died 04 January 1870 in Robertson County, Texas.

236 ii. Mary Calvert⁶⁴¹, born ca. 1852 in Texas.

237 iii. Charles Calvert, born ca. 1860.

58. Paulina Jane⁶ Calvert (Mary "Polly"⁵ Keesee, Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹)⁶⁴² was born ca. 1832 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama⁶⁴³. She married Joseph Tom Garrett⁶⁴⁴ 04 December 1845 in Saline County, Arkansas⁶⁴⁵. He was born ca. 1827 in Tennessee⁶⁴⁶, and died after July 1874⁶⁴⁷.

Children of Paulina Calvert and Joseph Garrett are:

238 i. Mary A.⁷ Garrett⁶⁴⁸,⁶⁴⁹, born ca. 1848 in Arkansas⁶⁵⁰,⁶⁵¹. She married (1) John H. Drennan. She married (2) Husband Drennan⁶⁵² ca. 1888⁶⁵³; born ca. 1855⁶⁵⁴; died Unknown⁶⁵⁵.

+ 239 ii. Lucy E. Garrett, born ca. 1852 in Texas.

+ 240 iii. John T. Garrett, born ca. 1858 in Robertson County, Texas.

59. Mary M.⁶ Calvert (Mary "Polly"⁵ Keesee, Thomas⁴, George Faris³, Richard², George¹)⁶⁵⁴,⁶⁵⁵ was born 04 October 1834 in Alabama⁶⁵⁶,⁶⁵⁷, and died 28 March 1889 in Waxahachie, Ellis County, Texas⁶⁵⁸,⁶⁵⁹. She married (1) Dr. Peter H. Smith⁶⁶⁰ 26 December 1848 in Saline County, Arkansas. He was born ca. 1819 in North Carolina, and died 12 November 1861 in Robertson County, Texas⁶⁶¹. She married (2) William Greene Lee Quaitie⁶⁶² 06 June 1864 in Robertson County, Texas⁶⁶³, son of (Unknown) Quaitie and Jane. He was born 04 February 1817 in near Hopkinsville, Christian County, Kentucky⁶⁶⁴, and died 17 April 1895. She married (3) T. M. Phaup⁶⁶⁵ 10 March 1880 in Ellis County, Texas⁶⁶⁶.
Children of Mary Calvert and Peter Smith are:
+ 241 i. Margaret "Maggie" E. Smith, born ca. 1850 in Saline County, Arkansas; died after December 1890.
+ 242 ii. Agness E. Smith \(^{667}\), born ca. 1854 in Texas \(^{667}\).
+ 243 iii. Peter P. Smith, born 17 January 1856 in Saline County, Arkansas; died 17 January 1925 in Ellis County, Texas.
+ 244 iv. Sarah F. Smith \(^{667}\), born ca. 1858 in Texas \(^{667}\); died before January 1868 in Robertson County, Texas \(^{668}\).
245 v. R. C.[Robert Calvert?] Smith \(^{669}\), born ca. January 1860 in Robertson County, Texas; died before January 1868 in Robertson County, Texas \(^{670}\).
+ 246 vi. Thomas Garrett Smith, born 19 June 1862 in Robertson County, Texas; died 20 May 1928 in Ellis County, Texas.

Child of Mary Calvert and William Quaite is:
247 i. Henry C. Quaite \(^{671}\), born 05 May 1865 \(^{672}\); died 30 August 1890 in Ellis County, Texas \(^{673}\).

62. George Marion \(^6\) Keesee (William \(^5\), Thomas \(^4\), George Faris \(^3\), Richard \(^2\), George \(^1\) \(^{674}\) was born 11 October 1830 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama \(^{672}\), and died 04 December 1892 in Wilson County, Texas \(^{9574}\). He married (1) Nancy S. Deaver \(^{675}\) 18 August 1852 in Washington County, Texas \(^{675}\). He married (2) Malinda/Rhoda A. Flake \(^{676,677}\) 20 December 1855 in Austin County, Texas \(^{578,679}\), daughter of Thomas Flake and Malinda Willingham. She was born 1831 \(^{680}\).

Children of George Keesee and Nancy Deaver are:
248 i. Minnie Keesee \(^{681}\). She married Bob Walters \(^{681}\).
249 ii. Gideon Keesee \(^{681}\).
250 iii. Robert Keesee \(^{681}\).

Children of George Keesee and Malinda/Rhoda Flake are:
251 i. Robert J. Keesee \(^{682}\), born 1857 \(^{682}\).
+ 252 ii. Thomas F. Keesee, born 1860 in Washington County, Texas; died 1923 in Jones County, Texas.
253 iii. Gideon G. Keesee \(^{682}\), born 1861 in Washington County, Texas \(^{682}\).
254 iv. Mary M. Keesee \(^{682}\), born 1864 \(^{682}\). She married Shephard Hunter \(^{682}\) 12 January 1882 in Hays County, Texas \(^{682}\); born 1861 in Iowa \(^{682}\).
255 v. Minnie Keesee \(^{682}\), born 1868 \(^{682}\).

63. Robert Wooding \(^6\) Keesee (William \(^5\), Thomas \(^4\), George Faris \(^3\), Richard \(^2\), George \(^1\) \(^{682}\) was born 08 November 1831 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama \(^{682}\), and died 22 November 1858 in Washington County, Texas \(^{682,683}\). He married Eliza E. \(^{684,685}\).
Children of Robert Keesee and Eliza E. are:

256  i.  William M. Keesee\textsuperscript{7,686,687}, died before 1872\textsuperscript{688}.
257  ii.  George M. Keesee\textsuperscript{689}.
258  iii.  Mary Alice Keesee\textsuperscript{690}, born ca. 1854. She married William Stribling\textsuperscript{691,692}.

64. William M. Keesee, Jr. (William\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2},
George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{693} was born 05 April 1833 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama\textsuperscript{693,694}. and died after
1880\textsuperscript{695}. He married (1) Sophie Wehnyer\textsuperscript{696} 17 December 1852 in Washington County,
Texas\textsuperscript{696}. She died before 03 August 1860\textsuperscript{697}. He married (2) Jennie P. Long\textsuperscript{698} 23 May
1866 in Washington County, Texas\textsuperscript{698}. She was born ca. 1850 in Texas\textsuperscript{700}.

Children of William Keesee and Jennie Long are:

+  259  i.  Warren Beckworth\textsuperscript{7} Keesee, born between 1867–1868 in Texas.
+  260  ii.  Callie Keesee, born 1869 in Texas.
261  iii.  Bessie Keesee\textsuperscript{701}, born 1876 in Texas\textsuperscript{701,702}; died in Houston, Harris
County, Texas\textsuperscript{702}. She married (1) B. L. Omahundra\textsuperscript{702}. She married (2)
(unknown) Gordon\textsuperscript{702}.
+  262  iv.  Birdie Keesee, born 1879 in Texas; died in Houston, Harris County,
Texas.
263  v.  Lithia Keesee\textsuperscript{702}, born after 1880\textsuperscript{702}.

65. Mary Jane Keesee (William\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{703}
was born 05 November 1834 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama\textsuperscript{703,704}. She married Issac
Hamilton Anderson\textsuperscript{705} 04 December 1860 in Washington County, Texas\textsuperscript{706}.

Children of Mary Keesee and Issac Anderson are:

+  264  i.  Bertha\textsuperscript{7} Anderson.
265  ii.  Harley Anderson\textsuperscript{707}, born 1868\textsuperscript{707}.

66. Thomas Milton Keesee (William\textsuperscript{4}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2},
George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{707} was born 02 March 1836 in Tuscaloosa County, Alabama\textsuperscript{707}, and died before
1880\textsuperscript{707}. He married Charlotte T. Hill\textsuperscript{707} between 1867–1868 in Crockett, Houston
County, Texas\textsuperscript{708}, daughter of Francis Hill and Adaline Platt. She was born 06 October
1843 in San Augustine County, Texas\textsuperscript{708}, and died 07 July 1870 in Chappell Hill,
Washington County, Texas\textsuperscript{709}.

Child of Thomas Keesee and Charlotte Hill is:

+  266  i.  Charlotte "Lottie" Montgomery\textsuperscript{7} Keesee, born 12 December 1869 in
Chappell Hill, Washington County, Texas; died 03 September 1956 in
Roswell, Chaves County, New Mexico.
67. Gideon Kesee (William, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 12 November 1837 in Washington County, Texas, and died 09 May 1881 in Washington County, Texas. He married Cary Pleasants 15 November 1864 in Chappell Hill, Washington County, Texas, daughter of Cary Pleasant and Mary Campbell. She was born 20 June 1845 in Fayetteville, Arkansas, and died 04 January 1939 in Daughter's house, Mission, Hidalgo County, Texas.

Children of Gideon Kesee and Cary Pleasants are:

   267  i.  Carey B. Kesee, born July 1870 in Washington County, Texas, died 17 October 1934 in Victoria County, Texas.

   268  ii.  Vallie Kesee, born 1872. She married Thomas W. Stone 26 November 1901 in Austin County, Texas.

   269  iii.  Dolie Kesee, born 1875.

70. Walstein H. Kesee (William, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 11 October 1843 in Washington County, Texas, and died after 1908. He married Mildred E.

Children of Walstein Kesee and Mildred E. are:

   270  i.  Walter Kesee, born 1868 in Texas.

   271  ii.  Emma Kesee, born 1871 in Texas. She married Calvin Payne 30 October 1895 in Ellis County, Texas.

   272  iii.  Mandi Kesee, born 1876 in Texas.


73. Elias Jenkins "Jinks" Kesee (William, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 23 March 1848 in Washington County, Texas, and died after 1900. He married Sallie Frances McCulloch.

Children of Elias Kesee and Sallie McCulloch are:

   274  i.  Ella Kesee.

   275  ii.  Lillie Kesee.

   276  iii.  Dee Kesee.

   277  iv.  Ola Kesee.

   278  v.  Robert Kesee.

   279  vi.  Franklin Kesee.

   280  vii.  Gideon G. Kesee, born 16 February 1899 in Coke County, Texas, died 04 February 1918 in Robert Lee, Coke County, Texas.

79. Pauline J. Kesee (Gideon, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 09 August 1844, and died 12 April 1917 in Bastrop County, Texas. She married (1) (Unknown) Owen. She married (2) Albert Burton Harrison.
December 1873. He was born 05 November 1838, and died 09 March 1917 in Bastrop County, Texas.

Children of Pauline Keesee and Albert Harrison are:

- 281 i. Albert Cooper, born 21 September 1874; died 29 March 1968.
- 282 ii. Robert Burton Harrison, born 01 February 1877; died 26 April 1945.
- 284 iv. Hortense Harrison, born 09 March 1881; died 11 September 1944.

**Generation No. 4**

84. Nancy Hicks (Elizabeth Keesee, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born ca. 1835 in Alabama. She married William F. Barlow ca. 1850. He was born ca. 1822 in Alabama.

Children of Nancy Hicks and William Barlow are:

- 285 i. James Barlow, born ca. 1852 in Alabama.
- 287 iii. William H. Barlow, born ca. 1859 in Alabama.
- 288 iv. Maria Barlow, born ca. 1863 in Arkansas.

87. Sarah Ann Keesee (Isaac Newton, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris) was born 03 March 1843 in Arkansas, and died 16 January 1920 in Pike County, Arkansas. She married Sidney DeSoto Sutton.

Children of Sarah Keesee and Sidney Sutton are:

- 290 ii. Unknown Sutton. She married Unknown Smalling.

88. John Jolly Keesee (Isaac Newton, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris) was born 25 November 1844 in Saline County, Arkansas, and died 09 February 1909 in Denton, Denton County, Texas. He married Mary Jane Wilson 19 January 1868 in Saline County, Arkansas, daughter of Green Wilson and Lucinda. She was born 09 January 1848 in Hall County, Georgia, and died 04 April 1929 in Denton, Denton County, Texas.

Child of John Keesee and Mary Wilson is:

- 291 i. Lou Keesee, born 1869. She married James M. Magill 1888; born 1855.
89. William Jefferson Keese( Isaac Newton, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 22 October 1846 in Prattsville, Saline County, Arkansas, and died 01 December 1913 in Grant County, Arkansas. He married (1) Sarah Ann Russell 14 May 1868 in Saline County, Arkansas. She was born ca. 1851 in Mississippi, and died between 1870–1874 in Arkansas. He married (2) Elizabeth Ann Camp ca. 1873, daughter of Martin Camp and Sarah Morgan. She was born 04 March 1842 in Georgia, and died 04 August 1887 in Grant County, Arkansas. He married (3) Hettie Ann Dugan November 1887 in Grant County, Arkansas. She died 1900. He married (4) Julia Ella Anderson 24 June 1900 in Arkansas, daughter of Jacob Anderson and Cinda Carr. She was born 23 October 1868 in Arkansas, and died 27 October 1930 in River Township, Grant County, Arkansas.

Children of William Keese and Sarah Russell are:

292 i. Unknown Keese.
293 ii. Joseph Newton Keese, born February 1870; died ca. 1939 in Crowell, foard County, Texas.

Children of William Keese and Elizabeth Camp are:

294 i. Arbilla Keese.
296 iii. Sarah Jane Elizabeth Keese, born 12 April 1878 in Prattsville, Grant County, Arkansas; died 19 August 1957 in Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas. She married Jesse Augustus Haywood Earle 19 November 1896 in Prattsville, Grant County, Arkansas; born 23 August 1875 in Grant County, Arkansas; died 10 January 1956 in Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas.

Child of William Keese and Hettie Dugan is:

297 i. Mary Lucinda Keese, born 13 December 1888; died between 1929–1930 in Arkansas.

Children of William Keese and Julia Anderson are:

298 i. Jacob Keese.
299 ii. Hester Keese.
300 iii. M. Jewell Keese.

91. Mary Samantha Keese (Isaac Newton, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 28 February 1849 in Prattsville, Saline County.
(now Grant), Arkansas, and died 23 June 1918 in Grant County, Arkansas. She married James Nicholas Crutchfield after October 1875, son of Thomas Crutchfield and Frances Petty. He was born 27 August 1845 in Prattsville, Saline County (now Grant), Arkansas, and died 03 December 1928 in Grant County, Arkansas.

Children of Mary Keesee and James Crutchfield are:

301   i.  William Richardson Crutchfield, born 20 June 1895 in Sheridan, Arkansas Grant County, Arkansas; died 25 December 1939 in Kilgore, Texas. He married (1) Myra Mattie Myers; born 1895, died 1988. He married (2) Myra Mattie Myers 01 July 1912 in Benton, Arkansas Hot Springs County; born 28 December 1895 in Malvern, Arkansas Hot Springs County; died 07 June 1988 in Malvern, Arkansas Hot Springs County.

302   ii. Alexander Crutchfield, born 21 December 1939 in Grant county, Arkansas.

303   iii. Elizabeth Crutchfield.
304   iv. Frank Crutchfield.
305   v. Margaret Crutchfield Ard.
306   vi. Ida Crutchfield Ard.
309   ix. George Washington Crutchfield, born 07 April 1868; died 18 April 1904.

310   x. Tomas L Crutchfield, born 1869 in Miss. He married Cynthia.
311   xi. Della Crutchfield, born 1872 in Miss.
312   xii. A.A. Crutchfield, born 1874 in Ar.
313   xiii. Houston Crutchfield, born 11 February 1887; died 26 August 1953.

92. Lucinda Emaline Keese (Isaac Newton, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 04 March 1854 in Saline County, Arkansas, and died 29 March 1886 in Grant County, Arkansas. She married Joel William Gilford Elrod, son of Jesse Elrod and Oneida Hambrick. He was born ca. 1852 in Arkansas.

Children of Lucinda Keese and Joel Elrod are:

314   i. Isaac A. Elrod, born ca. 1874 in Arkansas.
315   ii. John I. Elrod, born ca. 1878 in Arkansas.
316   iii. Cora Sally Elrod, born 07 January 1883 in Prattsville, Saline County, Arkansas. She married Otho Hutchens in Alvord, Texas.

93. Henry Rector Keese (Isaac Newton, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 29 January 1856 in Saline County, Arkansas, and died 16 August 1926 in River Township, Grant County, Arkansas. He married Sarah.
"Sallie" A.\textsuperscript{826} ca. 1879 in Grant County, Arkansas (probably). She was born 28 April 1855 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{827}, and died after 1926\textsuperscript{828}.

Children of Henry Keesee and Sarah A. are:
317 i. Ida\textsuperscript{8} Keesee\textsuperscript{829}, born January 1880\textsuperscript{830}.
318 ii. Fannie Mae Keesee\textsuperscript{831}, born 19 March 1888\textsuperscript{832}; died 05 September 1892\textsuperscript{832}.

94. Margaret Unity\textsuperscript{7} Keesee (Isaac Newton\textsuperscript{6}, George Polk\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1}) was born 22 October 1858 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{832,833}, and died 07 June 1898 in Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{834,835}. She married John Rice Elrod 22 September 1879 in Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{835}, son of Jesse Elrod and Oneida Hambrick. He was born March 1854 in Benton, Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{835}, and died May 1908 in Pulaski County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{835}.

Child of Margaret Keesee and John Elrod is:
319 i. Isaac Keesee\textsuperscript{8} Elrod\textsuperscript{835}, born 23 January 1896 in Prattsville, Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{835}; died 07 September 1946 in San Benito, Cameron County, Texas\textsuperscript{835}. He married Mabel Williams\textsuperscript{835} 08 September 1920\textsuperscript{835}; born 10 October 1888 in Cinderford, Gloucestershire, England\textsuperscript{835}; died 19 October 1977 in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas\textsuperscript{835}.

97. James Gideon\textsuperscript{7} Keesee (Isaac Newton\textsuperscript{6}, George Polk\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1}) was born 05 May 1865\textsuperscript{836}, and died 28 August 1928 in Pulaski County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{837,838}. He married A. Elizabeth\textsuperscript{839}. She was born 1874\textsuperscript{840}, and died 1940\textsuperscript{840}.

Children of James Keesee and A. Elizabeth are:
320 i. Grover Augustus\textsuperscript{8} Keesee\textsuperscript{841}, born 05 December 1885\textsuperscript{842}; died 05 September 1890\textsuperscript{842}.
321 ii. Dora Gertrude Keesee\textsuperscript{843}, born 21 November 1891\textsuperscript{844}; died 08 March 1896\textsuperscript{844}.
322 iii. (Unnamed son) Keesee\textsuperscript{845}, born 21 January 1894\textsuperscript{846}; died 21 January 1894\textsuperscript{846}.
323 iv. Olive Jamma Keesee\textsuperscript{847}, born 31 May 1898\textsuperscript{848}; died 26 October 1901\textsuperscript{848}.

98. George Washington\textsuperscript{7} Keesee (Isaac Newton\textsuperscript{6}, George Polk\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1}) was born 07 April 1868\textsuperscript{848}, and died 18 April 1906\textsuperscript{849}. He married (1) Louisa J. Cobb 03 April 1877 in Grant County, Arkansas, daughter of Susan. She was born ca. 1857 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{850}. He married (2) Mary F. Jordan 18 September 1881 in Grant County, Arkansas. He married (3) Francis Hicks after 1882. She was born 26 January 1860 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{851}, and died 23 July 1926 in River Township, Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{852,853}.
Children of George Keesee and Louisa Cobb are:
  324  i.  Henry\textsuperscript{8} Keesee, born 1878 in Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{854}.
  325  ii.  Nathan Keesee, born September 1879 in Grant County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{854}.

Child of George Keesee and Francis Hicks is:
  326  i.  Fannie Grace\textsuperscript{8} Keesee\textsuperscript{855}, born 25 July 1900\textsuperscript{856}; died 25 September 1917\textsuperscript{856}.

100. Priscilla Evaline\textsuperscript{7} Leech (Emelia Manda\textsuperscript{6} Keesee, George Polk\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{857} was born 19 March 1843 in Alabama\textsuperscript{858}, and died 1920 in Columbia County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{858}. She married Henry Francis Hicks\textsuperscript{859} 1865 in Columbia County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{860}. He was born 1839 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{861}, and died 1913 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{861}.

Children of Priscilla Leech and Henry Hicks are:
  327  i.  (unknown)\textsuperscript{8} Hicks\textsuperscript{862}, born ca. 1860\textsuperscript{863}.
  328  ii.  Mary Lou Hicks\textsuperscript{864}, born 1867 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{864}; died 1943 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{864}.
      She married Henry Thomas Bennett\textsuperscript{864}; born 1860 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{864}.

103. Finis Ewing\textsuperscript{7} Leech (Emelia Manda\textsuperscript{6} Keesee, George Polk\textsuperscript{5}, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{865} was born 18 December 1848 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{866}, and died 21 March 1916 in Bonham, Fannin County, Texas, at his home\textsuperscript{866,867}. He married (1) Susan Anna "Annie" Atchison\textsuperscript{868} 04 January 1872 in Columbia County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{869}. She was born 02 February 1856 in Henry County, Tennessee\textsuperscript{870}, and died 21 November 1901 in Texas\textsuperscript{870}. He married (2) Mary Middleton\textsuperscript{871} after 1901\textsuperscript{872}. She died after 21 March 1916\textsuperscript{872}.

Children of Finis Leech and Susan Atchison are:
  329  i.  Unknown\textsuperscript{8} Leech\textsuperscript{874}.
  330  ii.  Unknown Leech.
  331  iii.  Unknown Leech.
  332  iv.  Unknown Leech.
  333  v.  Unknown Leech.
  334  vi.  Unknown Leech.
  335  vii.  Unknown Leech.
  336  viii.  Unknown Leech.
  337  ix.  Unknown Leech.
  338  x.  Laura Leech.

Child of Finis Leech and Mary Middleton is:
  339  i.  (Unknown)\textsuperscript{8} Leech\textsuperscript{873}, born after 1901\textsuperscript{876}.
104. James Burkett Leech (Emelia Manda Keese, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 13 December 1850 in Saline County, Arkansas, and died 29 March 1918 in 12 miles NE Moran, Stephens County, Texas. He married (1) Martha Ann Yarbrough. She was born in Tennessee, and died April 1880 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas. He married (2) Emma K. Harrison. She was born August 1861 in Arkansas.

Children of James Leech and Martha Yarbrough are:

340. Luther Leech, born 1875 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas.

341. Arthur B. Leech, born November 1876 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas.

342. Leonard Leech, born 27 November 1878 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas; died 05 February 1963 in Hobbs, Lea County, New Mexico. He married Elfleda Lee Keith in Gainesville, Texas; born 20 August 1875 in Rhea County, Tennessee; died 23 June 1951 in Seminole, Gaines County, Texas.


Children of James Leech and Emma Harrison are:


345. George Herbert Leech, born March 1885 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Ark.; died in Eolian, Stephens County, TX. He married Nettie Caldwell.

346. Patterson D. Leech, born 04 March 1888 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Ark.; died 28 November 1911 in Eolian, Stephens County, Texas.

347. Frances B. Leech, born April 1892 in Stephens County, Texas.

348. Jacob Ewing Leech, born 09 May 1902 in Stephens County, Texas; died 11 January 1911 in Eolian, Stephens County, TX.

105. Doritha Tennessee Angeline Leech (Emelia Manda Keese, George Polk, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 11 February 1853 in Benton. Saline County, Arkansas, and died 03 October 1936 in Pine Bluff, Jefferson County, Arkansas. She married William B. Railey. She was born 17 December 1871 in Columbia County, Arkansas. He was born between 1851–1853.

Children of Doritha Leech and William Railey are:
106. George Keese 7 Leech (Emelia Manda 6 Keese, George Polk 5, Thomas 4, George Farris 3, Richard 2, George 1) 919 was born 09 December 1855 in Saline County, Arkansas 920,921, and died 01 October 1934 in Weatherford, Parker County, Texas 922,923. He married Martha "Mattie" Artilla Laughlin 924,925 22 January 1872 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas 926,927, daughter of Samuel Laughlin and Nancy Atkins. She was born 13 December 1852 in Ouachita County, Arkansas 928, and died 12 September 1940 in Breckenridge, Stephens County, Texas 929,930.

Children of George Leech and Martha Laughlin are:

355  
i. Della Mildred 8 Leech 930, born 25 October 1879 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas 931; died 20 January 1970 in Weatherford, Texas 932. She married Hezekiah Burrel Mahan 933 09 December 1896 in Stephens County, Texas 934; born 08 July 1871 in Holly Springs, Dallas County, Arkansas 935; died 08 May 1953 in Weatherford, Parker County, Texas 936.

356  
ii. Nannie Laura Leech 937, born 01 December 1881 in Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas 938,939; died 22 March 1915 in Eolian, Stephens County, Texas 940. She married James Edmond Mahan 941,942 27 July 1902 in Stephens County, Texas 943; born 1872 in Dallas County, Arkansas 944; died 09 September 1943 in Fort Worth, Tarrant County, Texas 945.

357  
iii. William Leech 946, born 26 February 1885 in Columbia County, Arkansas 947; died 06 March 1895 in Columbia County, Arkansas 948.

358  
iv. Hattie Leech 949, born 29 November 1886 in Columbia County, Arkansas 950; died September 1978 in Dallas, Texas 951. She married Ezra "Ed" Lee Briden 952,953 26 May 1886 in Harpersville, Stephens County, Texas 954; died 07 February 1935 in Parker County, Texas 955.

359  
v. Bell Patterson Leech 956,957, born 25 June 1889 in Stephens County, Texas 958; died 06 June 1903 in Stephens County, Texas 959.

360  

111. Agnes W 7 Russell (Dorothy 6 Keese, George Polk 5, Thomas 4, George Farris 3, Richard 2, George 1) 958 was born between 1855–1858 in Saline County, Arkansas 959,960,961. She married Mark E. Martain 962,963 25 October 1872 in Saline County, Arkansas 964. He was born between 1847–1850 in South Carolina 965,966.
Children of Agnes Russell and Mark Martain are:

361  i.  Tessie C.8 Martain965, born ca. 1875 in Saline County, Arkansas965.

362  ii. William A. Martain965, born ca. 1876 in Saline County, Arkansas965.


123. Arch Cline7 Keesee (Milton McKnight6, George Polk5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1) was born 21 August 1886967,968,969, and died 29 December 1978 in Arkansas970,971. He married Ruth L. Posey972,973. She was born 20 March 1891974, and died 13 January 1985 in Arkansas975,976.

Children of Arch Keesee and Ruth Posey are:

364  i.  Agnes8 Keesee977. She married (Unknown) Cooper977.

365  ii. Roland/Royland R. Keesee978,979,980, born 30 October 1912 in Prattsville, Grant County, Arkansas981,982; died 15 June 1982 in Pulaski County, Arkansas983,984. He married Marie Speer985,986; born 02 September 1916987; died 988.

366  iii. Posey Keesee988, born 04 March 1916989; died 02 November 1938 in Pulaski County, Arkansas990.

126. Dorotha "Dora" Drocer7a Keesee (Milton McKnight6, George Polk5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1) was born 27 November 1894991,992, and died 02 August 1936993,994. She married George Albert Dougan995. He was born 03 May 1887996, and died 02 March 1974.

Children of Dorotha Keesee and George Dougan are:

367  i.  Eunice Marie8 Dougan, born 09 November 1914998. She married Aubrey Earl Bradford; born 14 March 1912998; died before 1997.

368  ii. Thomas Coleman Dougan, born 18 December 1916 in Prattsville, Grant County, Arkansas999,1000; died 28 January 2001 in Muskogee, Oklahoma1001. He married Ivy Smith; born 18 August; died before 19971002.

369  iii. Cecile Mae Dougan, born 27 September 19191002. She married (1) Benjamin Veo Soffar; died 1981. She married (2) Eugene English.


371  v. Mary Lillian Dougan, born 11 February 19251004. She married Daugherty Lamar Hill; born 09 December 1926.


373  vii. Dorothea Jane Dougan, born 10 April 19301005; died in San Diego, California. She married Jerome Matchke.
127. William G. 7 Keesee (Thomas D. 6, Milton 5, Thomas 4, George Faris 3, Richard 2, George 1) was born 1848 in Arkansas 1006,1007, and died 1873 in Calvert, Robertson County, Texas 1008,1009. He married Jennie Erwin 1009,1010 between September 1870–1873 in Texas. She died 04 September 1874 1011.

Child of William Keesee and Jennie Erwin is:

374 i. Willie Erwin 8 Keesee, born 22 April 1873 in Austin, Travis County, Texas 1012,1013; died 04 September 1936 in Austin, Travis County, Texas 1014,1015. She married William Folts 1016 16 June 1892 in Nebraska 1016; born 30 August 1869 in Galveston, Galveston County, Texas 1016; died 09 May 1953 in Austin, Travis County, Texas 1016.

132. Henry Bennett 7 Keesee (William Calvert 6, Milton 5, Thomas 4, George Faris 3, Richard 2, George 1) 1017 was born 13 March 1858 in Texas 1018,1019, and died 12 August 1940 in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas 1020. He married Marguerite Theresa McHugh 1020,1021 06 October 1886 in Robertson County, Texas 1022. She was born July 1867 in Texas 1022,1023, and died 1916 in Marlin, Falls County, Texas 1024.

Children of Henry Keesee and Marguerite McHugh are:

375 i. Kate W. 8 Keesee, born December 1889 1025.
376 ii. Lucy Dickinson Keesee, born December 1891 in Texas 1026,1027. She married Frederick Estill Joekel 07 August 1926 in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas 1028; born 01 January 1896 in Texas 1028; died 18 September 1962 in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas 1028.
377 iii. Mary "Mamie" K. Keesee, born 16 October 1897 in Marlin, Falls County, Texas 1029,1030; died 12 August 1950 in Kerrville, Kerr County, Texas 1031,1032. She married Gully Cowsert 18 July 1921 in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas 1033,1034; born 14 June 1894 in Kerrville, Texas 1035; died 14 June 1958 in Austin, Texas 1036.
378 iv. Marguerite Keesee, born October 1898 1037.

134. Mary Elizabeth 7 Thomson (Lucy Rogers 6 Keesee, Milton 5, Thomas 4, George Faris 3, Richard 2, George 1) 1038,1039,1040 was born ca. 1859 1041, and died 18 August 1946 in Gatesville, Coryell County, Texas 1042. She married (1) William Colgin. He died before August 1946. She married (2) Husband William 1043 ca. 1880 1044. He was born ca. 1855 1044, and died Unknown 1044.

Children of Mary Thomson and William Colgin are:

379 i. George 8 Colgin 1045.
380 ii. W. M. Colgin.
381 iii. John R. Colgin, Sr.
382 iv. C. T. Colgin.
384 vi. K. M. Colgin. She married Kirby? M.? Post, Sr.\(^{1046}\).
385 vii. A. P. Colgin.

140. **Sarah "Sallie" Elizabeth Green** (Maryann\(^6\) Clardy, Agnes\(^5\) Keesee, Thomas\(^4\), George Faris\(^3\), Richard\(^2\), George\(^1\))\(^{1047,1048}\). She married **Jim Dougal**\(^{1049,1050}\).

Children of Sarah Green and Jim Dougal are:
386 i. William M.\(^6\) Dougal\(^{1051,1052,1053}\).
387 ii. Porter Bryant Dougal\(^{1054,1055,1056}\).
388 iii. Gordon F. Dougal\(^{1057,1058,1059}\).
389 iv. Attie L. Dougal\(^{1060,1061}\). She married D. P. Wilson\(^{1062,1063}\).
390 v. Mollie Z. Dougal\(^{1064,1065,1066}\). She married F. F. West\(^{1067,1068}\).
391 vi. St. Elmo Dougal\(^{1069,1070,1071}\).
392 vii. Katie A. Dougal\(^{1072,1073,1074}\). She married W. J. Harrison\(^{1075,1076}\).
393 viii. Ernest James Dougal\(^{1077,1078,1079}\). He married (Unknown) West\(^{1080,1081}\).
394 ix. Garland A. Dougal\(^{1082,1083,1084}\).
395 x. Lula B. Dougal\(^{1085,1086,1087}\). She married C. C. Dykes\(^{1088,1089}\).
396 xi. Rufus Larkin Dougal\(^{1090,1091,1092}\).
397 xii. George Webber Dougal\(^{1093,1094,1095}\).
398 xiii. Leonard M. Dougal\(^{1096,1097}\).
399 xiv. Charlie Dougal\(^{1098,1099}\).
400 xv. Addie F. Dougal\(^{1100}\).
401 xvi. Leonard M. Dougal\(^{1100}\).

142. **John E.\(^7\) Green** (Maryann\(^6\) Clardy, Agnes\(^5\) Keesee, Thomas\(^4\), George Faris\(^3\), Richard\(^2\), George\(^1\))\(^{1101,1102,1103,1104}\). He was born ca. 1843\(^{1105,1106}\). He married **Elizabeth Woodall**\(^{1107,1108,1109,1110}\).

Children of John Green and Elizabeth Woodall are:
402 i. Sarah Annie\(^8\) Green\(^{1111,1112}\). She married Jake Taylor\(^{1113,1114}\).
403 ii. John Robert Green\(^{1115,1116}\).
404 iii. Mary Alice Green\(^{1117,1118}\). She married Herman Frank Murray\(^{1119,1120}\).
405 iv. Sarah Ann Murray\(^{1121}\).
406 v. John Robert Green\(^{1121}\).
407 vi. Mary Alice Green\(^{1121}\).

143. **Elias D.\(^7\) Green** (Maryann\(^6\) Clardy, Agnes\(^5\) Keesee, Thomas\(^4\), George Faris\(^3\), Richard\(^2\), George\(^1\))\(^{1122,1123,1124,1125}\). He was born ca. 1845\(^{1126,1127}\). He married **Parrie Lee Coleman**\(^{1128,1129}\).

Children of Elias Green and Parrie Coleman are:
408 i. Agnes\(^8\) Green\(^{1130,1131,1132}\). She married P. D. O'Dell\(^{1133,1134}\).
409 ii. Sidney Elias Green\(^{1135,1136,1137}\). He married Mary Lattimer\(^{1138,1139}\).
iii. Calhoun "Calvin" Green

144. Benjamin Calhoun Green (Maryann Clardy, Agnes Keese, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born ca. 1847. He married Alice (or Allie) Eudore Engles.

Children of Benjamin Green and Alice Engles are:

i. Margaret (Maggie) Elizabeth Green. She married (Unknown) Frisby.
ii. Lillie Green. She married (Unknown) Atkins.
iii. Mattie Green. She married G. W. Helms.
iv. Mary (Maddie) Clardy Green. She married E. O. Tolar.
v. Galby William Green.
vi. Wade Preston Green.

i. Grace Green. She married (Unknown) Kelly.
ii. Johnnie Green.
ix. George Otis Green.
x. Mosie Green. She married (Unknown) Frisby.
xi. Thomas Francis Green.

Children of George Green and Mary Dougal are:

ii. Fred A. Green.
iii. Madie Green. She married J. A. Nelson.
v. Minnie Green. She married L. L. Adams.
vi. Carrie Green. She married George W. Payne.

i. Grace Green. She married (Unknown) Dollar.
ii. Lottie Green. She married (Unknown) Harsfield.
x. John S. Green.
xi. Madie Green.

Children of Benjamin Franklin Green are:

i. Minnie Green.

xiv. Carrie Green.
439  xv. Grace Green\textsuperscript{1241}.
440  xvi. George Henry Green\textsuperscript{1241}.
441  xvii. John S. Green\textsuperscript{1241}.
442  xviii. Herbert Edward Green\textsuperscript{1241}, born 20 October 1892 in Union County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1241}, died 03 January 1949 in Warren, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1241}. He married Joe Ira Turner\textsuperscript{1241}; born 20 January 1896 in Union County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1241}; died 03 January 1949 in Warren, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1241}.

146. Will\textsuperscript{7} Etheridge (Maryann\textsuperscript{6} Clardy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1242}. He married Sallie Benton Lawrence\textsuperscript{1242}.

Children of Will Etheridge and Sallie Lawrence are:
443  i. Eulan\textsuperscript{8} Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}. She married ? Burgess\textsuperscript{1242}.
444  ii. Frank Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}.
445  iii. Guy Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}.
446  iv. Agnes Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}. She married ? Jones\textsuperscript{1242}.
447  v. Pearl Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}. She married ? Tuberville\textsuperscript{1242}.
448  vi. Gorkie Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}. She married ? Gross\textsuperscript{1242}.
449  vii. Mattie Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}. She married ? Edwards\textsuperscript{1242}.
450  viii. Ed S. Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}.
451  ix. Dora Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}. She married ? Gillum\textsuperscript{1242}.
452  x. John Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}.
453  xi. Linnie Etheridge\textsuperscript{1242}.

147. Robert Calvert\textsuperscript{7} Murphy (Mary Elizabeth\textsuperscript{6} Clardy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1243,1244,1245} was born 16 November 1842 in Saline County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1246,1247}, and died 16 February 1936 in Cherokee Plantation, Cane River, Natchitoches, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1248}. He married Martha Williams Gulley\textsuperscript{1249,1250,1251} 17 August 1865 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1252}, daughter of James Gulley and Mary Purifoy. She was born 28 February 1846 in Wilcox County, Alabama\textsuperscript{1253}, and died 08 December 1919 in Cherokee Plantation, Cane River, Natchitoches, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1252}.

Children of Robert Murphy and Martha Gulley are:
454  i. G. Robert\textsuperscript{8} Murphy\textsuperscript{1253,1254}. He married Mary Alice Pratt\textsuperscript{1255,1256}.
455  ii. Fanny Murphy\textsuperscript{1257,1258}. She married (Unknown) Hunsicker\textsuperscript{1259,1260}.
456  iii. Emerson G. Murphy\textsuperscript{1261,1262}.
457  iv. Mattie Murphy\textsuperscript{1263,1264}.
458  v. Milton Murphy\textsuperscript{1265}, born 12 November 1866 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1265}; died 15 April 1867\textsuperscript{1265}.
459  vi. George Robert Murphy\textsuperscript{1266,1267}, born 20 April 1868 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1268}; died 25 June 1935 in Natchitoches, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1269}. He married Mary Alice Pratt\textsuperscript{1270} 19 August 1903 in Hillsboro, Union County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1271}; born 03 May 1883 in Hillsboro.
Union County, Arkansas; died 19 October 1974 in Nachitoches, Louisiana.

Charles Haywood Murphy, born 02 November 1870 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 03 April 1954. He married Bертie Wilson on 11 November 1915.

Mary Elizabeth Murphy, born 23 October 1872 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 21 April 1916 in Union Parish, Louisiana. She married Lee Tatum on 23 December 1891.

Annie Ruth Murphy, born 17 May 1874 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 02 July 1876 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

Linnie Alice Murphy, born 11 February 1876 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 28 February 1972 in Louisiana. She married Bob Hodges Sandlin.

John Marcus Murphy, born 19 March 1878; died 19 September 1923. He married Katie Johnson on 13 June 1906.

Fannie Floy Murphy, born 15 February 1880; died 15 March 1974. She married Monroe Hunsicker on 03 June 1915.

Lou May Murphy, born 04 May 1882; died 1977. She married Dr. Joshua Bennett Pratt on 04 May 1904.

Mattie Agnes Murphy, born 26 September 1884 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 17 November 1900.

Emerson Gulley Murphy, born 20 November 1888 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 18 July 1958. He married Lola/Leola Albritton on 02 July 1913.

Agnes Murphy (Mary Elizabeth Clardy, Agnes Keesee, Thomas, George Farris, Richard, George) was born 12 August 1844. She married William Ingram.

Children of Agnes Murphy and William Ingram are:

Ona Murphy Ingram. She married T. J. Breed.

Burl T. Ingram.

Pete Ingram.

William Ingram.

Maud Ingram.

Burl T. Ingram. He married Rosalie.

Dr. William "Billy" Clardy Murphy (Mary Elizabeth Clardy, Agnes Keesee, Thomas, George Farris, Richard, George) was born 05 December 1845, and died 14 October 1906 in Union Parish, Louisiana. He
married Mary Celinda Cammock. She was born 05 March 1849, and
died 06 April 1905 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

Children of William Murphy and Mary Cammock are:

475 i. Lillie A. Murphy. She married (Unknown) Crow.

476 ii. Henrietta "Etta" Ann Murphy. She married (1) (Unknown)
Harrell. She married (2) William Spears Harrell 11 February
1892 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

477 iii. Mary Celinda Murphy. She married Dr. Frank P.
Stevenson.

478 iv. Infant Murphy.

479 v. Mattie Murphy. She married (1) W. T. Hudson. She
married (2) Billy Birt Smith. She married (3) (Unknown)
Hudson. She married (4) (Unknown) Roark.


481 vii. Rosa Murphy, born 1886; died 1977. She married (1) Dr. J.
E. Bailey. She married (2) Thomas Walker Hudson. She
married (3) T. Walker Hudson.

482 viii. Carlton A. Murphy, born 1890; died 1958. He married
Elizabeth Harvey.

483 ix. Dr. George W. Murphy, born 1874. He married (1) Mary
Henderson.

484 x. Hattie Lou Murphy, born 21 January 1875 in Union Parish,
Louisiana; died 1876 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

485 xi. Mittie Murphy, born 1877; died 1913. She married J. Ed
Roark.

486 xii. Leska Maggie Murphy, born 26 January 1882 in Union Parish,
Louisiana; died 01 December 1883 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

487 xiii. Robert Cleveland Murphy, born 29 October 1884; died 16
December 1903 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

488 xiv. Paul Murphy, born 1889; died 1940. He married
Tessie.

150. James Moore Murphy (Mary Elizabeth Clardy, Agnes Keesee, Thomas,
George Faris, Richard, George) was born 24 March 1847, and died.
He married Texas Wooten 15 December 1868 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

Children of James Murphy and Texas Wooten are:

489 i. Annie Murphy. She married J. P. Powell.

490 ii. Minnie Murphy. She married J. M. Wallace.

491 iii. Minnie E. Murphy, born 1869; died 1912. She married James
Minor Wallace 02 June 1887 in Union Parish, Louisiana; born
1860; died 1951.
151. S. Annie\textsuperscript{7} Murphy (Mary Elizabeth\textsuperscript{6} Clardy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1467,1468,1469} was born 21 February 1849\textsuperscript{1470}. She married Frank Harrison\textsuperscript{1471,1472,1473}.

Children of S. Murphy and Frank Harrison are:

492 i. Anna Murphy\textsuperscript{8} Harrison\textsuperscript{1474}. She married C. E. Durham\textsuperscript{1474}.
493 ii. Beulah Harrison\textsuperscript{1474}. She married Unknown Sevier\textsuperscript{1474}.
494 iii. Annie Murphy Harrison\textsuperscript{1475,1476}. She married C. E. Durham\textsuperscript{1477,1478}.
495 iv. Beulah Harrison\textsuperscript{1479,1480}. She married (Unknown) Sevier\textsuperscript{1481,1482}.

152. George E.\textsuperscript{7} Murphy (Mary Elizabeth\textsuperscript{6} Clardy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1483,1484,1485} was born ca. 1853\textsuperscript{1486,1487}, and died before 14 October 1906\textsuperscript{1488}. He married Lottie Wooten\textsuperscript{1489,1490,1491}.

Children of George Murphy and Lottie Wooten are:

496 i. Minor I.\textsuperscript{8} Murphy\textsuperscript{1492,1493}.
497 ii. William Gordon Murphy\textsuperscript{1494,1495}.
498 iii. J. B. Murphy\textsuperscript{1496,1497}.
499 iv. Fenner W. Murphy\textsuperscript{1498,1499}.
500 v. Bessie Murphy\textsuperscript{1500,1501}. She married E. L. Ramser\textsuperscript{1502,1503}.

153. Henrietta "Etta"\textsuperscript{7} Murphy (Mary Elizabeth\textsuperscript{6} Clardy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1504,1505,1506,1507} was born 28 March 1854. She married John Purifoy Gulley\textsuperscript{1508,1509,1510} 16 November 1871\textsuperscript{1511}, son of James Gulley and Mary Purifoy. He was born 01 February 1850 in Cherry Ridge, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1512}, and died 20 September 1914 in Springhill, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1512}.

Children of Henrietta Murphy and John Gulley are:

501 i. R. Ed\textsuperscript{8} Gulley\textsuperscript{1513,1514}.
502 ii. Pearl Gulley\textsuperscript{1515,1516}. She married H. C. Garland\textsuperscript{1517,1518}.
503 iii. J. Frank Gulley\textsuperscript{1519,1520}.
504 iv. Birdie Gulley\textsuperscript{1521,1522}. She married (Unknown) Templeton\textsuperscript{1523,1524}.
505 v. Leonard George Gulley\textsuperscript{1525,1526}.
506 vi. Dr. Charles Henry Gulley\textsuperscript{1527,1528}.
507 vii. Alma Gulley\textsuperscript{1529,1530}. She married (Unknown) Taylor\textsuperscript{1531,1532}.
508 viii. Fred D. Gulley\textsuperscript{1533,1534}.
509 ix. Ruby Gulley\textsuperscript{1535,1536}. She married (Unknown) McCann\textsuperscript{1537,1538}.
510 x. J. Gulley\textsuperscript{1539,1540}. She married B. B. Bledsoe\textsuperscript{1541,1542}.
511 xi. James Haywood Gulley\textsuperscript{1543,1544}.
512 xii. (Infant) Gulley\textsuperscript{1545}, born 09 September 1887 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1545}; died 12 September 1887 in Union Parish, Louisiana.
154. John M. Murphy (Mary Elizabeth Clardy, Agnes Keese, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 04 September 1857. He married Mollie M. McGough.

Children of John Murphy and Mollie McGough are:

- Walton W. Murphy
- Dr. Garland D. Murphy
- Olive Murphy. She married (Unknown) Williams.
- Chauttie Murphy. She married G. A. Shaw.
- Norma Murphy. She married I. M. Cooper.
- Alice Murphy. She married (Unknown) Slade.
- Ollie Bert Murphy.
- H. M. Murphy.
- Elsie Murphy, born 31 August 1884 in Union Parish, Louisiana; died 04 March 1886 in Union Parish, Louisiana.

155. Lou C. Murphy (Mary Elizabeth Clardy, Agnes Keese, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George) was born 25 December 1860 in Union Parish, Louisiana, and died 19 July 1908 in Magazine, Logan County, Arkansas. She married Jeremiah Dumas Slade, son of Joseph Slade and Elizabeth Dumas. He was born 10 June 1858 in Macon, Georgia, and died 29 May 1934 in Magazine, Logan County, Arkansas.

Children of Lou Murphy and Jeremiah Slade are:

- Agnes Ruth Slade, born 22 June 1885 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana; died 27 August 1886 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana.
- Annie May Slade, born 28 November 1886 in Magazine, Logan County, Arkansas; died 28 February 1955 in Lubbock, Lubbock County, Texas. She married Charles Clarence Leftwich.
- Pearl Elizabeth Slade, born 12 February 1889 in Union Parish, Louisiana; died 1973 in Springhill, Union Parish, Louisiana. She married John P. Combs.
- Roy Voris Slade, born December 1891; died in Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas.
- Alice Elenor Slade, born 08 October 1893 in Arkansas; died December 1964 in El Dorado, Union County, Arkansas. She married Charles Embrey Gaylor.
- Joseph Murphy Slade, born 18 December 1896 in Conway, Faulkner County, Arkansas; died 24 January 1977 in El Dorado,
Union County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1619}. He married Nellie M. Hester\textsuperscript{1619} in November 1916 in Magazine, Logan County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1619}.

528 vii. Lillie Slade\textsuperscript{1619,1620,1621}, born 02 June 1899 in Arkansas\textsuperscript{1622}; died January 1979\textsuperscript{1622}. She married J. Pierce Foster\textsuperscript{1622,1623,1624} in 20 May 1917 in El Dorado, Union County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1625}.

156. Fanny\textsuperscript{7} Murphy (Mary Elizabeth\textsuperscript{6} Clardy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1626,1627,1628} was born 07 October 1863\textsuperscript{1629}. She married J. Fletcher Samples\textsuperscript{1630,1631,1632}.

Children of Fanny Murphy and J. Samples are:

529 i. Grace Alice\textsuperscript{8} Sample\textsuperscript{1633,1634}. She married L. L. Purifoy\textsuperscript{1635,1636}.
530 ii. Louella Sample\textsuperscript{1637,1638}. She married (Unknown) Moore\textsuperscript{1639,1640}.
531 iii. Lavelle F. Sample\textsuperscript{1641,1642}. He married Fanny B. Murphy\textsuperscript{1643,1644}.
532 iv. Charlie Sample\textsuperscript{1645,1646}.
533 v. Hugh Sample\textsuperscript{1647,1648}.
534 vi. Percy Sample\textsuperscript{1649,1650}.
535 vii. Harvey Sample\textsuperscript{1651,1652}.
536 viii. Clark Sample\textsuperscript{1653,1654}.
537 ix. Ruth Sample\textsuperscript{1655,1656}. She married (Unknown) Mullally\textsuperscript{1657,1658}.
538 x. Claud Sample\textsuperscript{1659,1660}.

157. Alice McKnight\textsuperscript{7} Murphy (Mary Elizabeth\textsuperscript{6} Clardy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1661,1662,1663,1664} was born 18 June 1865 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1665}, and died 04 June 1948 in Marion, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1665}. She married Fred Tucker\textsuperscript{1666,1667,1668,1669,1670} on 25 December 1883 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1671,1672,1673,1674}, son of Robert Tucker and Harriet Johnson. He was born 18 September 1859 in Tuckertown, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1675}, and died 09 June 1939 in Strong, Union County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1675}.

Children of Alice Murphy and Fred Tucker are:

539 i. B. E. Tucker\textsuperscript{1676,1677}.
540 ii. Clarence Tucker\textsuperscript{1678}, born 1884\textsuperscript{1678}; died 1928\textsuperscript{1678}. He married Lydia Cummings\textsuperscript{1678}.
541 iii. Bob Ed Tucker\textsuperscript{1679}, born 1886\textsuperscript{1679}; died 1969\textsuperscript{1679}. He married Grace Hill\textsuperscript{1679}.
542 iv. Mabel Elizabeth Tucker\textsuperscript{1679}, born 1889\textsuperscript{1679}. She married Louie L. Maroney\textsuperscript{1679}.
543 v. George Leonard "Dick" Tucker\textsuperscript{1679}, born 1891\textsuperscript{1679}. He married Clara Jack\textsuperscript{1879}.
544 vi. Fannie Lucille Tucker\textsuperscript{1679}, born 1893\textsuperscript{1679}; died 1938. She married Jim Bird Wheelis\textsuperscript{1679}.
545 vii. Sadie Agnes Tucker\textsuperscript{1679}, born 1895\textsuperscript{1679}. She married Louis Landry\textsuperscript{1679}.
546  viii. Grace Hattie Tucker1679, born 18981679. She married Grady Harrison1679; born 18941679.

547  ix. Mary Alice Tucker1679,1680,1681, born 10 August 1900 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana1682. She married (1) Hugh A. Werdemann1683. She married (2) Roy Charles Jewell1684 24 December 19281684; born 18 March 1887 in Harrisonville, Cass County, Missouri1684; died 14 February 1967 in Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas1684.

548  x. Dorothy Sue Tucker1685, born 19091685. She married John C. Duran1685.

158. William C. Moore7 (Saryan (Sarah Ann)6 Clardy, Agnes5 Keesee, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1)1686,1687,1688 was born ca. 1844 in Arkansas1689,1690,1691, and died after 19461692.

Child of William C. Moore is:

549  i. Tom5 Moore1693.

159. John Calhoun C. Moore7 (Saryan (Sarah Ann)6 Clardy, Agnes5 Keesee, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1)1694,1695 was born ca. 1842 in Arkansas1696,1697,1698.

Child of John Calhoun C. Moore is:

550  i. Tom5 Moore1699,1700.

161. George M. G. R. R. Moore7 (Saryan (Sarah Ann)6 Clardy, Agnes5 Keesee, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1)1701,1702,1703 was born 05 September 1849 in Union Parish, Louisiana1704,1705,1706, and died 20 August 1916 in Union Parish, Louisiana1707,1708. He married (2) Mattie S. Clark1709,1710 24 October 1870 in Union Parish, Louisiana1711,1712,1713. She was born 23 September 18511714,1715, and died 15 May 1922 in Union Parish, Louisiana1716,1717.

Children of George M. G. R. R. Moore are:

551  i. Joe G.8 Moore1718.
552  ii. (Unknown) Moore1718. She married J. W. Lee1718.
553  iii. Jesse W. Moore1718.
554  iv. E. A. Moore1718.
555  v. Louie Thomas Moore1718,1719,1718, died ca. 19461718.
556  vi. Christopher Moore1718,1718.

Children of George Moore and Mattie Clark are:

557  i. Joe G.8 Moore1719,1720.
558  ii. Jessie W. Moore1721,1722.
559  iii. E. A. Moore1723,1724.
iv. Christopher Moore\textsuperscript{1725,1726}, born 08 August 1871 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1729}; died 05 December 1901\textsuperscript{1729}.

v. James C. Moore\textsuperscript{1727,1728}, born 08 August 1871 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1729}; died 05 December 1901\textsuperscript{1729}.

vi. Lula Agnes Moore\textsuperscript{1730,1731}, born 13 May 1875 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1732,1733}; died 19 February 1956 in Shiloh, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1734,1735}. She married James William Lee\textsuperscript{1736,1737} 22 December 1892 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1738,1739,1740}; born 11 March 1867 in Shiloh, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1741,1742}; died 22 December 1950 in Shiloh, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1743,1744}.

vii. Louia Thomas Moore\textsuperscript{1745,1746}, born 13 May 1875 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1747}; died 30 October 1939 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1748}. He married Effie D. Cobb\textsuperscript{1749}; born 12 April 1884\textsuperscript{1749}; died 16 December 1980 in Louisiana\textsuperscript{1749}.

viii. Mollie O. Moore\textsuperscript{1750,1751}, born 19 July 1876 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1752}; died 13 February 1926 in Louisiana\textsuperscript{1752}. She married James M. Oliver\textsuperscript{1753} after 1907\textsuperscript{1754}; born 01 February 1867\textsuperscript{1754}; died 10 November 1935 in Louisiana\textsuperscript{1754}.

ix. Roxie Moore\textsuperscript{1755,1756}, born 10 April 1882 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1757}; died 15 January 1900 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1757}.

162. Thomas Keesee\textsuperscript{7} Moore (Saryan (Sarah Ann)\textsuperscript{6} Claridy, Agnes\textsuperscript{5} Keesee, Thomas\textsuperscript{4}, George Faris\textsuperscript{3}, Richard\textsuperscript{2}, George\textsuperscript{1})\textsuperscript{1758,1759,1760} was born ca. 1851 in Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1761}, and died 24 September 1920 in El Dorado, Union County, Arkansas\textsuperscript{1762}. He married (2) Ossie Ola Clark\textsuperscript{1762} 28 October 1877 in Oakland, Union Parish, Louisiana\textsuperscript{1762}. She was born 28 October 1861\textsuperscript{1762}, and died 14 July 1932\textsuperscript{1762}.

Children of Thomas Keesee Moore are:

566 i. ? (1) Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married ? Wooley\textsuperscript{1763}.

567 ii. ? (2) Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married L. H. Burnside\textsuperscript{1763}.

568 iii. T. G. Moore\textsuperscript{1763}.

569 iv. ? (3) Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married E. A. Buckley\textsuperscript{1763}.

570 v. ? (4) Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married W. W. Brillhart\textsuperscript{1763}.

571 vi. ? (5) Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married G. D. Murphy\textsuperscript{1763}.

572 vii. J. O. Moore\textsuperscript{1763}.

573 viii. ? (6) Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married Robert L. Duck\textsuperscript{1763}.

574 ix. Robert Claridy Moore\textsuperscript{1763}.

575 x. Lucille Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married Bob Elliott\textsuperscript{1763}.

576 xi. Zada Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married ? Cordell\textsuperscript{1763}.

577 xii. Haggie Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married ? Wooley\textsuperscript{1763}.

578 xiii. Maude Moore\textsuperscript{1763}. She married ? Hames\textsuperscript{1763}.

Children of Thomas Moore and Ossie Clark are:

579 i. Alice Eva\textsuperscript{8} Moore\textsuperscript{1764}, born 07 July 1879\textsuperscript{1764}; died 26 May 1944\textsuperscript{1764}.

580 ii. Margaret Ann Moore\textsuperscript{1764}, born 14 March 1881\textsuperscript{1764}; died 13 May 1935\textsuperscript{1764}.
iii. Bernie Clark Moore, born 26 April 1883; died 18 December 1952.
iv. Sallie Alzada Moore, born 26 September 1884; died 14 May 1914.
v. Thomas Galba Moore, born 26 May 1886; died 01 January 1946.
vi. Charlotte "Lottie" Agnes Moore, born 08 April 1888.
vii. Mattie Lee Moore, born 08 May 1889.
viii. Fannie Ellen Moore, born 26 February 1891.
ix. James Ollie Moore, born 25 April 1892; died 04 August 1954.
xi. Corban Moore, born 30 March 1896; died 1898.


Child of Mary Clardy and ? Canral is:

i. Ramey Cliff Canral.


Children of Lula Clardy and ? Paul are:

i. Elbert Paul.
ii. Oliver Paul; She married ? Sessor.
iii. Nettie Paul; She married ? Fitzhugh.
iv. Herbert Paul.

184. Charles "Charlie" T. Keesee (Milton S., Thomas, Thomas, George Faris, Richard, George). was born 20 May 1861 in Texarkana, Miller County, Arkansas, and died 25 February 1909. He married Cora Elizabeth Laughlin 22 February 1885 in Ellis County, Texas. She was born 19 June 1863 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas, and died 17 December 1942 in Electra, Wichita County, Texas.

Children of Charles Keesee and Cora Laughlin are:
598  i. Earl Keese 1773, born 31 March 1886 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas 1773,1774; died 1930 1775.

599  ii. Fannie Mae Keese 1776, born 1888 1776.

600  iii. Etta Keese 1776, born 1890 1776.

601  iv. Stella Keese 1776, born 1893 1776.

602  v. Paul Keese 1776, born 1895 1776.

603  vi. Jennie L. Keese 1776, born 1897 1776.

604  vii. Herman Keese 1776, born 1899 1776.

605  viii. Charles Thomas Keese 1776, born 09 July 1901 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas 1776; died 15 December 1978 in Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma 1776. He married Thelma Ruby Swafford 1776 19 June 1924 in Archer County, Texas 1776; born 11 April 1907 in Manitou, Tillman County, Oklahoma 1776; died 18 July 1981 in Indianapolis, Indiana 1776.

197. Ida F. Keese (Thomas J. 6, Thomas 5, Thomas 4, George Faris 3, Richard 2, George 1) 1777,1778 was born 1872 1779,1780,1781, and died 1957 1782,1783. She married Angus Quaite 1784 04 February 1890 in Ellis County, Texas 1785. He was born 31 August 1870 1786, and died 25 August 1906 in Waxahachie, Ellis County, Texas 1786,1787.

Child of Ida Keese and Angus Quaite is:


201. Tommie/Thomie Cornelia Keese (Thomas J. 6, Thomas 5, Thomas 4, George Faris 3, Richard 2, George 1) 1789,1790 was born 14 November 1862 in Union County, Arkansas 1791, and died 03 September 1895 in Ellis County, Texas 1792. She married Charles Waufine Putman 1793,1794 23 December 1884 1795, son of Joseph Putman and Christina Bordner. He was born 01 November 1860 in Fulton County, Illinois, and died 10 January 1922 in Ellis County, Texas 1795.

Children of Tommie/Thomie Keese and Charles Putman are:

607  i. Willie Edwin Putman 1796, born 28 October 1885 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas; died 04 October 1968 1797. He married Iva Elizabeth Munden 27 January 1907; died 05 August 1971 1797.

608  ii. Emma Christeen Putman, born 13 December 1888 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas; died 18 September 1979 1797. She married (1) George Huett Miers 20 October 1906 1797; died 10 March 1936 1797. She married (2) Fred Gomillion 02 June 1945 1797.


220. Millard Keese (John Hill 6, Thomas 5, Thomas 4, George Faris 3, Richard 2, George 1) 1802,1803,1804 was born 16 July 1884 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas 1805, and died 29
September 1959 in Waxahachie, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1805}\). He married Faun Bigham\(^{1806}\).
24 May 1911 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1807}\). She was born 20 May 1889 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1808}\), and died 29 January 1963 in Waxahachie, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1808}\).

Children of Millard Keese and Faun Bigham are:

1. Ruth Elizabeth\(^{8}\) Keese\(^{1808}\), born in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1808}\).
2. Martha Louise Keese\(^{1809}\). She married M. S. Gordon\(^{1809}\).
3. Sarah Jane Keese\(^{1810}\). She married Charles Frazer/Fraze\(^{1811}\).
4. Marilyn Keese\(^{1812}\), born 28 July 1924 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1812}\); died 19 December 1975\(^{1812}\). She married Ford C. Bangle\(^{1812}\).
5. Rebecca Ann Keese\(^{1812}\), born 1931 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1812}\); died 1989\(^{1812}\).

221. Bessie Dorman\(^{7}\) Keese (John Hill\(^{6}\), Thomas\(^{5}\), Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1812,1813}\) was born 10 February 1886 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1814}\), and died 26 June 1969 in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas\(^{1814}\). She married Berry Holt Spain\(^{1814}\) 09 February 1905 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1814}\), son of James Spain and Eliza McKnight. He was born 31 December 1879 in Readyville, Cannon County, Tennessee\(^{1814}\), and died 22 December 1948 in Denton, Denton County, Texas\(^{1814}\).

Children of Bessie Keese and Berry Spain are:

1. Louis Verrell\(^{8}\) Spain\(^{1814}\), born 15 October 1907 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1814}\); died 29 November 1998\(^{1815}\). He married Blanche Hildreth\(^{1816}\)
   31 August 1943\(^{1816}\).
2. Mary Evelyn Spain\(^{1817}\), born 09 March 1909 in Bowie, Montague County, Texas\(^{1818}\); died 20 August 1995 in DeSoto, Dallas County, Texas\(^{1818}\). She married George Armel Scott\(^{1818}\) 21 May 1938 in Henrietta, Love County, Oklahoma\(^{1818}\); born 07 March 1904 in Dallas County, Texas\(^{1818}\); died 20 March 1961 in Dallas County, Texas\(^{1818}\).
3. John Hill Spain\(^{1818}\), born 15 June 1918 in Sanger, Denton County, Texas\(^{1818}\); died 09 July 1999 in Tyler, Smith County, Texas\(^{1819}\). He married Elizabeth Jane Kay\(^{1820}\) 01 March 1941 in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas\(^{1821}\); born 16 April 1918 in Winona, Smith County, Texas\(^{1821}\).
4. Millard Holt Spain\(^{1821}\), born 17 September 1922 in Denton County, Texas\(^{1821}\); died 27 June 1989 in Baytown, Harris County, Texas\(^{1821}\). He married Annie Margaret Florene Casey\(^{1821}\) 05 October 1944 in Denton, Denton County, Texas\(^{1821}\); born 15 October 1923 in Chambers County, Texas.

222. Mary Winters\(^{7}\) Keese (John Hill\(^{6}\), Thomas\(^{5}\), Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1821,1822,1823}\) was born 20 November 1888 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1824}\), and died 16 January 1967 in Tulsa, Tulsa County, Oklahoma\(^{1824}\). She married Earl Palmer Harwell\(^{1824,1825}\) 12 July 1910 in Quanah, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1826}\). He was
born in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1827}\), and died in Fort Worth, Tarrant County, Texas\(^{1827}\).

Child of Mary Keesee and Earl Harwell is:

619   i. Margaret "Margo"\(^{8}\) Harwell\(^{1827}\). She married Jack Owens\(^{1827}\).

223. Lucy Fields\(^{7}\) Keesee (John Hill\(^{6}\), Thomas\(^{5}\), Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1827},^{1828}\) was born 19 November 1892 in Ovilla, Ellis County, Texas\(^{1829}\), and died ca. 1977 in Fort Worth, Tarrant County, Texas\(^{1829}\). She married Raymond E. Hendricks\(^{1830}\).

Child of Lucy Keesee and Raymond Hendricks is:

620   i. Raymond Edward\(^{8}\) Hendricks\(^{1831}\). He married (Unknown) Trees\(^{1831}\).

239. Lucy E.\(^{7}\) Garrett (Paulina Jane\(^{6}\) Calvert, Mary "Polly"\(^{5}\) Keesee, Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1832},^{1833}\) was born ca. 1852 in Texas\(^{1834},^{1835}\). She married (1) George F. Randolph 17 May 1871 in Robertson County, Texas. He died 16 October 1873 in Calvert, Robertson County, Texas\(^{1836}\). She married (2) Scott Field\(^{1837}\) 06 June 1878 in Robertson County, Texas, son of Henry Field and Mary Bates. He was born 26 January 1847 in Mississippi\(^{1838},^{1839}\), and died 20 December 1931 in Calvert, Robertson County, Texas\(^{1840}\).

Children of Lucy Garrett and Scott Field are:

621   i. Tom\(^{8}\) Field.
622   ii. Scott Field.
623   iii. Eugene Field.

240. John T.\(^{7}\) Garrett (Paulina Jane\(^{6}\) Calvert, Mary "Polly"\(^{5}\) Keesee, Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1841},^{1842}\) was born ca. 1858 in Robertson County, Texas\(^{1843},^{1844}\). He married Allie Gray.

Children of John Garrett and Allie Gray are:

624   i. Hazel\(^{8}\) Garrett.
625   ii. John Garrett III.

241. Margaret "Maggie" E.\(^{7}\) Smith (Mary M.\(^{6}\) Calvert, Mary "Polly"\(^{5}\) Keesee, Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1845},^{1846}\) was born ca. 1850 in Saline County, Arkansas\(^{1846}\), and died after December 1890\(^{1847}\). She married (1) (Unknown) Price\(^{1848}\). She married (2) Robert Patton Quaite\(^{1849}\), son of William Quaite and Hester Patton. He was born ca. 1843 in near Hopkinsville, Christian County, Kentucky\(^{1850},^{1851}\).

Children of Margaret "Maggie" Smith and Robert Quaite are:
626 i. Lee P. Quaite\(^{1852}\), born 1870\(^{1853}\), died 1928 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1853}\).
627 ii. Mary A. Quaite\(^{1854}\), died 20 January 1919 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1855}\).
628 iii. Lina May Quaite\(^{1856}\), died 09 May 1955 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1857}\).

243. Peter P.\(^{7}\) Smith (Mary M.\(^{6}\) Calvert, Mary "Polly"\(^{5}\) Keesee, Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1858}\) was born 17 January 1856 in Saline County, Arkansas\(^{1859,1860}\), and died 17 January 1925 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1860}\). He married Nancy "Nannie" Laura Collier\(^{1861,1862,1863}\) 18 October 1877 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1864}\). She died 01 April 1931 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1865,1866}\).

Children of Peter Smith and Nancy Collier are:
629 i. Harry\(^{8}\) Smith\(^{1867}\), born 17 August 1885 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1868}\); died 19 October 1887 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1869}\).
630 ii. Robert Manuel Smith\(^{1870}\), born 08 August 1890 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1871}\); died 11 December 1891 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1871}\).

246. Thomas Garrett\(^{7}\) Smith (Mary M.\(^{6}\) Calvert, Mary "Polly"\(^{5}\) Keesee, Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1872,1873}\) was born 19 June 1862 in Robertson County, Texas\(^{1874}\), and died 20 May 1928 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1875}\). He married Fanny Phillpott\(^{1876,1877}\). She was born 1866\(^{1878}\), and died 1901 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1878}\).

Children of Thomas Smith and Fanny Phillpott are:
631 i. Infant\(^{8}\) Smith\(^{1879}\), born 30 October 1887 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1879}\); died 31 October 1887 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1879}\).
632 ii. Thomas Garrett Smith\(^{1880}\), born 1901 in Ellis County, Texas\(^{1880}\); died 1968\(^{1880}\).

252. Thomas F.\(^{7}\) Keesee (George Marion\(^{6}\), William\(^{5}\), Thomas\(^{4}\), George Faris\(^{3}\), Richard\(^{2}\), George\(^{1}\)\(^{1881}\) was born 1860 in Washington County, Texas\(^{1881}\), and died 1923 in Jones County, Texas\(^{1881}\). He married Emma Terrissa Lackey\(^{1882}\) 20 December 1880 in Travis County, Texas\(^{1883}\), daughter of John Lackey and Terresa Mercer. died 1884.

Children of Thomas Keesee and Emma Lackey are:
633 i. Eugene\(^{8}\) Keesee\(^{1885}\), born ca. 1882 in Hays County, Texas\(^{1885}\); died ca. 1917\(^{1885}\). He married Emmadell P. Rogers\(^{1885}\).
634 ii. Ernest Keesee\(^{1885}\), born 15 December 1883 in Hays County, Texas\(^{1885,1886}\); died 25 January 1967 in Abilene, Taylor County, Texas\(^{1887,1888}\). He married Lela Hitt\(^{1889}\) in Seadrift, Texas\(^{1890}\).
635 iii. Robert Andrew Keesee\(^{1890}\), born 29 May 1885 in Hays County, Texas\(^{1890}\); died 13 April 1956 in Abilene, Texas\(^{1890}\). He married Laura Melvina Fogle\(^{1891}\) 14 May 1911 in Brown County, Texas\(^{1892}\).
636 iv. Ethel E. Keesee\(^{1892}\), born 1892 in Wilson County, Texas\(^{1892}\); died 04 May 1965 in Abilene, Texas\(^{1892}\). She married Leonard Passmore\(^{1892}\).
637  v. Richmond Keesee1892, born 14 December 1894 in Runnels County, Texas1892; died 19 September 1900 in Coke County, Texas1892.

638  vi. William Franklin Keesee1892, born 09 July 1897 in Coke County, Texas1892; died December 1964 in Tulsa, Oklahoma1892. He married Maude Suggs1892, 14 November 1917 in Pauls Valley, Oklahoma1892; born 05 July 18991893; died March 19741893.


640  viii. Luther Keesee1894, born 22 January 1900 in Runnels County, Texas1894; died July 1972 in Austin, Austin County, Texas1894. He married Nova Farquhar1894.


259. Warren Beckworth7 Keesee (William M.6, William5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1)1894 was born between 1867–1868 in Texas1894,1895. He married Sue Wallace1895.

Children of Warren Keesee and Sue Wallace are:

642  i. Wallace8 Keesee1895.

643  ii. Harry Keesee1895.

260. Callie7 Keesee (William M.6, William5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1)1895,1896 was born 1869 in Texas1897. She married (1) William "Will" A. Williamson1897. She married (2) Dr. (Unknown) Vermillion.

Child of Callie Keesee and William Williamson is:

644  i. Ava8 Williamson1897. She married Robert Peyton Mims1897.

262. Birdie7 Keesee (William M.6, William5, Thomas4, George Faris3, Richard2, George1)1898 was born 1879 in Texas1898,1899, and died in Houston, Harris County, Texas1899. She married (1) K. C. Woodward1899. She married (2) J. E. Brockhart1899.

Children of Birdie Keesee and K. Woodward are:

645  i. Bernice8 Woodward1899.

646  ii. Edgar Woodward1899.

Children of Bertha Anderson and Robert Burke are:
647 i. William Robert 8 Burke 1899.
648 ii. Gladys Burke 1899. She married (Unknown) Hopson 1899.

266. Charlotte "Lottie" Montgomery 7 Keesee (Thomas Milton 6, William 5, Thomas 4, George Parist 3, Richard 2, George 1). She was born 12 December 1869 in Chappell Hill, Washington County, Texas 1876, and died 03 September 1956 in Roswell, Chaves County, New Mexico 1902. She married Napoleon Lockett Allen 1903 17 November 1887 in Crockett, Houston County, Texas 1904. He was born 05 February 1859 in Cannon County, Tennessee 1865, 1866, and died 27 October 1906 in Grandview, Texas 1907.

Children of Charlotte Keesee and Napoleon Allen are:
649 i. Ida M. 8 Allen 1908, born September 1888 1908.
650 ii. Ruby Allen 1908, born February 1890 1908.
651 iii. Nannie Allen 1908, born November 1891 1908.
653 v. Roland Samuel Allen 1908, 1909, born 01 August 1895 in Grandview, Texas 1910, 1911; died 27 September 1946 in Roswell, Chaves County, New Mexico 1911. He married Zana Elkins 1911 20 April 1929 in Roswell, Chaves, New Mexico 1911. born 31 January 1907 in Portales, Sante Fe County, New Mexico 1911.

Endnotes

1. Given name from Spartenburg County, SC deed dated September 5 1803/ recorded July 21, 1804, Deed Book I, 367-369. Thomas Keesee and wife Mary Keesee signed as grantors. Deed citation from W. M. Putman. Surname of McKnight lacking proof; speculation based on oral history and naming patterns in family.
2. 1830 Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, Census, p. 668.
3. William Munden Putman, family history manuscript.
10. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 512.
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15. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 512.
17. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 512.
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34. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file.
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41. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson; infant was 10 days old when she died.
42. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson.
43. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson; "Louisey Verjinia Keesee died 28 Jan 1851. being 4 yrs., 11 months 15 days.
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47. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
48. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
49. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
50. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
52. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
53. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW.
54. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
55. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW.
56. Jane Clardy was the first person buried in Francois Cemetery, Hot Spring County, Arkansas.
57. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
58. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
59. Died in New Orleans of smallpox while serving in the Confederate Army.
60. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
61. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
62. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW.
63. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
64. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
65. RC died of mumps while serving in the Confederate army.
66. Ellis County Genealogical Society, comp., Ellis County, Texas Cemetery Records, Volume One, (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Genealogical Society, 1981)), 184. This text gives TK's dob as February 5th.
68. Ellis County Genealogical Society, comp., Ellis County, Texas Cemetery Records, Volume One, (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Genealogical Society, 1981)), 184.
69. Will of Thomas Keesee, Ellis County, Texas, Will Book A, p. 209, written November 22, 1879, filed January 22, 1880; only names wife Jane C. Keesee. Photocopy in possession of author.
70. Thomas Keesee, Jr. & Jane Caroline (Green) Keesee Family Bible.
72. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vach.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
73. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February 1998, from BSW, 2026 Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469. Photocopy of original record provided by BSW; in file.
75. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026 Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file.
76. Anita Kerr Williams, 1880 Census, Ellis County, Texas, (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Genealogical Society, n.d.[1990?]), p. 493; ED 53, #52/57 and 53/58. Sons Thomas J. and Milton S. Keesee both state mother born in SC.
77. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026 Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file.
78. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vach.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
80. A Memorial & Biographical History of Ellis County, Texas (Ellis County History), (1892, Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1892; rpr. Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Historical Museum & Art Gallery, 1972), p. 477, Mary, the widow of Gus. Franklin, was residing in Ellis County in 1892.

81. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to ceb, Oct. 18, 1998.

82. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.

83. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to ceb, Oct. 18, 1998.

84. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026 Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file.

85. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to ceb, Oct. 18, 1998.

86. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026 Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file.


88. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.


91. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.


93. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.


98. Annie Laurie Spencer, Marriage Bonds and Ministers Returns of Union County, Arkansas, 1829-1870, (1962), 139.


100. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026 Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file.

101. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.


103. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to ceb, Oct. 18, 1998, Patience W.

104. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.


106. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.

107. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.

108. Tombstone, Sterling Cemetery, Robertson County, Texas. Survey by author.

109. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.

110. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.

112. The Saline


114. Teddie Sue Carter, Correspondence (1 page), dated August 18, 1997; TSC is the gg-granddaughter of William Thomas and Mary C. Chappell Keesee.

115. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.

116. Teddie Sue Carter, Correspondence (1 page), dated August 18, 1997; TSC is the gg-granddaughter of William Thomas and Mary C. Chappell Keesee.

117. John Alexander Hargrove Autobiography, (Rockdale, Texas: 1903; Manuscript and typescript copies on file at Chappell Hill Historical Society Museum), JAH says her name was Mary J.

118. Teddie Sue Carter, Correspondence (1 page), dated August 18, 1997; TSC is the gg-granddaughter of William Thomas and Mary C. Chappell Keesee.

119. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.


121. Teddie Sue Carter, Correspondence (1 page), dated August 18, 1997; TSC is the gg-granddaughter of William Thomas and Mary C. Chappell Keesee.


123. Teddie Sue Carter, Correspondence (1 page), dated August 18, 1997; TSC is the gg-granddaughter of William Thomas and Mary C. Chappell Keesee.


128. 1860 U.S. Census, Washington County, Texas, (M653, 1307; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p. 219B, Dwelling 1160; PO Chappell Hill.

129. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)), citing to Andora (Keesee) Smith Potts' Family Bible.

130. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).

131. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)), citing to Andora (Keesee) Smith Potts' Family Bible.

132. 1860 U.S. Census, Washington County, Texas, (M653, 1307; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p. 219B, Dwelling 1160; PO Chappell Hill, Listed as "A.D."

133. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).

134. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.

135. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).

136. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.

137. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).


139. 1860 U.S. Census, Washington County, Texas, (M653, 1307; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p. 219B, Dwelling 1160; PO Chappell Hill.


141. 1860 U.S. Census, Washington County, Texas, (M653, 1307; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p. 219B, Dwelling 1160; PO Chappell Hill.


146. Obituary-Mrs. Martha W. Keesee, True Democrat, 7 December 1859, p. 3, c. 5.


152. Tuscaloosa County, Alabama, Marriage Records, Book 1, p. 312. Married by Jacob Pratt.


154. Tombstone, Magnolia City Cemetery, survey by author; photograph of tombstone in file.

155. Jesse Augustus Haywood Earle Papers, a manuscript collection of family information, in possession of author, hereinafter JAHE.

156. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.

157. INK was enumerated on the 1900 U. S. Census for Grant County, Arkansas, and his second wife remarried August 9, 1903.

158. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.


161. Buried Philadelphia Cemetery, Grant County, Arkansas.

162. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 254.

163. 1860 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, D. 63.

164. Not listed on the 1870 census with family. No further information.


168. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Tex 76086-9040).


170. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Tex 76086-9040).


172. Saline County, Arkansas, Marriage Book A, p. 28, photocopy in possession of author. Emelia's age is given as 17, "daughter of George Keesee." They were married by A. R. Crisp, J.P.


175. Jleech.ftw.

177. Jleech.ftw.
179. Jleech.ftw.
180. Jleech.ftw, Date of Import: Mar 18, 1999; gives surname as Holtens.
181. William E. Bedinger FGs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texas 76086-9040), Gives surname as Holtum.
183. William E. Bedinger FGs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texas 76086-9040), This source gives middle name as "Emoline."
187. Steven J. Porter, SSKCL@cs.com to ceb@rice.edu, 20 December 1999.
192. Steven J. Porter, SSKCL@cs.com to ceb@rice.edu, 20 December 1999.
196. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 53.
197. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 53. Elizabeth age 1, born Arkansas.
198. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 512.
199. George Polk Keesee. Loose Probate File, Saline County, Arkansas.
202. n. a., 1870 U.S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, Inc., [1990]).
204. George Polk Keesee, Loose Probate File, Saline County, Arkansas, Affidavit names all heirs: Dorothy Russell, deceased; names her children.
205. n. a., 1870 U.S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, Inc., [1990]), p. 87. Age 12.
206. n. a., 1870 U.S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, Inc., [1990]), p. 87.
207. George Polk Keesee, Loose Probate File, Saline County, Arkansas, Affidavit names all heirs: Dorothy Russell, deceased; names her children.
208. n. a., 1870 U.S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, Inc., [1990]), p. 87.
209. George Polk Keesee, Loose Probate File, Saline County, Arkansas, Affidavit names all heirs: Dorothy Russell, deceased; names her children.
211. n. a., 1870 U.S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, Inc., [1990]), p. 87.
212. George Polk Keesee, Loose Probate File, Saline County, Arkansas, Affidavit names all heirs: Dorothy Russell, deceased; names her children.
213. He is listed in his grandfather's estate papers in 1864 but isn't on the 1870 census with family.
217. Arkansas Death Certificate.
218. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
220. Saline County, Arkansas, Marriage Book C, p. 230, ceremony performed by C. F. Moore, MG.
221. 1880 U. S. Census, Hot Spring County, Arkansas.
222. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
224. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
226. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
227. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
228. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
229. 1880 U. S. Census, Hot Spring County, Arkansas, Martha, age 5, born Arkansas; p. 25. Saline Twp.; is she the same person as Betty?
230. 1880 U. S. Census, Hot Spring County, Arkansas.
231. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
234. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
236. 1880 U. S. Census, Hot Spring County, Arkansas.
237. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
239. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
240. Jleech.ftw.
241. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
242. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
243. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
244. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
245. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
246. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
247. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
249. Jleech.ftw.
250. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
251. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
252. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
255. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
256. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
257. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
258. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
259. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
260. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
261. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
262. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
263. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
264. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
265. Jolene Keesee <keze@amug.org> to ceb, 29 October 2000. (Jolene's husband Larry Keesee is the great grandson of Milton McKnight Keesee).
268. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
270. Jeech.ftw.
271. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
272. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson.
274. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson.
275. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5783)).
279. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5783)).
280. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson, LMJ to CEB Correspondence, August 26, 1997, p. 2. Keesee Enclosure; "John M. Keesee, son of Thos. and Martha Keesee, died 2 July 1870, aged 19 yrs., 3 months and 17 days."
281. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW. Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
282. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson.
283. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2, gives date of death as before October 25, 1862.
284. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson.
285. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
287. Family Bible of Mary Keesee Sims, d/o Milton Keesee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson; "Mary Jane Keesee, daughter of William C. Keesee and Mary Bennett, was born 11 July, 1849."
289. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW. Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
290. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997. resent to CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file; Beth Calvert's data lists Lucy as one of three children of William and Mary Keesee.
292. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
293. *A Memorial and Biographical History of McClenann, Falls, Bell, and Coryell Counties, Texas*, (Chicago, 1893), p. 770.
294. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
296. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), p.1., Keese family enclosure, "Mrs. Kirby M. Post says her grandmother (Lucy Rogers Keese) told her she was born in Tuscaloosa Co., Al in 1834. The family moved to Saline Co., Ark about 1836 and lived there 8 years, then moved to Texas about 1842. ... We are not sure whether Milton Keese settled first at Chapel Hill, Washington Co., or at Calvert, Robinson [sic: Robertson] Co., or in Falls Co.
297. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
299. Family Bible of Mary Keese Sims, d/o Milton Keese and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson; Bible record gives docs for all children of MK & MCK and other information.
300. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file. Beth Calvert has Lucy Rogers Keese DOB as 14 August 1834 (no source citation).
301. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file; Beth Calvert indicates DOB as 14 August.
304. Judy and Nath Winfield, Chappell Hill Historical Society Museum, Looseleaf Notebook, (Photocopies sections, CEB, 1999), Citation to Records of Final Settlement, Washington County, Texas, Vol. F., p. 490, that states he was son of William and Charlotte Hargrove.
307. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998; spelled "Tomson."
308. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file; Beth Calvert's data supplied Thomson's initials. 
313. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), p. 2; Obituary for Mrs. Lucy R. Couter lists a daughter Mrs. R. M. Colgin of Fort Worth.
314. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
315. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file. Beth Calvert's data had Anne Fontain Thomson listed as a child of Lucy R. & F. A. Thomson, but did not have R. M. Thomson listed in her list of children. No further info.
316. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
317. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
Keessee enclosure, Obituary of Lucy R. Couter; F. A. Thomson of Temple is listed as one of three surviving
children of Mrs. Lucy R. Couter.
319. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), p. 3,
Obituary of Mrs. Mary E. Colgin; F. R. [sic] Thomson is listed as her only surviving brother.
320. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), p. 3,
Keessee Enclosure, Clipping from album of Mary M. Keessee Sims [n.d.]: "Temple Oldster Has Big Plans
for U T Roundup: F. A. Thomson, well known retired Temple business man, hopes to attend his 1st UT
Roundup this spring at 86. He retired in 1952 after 40 years in the wholesale grocery business (Thomson
Grocery Co) and 23 years before that in retail grocery business in Gatesville, his birthplace. He was
President of the Texas Retail Merchants Assn. in 1910. He attended the University in 1884 and 1885."
321. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to
CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file; Beth Calvert’s data supplied the full given names
for F. A. Thomson.
322. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
323. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
325. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), p. 3.
Obituary for Mrs. Tom S. Sims, née Mary McKnight Keessee; She “was born in Arkansas on Dec. 6, 1836,
thus making her 95 years old on the day of her death.”
326. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure),
Calvert info, p. 2.
327. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
328. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
329. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
330. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
331. Robertson County, Texas, Marriage Book 2, p. 20.
332. 1870 U. S. Census, Robertson County, Texas, (M593, 1602; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p.
182A, Dwelling 274 (Mary Keessee), Family 342, PO Calvert, William H. Garrett not listed with family.
333. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure),
Calvert info, p. 3.
Obituary of Mrs. Tom S. Sims.
335. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
336. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
337. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
338. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
339. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure),
Calvert info, pp. 3-4, Mary’s “older daughter, Emma, married a man named Burt and had a large family
who lived in Temple.”
Obituary of Mrs. Tom S. Sims; lists as daughter, Mrs. H. M. Burt of Temple. Is this Emma W.? In every
other instance the initials after “Mrs.” are those of the woman rather than the husband.
341. Family Bible of Mary Keessee Sims, d/o Milton Keessee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy
Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson.
342. 1870 U. S. Census, Robertson County, Texas, (M593, 1602; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p.
182A, Dwelling 274 (Mary Keessee), Family 342, PO Calvert, age 12.
343. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to
CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file; Beth Calvert’s data has ____ Birt as name of
Emma’s husband.
344. Family Bible of Mary Keessee Sims, d/o Milton Keessee and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy
Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson.
345. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure),
Calvert info, p. 3.
346. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997, resent to
CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file; Beth Calvert’s data lists Willet Foster as "Dr."
347. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
348. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
349. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vach.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
350. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
351. Saline County, Arkansas, Marriage Book A, p. 22.
353. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
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753. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 254.
754. Judy (Tedder) Archer.
756. Judy (Tedder) Archer.
757. Widow’s Application for a [Confederate] Pension, Mary Jane Keesee, filed 13 March 1923, copies acquired from Texas State Archives on file. Widow’s statement confirms full name.
758. Widow’s Application for a [Confederate] Pension, Mary Jane Keesee, filed 13 March 1923, copies acquired from Texas State Archives on file.
759. Widow’s Application for a [Confederate] Pension, Mary Jane Keesee, filed 13 March 1923, copies acquired from Texas State Archives on file.
761. Saline County, Arkansas, Marriage Book C. p. 144.
762. Widow’s Application for a [Confederate] Pension, Mary Jane Keesee, filed 13 March 1923, copies acquired from Texas State Archives on file.
763. Widow’s Application for a [Confederate] Pension, Mary Jane Keesee, filed 13 March 1923, copies acquired from Texas State Archives on file.
764. Texas Death Certificate.
765. Widow’s Application for a [Confederate] Pension, Mary Jane Keesee, filed 13 March 1923, copies acquired from Texas State Archives on file. #38916, Denton Co., Texas.
766. Texas Death Certificate.
768. Hal Cecil Earle of Winn Parish, Louisiana, Manuscript Collection.
769. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
771. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
772. Hal Cecil Earle of Winn Parish, Louisiana, Manuscript Collection.
779. Arkansas Death Certificate, Julia Ella Anderson, Cert. # 482, Registration Dist. 5707. Was Mary Anderson her daughter from a previous marriage?; a Mary Anderson didn't have anywhere else to go, ended up in the State Hospital for the Insane in Little Rock, where she died. Informant on J. E. Keesee's death cert. is Mary Anderson of Prattsville. She died age 62 years, 4 days, of cerebral hemorrhage; undertaker Sam Merlin of Prattsville, doctor G. F. Cole of Prattsville. Burial in Philadelphia Cemetery.

780. Hal Cecil Earle of Winn Parish, Louisiana, Manuscript Collection. This source gave only month and year of marriage

781. Linda Atkins <B1wkk@ael.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 18 August 2000.

782. Arkansas Death Records Index, 1924-1933, p. 290.

783. Hal Cecil Earle of Winn Parish, Louisiana, Manuscript Collection, Child died young, not on 1870 census.

784. 1870 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas.


788. n. a., 1870 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas. (Bryant, Ark.: SCHHS, Inc., [1990]), D. 137, Saline Twp.


790. Johnny Elizabeth Orr-Hickey, 1880 Census, Grant County, Arkansas. (San Antonio, Texas: by the author, nd), Transcription by Johnny Elizabeth Orr-Hickey (San Antonio: by the author, nd). p. 29. Transcriber notes that "All other information [except name] blank. Could Arbilla have been born by the time the census taker came, but before the cutoff date for the census enumeration?"


792. Hal Cecil Earle of Winn Parish, Louisiana, Manuscript Collection.

793. Dayton Keeze, Church of Christ, 211 N. College Street, Minden, Louisiana, to Hal Cecil Earle of Winnfield, Louisiana, 8 February 1961.


800. Hal Cecil Earle of Winn Parish, Louisiana, Manuscript Collection.


802. Hal Cecil Earle of Winn Parish, Louisiana, Manuscript Collection, States WJK and 4th wife Ella Anderson had 2 children, both died in infancy.


804. Roger Crutchfield, 1512 Tawakoni Lane, Plano, Texas 75075, <ceb@rice.edu>, 13 September 1999; Roger states Mary Samantha Keesee and James Nicholas Crutchfield were his grandparents.

805. Crutchfield Family from Roger Crutchfield, c0024075@airmail.net, World Connect. ged. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.

806. 1850 U. S. Census, Saline County, Arkansas, (M432, Roll 30), D. 254.

807. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.

808. Roger Crutchfield, 1512 Tawakoni Lane, Plano, Texas 75075, <ceb@rice.edu>.
809. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
810. Roger Crutchfield. 1512 Tawakoni Lane, Plano, Texas 75075. <ceb@rice.edu>, JNC is RC's grandfather; e-mail 13 September 1999.
811. Crutchfield Family from Roger Crutchfield, c0024075@airmail.net. World Connect. ged. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
812. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
813. Roger Crutchfield. 1512 Tawakoni Lane, Plano, Texas 75075. <ceb@rice.edu>.
814. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
815. Roger Crutchfield. 1512 Tawakoni Lane, Plano, Texas 75075. <ceb@rice.edu>.
816. Crutchfield Family from Roger Crutchfield, c0024075@airmail.net. World Connect. ged. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
817. Roger Crutchfield. 1512 Tawakoni Lane, Plano, Texas 75075. <ceb@rice.edu>.
818. Roger Crutchfield. 1512 Tawakoni Lane, Plano, Texas 75075. <ceb@rice.edu>.
819. Crutchfield Family from Roger Crutchfield, c0024075@airmail.net. World Connect. ged. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
820. Ella Jo (Hutchens)Triplett to Carolyn Billingsley. correspondence. July 31, 1992. 2 pp., 1, EJT is the granddaughter of Joel William Gilford Elrod and Lucinda Emaline Keesee Elrod, through their daughter Cora Sally Elrod Hunchens.
823. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
824. Arkansas Death Certificate.
825. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
826. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
<ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>: tombstone identifies her as s/o Henry R.
827. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
828. No date of death on tombstone; husband's death certificate states he was married at the time of his death in 1926: no listing for death certificate for Sarah in Arkansas Death Index.
829. There is an Ida Keesee buried in Philadelphia Cemetery according to the survey of that cemetery at <ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>. Just one date is given: July 24 1881., as if she was born & died on that same day; tombstone says d/o H. B. [sic] & Sallie.
830. 1880 U. S. Census, Grant County, Arkansas, Davis Twp, HH 111, Ida -s-4 months old. born in January.
831. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
832. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
834. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
836. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
838. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
839. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
840. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
841. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
<ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>; tombstone identifies him as s/o JG & AE.
842. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
843. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
<ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>; tombstone identifies her as d/o J.G. & A.E. 
844. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
845. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
<ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>; tombstone states "Inf son of JG & AE." 
846. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
847. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
<ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>; tombstone identifies her as d/o of JG & AE. 
848. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
849. Tombstone gives DOD as April 18, 1904.  
851. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
852. Arkansas Death Certificate.  
853. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
855. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
<ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>; tombstone identifies her as "Dau of George & Frances."  
856. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.  
858. Jleech.ftw.  
861. Sandra "Sandy" Louise Bearden Gomer, Bridger, Montana <thebear@the-bear.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 1 February 2000.  
863. Jleech.ftw.  
864. Sandra "Sandy" Louise Bearden Gomer, Bridger, Montana <thebear@the-bear.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 1 February 2000.  
866. Jleech.ftw.  
869. Jleech.ftw.  
871. "Rev. Finis Ewing Leech was born ...", (Records of Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, mf. Reel 2; "Rare Books," including Presbyterian Ministers in Texas. Vol. I. 1936), from an unidentified typescript page at end of FEL section.  
872. FEL's first wife died 21 November 1901.  
873. FEL's obituary states his wife was still living when he died.  
874. FEL's obit states that he left 11 children when he died, two sons and eight daughters by his first wife and one son by his last wife. The obituary for Annie Atchison Leech, his [first] wife, states she left ten children and a devoted husband when she died.  
875. FEL's obit states he left one son by his second wife when he died in 1915.  
876. FEL's first wife died 21 November 1901.  
931. Jleech.ftw.
933. Jleech.ftw.
934. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040).
936. Jleech.ftw.
937. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040).
938. Jleech.ftw.
940. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040). This source provided middle name.
941. Jleech.ftw.
942. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040).
944. Jleech.ftw.
946. Jleech.ftw.
948. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040). This source provided full name.
949. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040).
951. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040). This source states name as "Patterson Bell Leech."
952. Jleech.ftw.
953. Jleech.ftw, Date of Import: Mar 18, 1999; middle name given as "Artilla."
954. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040). Middle name given as "Amanda."
955. Jleech.ftw.
957. William E. Bedinger FGSs provided 27 July 1999, (1802 Trailwood Drive, Weatherford, Texs 76086-9040).
958. George Polk Keesee. Loose Probate File, Saline County, Arkansas, Affadavit names all heirs: Dorothy Russell, dec'd; names her children.
967. Jleech.ftw.
968. Judith Hill <calico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
969. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
971. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
973. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas,
974. *Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas*.
976. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
980. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas,
981. Royland R. Keese Obituary.
982. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
983. Royland R. Keese Obituary.
984. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
985. Royland R. Keese Obituary.
986. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas,
987. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
988. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas,
   <ftp://ftp.rootsweb.com/pub/usgenweb/ar/grant/cemetery/philadelphia.txt>; tombstone identifies him as s/o Arch & Ruth.
989. Philadelphia Cemetery Survey, Grant County, Arkansas.
992. Judith Hill <jcalico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
993. Jleepch.ftw.
994. Judith Hill <jcalico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
995. Jleepch.ftw.
996. Judith Hill <jcalico97@hotmail.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 May 1999.
997. All information on this family, including children, DOBs and DODs, provided by granddaughter of George A. and Dora Dougan, Mary Lillian (Dougan) Hill of Dallas, Texas. Family information in file.
998. Information on this family provided by Mary Lillian (Dougan) Hill of Dallas, Texas, daughter of George A. and Dora Dougan.
999. Judith Lynne Hill to CEB, E-mail, September 3, 1997; JLH corrected yob.
1001. Judith Lynne Hill to CEB, E-mail, September 3, 1997.
1002. Information provided by Mary Lillian (Dougan) Hill of Dallas, Texas, daughter of George A. and Dora Dougan.
1003. Information provided by Mary Lillian (Dougan) Hill.
1004. Information provided by Mary Lillian (Dougan) Hill, 1990.
1005. Information provided by Mary Lillian (Dougan) Hill, 1990.
1007. *1870 U. S. Census, Robertson County, Texas*, (M593, 1602; Heritage Quest Digital Microfilm), p. 182A, Dwelling 274 (Mary Keese), Family 342, PO Calvert, age 21, no middle initial.
1008. Family Bible of Mary Keese Sims, d/o Milton Keese and Mary Calvert, as transcribed by Lucy Foster Miller, mother of Lucy M. Jacobson, LMJ to CEB Correspondence, August 26, 1997, p. 2, Keese Correspondence; “William G. Keese, son of Thos. Keese, died 22 Feb. 1873, aged 22 yrs. 10 ms. and 2 days (the date 1873 is incorrect, he died in 1874 LFM).”
1010. Texas Death Certificate, Mrs. Willie Keesee Folts, Austin, Travis County, Texas, #72749; surname spelled "Irwin" on this record.
1013. Texas Death Certificate.
1015. Texas Death Certificate.
1018. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1019. 1900 Manuscript Census, Falls County, Texas, p. 54B, ED. 16, Sheet 27, 27/28 June 1900. Although census states Marguerite has borne 5 children and 5 are still living, only four daughters are listed with family.
1020. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1021. 1900 Manuscript Census, Falls County, Texas, p. 54B, ED. 16, Sheet 27, 27/28 June 1900.
1022. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1023. 1900 Manuscript Census, Falls County, Texas, p. 54B, ED. 16, Sheet 27, 27/28 June 1900.
1024. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1025. 1900 Manuscript Census, Falls County, Texas, p. 54B, ED. 16, Sheet 27, 27/28 June 1900.
1026. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1027. 1900 Manuscript Census, Falls County, Texas, p. 54B, ED. 16, Sheet 27, 27/28 June 1900.
1028. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1029. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1030. 1900 Manuscript Census, Falls County, Texas, p. 54B, ED. 16, Sheet 27, 27/28 June 1900.
1031. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1032. Texas Death Certificate #578, Mamie Keesee Cowser, copy in possession of author; MKC died of lung cancer in Peterson Memorial Hospital, Kerrville, Texas, and was buried in Copperosus Cemetery, Kimble, Texas. Her usual residence was Junction, Kimble County, Texas. The informant was K. Cowser.
1033. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1034. Marriage Certificate, Bexar County, Texas, #61186, copy in possession of author; Witnesses were Lucy Diskmoore [sic] Keesee and K. K. Keesee; ceremony by J. Leighton Green, Presbyterian minister.
1035. Death Certificate #36008, Gully Cowser, Texas Department of Health, copy in possession of author. Death Certificate states GC b. 12 June 1896, was retired Texas Ranger, died 11 June 1958, of lung cancer, in Seton Hospital. He was the son of John A. Cowser and Kate Moore. He was buried in Junction Cemetery, Junction, Kimble County, Texas. The informant was Gully Cowser, Jr.
1036. DAR Application for Membership to the National Society, National Number #0755768 (Karen Cowser Maynard), citation to 668798 (Marguerite T. Green), 2.
1037. 1900 Manuscript Census, Falls County, Texas, p. 54B, ED. 16, Sheet 27, 27/28 June 1900.
1039. Beth Calvert <calvert@netdoor.com> to Alicia Deats <AJD@aol.com>, 5 March 1997. resent to CEB@rice.edu, 6 October 1997, hard copy in Deats file. Beth Calvert's data gives name of Mary Elizabeth Thomson and indicates she married William.
1040. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW. Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
1041. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), pp.2-3, Keesec enclosure, obit of Mrs. Mary Colgin, age 87.
1042. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), pp. 2-3, Keesee enclosure, obit of Mrs. Mary Colgin; MEC "died of a heart ailment last Sunday morning, Aug. 18 at 8:40 after several weeks of illness. She was at the home of her son, John R. Colgin, Sr. at the time of her passing. . . . Interment took place by the side of her late husband in the City Cemetery [Gatesville?] . . . ." Lists survivors including children and grandsons who were pallbearers, a sister, and a brother, and "21 grandchildren and 15 great grandchildren."
1043. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW. Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
1044. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
1045. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), pp.2-3, Obituary of Mrs. Mary E. Colgin; Survivors included son George Colgin of California.
1046. Lucy M. Jacobson to Carolyn Earle Billingsley, August 26, 1997 (2 pp., with 40 pp. enclosure), pp. 2-3, Obituary of Mrs. Mary E. Colgin; daughter Mrs. K. M. Post of Tyler is listed as a survivor; grandsons John T. Post of Tyler and Kirby M. Post, Jr. of Tyler were among the pallbearers.
1047. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12. 1998.
1048. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW.
1049. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12. 1998.
1050. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1051. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1052. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1053. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1054. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1055. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1056. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1057. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1058. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1059. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1060. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1061. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1062. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1063. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1064. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1065. Bcldary FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1234. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1235. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1236. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1237. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1238. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1239. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1240. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1241. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1242. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1243. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1244. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1245. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1246. Ann Finkenstaedt <annf@ mindspring.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 9 April 1999. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1247. "Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]," Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets, p. 213, 217.
1248. "Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]," Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets, p. 213.
1249. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1250. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1251. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1252. "Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]," Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets, p. 213.
1253. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1254. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1255. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1256. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1257. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1258. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1259. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1260. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1261. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM. printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.

Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.

Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM. printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217, spelling of surname given as "Sandlen."

Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.

Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM. printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.

Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM. printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyLO126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM. printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM. printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217. Tierney supplied given name.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217.

Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM. printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.

"Murphy-Pratt Ahnentafel [FGSs, etc.]." *Louisiana Ahnentafels, Ancestor Charts, and Family Group Sheets*, p. 217. Tierney provided middle name.
1371. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1372. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1374. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1375. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1376. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1377. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1378. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1379. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1380. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1381. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1382. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. WSH and EAMH are Anne Meadows' great grandparents.
1384. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1385. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1386. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1387. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1388. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1389. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1391. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1393. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1394. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1397. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1398. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1435. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1438. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1439. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1440. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1442. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1443. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1444. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com, to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1445. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfnk@mindspring.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 9 April 1999, (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1447. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1448. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1449. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1452. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1453. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1454. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1455. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1456. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1457. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1458. Bclaridy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1459. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1460. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1461. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1463. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1467. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1468. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1469. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1470. Ann Finkenstaedt <canfnk@ mindspring.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 9 April 1999. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1471. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1472. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1473. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1474. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1475. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1476. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1477. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1478. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1479. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1480. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1481. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1482. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1483. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1484. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1485. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1571. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1572. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1573. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1574. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1575. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1576. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1578. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1580. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1581. Anne Meadows <danme@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GWM & MECM.
1582. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@ix.netcom.com> to ceb, September 6, 1998. AF is the great granddaughter of Lou C. Murphy Slade.
1583. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@ix.netcom.com> to ceb, September 6, 1998. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1584. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1585. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1586. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@ix.netcom.com> to ceb, September 6, 1998. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1588. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@ix.netcom.com> to ceb, September 6, 1998. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1590. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@mindspring.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 April 1999; JD Slade FGS, attachment. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1592. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@mindspring.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 April 1999; JD Slade FGS, attachment. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1593. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@ix.netcom.com> to ceb, September 6, 1998. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264), "My grandmother, Annie May Slade Leftwich, was the oldest daughter [of 7 children, 6 of whom lived to adulthood and married]."
1594. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1595. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998. FW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1596. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@mindspring.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, 10 April 1999; JD Slade FGS, attachment. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1597. Ann Finkenstaedt <annfink@ix.netcom.com> to ceb, September 6, 1998. (6409 Ridgecrest Drive, Edmond, OK 73034; 405-348-6264).
1654. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1655. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998.
1656. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998.
1657. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998.
1658. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1659. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998.
1660. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1661. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GW M & MEC M.
1662. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJ W is GG GD of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1663. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998.
1664. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1665. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJ W is GG GD of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1666. Anne Meadows <danne@compuserve.com> to author <ceb@rice.edu> October 1, 1997, 5:07 AM, printed copy on file. Meadows is a descendant of GW M & MEC M.
1667. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJ W is GG GD of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1668. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998.
1670. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1671. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJ W is GG GD of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1674. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998. FTW.
1675. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJ W is GG GD of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1676. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998.
1677. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>. October 12, 1998. FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1680. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJ W is GG GD of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1682. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJ W is GG GD of Benjamin Clardy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1684. Peggy Jewell Wilkins Pedigree Chart; PJW is GG GD of Benjamin Claridy and Agnes Keesee; 15011 Sweet Gum Drive, Alexander, AR 72002, 501-847-2223.
1687. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1688. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1689. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1691. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1694. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1695. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1696. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1698. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1699. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1700. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1701. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1702. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1704. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1706. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1707. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1708. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1709. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1710. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW, Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1711. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1713. Belardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1742. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1743. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1744. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1745. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1746. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1747. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1748. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1749. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1750. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1751. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1752. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1753. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1754. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1755. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1756. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1757. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1758. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.
1759. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1761. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW.
1763. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1765. Bclardy FTM file, compiled by Roy Austin <RoyL0126@aol.com>, transmitted to <ceb@rice.edu>, October 12, 1998.FTW. Date of Import: 24 Oct 1999.
1766. Angela Adams to CEB, fax 8/28/98, <adadams@mail.msn.com>.
1768. Angela Adams to CEB, fax 8/28/98, <adadams@mail.msn.com>.
1770. Milton S. Keese Estate, Ellis County Probate Court, Estate Packet #629, C. T., over 21 years old in February 1887.
1771. Angela Adams to CEB, fax 8/28/98, <adadams@mail.msn.com>.
1773. Angela Adams to CEB, fax 8/28/98, <adams@msn.com>.
1774. "Waxahachie Enterprise, April 9, 1886," *Searchers and Researchers of Ellis County, Texas*, Vol. III, No. 3 (Summer 1980); p. 146, Family Record: "The Cradle"—At Ovilla, March 31st, to Mr. and Mrs. C. T. KEESEE, a boy.
1776. Angela Adams to CEB, fax 8/28/98, <adams@msn.com>.
1777. A Memorial & Biographical History of Ellis County, Texas (Ellis County History), (1892, Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1892; rpr. Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Historical Museum & Art Gallery, 1972), 477.
1781. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1783. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vabch.com>, World Connect.FTW, Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1784. A Memorial & Biographical History of Ellis County, Texas (Ellis County History), (1892, Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1892; rpr. Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Historical Museum & Art Gallery, 1972), 477.
1794. A Memorial & Biographical History of Ellis County, Texas (Ellis County History), (1892, Chicago: Lewis Publishing Co., 1892; rpr. Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Historical Museum & Art Gallery, 1972), 477.
1803. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to ceb, Oct. 18, 1998.
1804. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vach.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1806. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to ceb, Oct. 18, 1998.
1813. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vach.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1815. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to CEB, 26 July 1999.
1819. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to CEB, 26 July 1999.
1820. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026 Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file. Middle name provided in 26 July 1999 e-mail.
1823. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vach.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1826. Barbara Scott Wyche <robertw@worldnet.att.net> to CEB, 26 July 1999.
1828. Green Family from William D. Andrews <wda@vach.com>, World Connect.FTW. Date of Import: 18 Sep 2000.
1830. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026
Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file, Middle initial given in John Hill Keesee's
obituary.
1831. Barbara Scott Wyche Family Group Sheets, 25 February & 13 April 1998, from BSW, 2026
Windmill Drive, Richmond, Texas 77469, copies in BSW file.
1832. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
175B Dwelling 392, Precinct #3, PO Sterling, Texas.
1834. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW.
175B Dwelling 392, Precinct #3, PO Sterling, Texas, age 8.
1836. Robertson County, Texas, Probate Minute Book 1, pp. 96-99.
1837. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
1838. Texas Confederate Pension Application #49968. Scott Field, Sr.; copy acquired from Texas State
Archives in files.
1839. Texas Death Certificate, Scott Field, Sr., #58047.
1840. Texas Confederate Pension Application #49968. Scott Field, Sr.; copy acquired from Texas State
Archives in files.
1841. Calvert family, Alicia Deats, AJD@aol.com, compiler, Nov 97.FTW, Date of Import: Nov 9, 1998.
175B Dwelling 392, Precinct #3, PO Sterling, Texas.
175B Dwelling 392, Precinct #3, PO Sterling, Texas.
1845. Ellis County, Texas, Will Book A, pp. 332 [will of Mary M. Pfaup] and 386 [will of Henry G.
Quait]., which names her as "Maggie E. Price."
177A, Dwelling 408, Precinct #3, PO Sterling, Texas.
1847. Ellis County, Texas, Will Book A, p. 386.
Presbyterian Church, (Waxahachie, Texas, n.d.), pp. 12-13. This source gives place of birth, no date.
1851. 1850 Christian County, Kentucky, US Census; District #2, Roll 196, p. 394, Transcription of this
census entry provided by Alicia J. Deats, in an e-mail to me dated June 4, 1999.
1853. Ellis County, Texas, Cemetery Records, Vol. 6, (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Genealogical
Society, n.d.), p. 239.
1855. Ellis County, Texas, Cemetery Records, Volume Six, (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County
1857. Ellis County, Texas, Cemetery Records, Volume Six, (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County
Genealogical Society, n.d.), p. 239, This transcription lists middle name as "Mary."
177A, Dwelling 408, Precinct #3, PO Sterling, Texas.
1859. Rebecca Boyce Chapter DAR Genealogical Records Committee, "From the Ellis County Mirror,
Waxahachie, Texas." Ellis County, Texas, Genealogical Records, Vol. XVIII, (typescript, n.d.), p. 17,
Gives year of birth only and place.
1860. Ellis County, Texas, Cemetery Records, Vol. 6, (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Genealogical
Society, n.d.), p. 239.
1868. *Ellis County, Texas, Cemetery Records*, Vol. 6. (Waxahachie, Texas: Ellis County Genealogical Society, n.d.), p. 239. Tombstone says age at death was 2 years, 2 months, 2 days.
1872. Ellis County, Texas, Will Book A, pp. 332, and 386. Named as child to Mary M. Phaup and brother to Henry G. Quaite.
1881. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1882. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence, Family Bible of Dolly O. Keesee.
1883. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1884. Jeff Henson, 4010 Tecate Trail, Austin, TX 78739, 512/280-4691, <jwhenson@onr.com> to <ceb@rice.edu>, July 11, 1998: Emma is buried next to her husband at Phantom Hill Cemetery in Jones County, Texas.
1885. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1887. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1889. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence, Citation to Maudeen Gilbreath.
1890. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1891. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence, Citation to Dody Willis.
1892. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1894. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1895. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).
1896. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1897. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).
1898. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1899. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).
1900. Jeff Henson E-mail Correspondence.
1901. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)). Death Certificate, Chaves County, New Mexico, #1952; Charlotte M. Allen; and correction filed, same county by TSC.
1902. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).
1903. Charlotte M. Allen, Death Certificate, Chaves County, New Mexico, #1952; corrected death certificate by TSC.
1905. 1900 Soundex, Texas, Napolen L. Allen.
1906. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).
1908. 1900 Soundex, Texas, Napolen L. Allen.
1909. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).
1910. 1900 Soundex, Texas, Napolen L. Allen.
1911. Teddie Sue Carter, (11018 Vivian Drive NW, Huntsville, Alabama 35810 (205/852-5788)).
1912. 1900 Soundex, Texas, Napolen L. Allen.
BIBLIOGRAPHIC ESSAY: GENEALOGICAL SOURCES

The most important body of genealogical sources is correspondence with individuals tracing their own family lines that correspond with one's own research goals. Although some genealogists may not always provide complete documentation for their data, the information gathered from them can provide valuable clues to which records to search. In general, family genealogists are most accurate when compiling information about the most recent generations; that is, you can be fairly certain that these individuals know their own children, parents, grandparents, and even great-grandparents—and they have gathered this data from oral history, family papers, and searches of cemeteries and courthouses near their own homes. However, the further back in time, the more the accuracy of their data depends on good research skills and, therefore, may not be as dependable. In general, however, it is best to begin by discovering what other researchers have uncovered.

There are a variety of ways to contact other family history researchers. Genealogical journals usually have queries (people placing "ads" to find others who might connect to their lines and with whom they can pool information) and are often geographically or surname specific. The Internet is a great tool for finding others researching the same family lines; use any search engine to query for a particular name or county and chances are, there will be more than one reference on which to follow up. There are also e-mail lists for particular surnames, ethnic groups, and geographic areas.
(usually counties or parishes) that anybody can join or access the archives for that list. Rootsweb.com is one of the largest and most popular sites and is free.

Ancestry.com and Genealogy.com are other web sites that offer a variety of services and search capabilities, some of which are free and some of which are paid subscription services. There are also family tree searchable databases online and if you find a family of interest, many are downloadable; worldconnect.com is one example of this type of collection. To make the most use of family tree downloads, a genealogical computer program is usually necessary. One of the most popular is Family Tree Maker and it is available at stores that sell computer software or is easily purchasable online.

The United States Genealogy Network, Inc. is located at www.usgennet.org/ and provides connections to sites in almost every state and county in the U.S., each of which offers a variety of local genealogy sources, including county records, transcriptions of censuses, military records, and biographical sketches. Cindi’s Lists of Genealogy Sites on the Internet (www.cyndislist.com/) has almost 100,000 links to important genealogical sites. Federal land records can be searched by name or land description at the Bureau of Land Management web site (www.glorecords.blm.gov/).

There are a variety of how-to books that outline basic genealogical research methodology. One that I can recommend particularly is Beginner’s Guide to Family History Research by Desmond Walls Allen and Carolyn Earle Billingsley, and it can be read free or ordered online at www.arkansasresearch.com/. Learning the basics of genealogical research and of genealogical record keeping is key. Genealogists have spent centuries perfecting charts and numbering systems that work and adopting tried-and-true methods is more efficient than reinventing the wheel.
Once the available data from individuals, groups, and the Internet have been mined, family history research then continues in courthouses, libraries, and archives. There are many libraries and archives dedicated to genealogy—the Clayton Library, part of the Houston, Texas, Public Library System is an excellent example (catalog.houstonlibrary.org/)—and their catalogs can often be searched online. More traditional research facilities can also provide the documentation so necessary for genealogical research, including newspapers, census, city directories, and manuscript collections. Many types of records can be purchased on CD for use on home computers. Heritage Quest offers census CDs that replicate the various census microfilms and are much easier to search and to print (www.heritagequest.com).

Genealogical sources can supplement more traditional sources in facilitating historical research into antebellum families, as well as families from other eras. Using them will enrich traditional historical research by providing greater depth to kinship studies. Like all sources, they are subject to error and lack of sufficient documentation, but provide vital clues and links to the researcher interested in family relationships.