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Memo on Lucy Hunk's Marriage License:

Took up with Dr. Warren at Fort Wayne the question of the word "doy" or "day" in the original. The attached notes explain his position. I ask him if he has any knowledge of the whereabouts of the original document. He said at once, "Yes, that they are in the Barton collection in the Harper Memorial Library of the Chicago University." That institution having acquired the Barton collection recently.

He says that both Bartlett and Paul Angle have seen it and told him of its presence there. He says that after Barton's book appeared that he went to the clerk there, which he said he had lent Dr. Barton sometime before but never opened since it had been returned, but the license was in the backing. They examined it and found it was not there. Warren says that he tried to find some clue where it was - if he had returned - but he never could get an answer.

It was agreed that I should see the director of the library in Chicago, ask him for a look at the document, also ask him if there would be any objections of my getting a handwriting expert for examination.

When I went to Chicago I did this. The accompanying notes is the result of my visit.
"prefix" I observe before the letter "d" three downward strokes slanted at about the same degree as the downward strokes of the letters in the body of the certificate and of about the same length. I observe approaching the top of the first downward a lighter line, also a lighter line leaving the bottom of the third stroke and joining the letter "d" about midway of the lower part of the letter. Where this line joins the letter there is a slight shaded place in the line which shows the joining of two lines. Even fainter still I see upward strokes leaving the bottom of both downward strokes one and two.

"dey" The word day is written in two different places in the certificate, and in each instance there is the natural downward stroke after the completion of the enclosed portion, as there is in all the other letter "n". That the second letter in this word is "o" cannot be disputed if it is compared with the other letter "o"s. It does not appear to me that the word is "day" but "dey".

"day"- usage I have looked through hundreds of old papers dated in various ways but I have yet to find one using the form "April 36th day 1790". The most common form at that early date was "This 36 day of April 1790", or "36th April 1790", "or just "April 36, 1790". I cannot think Lucy intended to write "Given under my hand this day April 36th day 1790."

"day"- position The most convincing evidence against the word if it were "day" would be its unnatural position. If it were an afterthought it would have either been placed after "Th." or between "36" and "1790" at a point on the line below. There is no occasion for placing it between "April" and "36".

"wido" If the word is not "day" but "wido" it can mean nothing by itself. But it is something and it was written to represent something. It cannot be related to Robert because of a higher position but the sequence would be correct with the following and lower word Lucy. In the upward flourish in closing the "y" in "wido" there is a general direction which would allow the writer to begin the "L" in Lucy with the same flourish of the hand. Admitting the prefix "wi" the word is easily connected with the signature.

"objections" (1) "y" is not "w" but it is not a serious violation of euphony, as associated with the word widow in pioneer days. (2) "Dimness of letters" Lucy had finished writing the certificate and date, she then hesitated to make some inquiry about the signature. She was using a goose quill pen. She wrote the first two letters of her signature beginning Widow and found the ink about gone so dipped her pen and started with the letter "d".

"Lucy Hanks" There is no documentary proof that she was not a widow and many well established traditions that she was.