

# Sons of the American Revolution (SAR)

## Application Preparation Manual



12 October 2020

Authorized by NSSAR Genealogy Committee  
Application Preparation Manual Subcommittee  
Jim W. Faulkinbury, Chairman  
Paul M. Hays  
William Marrs

Please send comments to: [bob@bfish.org](mailto:bob@bfish.org)

# Contents

Purpose	4
Duties & Responsibilities of Registrars	5
Standards of Documentation	6
The Patriot Ancestor and Proof of Service	8
Dos and Don'ts – Common Problems with Applications	10
<b>DNA Evidence</b>	<b>20</b>
Recommended Abbreviations	26
Using Previously Approved DAR, & C.A.R. Record Copies	29
Citing Sources on the Application	30
“Family Plan” Applications	32
Junior Membership Applications	32
“Grandfathered” Applications	33
Supplemental Applications	33
Memorial Applications	33
Expedited Processing	34
Research Tips & Example Proof Arguments to Resolve Problems	35
Tips for Finding the Maiden Name	44
Examples of Acceptable and Insufficient Documentation	44
Pended Applications	49
Appeals	50
Frequently Asked Questions	50
Changes to Previous Version	51

## **Purpose**

One of the primary objectives of SAR in general, and of its State and Chapter Registrars in particular, is growing its numbers. Key factors in that process are the preparation, review, and approval of membership applications. The intent of this Manual is to help Registrars understand their responsibilities as Registrar and understand the elements of a successful application by discussing in general terms policies adopted by the NSSAR Genealogy Committee, and by providing examples both of best practices and common pitfalls. For detailed text of current policies, see the Genealogy Committee Policies Manual.

## Responsibilities of Registrars

The Sons of the American Revolution is a heritage society. It is not a genealogical society that requires proof of every name, place and event listed on the application, but it does require sound proof of the bloodline to a patriot ancestor and of the service rendered by that ancestor. By “sound proof” we mean adequate documentation of each parent/child link in the line, and differentiation of people with similar names living near one another at the same time.

SAR does not require proof of data concerning non-bloodline spouses. It does require that all such known data be included in the Lineage section on page 1 of the application. The distinction is that, while not needed for the immediate purpose of proving the lineage claimed on the application, added data contributes to verifying the bloodline, and may be of use to future applicants who share common lineage.

By signing an application, the State Registrar verifies that in his opinion it contains sufficient proof of every fact claimed to meet the requirements for membership of the National Society. He should be knowledgeable of the requirements set forth in the policies of the Genealogy Committee, “Requirements for Preparation of Applications.” Applications he deems insufficient to meet those standards should be returned to the Chapter Registrar or applicant to resolve any concerns. State Registrars may make hand-printed corrections to signed applications in black ink to add information or references to documentation, prior to submission. Only those considered acceptable should be forwarded to the National Office for processing by the NSSAR Genealogy Staff. If in doubt the State Genealogist, if one has been appointed or elected, should be consulted.

Chapter Registrars also need to be aware of the documentation standards and requirements so they do not burden the State Registrar with inadequate applications that will have to be returned, modified and/or researched further.

It is a disservice both to the prospective member and to SAR to forward an inadequately-documented application. The prospect and his sponsors become frustrated when his application is placed in indefinite limbo pending resolution of the deficiencies (for which the shorthand is “pended”). Moreover his filing fee is not refundable, inevitably causing hard feelings. Further, a pended application takes an inordinate amount of staff time to review, research, and explain the reasons for its having been pended to the State Registrar. This contributes significantly to the length of time it takes for other applications to be reviewed.

# Standards of Documentation

Standards in genealogy have changed over the years, and many previously-acceptable sources have been found to be unreliable or incorrect. One major development is the replacement for the “preponderance of evidence” criterion previously considered the standard of proof in genealogy with a genealogical proof argument that is made using a verifiable research methodology.

Change was needed in recognition of differences between legal and genealogical decisions. In the legal environment there are often two sides, with each side pushing the other to perform reasonably exhaustive research. After results are presented, a decision is rendered. In civil cases, the decision is based on a preponderance of evidence: the side with over 50% of the weight of the evidence wins. In criminal cases, the plaintiff must prove its charges beyond all reasonable doubt. In genealogy there is often only “one side” presenting evidence. If research is insufficient, or if the presenter is unfairly selective about what evidence is presented, the decision will not be sound. Even when research is exhaustive and the presentation fair, genealogists want more than just a “preponderance of evidence,” especially if a potential conflict is found, but not so much as “beyond all reasonable doubt.” The genealogical proof argument falls between the two legal standards: the evidence supporting a conclusion must be of sufficient power to convince a reasonable, unbiased person. A “Devil’s advocate” objection that something else could be the case, without consideration of likelihood or evidence, is not considered to be the objection of a reasonable, unbiased person.

The genealogical proof argument is now the criterion used by the genealogy community to build a solid case, especially when there is no direct evidence to support a conclusion. There are five requirements to be met to build a proof argument:

1. *“Conduct a reasonably exhaustive search for all information that is or may be pertinent to the identity, relationship, event or situation in question;*
2. *“Collect and include in our compilation a complete, accurate citation to the source or sources of each item of information we use;*
3. *“Analyze and correlate the collected information to assess its quality as evidence;*
4. *“Resolve any conflicts caused by items of evidence that contradict each other or are contrary to a proposed (hypothetical) solution to the questions; and*
5. *“Arrive at a soundly reasoned, coherently written conclusion.”*

Therefore, evidence must be sufficiently convincing to the NSSAR Genealogy Staff before proof is accepted, and the quality of evidence is a key element.

- Sources are either original or derivative.  
Derivative sources are those that copy, transcribe, abstract, or repeat information from an original source. It should be recognized that errors or omissions may have occurred in the process of making the derivative copy, even in filming. In the analysis of quality, originals are weighted heavier than derivative sources and microfilmed copies of originals usually are weighted heavier than abstracts or transcriptions.
- Information found in sources may be primary and/or secondary.

For instance, on a death certificate the birth information is usually secondary -- based on the recollection of the informant -- while the information regarding the death is usually primary. Family Bibles are another area where information may be primary or secondary. If the publication date of the Bible is generally contemporaneous with the events listed, the information is considered primary and more reliable than information that may have been entered about events that occurred years before the Bible was published and the entries made. While family Bibles can be dependable, they are less reliable than town records of the same events.

- Evidence may be direct or indirect.

Direct evidence is evidence that seems to answer a question on its own. However, it should be noted that direct evidence may incorrectly answer the question. For example, a published history that states that John Doe is the ancestor of the person of interest may or may not be true but the statement is direct evidence. Indirect evidence usually requires more than one document to prepare a conclusion.

Narrowly interpreted, direct evidence must state explicitly the fact to be proven. Most lineage societies, including SAR, are more generous than that in defining direct evidence. For example, even though the relationships among members of a household are not stated in 1850-1870 censuses, the presence of a child in a household is usually accepted as proof of parentage unless the child's age conflicts with the makeup of the family group. Likewise, absent a known conflict, most genealogists accept information on a death certificate regarding the names of the parents as correct. However, both direct and indirect evidence can be called to question when there is additional evidence that conflicts with the conclusion.

When there is no acceptable direct evidence, a case based on reasonably researched, analyzed, and correlated evidence is needed to make a proof argument. The Registrar is responsible for reviewing the documentation provided and making a decision to 1) endorse and forward the application, 2) optionally, if he is able and willing, research the line and, in consultation with the applicant/sponsor add additional documentation to support the application, or 3) return the application to the submitting chapter or applicant for further work.

Other portions of this Manual discuss acceptable and unacceptable evidence. While some unacceptable sources can be valuable in providing leads for further research, they do not in and of themselves constitute acceptable proof. For more detailed discussions of the distinction, the following works are helpful:

- Elizabeth Shown Mills, Evidence Explained: Citing History Sources from Artifacts to Cyberspace, 2007, 885 pp
- Noel C. Stevenson, Genealogical Evidence, 1979, 233 pp
- Christine Rose, Genealogical Proof Standard: Building a Solid Case, 2009, 58 pp
- Black's Law Dictionary (the first two editions are particular useful since they include legal definitions found in early American documents and not found in later editions)

# The Patriot Ancestor and Proof of Service

The date of birth should be given if it can be obtained. If it is impossible or impractical to ascertain the date of birth, some fact should be furnished with proof, to show the ancestor was living at the time of the claimed service and of an age for the service claimed.

The date of death is to be provided if known. If it cannot be found, some proven date identified with the ancestor and after the date of service may be used as a substitute (e.g. "After 1795 when he signed deed"). Proof such as a copy of the deed is to be included with the documentation package.

The applicant must provide sufficient evidence that the person claimed as the patriot in the lineage is the same person who performed the service claimed. See Policy 5.5000.

Sources of information as to Revolutionary War service:

- Published Revolutionary records of the various colonies,
- Unpublished records (e.g. muster rolls and payrolls) residing in State Archives, Adjutant General's Offices, State Libraries, and the National Archives,
- Minutes of Town Meetings and similar records of State and County Governments, listing those who were appointed to various Committees of Safety, other government positions during the War, those who took the Oath of Allegiance, etc.
- Account books of State, County and Town Treasurers, showing payment for various services directly connected with the Revolutionary War effort.
- Contemporary newspapers, broadsides, letters, or other correspondence.

Unsupported statements in town and county histories, biographical dictionaries, family histories and genealogies, and prior applications may not be accepted. In the absence of such a record directly stating a service or if such a record may be open to reasonable question, SAR may consider on a case-by-case basis credible presentations of evidence that indirectly demonstrate that the ancestor was a support of the patriot cause based on a well prepared argument following the Genealogical Proof Standard described earlier.

Fiduciaries such as bondsmen for marriages; executors and administrators of estates, conservators, guardians, and those appointed to similar positions, and witnesses are not considered to perform a civil service that qualifies as Revolutionary service. In certain states, however, serving in some of the above positions required swearing or affirming allegiance and may provide evidence that can be used in an indirect proof of Patriotic Service. A witness can qualify for Patriotic Service if his testimony supports the government against activity against it, such as the sale of arms to the enemy.

Revolutionary War Pension Files often contain letters from the Commissioner of Pensions that provide a recap of the pensioner's service in response to inquiries. If these letters are available in the file, they are preferred as the source documentation rather than the hand-written documents in the file to aid the staff in its review.



# Dos and Don'ts - Common Problems with Applications

## GENERAL COMMENTS

No preliminary decision will be given on a line of descent, service or evidentiary value of proposed evidence. When examined with all available evidence, such preliminary decision might prove to be incorrect and the National Society cannot accept responsibility for such a decision.

Spelling of the Patriot Ancestor's name sometimes is different than the spelling on the Revolutionary War service proof document submitted. The Genealogy Staff usually uses the spelling found on the Service record. However, if a different spelling is used, a note needs to be submitted indicating which spelling the Applicant wants on his certificate. The Genealogy Staff will still annotate the difference on the application but the Applicant's certificate can read the way the Applicant prefers.

Corrections/changes can be made on an already approved application. The correct process for affecting that correction/change would be to provide primary documentation that supports the correction/change accompanied with a letter, or a copy of the original application, with the incorrect data listed on it, and a cover letter stating which areas on the application need "change." If the reviewing genealogist agrees that the new, supportive documentation does allow the change(s) requested, the necessary change(s) will be made, the application will be re-scanned, and the additional supportive documentation will be placed in the file, under the patriot ancestor's name. Reference will also be made on the new documentation to the Compatriot for whom it applies. There are initials of the Reviewing Genealogist listed on the back of the approved application thus "new" material that warrants the change(s) should be addressed to that person's attention.

### **Submission of Additional Information**

If additional information is requested by the Genealogy Staff to resolve an issue pending an application, the request is made through the designated State Point of Contact who should pass the request on through the Chapter Registrar and the applicant. All additional mail regarding an approved application already on file, or a pended application, must be vetted through the State Point of Contact, who will evaluate the material and forward to National only that which is necessary/pertinent to the specified new or supplemental application. When sending in additional information, documentation, material, etc. for a file that has already been received at National, it should be sent separate and apart from any other mailing and should refer to the ACN# already assigned to that application. When no money is included with a mailing, it can go directly to the person it is intended for. Otherwise, if it is put in with other mail that

has money, it has to go through several hands before it is given to Genealogy resulting in an unnecessary delay in handling.

## **THE APPLICATION FORM DOS & DON'TS**

### **Form Requirements**

- Forms must be typed or on computer-printed forms using black print. Handwritten applications will not be accepted. Application forms printed before 1990 will not be accepted.
- Applications must be printed using the legal size print option on both sides of official, SAR legal sized watermarked, bond paper. If a third page is needed, it must also be on SAR legal sized watermarked, bond paper.
- Applicants must submit the original application form containing all necessary signatures. Photocopies of applications will not be accepted.
- Nothing may be attached to the application form by staple, glue, tape, pin, thread, or other means.
- All known information regarding names, dates, and places for the persons listed in the bloodline to the patriot must be included on the obverse of the application form even if the application is based on a previously approved application. Only the reference list on the reverse side of the form can be simplified by listing that previously approved application as the source documentation for each generational link in common.
- The description of the patriot ancestor's service on the front of the application should be an actual description, not just the type of qualifying service such as "Patriotic Service, VA".
- Leave all unknown fields blank – do not type "unknown" question marks, etc. into those fields.
- Do not bracket any data field on the front of the application (dates, locations, or names).
- Documentation of applicant's lineage is required; other information and documentation is requested and encouraged. Information should not be stated on the application form if no proof is provided to verify that information. A birth certificate is usually preferred as evidence of the applicant's link to his parent in the lineage. However, in the case of adoptions, U.S. States and territories routinely issue new birth certificates showing adoptive parents as the birth parents. Following an adoption, original birth certificates are sealed and laws regarding access to original birth records vary among U.S. States and territories. A prospective applicant should certify that to the best of his knowledge that his lineage to the patriot ancestor does not include any adoptions that would affect that direct lineage.

- All proof documentation must be cited on the reverse page of the application form to the extent that space allows. The citations should provide sufficient information to indicate the source and location of the document. A third page may be utilized for citing documentation for which space was unavailable, as long as SAR-watermarked bond paper is utilized.
- Photocopies of vital records, not certified copies, are preferred.

### **Applicant's Signature**

Adults (18 and over) who apply for membership must sign their application, unless they are incapacitated. Exceptions may be approved by the Genealogist General. Junior Members (under age 18) may sign their application or an adult family member (parent or legal guardian) may sign on their behalf.

### **Missing Signatures**

The new member application must include the signatures of the applicant, two sponsors, the State Registrar, and the State Secretary. A Supplemental application only requires the signatures of the applicant, and the State Registrar.

### **Incomplete Lineage Information**

All known items, including those for the non-bloodline parent, are required on the application. If information is present in the documentation submitted, it must be included on the application. The applicant is to list "all names, dates, and places known" according to the instructions. If the accompanying documentation provides the full middle name, the full middle name should be included on the application.

### **Information on Application Matches Documentation**

Do make sure that the names, dates, and/or places on application agree with the supporting documentation submitted. The application should be carefully examined before being sent to National, and before obtaining all the required signatures. If a discrepancy is received by the Genealogy Staff, the correction will be marked on the application in red pen.

### **Patriot's Name**

The Patriot's name shown on the application should reflect the name as spelled on the records of the day. Slashes may be used to indicate additional spellings of the name (ie: Diebold/Dibold/Diebolt). A preference in spelling of the name on the membership certificate may be requested by letter submitted with the application.

### **Ranks & Titles**

Do not include ranks or titles, such as "M.D," "Col.," "Dr.," "Rev.," etc. in the lineage portion of the application or in the field for the patriot's name at the top. Only names are to be entered in those fields.

### **Date Format**

The standard date format used by the SAR and all lineage societies is in the form “10 Jan 1900”, rather than “01/10/1900”. Dates in the latter format are unacceptable because of their ambiguity: this date could be interpreted either as 10 Jan 1900 or 01 Oct 1900. The month should be abbreviated using the 1<sup>st</sup> three letters of the month.

### **Date Abbreviations**

The following abbreviations can be used with dates

- "abt" for "about" (instead of “ca” or "circa")
- “aft” for “after” (instead of “p” for “post”)
- “bef” for “before” (instead of “a” for “ante”)
- “prob” for probably

### **Place Format**

The standard format for places used should be “town/county/state. If the town is unknown, a preceding “/” is used, i.e., “/county/state/. If both the town and county are unknown, two preceding slashes are used --- “//state”. The state should be the two-letter postal designation for the state, e.g., VA for Virginia. When cities or towns are entered, also enter the county. Care should be taken to identify the correct county when the town is provided. This may not be the current county since boundaries may have changed. Do not spell out “County”. The abbreviation “Co” may be used but not necessary. “Township” should be abbreviated “Twp”. Foreign countries entered in places should be spelled out unless there is insufficient room in which case, try to use a shortened clearly recognizable abbreviation.

### **Unknown Information**

Do not put “unknown”, “unk”, or “N/A” in a name, date, or place field on the application form. If the information is unknown, leave the field blank.

### **Error Check**

Check for typographical errors prior to submitting the application.

### **Organization of the Application Package**

The application package should be organized with the application followed by the documentation in generational order, beginning with the birth certificate of generation 1. The package should be held together with one big, suitably sized binder clip (do not use a paper clip). If a source document covers multiple generations, it should be included with the most recent generation for which it applies.

## **DOCUMENTATION DOS & DON'TS**

### **Applicant's Birth Certificate**

A copy of the applicant's birth certificate identifying him, his date and place of birth, and his natural parents' names is required unless one cannot be obtained from any source.

Occasionally, a baby's name is not given on the birth certificate or the spelling used by the applicant is slightly different than the spelling listed on the certificate. The Genealogy staff accepts items such as a copy of a driver's license or passport showing a matching last name and birth date as found on the birth certificate. Differences in the spelling used by the applicant are accepted when there is an accompanying statement by the applicant that confirms the difference, the name is phonetically similar, and there the application is annotated to show both spellings. The confirmation of the difference and the presence of both spellings on the application is used by the Genealogy Staff to confirm that the difference wasn't just a typographical error on the application.

### **Acceptable Published Sources**

To be considered as an adequate proof document, any published derivative source **must** include a citation describing the original source record that the information came from so the original source can be found and consulted if necessary. No unsourced information can be considered as evidence unless it can be demonstrated that the author of that unsourced information was in a position to have personally known the family members he names, and/or witnessed the events he describes. This is in compliance with the Genealogy Policy, Sec. 5.4000 on the use of Family and Local Histories. Many published books contain information that is uncited and does not meet the criteria of Sec. 5.4000 mentioned above. Such uncited information is unacceptable for use in a SAR application for genealogical proof but these volumes may provide clues for further research into other records. Prospective members are encouraged to use any clues to help them find and develop a solid proof. However the unsourced book should not be included in the documentation submitted with the application.

### **Missing Documentation**

All documentation listed on the application must be submitted with the application.

### **Complete Documentation Pages**

Each piece of documentation **must** contain the entire image of the document. If a pertinent section is difficult to read, a partial blow-up of that section may be printed on the reverse of the page. All documents should be oriented properly (portrait or landscape) to maximize readability.

### **Readability**

All documentation must be readable. If the record is difficult to read, try blowing up the section of relevance and printing the blown up section on the reverse (the obverse must include the complete documentation page so no part is missing). If the document is too light to easily read, try to darken it prior to submission.

### **Superimposed images**

Do not put enlargements or superimposed images on the same page.

Enlargements or superimposed images of pertinent information that are put on top

of the complete image obscure other parts of the page. Enlargements may be put on the reverse side of the document if needed for readability

### **Annotations**

Do not make any annotations to documents submitted since documents must be taken at face value as written. Only a reference to identify the generation by number should appear in the margins and the pertinent text underlined in red fine-tip pen or pencil. Extraneous annotations by others on records are not generally acceptable. This includes such things as annotations listing the family with a photo or transcription of a tombstone record.

### **Preferred Paper Size**

All pages of documentation should be submitted on standard 8 ½ by 11 paper if possible. Legal sized documents such as DAR Record Copies should be reduced to that size. Smaller documents should be scanned to fit on an 8 ½ by 11” page.

### **Staples, Paperclips, Dividers**

Do not use staples or paperclips within the documentation package. Only a single large binder clip to hold the complete package together should be used. Do not use Post-it or similar notes or flags stuck to pages. Do not use divider pages to separate the generations (the generation numbers should be identified on the page only).

### **Highlighters and Markers**

Do not use highlighters or markers on documentation to indicate important text. Underline pertinent text with a fine-line pen or pencil (red is preferred). Felt-tip pens or highlighters can obliterate the text they cover or touch when copied or scanned.

### **Proper Marking of Documentation**

Do underline relevant passages in the document that support the proof and write the generation number of the generation for which the passage applies in the margin beside the underlined passage(s) using a red fine-tip pen or pencil in the documents submitted. Mark all of the generation numbers to which the document applies in red fine-tip pen or pencil at the top of the document.

### **Multiple Copies of Same Documentation**

Do not submit duplicate pages of a documentation source. Only one copy of a document is needed, no matter how many generations are accounted for on that document. The generation numbers that the document pertains to should be marked in red fine-tip pen at the top of the first page of that document and the document should be referenced in each corresponding line in the documentation proofs on the Application form.

### **Redundant/Extraneous Information**

Do not supply redundant information when the package already contains adequate proof. If a vital record is submitted, do not provide an index for that record. Do not supply

census summary pages, just a copy of the actual census page. Obituaries are an exception; the Genealogy Staff welcomes obituaries, even though a death record may have been submitted because the obituary may give more information on the family which may help prove the relationship between the deceased and another family member that was not listed on the death record.

### **Narrative Summaries in Proof Arguments**

Include a narrative describing how multiple documents provide indirect proof of a conclusion. Without this, staff must analyze the documents and arrive at its own conclusions. Make sure the narrative resolves any conflicting evidence, and in the case of multiple persons of the same name in the same area, that all ambiguity is eliminated. Do not provide unnecessary narratives that are not part of a “proof argument” using indirect evidence and needed to explain how the pieces of indirect proof reach the stated conclusion.

### **Pages Required With Published Records**

All published sources submitted as proof must include both the page(s) of interest and the title page providing the title, author, and date of publication. If abbreviations are used in the published source, the “key to abbreviations” page must also be included. If the published source has multiple pages referencing the same surname (such as an alphabetized list of vital records) and the surname is not shown on the page that of interest, all the previous pages beginning at the point where the surname is shown should be provided in addition to the page of interest and the title page.

### **Abstracted records**

Published full transcriptions of documents are preferable to abstracts. Either must contain source information, including state, county, volume/book, and page number.

### **Proof of the Maternal Bloodline**

If the bloodline goes through the maternal side, there must be acceptable evidence of the connection between the woman and her parents, as well as between the woman and her child. A will or Bible record explicitly describing the relationship is of course preferred. By themselves census records usually will not suffice, unless one shows the father and/or mother living in the married daughter’s household, but other indirect evidence may establish the linkage. If a will, deed, or court record is used to show her maiden name but doesn’t indicate her married name (“ to my daughter Mary”), more proof is required to show the marriage and establish both her married and maiden names.

### **Death certificates of remarried wives**

If her death certificate is under the surname of a second spouse, proof of the name change from that of the bloodline spouse to that of the second spouse is needed.

### **Proof of Service**

If the applicant is not citing a previously approved NSSAR or NSDAR application, the proof of service using acceptable sources must be provided. If the source used for proof of service on an SAR or DAR approved application does not meet current standards, a copy of an acceptable proof of service is required.

### **Using SAR, DAR, or C.A.R. Record Copies**

Unless new applications qualify under the “Grandfather Policy”, they must cite either Record Copies of well documented SAR, DAR, or C.A.R. applications, or include their own documentation. Note that submission of older approved SAR Record Copies in support of a new application is not required with the application package to NSSAR but a Record Copy MAY be required by Chapter and/or State Registrars so that he/they may be satisfied that the proof is there for the generations and/or service being claimed by an applicant (check with your Chapter or State Registrar). Since the NSSAR may or may not have any (acceptable) backup documentation for an old application (particularly applications approved prior to 1978), if an old SAR application is in question when being considered as proof for a new SAR application, the Genealogy staff would prefer a phone call or email from the STATE POINT OF CONTACT, asking about the viability, or existence of documentation for an old SAR application rather than having to pend one after it reaches review.

### **Older Approved SAR Applications/Ancestry.com SAR Record Copies**

Older, previously approved SAR applications can be useful in determining lineages and service by providing information that may be useful as clues to find actual documentation but may not be sufficient to support new applications since the requirements for establishing proof of lineage and service have changed over the years. Old SAR Record Copies usually do not have any documentation in the files to support them. Prior to 1909, only names in each generation were required and no documentation was cited in the applications. From 1909-1920, the names and years of events were included in the applications but not the full dates nor the places of the events. From 1920 to February 1955, most applications contained the day, month, and year of events but few included locations. In October 1953 a new form was developed requiring dates and locations and the old format was phased out. The modern application format also requiring references was instituted in August 1960 (starting with member no. 85,439). Some of these contain enough documentation to be useable as a reference for a new application. However, the SAR did not move many of the application files when the Headquarters was moved from Washington D.C. to Louisville thus older files prior to 1978 may not be complete for verification without additional references. Several sources used in older applications have also be found to be unreliable and are no longer accepted as sufficient proof of lineage or service.

- Screen prints of SAR Record Copies from Ancestry.com are not acceptable as proof.
- Family Group Sheets printed from the SAR Patriot Index are not acceptable as proof.



- The SAR Patriot and Grave Index is not an acceptable proof of service.

### **DAR and C.A.R. Record Copies**

In general, “Record”, electronic/digital “Chapter” copies made after 2009, and “Duplicate” copies of approved DAR and C.A.R. applications may be used as supporting documentation for SAR applications. With certain narrow exceptions, such applications approved in 1985 or later are acceptable. See page 21 of this Manual for a more complete explanation of SAR policy on the use of these post-1984 applications, and on ways to use earlier applications.

- Do not include the first page of downloaded DAR Record Copies that begin with “What has changed”. Pages 2-5 of downloaded DAR Record Copies may be printed double-sided to save paper, postage, and space.
- Entries in “The DAR Patriot Index” are not acceptable proof of service.
- Copies printed from the DAR GRS website "Descendants Database Search" are not acceptable of proof of lineage or service
- Pages copied from DAR Lineage Books, or pages copied from DAR State Society “rosters of patriots are not acceptable as proof of lineage or service.

### **Corrections Made to Earlier SAR, DAR, or CAR Applications**

The Genealogy Staff of these organizations occasionally make hand written corrections to information submitted by bracketing unsupported information or by annotating a correction. When submitting a new or supplemental SAR application, make sure the information listed on the new application reflects these annotations and not the information that has been corrected.

### **Census records**

The entire census page must be shown so the data can be evaluated in context. If the data must be enlarged to read, include an enlargement of the section on the reverse side. Transcriptions or printed summaries on “printer-friendly/source pages” are not acceptable. The census images should be printed in the correct orientation for that census year (usually portrait for 1850-1880 and landscape for the later census years) so the image can be optimally read. Acceptable proof of parent/child family relationships are only shown on 1850 and later census records. Earlier census records may be useful in building a proof argument but do not prove a parent/child link without other supporting documentation. Since actual images of census records are now so readily available, the actual images should be used for documentation instead of older published transcriptions of census records. Transcriptions are subject to error and usually don’t provide the full context of the record such as neighbors, census date, or other identifying facts that are available with an actual image.

### **Bible records and Other Original Documents**

Bible records and other original family documents, such as old letters and journals, will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. To prove lineage, the relationship between two generations must be explicit, or used with other documentation to reasonably prove a parent-child relationship. If possible, a photo or scanned image of all the

pages showing the family information must be submitted, and in the case of a Bible, a photo of the Bible's title page, giving an indication of the Bible's age and the genealogy presented, is required. Evaluation will not only consider the apparent age of the document, but also the handwriting and ink used, and evidence that the events were recorded soon after they occurred. If the writer can be identified through the handwriting (through old letters, etc.), proof of the identification should be included. Bible entries apparently entered long after the event will reduce their usefulness. Transcripts of Bible records, though having less value, may also be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. As much as is known, the document's provenance, including its present location, should be cited in the "References" on the document.

### **Records in Foreign Languages**

English is the language of use for SAR applications. A document in a foreign language may be submitted provided that it is accompanied by an accurate English translation. If the foreign language document is in an archaic handwritten style, with the text not easily recognizable, a transcription of the pertinent portion of the document, including any diacritic marks (e.g. umlauts, accents, etc.) is also required.

### **Birth certificates**

Short-form birth certificates that do not identify the parents are insufficient. The long-form birth certificate usually provides additional information regarding the parents' ages and birthplaces. If the grandson of a SAR member is applying for membership, a birth certificate or other acceptable proof of relationship is required between the SAR member and his child through which the grandson is applying.

### **Tombstone records**

Tombstones used as supporting evidence must be contemporaneous to the time of the subject's death and include a readable photograph of the marker. New stones containing information about events that occurred years ago are not recognized. Copies of inscriptions from tombstones erected in the time period of the death of the ancestor, with notation of the name and location of the cemetery (city/county/state), shall be accepted as evidence. Readable photographs are strongly preferred to transcriptions and abstracts

### **Findagrave Memorial Pages**

Memorial pages found on [www.findagrave.com](http://www.findagrave.com) are not acceptable unless they include a readable photograph of the actual tombstone and the information on the memorial page stating where the subject is buried (name of cemetery, city/county/state). Only the text on the tombstone is accepted as evidence. Acceptable tombstone photographs are those that appear to be of the contemporary to the death. New stones containing information about events that occurred years ago are not recognized. Vital records posted with the memorial page will be accepted and attached obituaries may also be considered if they provide the newspaper name, place published, and date of publication). User entered information added to the memorial page is not accepted as proof. This would include

names, dates, and relationships listed or any other personal data entered that is not on the tombstone.

### **Newspaper Articles**

Copies of newspaper articles such as an obituary or wedding announcements must include identifying publication names, locations, and dates of publication.

### **Unacceptable documentation**

The following unacceptable sources should not be submitted as “proof” of a bloodline:

- User-submitted family trees or information found on online websites, including GEDCOMs, Ancestry.com, World Family Tree, Rootsweb.com, and similar sites, or from personal online family pages.
- LDS Ancestral File and/or IGI records;
- US and International Marriage Records from Ancestry.com;
- Documents so illegible that the applicant has had to write in the pertinent information;
- Unpublished transcriptions of wills or other legal documents posted online;
- Quotes from sources regarding military service posted in online family trees;
- Photographs with names or other information entered by the applicant to show lineage;
- Un-sourced newspaper articles are not acceptable proof.

### **Published family and local histories**

These records may be acceptable, especially when properly annotated with the source of the information. Consideration may also be given to un-annotated histories, when the author can be shown to have been in a position to have first-hand knowledge of the person or event in question. In such cases, a narrative explanation of why the source should be considered should be attached. For instance, the biographies in many county histories were provided by the subjects themselves. While the author may be presumed to have known his own parents, grandparents, children, and grandchildren, portions of such sketches relating to the subject’s family in colonial times would properly be deemed unacceptable hearsay.

### **Initials or use of middle names instead of first names**

Documents containing initials rather than a full given name can be problematic, and normally require additional supporting evidence that the subject is the correct person. It is not to be assumed that one record referring to J. W. Smith and another referring to J. Smith or John Smith, refer to J. William Smith, without additional evidence that J. William went by both names. Other records may be required to show this, such as a census recording the names of other family members in the household with him.

## **DNA Evidence**

DNA evidence can only be used as part of a proof argument that includes additional conventional proof of the lineage.

Currently, the SAR has limited the use of DNA evidence to only proving the applicant's relationship to his biological parent in situations such as adoptions or the inability to find any other documentation of his parents. However, DNA testing may still be of value in discovering new relatives and using traditional evidence to establish the connection to them and their connection to qualifying patriots. DNA evidence showing a relationship must be accompanied with consent forms (<https://www.sar.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/2020-09-04-DNA-Consent-Form-Applicant-1.pdf> and <https://www.sar.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/2020-09-04-DNA-Consent-Form-Match-1.pdf>) from both the applicant and any matches used to support the relationship and must include an affidavit from the match acknowledging the relationship with any explanations that may be known.

In addition to the court recognized paternity tests to prove parentage, there are four types of DNA testing currently available; Y-DNA that looks at the male sex chromosome, autosomal DNA (atDNA) which tests the other 22 chromosomes except the sex chromosome, mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) which tests the mitochondria surrounding the chromosomes and is passed through the female line, and X-DNA that tests only the female sex chromosome.

**Y-DNA** is passed from father to son in the direct male line. Testing of markers on the Y chromosome is available at several different levels. In earlier years, the test looked at 12 markers to predict a likely relationship. Now tests are available for 12, 25, 37, 67, and 111 markers. **It is recommended that, at a minimum, the 37-marker test is needed, and the 67-marker test is preferred to make reasonable conclusions about any likelihood of common recent ancestry.** Each marker represents a specific section of the chromosome where repetitions of genetic material are found. The number of these repetitions on each marker is the reported result. The term "genetic distance" is used with the test to provide the number of variations between two test takers at the given level of testing. Mutations result in variations in the number of repetitions found on a specific marker. For example, at the 67 marker level, a genetic distance of 2 means that the number of repetitions on one marker differs by a count of 2, or the number of repetitions on two markers varies by a count of 1. The genetic distance is the total difference across all markers. Usually a genetic distance of 0 or 1 on a 67 marker test would indicate a recent close relationship. That being said, the likelihood of a close relationship, does not establish that the two test takers have a specific ancestor. The relationship could be a sibling, parent, grandparent, or cousin of the specific ancestor. Other conventional evidence would be needed to build a case showing the relationship. **Autosomal DNA combined with Y-DNA can provide evidence to narrow in on the relationship.**

**Autosomal DNA (atDNA)** compares the number of shared centimorgans (cM) of DNA on the 22 chromosomes other than the sex chromosomes. It may also show the shared cM of DNA on the X chromosome. This test can predict relationships between test takers


based on the percentage of shared DNA but does not specify which ancestral family line that relationship comes from. The International Society of Genetic Genealogy (ISSOG) at <https://isogg.org> provides several useful tools for analyzing DNA including Blaine T. Bettinger's "Shared cM Project" table (following) of predicted relationships based on the amount of shared cMs between atDNA test takers. Children receive 50% of their DNA from each parent. Because of the effect of recombination, the percentage received for earlier generations is only approximate, but around 25% from each grandparent, 12.5% from each great-grandparent, 6.25% from each 2<sup>nd</sup> great-grandparent, 3.125% from each 3<sup>rd</sup> great-grandparent, etc. Within 5 generations, there is a 98% chance that there would be some amount of shared DNA. However, beyond the 5th generation, some of the DNA would drop off of the genetic family tree and no DNA would be received from some of the 6<sup>th</sup> generation or earlier ancestors. Autosomal testing looks at a total of about 6800 locations on the 22 chromosomes. A segment of shared locations is measured in centimorgans (cM). Shared blocks of 7 cM or greater are considered to be indicative of a relationship while smaller blocks can be just random occurrences. A total of 30 cMs in all blocks greater than 7cM is a strong indication of a relationship. By looking at the total number of shared cMs, using the Shared cM project chart below, a relationship prediction can be made. Conventional research methods can then be used to locate potential common ancestors. However, once a potential common ancestor has been identified, further atDNA testing is needed to confirm the relationship. Using conventional research, other descendants of the same potential ancestor should be identified and tested. This often requires finding known descendants who are willing to take the test to see if their predicted relationship is confirmed. Five (5) to seven (7) confirmed matches based on this methodology is good evidence that the potential ancestor is in fact the actual ancestor. Software applications such as GEDmatch and Genome Mate Pro are available to analyze shared matching segments of DNA. By developing a bank of tested known close family members, including aunts, uncles, 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> cousins, it is possible to analyze the matching segments and determine which came from which family lines.

**AT THIS TIME THE SAR WILL ONLY ALLOW THE USE OF atDNA AS EVIDENCE IN PROVING THE APPLICANT'S BIOLOGIC PARENT.** That would usually be shown by matching relationships to a parent, grandparent, full-sibling, aunt/uncle, half-sibling, or a niece/nephew involving a total cM match of over 1300 cMs. See the chart on the next page to see ranges and averages by relationships.

**X-DNA** is passed from the mother to both her sons and daughters. Sons would inherit a Y chromosome from their father and an X chromosome from their mother while daughters would inherit an X chromosome from both parents. For males, the presence of an X-DNA match would suggest that the match goes through the mother's line rather than the father's line. However, for female testers, the line could go through either parent.

# The Shared cM Project – Version 4.0 (March 2020)

Blaine T. Bettinger  
www.TheGeneticGenealogist.com  
CC 4.0 Attribution License



								Great-Great-Grandparent	GGG-Aunt/Uncle		
								Great-Great-Grandparent	GGG-Aunt/Uncle		
Half GG-Aunt/Uncle 208 103 – 284	Great-Grandparent 887 485 – 1486						Great-Great Aunt/Uncle 420 186 – 713	1C3R 117 25 – 238	2c3R 51 0 – 154		Other Relationships
Half 1C2R 125 16 – 269	Half Great-Aunt/Uncle 431 184 – 668	Grandparent 1754 984 – 2462				Great Aunt/Uncle 850 330 – 1467	1C2R 221 33 – 471	2c2R 71 0 – 244	3C2R 36 0 – 166		6C 18 0 – 71
Half 2c1R 66 0 – 190	Half 1C1R 224 62 – 469	Half Aunt/Uncle 871 492 – 1315	Parent 3485 2376 – 3720		Aunt/Uncle 1741 1201 – 2282	1C1R 433 102 – 980	2c1R 122 14 – 353	3C1R 48 0 – 192	4C1R 28 0 – 126	6C1R 15 0 – 56	
Half 3c 48 0 – 168	Half 2c 120 10 – 325	Half 1C 449 156 – 979	Half-Sibling 1759 1160 – 2436	Sibling 2613 1613 – 3488	SELF	1C 866 396 – 1397	2c 229 41 – 592	3c 73 0 – 234	4c 35 0 – 139	5c 25 0 – 117	6C2R 13 0 – 45
Half 3c1R 37 0 – 139	Half 2c1R 66 0 – 190	Half 1C1R 224 62 – 469	Half Niece/Nephew 871 492 – 1315	Niece/Nephew 1740 1201 – 2282	Child 3487 2376 – 3720	1C1R 433 102 – 980	2c1R 122 14 – 353	3C1R 48 0 – 192	4C1R 28 0 – 126	5C1R 21 0 – 80	7C 14 0 – 57
Half 3c2R 27 0 – 78	Half 2c2R 48 0 – 144	Half 1C2R 125 16 – 269	Half Great Niece/Nephew 431 184 – 668	Great-Niece/Nephew 850 330 – 1467	Grandchild 1754 984 – 2462	1C2R 221 33 – 471	2c2R 71 0 – 244	3C2R 36 0 – 166	4C2R 22 0 – 93	5C2R 18 0 – 65	7C1R 12 0 – 50
Half 3c3R	Half 2c3R	Half 1C3R 60 0 – 120	Half GG Niece/Nephew 208 103 – 284	Great-Great-Niece/Nephew 420 186 – 713	Great-Grandchild 887 485 – 1486	1C3R 117 25 – 238	2c3R 51 0 – 154	3C3R 27 0 – 98	4C3R 19 0 – 60	5C3R 13 0 – 30	8C 11 0 – 42

Minimum was automatically set to 0 cM for relationships more distant than Half 2C, and averages were determined only for submissions in which DNA was shared

**Blaine T. Bettinger's Shared cM Project Chart**  
Used by permission


## Examples of Testing R Using atDNA

AncestryDNA doesn't provide the chromosome browser (although the customer can download that information to GEDMatch or another 3<sup>rd</sup> party tool to see the segment data). Their "Family Finder" reports provide the names and amount of shared DNA with other customers that match. This example doesn't show any close matches. After contacting the first match with a shared 289 cM (about 4.25% match) it was determined that they were 1<sup>st</sup> cousins twice removed.

After contact with the next match at 287 cM, it turned out to be a third cousin match. The third match has not responded to contact and remains unknown although the "leaf" indicates a common ancestor and if the tree can be proven would be another 3<sup>rd</sup> cousin match.

The limitation of using DNA to only prove the link from the applicant to his parent would preclude the use of these more distant relatives to show adoptions or similar situations where there is no traditional proof of the applicant's biologic parent.

If a match is found that would be useful in determining the biologic parent, the matching individual would have to agree to providing proof of their relationship to the common ancestor (birth certificates, etc.), an affidavit acknowledging the relationship and any information that would explain the situation along with the signed "Matches Consent Form" to allow the SAR to use that evidence in support of the applicant's application. The applicant would provide the DNA report showing the matching information and also submit the signed "Applicant's Consent Form"



The screenshot shows the AncestryDNA interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with "ancestry" logo and links for Home, Trees, Search, DNA, Health, Help, and Extras. Below this is a "Back" button and a "DNA Matches" header. The main content area shows a list of matches under the heading "2nd Cousin". The matches are filtered by "Unviewed", "Common ancestors", "Messaged", "Notes", "Trees", and "Shared DNA".

Match	Relationship	Shared DNA	Additional Info
[Redacted]	2nd-3rd Cousin	289 cM across 15 segments	Unlinked Tree
[Redacted]	2nd-3rd Cousin	287 cM across 12 segments	5,835 People, Common ancestor
[Redacted]	2nd-3rd Cousin	280 cM across 16 segments	42 People, Common ancestor







This is an example of the FamilytreeDNA matches between a customer and his daughter and his half-sister. FamilytreeDNA tests almost 6800 locations. A parent/child relationship would be a 50% match (3377 cMs). A full sibling would be between 50% and 25%. A grandparent/half-sibling/aunt-uncle/niece- nephew match would be 23%-29% based on expected results considering the recombination process of genetic inheritance. Note that the results in both matches show a X chromosome match indicating that the match is on the female side. The customer name and kit number is shown on this page in the top right (not shown on this example).

Family Finder - Matches Most Common Surnames: [REDACTED]

Search name or ancestral surnames   [Advanced Search](#)


Chromosome Browser  In Common With  Not In Common With  [Reset Filter](#) 1-30 of 4984     Page 1 / 167

All (4984)  Paternal (0)  Maternal (0)  Both (0)

Name	Match Date	Relationship Range	Shared cM	Longest Block	X-Match	Linked Relationship	Ancestral Surnames
 [REDACTED]	11/12/2019	Mother/ Daughter	3,377	267	X-Match		
 [REDACTED]	10/14/2015	Half Sister, Grandmother/ Granddaughter, Aunt, Niece	1,671	127	X-Match		



The FamilytreeDNA match as shown with their “Chromosome Browser”. The Chromosome browser may be useful for locating more distant common ancestors but for matching cM percentages over 20%, there are only a few close relationships available (parent/child, grandparent/grandchild, siblings, half-siblings, aunt or uncle/niece or nephew). See Blaine Bettinger’s “Shared cM Project Chart” for possible relationships.



## **RECOMMENDED ABBREVIATIONS**

### **Standard USPS Postal designations for States and US Territories:**

• Alabama	AL	• North Carolina	NC
• Alaska	AK	• North Dakota	ND
• Arizona	AZ	• Ohio	OH
• Arkansas	AR	• Oklahoma	OK
• California	CA	• Oregon	OR
• Canal Zone	CZ	• Pennsylvania	PA
• Colorado	CO	• Puerto Rico	PR
• Connecticut	CT	• Rhode Island	RI
• Delaware	DE	• South Carolina	SC
• District of Columbia	DC	• South Dakota	SD
• Florida	FL	• Tennessee	TN
• Georgia	GA	• Texas	TX
• Guam	GU	• Utah	UT
• Hawaii	HI	• Vermont	VT
• Idaho	ID	• Virginia	VA
• Illinois	IL	• Virgin Islands	VI
• Indiana	IN	• Washington	WA
• Iowa	IA	• West Virginia	WV
• Kansas	KS	• Wisconsin	WI
• Kentucky	KY	• Wyoming	WY
• Louisiana	LA		
• Maine	ME		
• Maryland	MD		
• Massachusetts	MA		
• Michigan	MI		
• Minnesota	MN		
• Mississippi	MS		
• Missouri	MO		
• Montana	MT		
• Nebraska	NE		
• Nevada	NV		
• New Hampshire	NH		
• New Jersey	NJ		
• New Mexico	NM		
• New York	NY		

## Military Abbreviations

These may be found on earlier DAR or SAR papers or may be used on applications:

• 1 <sup>st</sup> Lieutenant	1Lt	• Ensign	Ens
• 2 <sup>nd</sup> Lieutenant	2Lt	• Fifer	Fif
• Aide de Camp	ADC	• Fife Major	FifMaj
• Admiral	Adm	• French Army	FrA
• Artificer	Arfr	• French Navy	FrN
• Armorer	Armr	• General	Gen
• Artillery	Artl	• Gunner	Gnr
• Assistant	Asst	• Guard	Grd
• Bombardier	Bmd	• Lieutenant Col	LCol
• Brigadier General	BGen	• Lieutenant Gen	LGen
• Boatswain	Bosn	• Lieutenant	Lt
• Boatman	Btm	• Major	Maj
• Cadet	Cadet	• Marines	Mar
• Captain	Capt	• Matross	Matr
• Captain Lieutenant	CapLt	• Major General	MGen
• Calvary	Cav	• Midshipman	Mid
• Commander	Cdr	• Militia	Mil
• Coast Guard	CG	• Minute Man	MM
• Chaplain	Chp	• Mariner	Mnr
• Continental Line	CL	• Master of ship	Mstr
• Clerk	Clerk	• Mate on a ship	Mte
• Commissary	Cmsry	• Musician	Mus
• Continental Navy	CN	• Navy	N
• Cornet	Cnt	• Non-Commissioned	Noncom
• Colonel	Col	• Naval Service	NS
• Commodore	Commo	• Officer (rank unk)	Of
• Corporal	Cpl	• Orderly	Ordl
• Civil Service	CS	• Orderly Sergeant	OrdlSgt
• County Lieutenant	CtyLt	• River Pilot	Pilot
• Deputy	Dep	• Paymaster	PM
• Physican/Surgeon	Dr	• Pensioned Soldier	PNSR
• Drummer	Drm	• Patriotic Service	PS
• Drum Major	DrmMaj	• Private	Pvt
• Engineer	Eng	• Privateer	Pvtr
		• Quartermaster	QM

- Quartermaster Gen QMGen
- Quartermaster Sgt QMSgt
- Signer Dec. of Indp SDI
- Sea Captain SeaCap
- Sergeant Sgt
- Sailor Slr
- Seaman Smn
- Soldier (rank unk) Sol
- Spy Spy
- Surgeon's Mate SrgnMte
- Surgeon General SurGen
- Teamster Tms
- Trumpeteer Trm
- Volunteer Vol
- Wagon Master Wgm
- Wagoneer Wgn

## Using Previously Approved DAR & C.A.R. Record Copies

Many applications are submitted using previously-approved SAR, DAR and C.A.R. applications. As noted in the disclaimer on the Ancestry.com webpages for SAR Membership Applications 1895-1970, the documentation on many older SAR applications would fail to meet modern SAR genealogy standards, and it may be necessary to supplement the old SAR application with additional evidence.

Likewise, DAR recognizes that many of its older applications are insufficiently documented by current standards. As has SAR, in recent decades DAR has implemented more detailed review of new applications that rely on previously-proven lineage and service, and now flags facts that must be proven anew by future applicants. The C.A.R. follows the same procedures as the DAR.

Out of respect for the genealogical standards of the DAR and C.A.R., it is SAR policy to accept as evidence of lineage and related facts on SAR applications, corresponding facts on official copies of DAR or C.A.R. applications approved after 1 January 1985 unless relevant portions of the applications have been determined to be incorrect by the DAR, C.A.R. or the SAR Genealogist General. Short-form DAR or C.A.R. applications are also deemed acceptable evidence of the lineage and related facts presented thereon.

The earliest DAR application approved in 1985, and therefore accepted for these purposes, was for DAR Member No. 688702. DAR supplemental applications in "Add Vol." 622 and above will also have approval dates in 1985 or later. The first C.A.R. new-member application in 1985 was No. 130021.

If the patriot ancestor can be found in the online DAR Ancestor Database, the DAR members who claimed that patriot ancestor can be easily identified by their Member Number prior to purchasing a Record Copy. The "Add Vol." number is also provided on the same listing for any supplemental applications based on that patriot.

For pre-1985 DAR or C.A.R. applications the information contained may be considered as evidence if 1) the specific relevant facts have a verification check-mark on each datum of evidence, 2) the sources used are provided, *and* 3) those sources meet current standards of acceptability. Regardless of whether acceptable as evidence, these earlier applications may still be valuable resources to help in further research by applicants.

## Citing Sources on the Application

One major value of establishing a patriot's service for membership in the SAR is the information provided in the application as a source for future members to use in establishing their own memberships. Incomplete citations such as "death certificate", "census record", "family history" are of little help. To help with this situation, the following standards for citing the sources used are suggested, not required, but their use will enhance the future value of our Record Copies.

**Birth, marriage, and death certificates or licenses** – Use the abbreviation "b/c", "m/c", "m/l", or "d/c" etc. and list the name of the party(s) for which it is relevant. Unless there is some special reason for indicating the year or place where the record was located, that information isn't needed since the date and place is already provided on the application.

- b/c - John Smith.
- m/c - John Smith to Jane Doe.
- delayed b/c – Mary Walser, Sacramento Co. CA, 1952. *[In this case the person was born in Iowa in 1889 but the delayed birth certificate was issued in California in 1952].*

**Census records** – Provide the census year, county, state, and name of the head of household as found in the census.

- 1860 cen. Clayton Co., IA, p. 193, John Smith hh.

**Published records** – Provide the complete name of the volume, year published, and page number(s) of interest. The year of publication is of particular value when multiple books with similar titles are available.

- "History of Clayton County, Iowa", 1882, p. 691.

**Court records (probate, land, etc.)** – Provide the place, year, volume, page, and name of persons of interest.

- Loudoun Co., VA Deed Bk R (1789), p. 440, Ashley to Mann.
- Lancaster Co., SC Minutes Court of Equity, Bk B (1834-1841), pp. 222-223, Terrill heirs.

**Bible Records** – Provide original owner and publication date.

- Meshack Vanlandingham family Bible, 1837.

**Newspaper article** – Provide type of article, person of interest, newspaper, and page.

- Obit John Smith, San Francisco Call, 21 Feb 1885, p. 4.

**DAR Record Copy** – Provide the DAR number and the name of patriot.

- DAR RC #809010 – Richmond Terrill.

**SAR Record Copy** – Provide the SAR number and the name of the patriot. Note: a copy of the SAR Record Copy is not needed since the Genealogy Staff has access to it already. However, it may be required for use by the State and Chapter Registrars in the verification process.

- SAR RC 156802 – Samuel Hoard

## **Family Plan Applications**

The SAR offers a “family plan” for applicants filing initial or supplemental applications using the same genealogical line and connected by relationships not to exceed two linkages removed from the line of some other applicant in the family plan. In the case of supplemental applications, each supplemental application can also be from an ancestor or spouse of an ancestor that both the first applicant and the additional applicant(s) have established through their previously accepted SAR applications. Family applications must be submitted to the National Society at the same time and on the same Transmittal Form.

This plan provides a reduced application fee for the additional family members. Each application should list the same documentation for each generation link but only copies of birth certificates are required to connect the to the common ancestor. Do not submit duplicate pages of documentation. Only one copy of a document is needed no matter how many applications submitted under the family plan it pertains to. For instance, if a grandson’s application is being submitted with the initial applicant’s, the only additional documentation required would be a copy of his and his father or mother’s birth certificate showing the blood line to the patriot. The documentation submitted by the primary applicant will provide the remainder of the supporting paperwork. The family plan package should contain the primary applicant’s application and documentation first followed by the addition family member’s applications and the documentation that connects them to the common ancestor used by the primary member.

## **Junior Membership Applications**

Jr. Memberships are often based on a father’s or grandfather’s previously approved SAR application. Since the bloodline has already been approved by the SAR, the Jr. Member application would cited the previously approved SAR Record Copy by member number and patriot as the source documentation for those generations that have already been proved. A copy of the SAR application is not needed with the application since the SAR staff already has access to it.

If the Jr. Member application is based on a DAR or C.A.R. application instead, a citation to the DAR or C.A.R. Record Copy AND an official Record Copy is needed in the documentation package. The DAR Record Copy must meet the same criteria for sufficient supporting documentation that is required with a regular application

Source documentation from the Jr. Member to the common link in the bloodline is required. This is normally in the form of birth and/or death certificates.

## **Youth Registrants and Youth Registration**

In 2001, a “Youth Registrant” program was established whereby a person under the age of 18 could file an application which if approved would allow that person to



automatically convert to Regular Membership without any further documentation or application being required if the applicant requested the change and paid the full Regular Member dues at that time prior to age 29. The Youth Registrant program was terminated in 2011 but all existing Youth Members could either convert to Jr. Membership or, after they reached their 18<sup>th</sup> birthday and before age 29, could still apply for Regular Membership as originally provided.

Prior to the Youth Registrant program which was begun in 2001, there was another program called the “Youth Registration” program. Under this program, a parent, grandparent or great-grandparent of a current member could put his son, grandson, or great-grandson on a list of those who may qualify for future membership in the SAR. No documentation was submitted for approval. The potential member would receive a pin and a certificate that that stated that he “HAS BEEN DULY REGISTERED AS A CANDIDATE FOR FUTURE MEMBERSHIP IN THE SOCIETY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE BYLAW IN EFFECT ON THE DATE OF APPLICATION.” Persons registered under that program have no documentation on file to allow an automatic transfer and must submit a regular application as is required for any new prospective member. They may be able to document their application using their father, grandfather, or great-grandfather’s SAR Record Copy, however, that SAR Record Copy may or may not meet current standards and more documentation could be required unless the applicant chose to qualify under the “Grandfathered” provision below.

## **“Grandfathered” Applications**

These would be applications based on older SAR or DAR applications which are considered inadequate but meet the criteria set forth for “grandfathering” (see the Genealogy Committee Policies Manual). The applicant understands that the grandfathered application, although approved, will be flagged as a “grandfathered” application. This means that future applicants will not be able to use a “grandfathered” application as a proof document in support of their application until the missing documentation is provided.

## **Supplemental Applications**

The same criteria as stated above regarding approved SAR and DAR Record Copies applies for all common generations in the bloodline.

Generations that are not included in the approved SAR or DAR Record Copy would require the same supporting documentation as required in a new application.

The signatures of a sponsor, co-sponsor, or the State Secretary are not necessary on Supplemental Applications. They are only required for new applicants.

## **Memorial Applications**

A Memorial Application can be submitted for a male who is a deceased close relative (within two generations) of an SAR member and whose application is based on (most of) the same lineage as that SAR member. There are no dues and a portion of the application fee goes to the Society's Permanent Fund. The filing of Memorial Memberships is only available to active SAR members. The PDF application found on the NSSAR website has the capability to prepare a Memorial Application. The Memorial Application would be filled out and signed by the submitter who is a close relative within the required two degrees of kinship using his own contact address and contact information. The rest of the application would be filled out just as if it were a Regular Membership application with every name, date, place shown on the obverse. The References section on the reverse side of the form would list the supporting SAR application (SAR RC #xxxxxxx-patriot) for all of those generations that are in common with the previously approved application. A copy of the birth and death certificate for the memorialized applicant as well as any other necessary proof documents to link the application to the previously approved application would also be required. The fee for a Memorial Application differs from the fees for Regular Membership and the NSSAR, State Society, and Chapter fees should be checked for any differences prior to submission. The approved Memorial Membership certificate will be returned to the submitter by way of his Chapter.

## **Expedited Processing**

An applicant, sponsor, state registrar, or state president has the right to request immediate processing of an application in writing to the Executive Director, Genealogist General, and/or Chairman of the Genealogy Committee. Email requests are considered as written requests.

Authorization of a request for expedited processing requires the written approval by a sufficient number of members from the following group: Executive Director, Genealogist General, and Chairman of the Genealogy Committee. The number of members required for approval is:

- One member, for active duty military applicants currently serving in a war zone or facing imminent deployment to a war zone;
- One member, for applicants who are nearing the end of their lives (in hospice care, extreme advanced age, etc.);
- Two members for applicants of very high social or governmental status, such as governors, ambassadors, etc.;
- Three members for all other cases.

# Research Tips and Example Problem Resolutions

## Using a Proof Argument

The following research suggestions are often useful in finding an ancestry which seems to have hit a brick wall.

- **Check Original Records** - If there is a published abstraction of records it may not be a complete record of all pertinent facts. Abstracts of marriages may not list bondsmen or parental permissions. Some abstracts of wills have been found to only include those receiving bequests and omitting the names of executors who may also be named as children but had previously received their share of the estate in a gift deed and thus not listed in the bequests. The published “Virginia Publick Claims” don’t list the complete reasoning that individuals were granted the claim. Original records have shown cases where a claim was made for providing rations during the person’s own military service and thus the individual is qualified for both public and military service.
- **Siblings & Other Known Relatives** - Sometimes, following clues about the ancestor’s siblings or relatives can tear down the brick wall. What may not be found in the records that would connect your ancestor to an earlier generation may be found in the records that concerned the brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles, nieces or nephews of the ancestor. Proof of parentage may be found indirectly through proof of a sibling relationship and proof of the sibling’s parentage.
- **Land Records** - Many deed records record the transfer of property between parent and child. These often have a nominal consideration received (\$1 or 5 shillings) and may also state “for the natural love and affection I have for...” Useful land records may be found years after the death of an individual and provide information about his children. They may have been created for a partition of the land that was jointly received by the children as an inheritance, or for a sale between one or more of the heirs of his/her share of an inheritance. These records usually show how the land was obtained, “from the estate of John Doe, decd”. Land could have been passed down between family members without the recording of any deeds. At some future date, one of the descendants must record a deed of sale to a third party and must show how the title passed to him/her. Releases of dower rights may also provide clues to the wife’s surname. Witnesses to deeds were often related.
- **Newspapers** - Newspapers are an often-overlooked resource for locating family information. Vital statistics are frequently printed in papers even though the events were never officially recorded. Newspaper accounts of a person’s death can lead to the identification of heirs; provide the date of birth or the age which can be used to calculate and birth date; and provide the place of birth. The probate process requires the publishing of a probate notice in local papers. These notices can provide the

names and last known residences of the heirs, some of who may not be named in a will or named anywhere else if there was no will.

- **Census Records** – Sometimes census records cannot be easily found due to the way the name was either enumerated or indexed. Use some creative ways to search for families that don't appear to be in an index such as Ancestry.com's search engine. Be aware of possible variations in spellings that may have been used; for example "Cowin" may have been indexed as "Corvin. Try using wildcards with only the first three letters of the surname or for vowels in the surname. Use approximate ages and birth states for all known members of the family group (not just the head of the household). Browsing the complete census record of the locations can often yield positive results when all else fails.
- **Build a Case With Indirect Evidence** - One of the problems in preparing the required proof for SAR membership is the availability and reliability of documented evidence. There are still ways to establish proofs using several independent documents, none of which in themselves prove the link but, in aggregate, build a case that proves the link using a proof argument. NOTE: A separate proof argument is required for each link that can't be established using acceptable direct evidence or in situations where there is conflicting direct evidence or multiple possibilities with persons of the same name living in the same area at the time period of interest. The proof argument should indicate 1) what is to be proved, 2) why the proof argument is needed, 3) a summary of findings including the documents used, an analysis of each document used and how it fits in resolving the problem, and 4) a conclusion based on the analysis.

The following examples taken from actual applications are provided to demonstrate some of the ways potential problems can be overcome. The narratives used are in the format included with the source documents.

**1. A death certificate is incorrect in naming of the spouse and the parents of the decedent. The bloodline went through Emma Rixon and Mary Jane Cardinell. This proof summary was successfully used to support SAR, C.A.R. and Mayflower Society applications. Photocopies of the supporting documents were included with the packages.**

**PROBLEM**

The death certificate for Emmie E. Hoard, erroneously identifies her late husband as William H. Hoard, not George Hoard and her father as William Rexor, not William Rixon. Her mother is identified as Mary J. Cardenell.

**PROOF SUMMARY of relationship to mother, Mary Jane Cardinell [#5] and correct identification of husband and father.**

- **Emmie E. Hoard death certificate**, no. 31-00082, CA Dept. of Public Health (copy attached). – Summary of important points:  
Emmie E. Hoard, b. 17 April 1856 Canada, father William J Rexor (sic) b. Canada, mother Mary J Cardenell b. Canada, spouse “**late William H. Hoard**”, d. 24 January 1931 Sanger, CA (sic). The informant was W. H. Hoard of Sanger (Fresno Co.), California. He evidently put his name down as his father’s name.
- **George Hoard death certificate**, no. 14-017271, CA Dept. of Public Health (copy attached). – Summary of important points.  
George Hoard, b. 24 February 1850 Indiana, married, d. 21 June 1914 Sanger, CA. The informant was also W.H. Hoard of Sanger
- **1910 federal census**, population schedule, Fresno Co., CA taken 26 & 27 April 1910, 7<sup>th</sup> Ward, Fresno City, E.D. 48, sheet 7A, 855 Callisek St., dwelling 151, family 170 (NARA microfilm T624-75, Ancestry.com image 13 of 25). – Summary of important points.

George Hoard	60	head	[born] Indiana
Emma	53	wife	[born] Canada
William H.	32	son	[born] CA

This census shows that Emma Hoard was the wife of George Hoard and mother of William H. Hoard and not the spouse of the “late William H. Hoard” as stated on her death certificate. Her age and birthplace match the information on her death certificate.
- **Marriage license George Hoard to Emma Etta Lisette Rixon**, San Joaquin County Records Office – Summary of important points.  
Emma Etta Lecetta Rixon m. George Hoard 1 January 1877. The official performing the ceremony was her father William J. Rixon, Minister of the Gospel.
- **Obituary William John Rixon**, source unknown, copy found in Bruce Hoard family Bible in possession of Jim Faulkinbury, Sacramento, CA – Summary of important points.  
William John Rixon, b. 4 July 1826, m (1). Mary Jane Cardinell 12 October 1852 in Belleville, Canada. To first marriage, had a family of five daughters and one son, including Mrs. E. Hoard of Sanger. He moved from Canada to Michigan in 1865 and to California about 1873.
- **1870 federal census**, population schedule, Muskegon Co., MI taken 29 August 1870, Oceana, p. 349, dwelling 99, family 98 (NARA microfilm M593-692, Ancestry.com image 13 of 24) – Summary of important points.

Rixon William	43	[born] Canada
Mary	32	[born] Canada
Emma	14	[born] Canada
Hannah	12	[born] Canada
Minnie	7	[born] Canada

**2. The only direct source found to support a parent/child link in the bloodline is an undocumented family history. This proof summary was successfully used to support a SAR application. Photocopies of the supporting documents were included with the packages.**

**PROBLEM**

**The only source indicating that John Arndt Sletor is a son of John Sletor and Sarah Arndt is an undocumented family history written in 1922.**

**PROOF SUMMARY** showing that John Arndt Sletor is a son of John and Sarah (Arndt) Sletor.

- The book “Story of the Arndts” [copy of selected pages attached] by John Stover Arndt (Philadelphia: Christopher Sower Co., 1922) identifies John Arndt Sletor as one of four children of John Sletor and Sarah Arndt. Unfortunately, this book does not provide any documentation of the fact.
- A check of Northampton Co. Pennsylvania probate records, church records, and land records did not reveal any direct connection between John A. Sletor and John Sletor.
- John Slater is listed in the 1830 census of Northampton Co., Pennsylvania (p. 5, Easton) with two males of proper ages to be John A. and Thomas. This is the only Slater/Sletor family in Northampton Co. that year.
- The book “Some of the First Settlers of ‘The Forks of the Delaware’ and Their Descendants” [copies of selected pages attached], translated and published by Rev. Henry Martyn Kieffer (Easton, PA: 1902) records the baptisms and marriages in the First Reformed Church of Easton, Pennsylvania. The marriage of John Sletor to Sarah Arndt and the baptism of their daughter Mary Ann Sletor, born 26 January 1814, is recorded in this book.
- The DAR Record Copy No. 8847 [copy attached], filed by the granddaughter of John and Sarah (Arndt) Sletor in 1895 shows that Thomas Sletor was also a child of John and Sarah.
- The obituary for Thomas Sletor from the *Easton Weekly Argus* of 9 March 1883 [copy attached] states that he “took charge of the business of his father, John Sletor, who was then the proprietor of a hotel on the corner of Third and Lehigh streets”. This obituary indicates not only that Thomas Sletor was a son of John Sletor but also provides an indication of the property owned by the Sletor family.
- The obituary for John A. Sletor for the *Easton Weekly Argus* of 11 February 1874 [copy attached] does not indicate the name of his father but it does indicate that he was also the keeper of the hotel at Third and Lehigh.

The confirmation of the names of two of the children, Mary Ann and Thomas, named in the “Story of the Arndts” is made by direct evidence. The confirmation of John A. Sletor as a son is made by his connection to the hotel property at Third and Lehigh previously run by his father John Sletor, and his brother Thomas Sletor.

**3. Several undocumented sources may be used in conjunction with some documented sources to build a case for two generational links. Note the comments used to explain the rationale for consideration of sources #2 and #3. This proof summary was successfully used for SAR, CAR and Mayflower Society applications. Photocopies of the supporting documents were included with the packages.**

**PROOF SUMMARY of relationship to mother, Phoebe Richmond [#7] and grandparents, Sylvester and Jane (Bowerman) Richmond [#8].**

1. **“The Marriage Register 1803-1823 of Stephen Conger, J.P. Hallowell”** (Kingston, Ontario: Ontario Genealogical Society, nd) – Summary of important points.  
Entry 61) – James Cardinal of Hallowell married Deliah Darling of Hallowell on 11 Nov 1821. Hallowell is 2 miles from Picton on the Bay of Quinte.
2. **“The Posterity as near as we can ascertain of Ichabod Bowerman”** written by Levi Vincent Bowerman about 1904 and transcribed by his grandson Merton Yarwood Williams, PhD, copy provided by Seventh Town Historical Society, Marilyn Adams Genealogical Research Center, Ameliiasburg, Ont. [The original typescript is in the holdings of the Merton Yarwood Williams collection in the archives of the University of British Columbia where Dr. Williams (1883-1974) was one of the original faculty members and head of the Department of Geology and Geography. NOTE: The original record was written Levi Vincent Bowerman (1832-1910) to record his knowledge of the Bowerman family in the Bay of Quinte area. He was born and died in that area and knew many of the descendants listed in the “Posterity”. Some of the information came from the notes and journal made by his father, Vincent Bowerman (b. 1760)]. – Summary of important points  
p. 3 – Phoebe Richmond married John Darling and had children Sylvester, Delila, and William.
3. **Family data in 24 May 1981 letter from Carolyn Keyes Johnson, a granddaughter of Charity Rixon Gaines.** Carolyn lived with Charity Gaines who was the granddaughter of Delilah (Darling) Cardinell and had access to the stories and photographs that were passed from Delilah Cardinell to Charity Rixon Gaines. Charity took care of Delilah in her old age and recorded these notes from her grandmother. The family information passed down from Delilah indicates that her maiden name was Delilah Darling and she was married to James Cardinell on 11 November 1822 or 1823. She was born near Picton, Canada in May 1803. Her mother was a member of the Quaker sect and her father was a member of the Presbyterian Church. Her grandfather was named Sylvester Richmond and her mother, Phoebe Richmond, married John Darling.  
NOTE: This information came from Delilah (Darling) Cardinell, the daughter of John Darling, who would be reasonably assumed to know the names of her parents and grandparents.
4. **“Pioneer Life of the Bay of Quinte”** (Toronto: Rolph and Clark, Ltd, 1905) – Summary of important points.  
p. 131, Jane Bowerman m. Sylvester Richmond; settled in Hallowell and had children: (1) Sarah, (2) Job, (3) Cyrus, (4) Abigail, (5) Ichabod, (6) Phoebe, (7) Lydia, (8) John, (9) Jane, and (10) David.
5. **“Assessment of the Township of Hallowell for the Year 1808”** (Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records, Vol. 6, pp. 168-170 (Ontario Historical Society, 1905, downloaded from <http://my.tbaytel.net/bmartin/assessmt.htm>) – Summary of important points.  
John Darling is shown as the owner of 50 acres of cultivated land and 150 acres of uncultivated land. He is the only Darling entry in the Assessment.
6. **“Abstracts of Surrogate Court Wills, Kingston and Vicinity 1790-1858”**, comp. by Loral and Mildred Wanamaker (Kingston, Ont: Kingston Branch Ontario Genealogical Society, 1982) – Summary of important points.  
p. 30, will of Silvester Richmond dated 7 June 1802 indicates that Phoebe Richmond is one of his daughters.
7. **“Settlers of the Beekman Patent”**, Frank J. Doherty (Pleasant Valley, NY) – Summary of important points:  
Vol. I, p. 382, **Quakers and the Military** Sylvester Richmond is listed as a Quaker in the 1755 enrollment of Quakers for Dutchess Co. This matches the information passed down by Deliah Cardinell that her grandfather, Sylvester Richmond, and her mother, Pheobe (Richmond) Darling, were Quakers  
Vol. II, pp. 659, **The Bowerman Family** shows that Jane Bowerman married Sylvester Richmond and had a daughter Phebe.  
Vol. II, pp. 660, **The Bowerman Family** shows that Vincent Bowerman was a son of Thomas Bowerman (vii). This Vincent is the original source of the “Posterity of Ichabod Bowerman”.

The Beekman Patent was part of Dutchess Co., NY. Phoebe (Richmond) Darling was born in Dutchess Co., NY and according to her daughter, Deliah (Darling) Cardinell, was a Quaker.

**4. This is an analysis used on an SAR Supplemental, employing Civil War letters and later land records to prove an otherwise undocumented father-daughter relationship. Photocopies and transcriptions of two letters and the land records were provided.**

**The problem:**

No direct evidence has been found proving that Eliza, wife of James W. Moore, was the daughter of John M. Hankins.

**Analysis of letters and land records:**

The first letter, dated 24 Sep 1862, shows that J. W. Moore had a relationship with John M. Hankins, and that the relationship involved an Eliza. Four days later George Hankins addressed a letter to John M. Hankins and Family with 1) a salutation "Dear Father and Mother," and 2) a postscript "To E. J. W. Moore.....J. W. Moore," mentioning at the conclusion "Abba," the only child of Eliza and James Wesley Moore.

The significance to the short postscript is not only that E. J. W. Moore was related to John M. Hankins; it gives the earliest indication that Eliza Jane had another middle name. Eight years later, in the 1870 Fayette County census, she is listed as E. J. W., wife of J. W. Moore. Two years after that, when Martha Hankins sold part of her late husband's estate, Eliza signed the contract "Eliza W. Moore." Four years after that, she and her father's other heirs quitclaimed their interests in a tract of his land to Robert Price Hankins, and the official record lists one of the signatories as "E. J. W. Moore." In 1878 (Deed Book 4, p. 137), even more explicitly, she is recorded as Eliza J. W. Moore. Nevertheless, until the discovery of the September 28, 1862 letter, the signatures on the legal papers were assumed to have been by James Wesley Moore acting on behalf of Eliza, since few women of that era were allowed to execute legal documents -- their husbands had to act for them. This note would seem to indicate that not only did Eliza sign for herself at those later times, but also that, like several of her siblings, she had two middle names.

**1. Letter from J. W. Moore to John M. Hankins**

Chattanooga, Tennessee, September 24th, 1862

Mr. John M. Hankins,

Yesterday I wrote a letter to Eliza and it strikes me that I didn't date it, though if you get both letters you may know Eliza's was written and mailed one day sooner than this one. Some of the boys say that a letter will go sooner by not paying the postage. I am going to try the experiment. I paid postage on the one I wrote yesterday, and on this one I will not pay it and see which gets there first. The soldiers here are afraid to buy anything to eat outside of lines. The Union men have been guilty of poisoning soldiers through this country. The general talk here this morning is that we will get off from here in a day or two, though I think it very uncertain when we will leave this place. When we leave here we will go into Cold country. I have bought one linen shirt and one linen pair of drawers. They are both the best kind of linen. They both just cost four dollars. If I knew that I wouldn't lose any of my clothes I wouldn't need all of that linen that Eliza is fixing for me, but maybe she had better keep it till she hears from me again. Since I have been writing, M. C. Moore has stepped in to our tent. His crowd is gone and I thought he was gone, though he was taken down here with the chills and fever and has been in the hospital. He will leave here about the same time we do. Take good care of yourself and family. So nothing more this time. Only remains yours truly. Write soon and often if you can.

To John M. Hankins

J. W. Moore

**2. Letter from George A. B. Hankins to his parents, with postscript from J. W. Moore to E. J. W. Moore**

Knoxville, Tennessee, September 28th 1862

Dear Father & Mother,

I wrote you a letter and some time back. I sent it by Mr. Bobo. It was Lev Bobo. I also sent thirty dollars of money by him. Father, I sent twenty dollars to you and ten to mother. I have plenty of money here to answer my purposes I was sick when I wrote to you, though I have now gotten well I am in as good health as could be expected under all prevailing circumstances. We have gotten marching orders. We have to leave this place tomorrow morning. We have to march 250 miles up in Kentucky somewhere. I don't know where we will stop. I don't know when I will get to come home. Mother, I understand that you are fixing me some clothes. I don't need anything and won't in a long time. If anything should happen that I should need clothes, I will try to get to come after them. Well, buying me a cot -- I would advise you to not buy it unless you can get a good bargain. You are judge enough to know what to do. We can fix up about a horse when I get home I am in hopes that this thing will not last long. It is the opinion of most of the soldiers that it will wind up some time this winter. Sam Prichard sends you his best respects. Robert says he will write to you when we get stationed, and I will do the same. Franklin, you and Woody mustn't marry until I get home. Take good



care of your cots. I would like mighty well to see you all. You must write to me as soon and often as you can -- something more this time. Only remains yours as ever

G. B. Hankins To Jonn M. Hankins and Family

Eliza, you must get your father to see something about paying my tax. It will be a small amount. I am very sorry that I can't get a chance to send you some money but there is no chance now. I wrote to you yesterday. We have to start tomorrow on a long march, and I am afraid we will have to leave some of our things. Do the best you can. Yours as ever.

To E. J. W. Moore.....J. W. Moore

Tell Abba that I want to see her mighty bad.

Original letters in the possession of \_\_\_\_\_; transcription by \_\_\_\_\_, April 2004

**3. Sanford County Deed Record Vol. 1, p. 229, 24 Jun 1872:** Robert Hankins, Franklin Hankins, Caroline Taylor, Martha Taylor and **Eliza Moore, children and heirs of John Hankins, deceased**, give up rights to land mentioned on page 228 to William Woods (see notes for James Wesley Moore). Franklin and Martha could not sign their names. Witnesses - W. G. Bailey, P. M. Woods, T. B. Woods. Signed - Caroline Taylor, R. P. Hankins, Franklin (X) Hankins, Martha (X) Taylor, E. J. Moore.

**4. Sanford County Deed Record Vol. 1, p. 453, 15 May 1872:** Martha Hankins, Caroline Taylor, Robert P. Hankins, **Eliza W. Moore**, Franklin M. Hankins and Martha Taylor sold to Wm. G. Bailey for \$120 - the SWNE § 26, T14R15 - 40 acres. Signed by all six sellers.

**5. Sanford County Deed Record Vol. 3, p. 437, 4 Sep 1876:** deed between the heirs of John Miller Hankins and his son, Robert Price Hankins, ceding to R. P. Hankins the interests of all the other heirs of J. M. Hankins in a division of lands belonging to the estate, signed by **E. J. W. Moore**.

**6. Sanford County Deed Book 4, p. 137, 4 Jan 1878:** Franklin Hankins receives his share of his father's estate consisting of the NWNW § 25, T14R15. Signed - **Eliza J. W. Moore**, Martha Hankins (X), Martha E. Taylor (X), W. J. Taylor, J. Taylor (X), S. F. Taylor (X), M. A. Taylor (X), F. J. Taylor (X), E. E. Priddy, M. M. Johnson, R. P. Hankins. Witness - P. M. Woods

#### Cast of Principal Characters

**Abba:** Martha Abigail, Jun 1858 – 5 Sep 1938, daughter of Eliza Jane Wilmoth Hankins & James Wesley Moore;  
**Caroline Taylor:** Telitha Ann Caroline, 12/13/1827-, daughter of Martha Morton & John Miller Hankins, wife of Wm. B. Taylor;

**Eliza/E.J./E.J.W. Moore:** Eliza Jane Wilmoth, 27 May 1841 – 18 Mar 1914, daughter of Martha Morton & John Miller Hankins, wife of James Wesley Moore;

**Franklin Hankins:** Stephen Franklin, 19 Apr 1846 - , son of Martha Morton & John Miller Hankins;

**G. B. Hankins:** George A. Burton, 11/29/1843 – 7/20/1864, Co. K, 41st Alabama Infantry, son of Martha Morton & John Miller Hankins;

**J. W. Moore:** James Wesley Moore, 1 Apr 1829 – 5 Aug 1905, Co. K, 41<sup>st</sup> Alabama Infantry, husband of Eliza Hankins;

**John M. Hankins:** John Miller Hankins, c. 1807 – 25 Oct 1863, father-in-law of James Wesley Moore

**M. C. Moore:** Milton Craig, 8 Jan 1838 - , Co. K, 16<sup>th</sup> Alabama Infantry, brother of James Wesley Moore;

**Martha Hankins:** Martha Morton, 28 Jan 1810-20 Mar 1891, wife of John Miller Hankins;

**Martha Taylor:** Martha E., Oct 1851-, daughter of Martha Morton & John Miller Hankins, wife of John B. Taylor;

**R.P./Robert Hankins:** Robert Price, 17 Nov 1838 – 23 Feb 1916, Co. K, 41st Alabama Infantry, son of Martha Morton & John Miller Hankins

**Woody:** Woodvil Simpson, c. 1849 - , son of Martha Morton & John Miller Hankins;

**This is an example showing a proof argument to distinguish between persons of the same name.**

**Proof that the Mary Jenkins (gen. 4) who married William Henry Webb is the daughter of Lewis Jenkins (gen. 5).**

**Problem:** there are three contemporary Mary Jenkins who lived and married in Union Co. Ohio between 1856 and 1863.

**Evidence:**

- Marriage entry for William Webb to Mary Jenkins - Union Co., OH Marriage Book, Vol. A, 14 Sep 1856. The marriage was solemnized by Warret Owen, J.P.
- Marriage entry for B.P. Hildreth to Mary Jenkins – Union Co., OH Marriage Book, Vol. B, 19 Jul 1863. The marriage was solemnized by Moses Thompson, J.P.
- Marriage entry for Franklin Welch to Mary Jenkins – Union Co., OH Marriage Book, Vol. A, 5 Aug 1862. The marriage was solemnized by John Mitchell, J.P.
- 1850 census Millcreek Township, Union Co., OH, p. 283 lists a Mary Jenkins, age 12 as the daughter of Mary Jenkins and siblings, Jacob, Lewis, Erastus and Phebe A. Jenkins.
- 1860 census of Leesburgh Township, Union Co., OH, p. 32-33 lists a Mary Jenkins, age 19 as the daughter of John (50) and Nancy Jenkins 39). Also on page 33 is the family of William Hildreth with son B. Hildreth, age 30. This is the only B. Hildreth in the 1860 census of Union Co.
- The 1870 census of Leesburg Township, Union Co., OH, p. 103 lists the family of Benonie Hildreth (40) and wife Mary (29).
- The 1860 census of Millcreek Township, Union Co., OH, p. 8 lists the family of William Webb (30) and wife Mary (21). Two households away is the family of Mary Jenkins (51) with son Erastus and daughter Phebe A.
- The 1860 census of Union Township, Union Co. OH, p. 76 lists the family of another Jenkins (48) with wife Elizabeth (50) and daughter Mary (22).
- The 1870 census of Taylor Township, Union Co., OH, p. 198A lists the family of Franklin and Mary Welch (32).
- The 1860 census of Union Co., OH shows that Warret Owen, J.P. lived in Millcreek Township (p. 8), Moses Thompson, J.P. lived in Leesburg Township (p. 41), and John Mitchell, J.P. lived in Union Township (p. 145). These townships are in different areas of Union Co.
- Union Co., OH Administration Record of 28 Oct 1848 shows that Mary Jenkins relinquished her right of Administration to the estate of Lewis Jenkins and was granted guardianship of children Lewis, Mary, Erastus, and Phebe A. Jenkins. On 20 Nov 1849 she is named in the Administration Record as the widow of Lewis and the children are named as his.

**Conclusion:**

All three marriage records for a Mary Jenkins were solemnized by a J.P. who lived in different townships that correspond to the residences of one of the three Jenkins families with daughter Mary. The Mary Jenkins who married William Webb as well as the officiating J.P. lived in Millcreek Township and the 1860 census shows that William and Mary Webb lived two households away from Mary Jenkins who is listed in the probate records as widow of Lewis Jenkins. Lewis was the father of Mary (Jenkins) Webb.

**Genealogy Policy, Sec. 4.4000 allows indirect evidence in support of service. The following is an example of a proof argument using indirect evidence to establish patriotic service** through the signing of an Oath of Allegiance in the absence of any record of the oath.

Indirect proof that Matthew Busey (Gen. 6) performed patriotic service by swearing an Oath of Allegiance is established by the following:

- Chapter III, Sec. XXI of the Laws of North Carolina for 1778 which directs the taxing authority shall impose a three-fold or four-fold tax on those who refuse to take an Oath of Allegiance for religious or political reasons.
- The 1778 Tax List for Rowan County, North Carolina indicates that some residents of the county were taxed at the four-fold rate demonstrating that Rowan County was complying with the State Law.
- The 1778 Tax List for Rowan County, North Carolina shows that Matthew Busey was taxed at the standard rate.

It can thus be concluded that Matthew Busey sign an Oath of Allegiance although no record of those signed said oaths in Rowan County can be found.

## **Tips for Finding the Maiden Name**

When the bloodline goes through the mother, there must be evidence showing the maiden name which can often be found in birth, death, or marriage certificates. However this may not always be that easily found. The following suggestions are ways that the lack of a direct proof can be overcome:

- See if a deed listing the couple as grantor or grantee can be found that provides the maiden name of the wife.
- See if a probate record for the wife's supposed father, mother, or a sibling names her by her married name rather than her maiden name. If it is found in a sibling's probate, then proof of the sibling relationship must be also provided.
- See if the death record for a sibling provides the mother's maiden name. This would also require proof of the sibling relationship.
- See if a marriage record for a sibling provides the mother's maiden name. This would also require proof of the sibling relationship.
- See if an obituary or biographic sketch for a sibling mentions the maiden name of the mother. This would also require proof of the sibling relationship.

## **Examples of Acceptable and Insufficient Documentation**

The following pages provide some examples of both acceptable and unacceptable documentation.

Below is an example of a page from a professional journal. The editorial requirements of these journals (The American Genealogist, The New England Historical and Genealogical Register, The Genealogist, The National Genealogical Society Quarterly, and several others) are stringent regarding proper citation of facts. Articles on families found in these publications are well researched and documented and thus usually acceptable proof for lineages in a SAR application. Be sure to include the title page and table of contents.

110 *The American Genealogist* [April  
 [hereafter *Gloc. TC Recs.*], 1:5 [Glocester Town Hall].  
 John's first wife is unknown. He married secondly at Glocester on 6 June 1749, ALICE READ (Glocester BMD, 31). The fact that there was no mention of a widow in the settling of John's estate, when ordinarily the widow would have had the first right of administration, leads to the conclusion that she had predeceased her husband. That John had an earlier wife is shown by the guardianship of his son John Callum, an "infant" who on 17 September 1754 nominated Lt. John Ross to be his guardian, indicating that he was above the age of fourteen (*Gloc. TC Recs.*, 1:5). Thus, he was born between 1733 and 1740.

Children of John's Callum, all with 1st wife:

i (prob.) SARAH<sup>4</sup> CALLUM, m. Providence, R.I., 14 Dec. 1743, as his 3d wife. PETER<sup>4</sup> TEFFI, b. Kingston, R.I., 19 Dec. 1699, son of Peter<sup>3</sup> Teffi (*Samm<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>*) and Mary (—); resided at Smithfield, R.I., Gorton, Conn., and Providence, R.I. (Rev. C.H.W. Stocking, *Teffi Ancestry* [Chicago, 1904], 15). He d. Smithfield bet. 27 March 1775 and 2 Sept. 1779; the dates that his will was executed and proved. This document mentions his wife Sarah, sons Samuel, Peter, David, William, Daniel, James and John Teffi, and dau. Abigail Corey, Sarah Randall, Jemima Handey, Jerusha Bishop and Mary Teffi (several of these children were by Peter's 1st 2 wives) (*R.I. Gen. Reg.* 172d ed., 1986:217).

Children of Peter and Sarah<sup>4</sup> (Callum) Teffi, b. Providence, R.I. (Arnold's *VR*, 2:249):

- 1 John Teffi, b. 13 Sept. 1744; m. Smithfield 29 Oct. 1762 Mary Mathewson of Glocester, R.I. (Arnold's *VR*, 3:74).
- 2 Sarah Teffi, b. 4 Feb. 1746; m. by 1775 — Randall.
- 3 Jemima Teffi, b. 18 Jan. 1749; m. (m.) Uxbridge, Mass., 4 Feb. 1764 Ebenezer Handy (*VR*, 2:55).
- 4 Jemima Teffi, b. 3 March 1762; m. Smithfield 16 April 1769 Thomas Bishop (Arnold's *VR*, 3:74).

ii (prob.) MARY CALLUM, m. Glocester, R.I., 28 Feb. 1745 GEORGE<sup>4</sup> BUMPUUS (Arnold's *VR*, 3:11), b. Rochester, Mass., 16 Dec. 1717 (*VR*, 1:62), d. Fishkill, N.Y., bet. 1790 and 1800 censuses, son of Jacob<sup>3</sup> Bumpus (*Gloc<sup>2</sup>, Edward<sup>1</sup>*) and Catherine (Aldridge) (Mrs. John E. Barclay, "The Bumpus Family of New England," *TAG* 43[1967]:75).

iii JOHN CALLUM, b. ca. 1733-40, d. by 1759 when the inventory of his estate was presented; m. MARY —. He was a soldier in Capt. Ebenezer Jenckes's company in 1758 (Howard M. Chapin, *A List of Rhode Island Soldiers and Sailors in the Old French and Indian War, 1755-1762* [Providence, 1928], 46) and was called "deceased" in the 23 Jan. 1759 accounting of Capt. Jenckes' (*Nine Rhode Island Muster Rolls Enlisted During the Old French War* [Providence, 1915], 29). The administration of his estate, granted to his widow Mary Callum on 7 April 1759, reads: "Whereas John Callum of Glocester, . . . who was the last summer a soldier in his majesties Rhode Island Regiment who died intestate: and left some personal estate. . ." (*Gloc. TC Recs.*, 1731-1784, 1:30). The fact that he served as a soldier in 1758 fits our supposition that he was born between 1733 and 1740. His widow was prob. the Mary Callum of Glocester who m. there 29

1995] *The Callum Family of Mass. and R.I.* 111  
 March 1762, Stephen Ballou of Smithfield (Arnold's *VR*, 7:8).  
 Child of John<sup>4</sup> and Mary (—) Callum:  
 1 Hespereth<sup>5</sup> Callum, called "of John of Glocester" when she m. Wettersfield, Conn., 2 Aug. 1786 Abraham Herenden "of Obadiah of Adams-town, Massachusetts" ("Records of Old Smithfield," *Norragenzer Historical Register* 4[1885-86]:260). In June 1761, David Salisbury of Glocester, husbandman, brought a suit against Hespereth "Collum" of Glocester, an infant and heir at law to John Collum, late of Glocester. Hespereth defaulted. The execution of the judgment for £60 was made by attaching about 25 acres of land set forth "by the mother and by attaching of the within named Hespereth Collum to be sold as the law directs." (Providence Co. Court of Common Pleas, 4:451 [R.I. Judicial Archives, Pawtucket].)

iv (prob.) JEMIMA CALLUM, m. Smithfield 26 March 1749 WILLIAM FORD (Smithfield Book of VRS, 1:69 [City Hall, Central Falls, R.I.]); resided at Smithfield and Scituate, R.I., bet. her husband removed to Grafton, N.H. She may have d. bet. 5 May 1778 when she, with her husband, signed by mark a deed, conveying land at Scituate to Jeremiah Andrews, and 9 Feb. 1779, when she failed to acknowledge her mark (Scituate Land Evidence, 7:142). Her relationship to John Callum is suggested by William Ford's participation as administrator in the estate of John Callum.

Children of William and Jemima<sup>4</sup> (Callum) Ford, b. Smithfield, R.I. (Smithfield *VRs*, 1:69 [Smithfield Town Hall]):

- 1 William Ford, b. 12 Sept. 1749; m. Keziah Blackman ("Ford, Marston, Martin & Allied Families" [Bible rec. copied by Rumford Chap. DAR], N.H. Hist. Soc., Concord).
- 2 Jean Ford, b. 2 Nov. 1750.
- 3 Zadok Ford, b. 21 Sept. 1752.
- 4 Richard Ford, b. 13 Dec. 1753; m. Sarah Kimball (Rev. War Pension #S22246).
- 5 Joseph Ford, b. 18 Aug. 1755; m. Foster, R.I., 11 Nov. 1787 Olive Irons (*VRs*, 1:56 [Foster Town Hall]).
- 6 Anne Ford, b. 21 April 1757.
- 7 Beersheba Ford, b. 25 Nov. 1758.
- 8 Prudence Ford, b. 8 Jan. 1763; m. Aaron Barney Jr. (Eugene Dimon Preston, *Genealogy of the Barney Family in America* [n.p., 1990], 153).

(concluded)

We are grateful to Janet Ireland Delorey of Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, for her research and assistance in the preparation of this article.

CORRECTION: The first installment of this article (7[1995]:5, line 1) states that John<sup>2</sup> Callum was born in Salem; he was, in fact, born in Lynn.

David Curtis Dearborn (1514 Beacon St., #35, Brookline MA 02146) is head reference librarian at the NIEHGS. William Ford Larson (4205 Woodbridge Rd., Peabody MA 01960) is a computer systems director at John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company.

The following two pages show an example of a well documented family history which meets the proof requirements of the NSSAR. The footnotes and/or transcripts of primary documents show the sources used to compile the lineage. Only the pages that establish the blood line in the SAR lineage are needed. The title page of the family history is also required in the document submission.

## THE HALL FAMILY OF KENTUCKY AND TEXAS

In the late 1920's or early 1930's, an elderly woman wrote to her daughter about her people: "George Hall was a full-blooded Englishman from Birkenhead, Cheshire, England; came in the early days and settled in Pennsylvania, then to Kentucky. His wife was a Ruble. They had one son, Jesse, who was my grandfather."

These intriguing writings contain errors, but enough truth was present to set off an extensive search for "George Hall, the Englishman." That the Halls came from England no doubt is true, but it is known that another Hall, not George, married a Ruble. Further, there is reason to believe that the Halls may have settled either in North Carolina or Virginia - possibly from Pennsylvania - before moving on to Kentucky. The name "George" is extremely rare among this branch of the family of Hall.

1 David HALL is the earliest HALL about which anything is known for certain, and in the census of 1880, in Breckinridge Co, KY, his oldest daughter stated that her father was born in North Carolina. At the time of this census, however, she was noted as suffering from "nervous insanity" and it is possible that someone else answered the census for her. David's other daughter stated in the same census that he was born in Virginia; however, she has not been identified beyond all doubt as actually being his daughter. He first appears on the tax lists of Mercer County as David "Hale" in the summer of 1800.

According to the various censuses, David was born between 1775 and 1779.<sup>1</sup>

David HALL, and a neighbor, John HUNGATE, executed a bond for his marriage to the widow Elizabeth (Ruble) HALE in Mercer County, Kentucky, on 22 December 1800<sup>2</sup>, and they were married in Washington County, Kentucky, just across the Washington/Mercer County line, on 24 December 1800. Elizabeth, who is thought to have been born about 1767, in Henry County, Virginia, was married on 16 January 1789, in Franklin County, Virginia, to Armstrong HALE, son of Thomas HALE<sup>3</sup> and Jane ARMSTRONG.<sup>4</sup> They moved to Kentucky around 1795, and appear on the tax roll of Madison County in 1796, before moving on to Mercer County in 1797. Armstrong was related to the HALEs who had come to Mercer County from Botetourt County, Virginia, about 1785. On 22 May 1798, Armstrong HALE purchased 125 acres of land on the waters of Deep Creek, Mercer County, for £130. This land was part of a survey made in the name of Joseph Willis, and patented in the name of Christopher Lillard.<sup>5</sup> Since this will be the home for David and Betsy for the next twelve years, it is worthwhile to quote the exact description as listed in the deed:

---

<sup>1</sup>1810 US Census of Mercer Co, KY, p.313, & 1820 Census of Ohio Co, KY, show David as being between 26-45 years of age; 1830 US Census of Ohio Co, KY, lists him as being between 50-60 years of age. He died before 1840.

<sup>2</sup>Marriage Bond Box 3, Office of the County Clerk, Mercer Co, KY.

<sup>3</sup>Court Order Book 1, 1786-1789, p.169, Office of the County Clerk, Franklin Co, VA.

<sup>4</sup>Katherine Cooper, Paducah, KY, letter to author dated 27 Aug 1984.

<sup>5</sup>"Deed from Samuel Peter and Mary to Armstrong Hale," Deed Book #3, p. 450, Office of the County Clerk, Mercer Co, KY. Extract provided the author by Rudelle Mills Davis, El Paso, TX.

*Indenture between Samuel Peter & Mary of Washington Co and Armstrong Hale of Mercer County. For £130.0.0 a tract containing 125 acres in Mercer County on "Deep Creek which is the waters of Chaplin", it being part of a survey of 400 acres patented in the name of Christopher Lillard and part of a survey made in the name of Joseph Willis and of the lower or north end of said Lillard survey and of the upper or south end of said Willis survey and bounded as followeth, to wit: Beginning at 2 beech trees and sugar tree on the bank of Deep Creek and running thence south 63 degrees east 40 poles to a small ash dogwood & sugar tree in the original line & with the same. North 30 degrees east 144 poles to an elm & sugar tree thence North 60 degrees west 60 poles to a poplar or beech tree in the field. Thence North 82 degrees west 52 poles to a hickory & redbud. Thence South 45 degrees west 40 poles to an ash and redbud. Thence North 60 degrees west 64 poles to a sugar tree & white oak in the original line and with the same South 30 degrees west seven poles to a hickory & sugar tree, thence (along?) the original line south 27 degrees east 109 poles to two beech trees on the bank of a branch, thence down the branch and binding thereon 64 poles crossing the creek to the beginning.*

Armstrong HALE died in October 1799,<sup>1</sup> in Mercer County, and settlement of his estate showed that he and Betsy had the following children: Caleb, Josiah, Jehu, Jane and Armstrong, Jr. They became David HALL's step-children.<sup>2</sup> Appraisal of Armstrong's estate showed that he was a farmer who owned eight sheep, 21 hogs, nine cows and various farm implements.<sup>3</sup> Armstrong's estate also contained three slaves; Bob, Betty and Phily (female). Armstrong, Jr. was born in 1799, and died in Meade County, Kentucky, in 1859. Jane HALE married Jabez LEWELLEN and lived in Ohio County, Kentucky. It has been speculated that Elizabeth, David's wife, died in Askins, Ohio County, Kentucky, on 12 November 1829; she does not appear with David in the census of 1830, and certainly died prior to 1830, in Ohio County.

Elizabeth (Ruble) HALL was the granddaughter of Ulrick RUBLE (or RUBEL) and the daughter of Captain Owen RUBLE. On her mother's side, she was the great granddaughter of William HOGE of Virginia, and the granddaughter of Margaret (Hoge) WHITE.

In Mercer County, Kentucky, there is the following Marriage Bond furnished by David HALL when he married the widow Elizabeth "Betsy" HALE:<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Deed Book #2, p. 148, Office of the County Clerk, Mercer Co, KY.

<sup>2</sup>Deed Book #7, p. 161, 4 Sep 1809, Office of the County Clerk, Mercer Co, KY

<sup>3</sup>"Will of Armstrong Hale," WB 2 p. 151, Office of the County Clerk, Mercer Co, KY, Nov 1799

<sup>4</sup>"David Hall marriage bond to Betsy Hale, 22 Dec 1800," Marriage Bond Box 3, Office of the County Clerk, Mercer Co, KY, photocopy owned by the author.

This is an example of a page from the typical family history which does not meet the proof requirements of the NSSAR. The lineage lists names, dates, and places but fails to provide any sources for where this information was obtained. It is unknown if this was merely hearsay or based on real evidence. Family histories such as this can provide clues from which better documentation can be obtained to accompany an application but this type of documentation is not sufficient for approval of an SAR application.

*Seventh Generation.*

245

CHILDREN BY FIRST MARRIAGE :

- 3926. CAROLINE A.<sup>8</sup>, born April 24, 1819; unmarried; resided in Norton, Mass., in 1860.
- + 3927. ALEXANDER K.<sup>8</sup>, born Dec. 14, 1821; married *Elizabeth A. Perry*.
- 3928. OLIVE<sup>8</sup>, born Jan., 1823; died Oct., 1825.

CHILD BY SECOND MARRIAGE :

- 3929. HEPTZIBAH<sup>8</sup>, born Dec. 10, 1833; died Dec. 20, 1833.

**1564. OLIVE RICHMOND**<sup>7</sup> (George<sup>6</sup>, Gershom<sup>5</sup>, Josiah<sup>4</sup>, Edward<sup>3</sup>, John<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>) was born in Middleboro, Mass., February 21, 1790, and died in Norton, May 2, 1863. She married, February 26, 1818, Jonathan, son of Joseph and Mehitable Redding of Raynham; he was born September 1, 1793, and died January 22, 1833.

CHILDREN :

- 3930. OLIVE REDDING<sup>8</sup>, born June 27, 1819; married, May 22, 1845, *Joseph*, son of *Edward* and *Mary Adams*; he was born June 26, 1819.
- 3931. JONATHAN REDDING<sup>8</sup>, born Feb. 5, 1823; married, Sept. 14, 1845, *Ann M.*, daughter of *Henry* and *Ann Mitchell* of Bridgewater; she was born Oct., 1826. Children: *Adeline A.*<sup>9</sup>, born March, 1849; *Edwin Lewis*<sup>9</sup>, born Feb., 1851.

**1565. BETSEY RICHMOND**<sup>7</sup> (George<sup>6</sup>, Gershom<sup>5</sup>, Josiah<sup>4</sup>, Edward<sup>3</sup>, John<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>) was born in Middleboro, Mass., June, 1793, and died in Rehoboth, June 27, 1833. She married, August, 1813, Sylvester, son of John and Hepzibeth Thayer of Taunton.

CHILDREN :

- 3932. ELIZA T. THAYER<sup>8</sup>, died in Taunton, July, 1843.
- 3933. NANCY THAYER<sup>8</sup>, born May 26, 1819.

**1566. ROSANNA RICHMOND**<sup>7</sup> (George<sup>6</sup>, Gershom<sup>5</sup>, Josiah<sup>4</sup>, Edward<sup>3</sup>, John<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>) was born in Middleboro, Mass., 1794, and died February 3, 1854. She married (banns published May 25, 1816) William, son of David and Silence Harvey of Taunton; he was born June 27, 1792, and died February 4, 1838, in Taunton.

CHILDREN :

- 3934. ELMIRA HARVEY<sup>8</sup>, born April 11, 1818; died in May, 1818.
- 3935. WILLIAM HARVEY<sup>8</sup>, born May 12, 1819; married *Betbiab*, daughter of *Elijab* and *Lucinda Leonard*; he was born April 21, 1814. Children: *Rosanna*<sup>9</sup>, born June 11, 1824, died Sept. 11, 1826; *Caroline*<sup>9</sup>, died Jan. 19, 1849; *George S.*<sup>9</sup>, born Aug. 2, 1833, married, Feb. 28, 1854, *Ellen M. Sinclair*, and had *Walter C.*<sup>10</sup>, born Dec. 9, 1855.

**1567. PHEBE RICHMOND**<sup>7</sup> (George<sup>6</sup>, Gershom<sup>5</sup>, Josiah<sup>4</sup>, Edward<sup>3</sup>, John<sup>2</sup>, John<sup>1</sup>) was born in Norton, Mass., August 13, 1798, and died in Attleboro, July 17, 1856. She married, October 15, 1820, Abiathar, son of Abiathar and Betsey Thayer of Attleboro. He was born May 31, 1796.

CHILDREN :

- 3936. HORACE A. THAYER<sup>8</sup>, born Oct. 23, 1824; married, May 27, 1848, *Abby R.*, daughter of *Noah* and *Rosanna Blanding*; she was born March 5, 1826. Child: *Anne F.*<sup>9</sup>, born Jan. 22, 1849.
- 3937. PHEBE ANN THAYER<sup>8</sup>, born June 23, 1833; married, Dec. 28, 1856, *James B.*, son of *Gilbert Hewitt* of Taunton.



# Pended Applications

The Genealogy Staff may pend an application if the documentation submitted is not sufficient to prove the lineage and/or service. If the application is pended, the applicant may submit additional documentation to establish the lineage or may use another patriot to qualify for SAR membership. If neither course is taken, the application may be withdrawn by the applicant or after a period set in policy. After the period set in policy, the application will be returned to the State Society or destroyed unless an exception has been granted by the Genealogist General.

The Genealogy Staff may also pend an application if there is a serious administrative problem with the application such as dates entered in to form 10/10/1900. Staff will notify the state point of contact regarding the problem(s) must be resolved before the application can be approved.

If additional documentation is provided to resolve the questions for which the application was pended, and it is less than five (5) pages, that information can be submitted, via the State Society Point of Contact, as an email attachment. If the additional documentation is more than five (5) pages, it must be mailed by the Point of Contact. The POC should address the additional documentation to the NSSAR with attention to the Genealogist Staff member who pended the application and a cover letter providing the ACN# of the pended application.

If the applicant chooses to use another patriot ancestor, approval of the revised application closes the transaction. For new member applications, a maximum of two changes of the Patriot ancestor used for an application are permitted without payment of an additional application fee. The replacement application and documentation should be mailed by the POC, also using a cover letter explaining that the application is a replacement to the pended ACN#, and sent to the NSSAR with attention to the Genealogist Staff member who pended the application. If additional information is subsequently found that proves the initial pended line, the applicant may submit a supplemental application as a totally separate transaction as though he had not filed an application on that patriot previously.

Since additional fees are not included, the additional material or replacement applications should NOT be sent with a transmittal form. They should only be sent with a cover letter referencing the applicant's name and the ACN#. Additional or replacement material should NOT be sent in the same package with new or supplemental applications which require a transmittal form. It is recommended that documents associated with separate applications be sent in separate envelopes within a larger envelope.

# Appeals

The Genealogy staff may pend an application based on one or more of the following adverse decisions:

- denying that a particular service of the patriot has been proven
- denying that a particular name on the application has been proven, usually a spouse not in the bloodline of descent from the patriot to the applicant
- denying that a date or place of birth, death, or marriage has been proven.

A state registrar has the right request that the Genealogist General review an adverse decision or decisions made by the Genealogy Department staff. See the Genealogy Policy, Sec. 6.5005 for information regarding the process.

An applicant, state registrar, state genealogist, or state president has the right to appeal an adverse decision of the Genealogist General under the provisions of Bylaw 9. The process is described in by the Genealogy Policy, Sec. 6.5000.

## Frequently Asked Questions

Q: How many copies of the application are needed on the watermarked SAR Paper?

A: The NSSAR Genealogy Staff only requires one copy. However, several State Societies may require a second copy for their records. Check with your State Registrar or Genealogist for the number needed by your State Society.

Q: If I have problems, which SAR genealogist should I phone or e-mail.

A: Contacts with the SAR genealogy staff are limited to your state's state point of contact. You should contact him with your questions. In most cases, he will be able to answer your questions. If not, he can contact the genealogy staff and get the answer back to you. Direct contact by the applicant or sponsor with the Genealogy Staff member is permitted when initiated by the Genealogy Staff member.

Q: If I wish to correct an already approved application, what is the process?

A: The Genealogy Staff considers any additional documentation submitted for any reason. If it is submitted to correct a file, it is compared to the earlier documentation to assess which is stronger (primary documentation is usually given more credibility than secondary sources). If the new documentation is found to be credible, changes/corrections/additions/deletions are made directly on the area of the approved application where applicable as deemed valid. If the previously approved application is assessed to be incorrect in the lineage or service based on the new information, it is marked accordingly and so is its corresponding documentation.

## Changes to Previous Version

### 6 March 2015

#### **Modified:**

- p. 5 – added sources for proof of service
- p. 7, “Form Requirements” – applicant’s birth certificate
- p. 15. Documents in a foreign language
- p. 21 – revised policy on use of older SAR, DAR, and C.A.R. Record Copies
- pp. 45-57 with examples of DAR Record Copies removed.

### 10 April 2015

#### **Modified**

- p. 21 removed SAR Record Copies from revised policy explanation.

### 1 June 2015

#### **Modified**

- p. 2 added statement that Registrars may make pen and ink corrections on applications to show inclusion of more information or documentation.
- p. 13 modified explanation regarding DAR and C.A.R. Record Copies.
- p. 14 removed statement regarding acceptability of DAR Short Forms.

### 22 November 2015

#### **Modified**

- Replaced references to previous genealogy policies replaced by the most recent consolidated Genealogy Policy.
- p. 26 – added information regarding expedited processing of applications.
- p. 45 – additional information regarding reasons for staff pending of applications.
- p. 46 – additional information regarding the appeal process.

### 26 February 2016

- p. 7 & p. 9 – criteria regarding possible adoptions.

### 20 January 2018

#### **Modified**

- p. 4 – description of direct evidence.
- p. 5 – proof of Service.
- p. 7 – application form requirements regarding paper and entry of unsupported information.
- p. 17 – DNA evidence.
- p. 27 – Family Plan applications per change to Bylaw 22 Fees and Dues.
- p. 27 – added C.A.R. applications in support of Jr. Member applications.
- p. 44 – return or destruction of pended applications after period set in policy.

**12 October 2020**  
**Modified**

- **p.20ff – DNA Section completely updated**