

Addenda

Something I did not address in my book (*Some Research Notes*, 7th ed.) that's worthy of serious attention from anyone doing Arterburn genealogy is a closer look at the anomalous households of Peter and William in the 1775 and 1785 Dunmore/Shenandoah County censuses, as compared to their families of record that we know from *The Arterburn Cousins*.

The following family lists are taken from *The Arterburn Cousins*—I refer to these afterward as the “families of record.” The dividing line indicates those children born BEFORE and AFTER the census of 1775:

Peter & Sarah (total family size: 9):

1. Jemima (1766)
2. Elizabeth (1768)
3. John (1770)
4. James (1771)
5. Henry (1773)
6. Sarah (1774)

7. Jacob (1780)

William & Nancy (total family size: 10):

1. Elijah (1770)
2. Samuel (1771)

3. Lydia (1774)

4. Mary (1777)

5. Presley (1778)

6. Elizabeth (1779)

7. William (1780)

8. Sarah (1781)

John Netherton's census of Dunmore County's military district #3, in 1775 (cf. Brumbaugh, 1935), shows the following (W = White):

<u>Head of household</u>	<u>Males under 16</u>	<u>Females</u> (age not listed)
Peter Arterburn 1W	3W	7W

According to Netherton's census, both of Peter's sons, John and James are accounted for, but we have 1W male under 16 unaccounted for—in comparison to the family of record. All of Peter's 4 known daughters show up by 1775, but we are left with 2 females, ages unknown, unaccounted for—after allowing that one of the 7 would have been Sarah. Total household size, including Peter & Sarah, was 11, in the 1775 census.

In 1785, John Netherton compiled another census in conjunction with the tax list of residents along a stretch of the upper South River (cf. Wayland, 1927). In this census, enumerations included name of head of household as before, but only the total number of both sexes combined, ages not listed, in the household, along with a count of dwellings and other out-buildings. Wayland's transcription of this census notes that the family group count did not include the head of household:

<u>Head of Household</u>	<u>White Souls</u>	<u>Dwellings</u>	<u>Other Buildings</u>
Arterbern, Peter	13	1	--

The number in Peter's household, in 1785, now totals 14, including Peter, or 3 more than in the 1775 census, and 5 more than the known family of record (7 + 2).

Now, a look at William Arterburn's household in these two censuses—first, from 1775:

<u>Head of household</u>	<u>Males under 16</u>	<u>Females</u> (age not listed)
Wm. Arterburn 1W	4W	1W

William's 2 sons, Elijah and Samuel, are here accounted for, but 2 additional males under 16 are also recorded. Lydia, the only daughter of record born by 1775, does not appear. The 1 female listed must have been William's wife, Nancy. Thus, in this census William's family totaled 6, in 1775 (including William & Nancy). According to our dates of the family of record, William's family totaled 5 (including William & Nancy), by 1775.

In the 1785 census, we find the following for William's family:

<u>Head of Household</u>	<u>White Souls</u>	<u>Dwellings</u>	<u>Other Buildings</u>
Arterbon, William	9	--	--

William's family of record, by 1785, amounted to 10 (including William & Nancy). In Netherton's 1785 census, all 10 in the family of record can be accounted for, since head of household was counted separately (1 + 9). No real mystery here, unless William & Nancy had two additional sons that failed to survive to manhood, born before 1775. The alternative would seem to be a discrepancy for dates of birth for some of William's children, as assigned by *The Arterburn Cousins*. The 1775 census seems to indicate that all 4 of William's sons may have been born by or before 1775, and that his daughters were born after 1775.

But in the family of Peter & Sarah, we do have a mystery. Who were these additional 5 unaccounted for family members (1785) in Peter's family?

Some possibilities for the 1 unaccounted for male (1775):

1. In the 1775 census, the extra male (under 16) might have been "Henry," who could actually have been a male child. "Harry/Hany" (e.g., Hanna, Hanne) who married Robert Abbitt in 1790 might have been one of the unaccounted for females. If so, Henry might not have survived to manhood, and thus we would have no other public record of him.
2. The extra male child might have been Jacob, whose family of record birth date (1780) could be wrong.
3. The extra male child could have been an unknown son (not Henry or Jacob) of Peter & Sarah that did not survive to manhood.
4. The extra male child in 1775 could have resulted from a blended family—Sarah could have been a widow with children from a previous marriage. If so, he may not have survived to manhood, or could have married under a different surname, or have moved away. In Shenandoah County, there were no tithable males (over 16) in Peter's household other than Peter in the 1783 tax list or 1787 tax list, and no other Arterburns listed other than William.

Some possibilities for the 2-3 unaccounted for females in Peter's household (1775):

1. Even if "Henry" was female, we are still left with 2 unaccounted for females, in 1775.
2. The 2-3 unaccounted for females in 1775 could have been other children born to Peter & Sarah. One or more may not have survived, or may have remained spinsters and never married, or could have married under heretofore unrecognized surname spellings,*** or have married in another county.
3. The 2-3 unaccounted for females in 1775 could have included one or more daughters from Peter's first marriage (before 1737). If so, one or more may have remained spinsters and never married, or could have married under heretofore unrecognized surname spellings,*** or have married in another county.
4. The 2-3 unaccounted for females in 1775 could have resulted from a blended family—Sarah could have been a widow with children from a previous marriage. One or more may have remained spinsters and never married, or could have married under heretofore unrecognized surname spellings,*** or have married in another county.
5. One of these females might possibly have been Sarah's mother, especially since we don't know Sarah's age or anything about her family.
6. One or more might have been other relatives, although we have no real clues of an extended family other than that of William.

By 1785, Peter & Sarah's household shows a total of 5 extra family members—male and/or female, compared to the family of record, all of which are probably to be explained by some combination of the above.

***(e.g., Susannah Alterfer m. James Harris, in 1781—see Wayland, 1927)