

564 Woodline Ave.

Warren, Ohio

June 11, 1928

Miss Ida M. Tarbell
120 East Ninetieth St.
New York City

My dear Miss Tarbell:-

Your letter of May 23rd was duly received. I have been very busy, else it would have been answered ere this, I assure you.

Of course you know that our brave and generous friend, Souie Dean White, is at home in Brookline again after a most trying seven-week flight from her beloved "Aesch". She did not find Lucy Shipley, but her findings have added much to the chain of evidence that such a person really existed; and, judging from a similarity of given names, there is much reason to believe that Robert³ Shipley - b. 1713 -, son of Robert² and Elizabeth, was he who appeared in Sumner Co., Va., in 1768, and who fathered Sarah Shipley-Mitchell, Rachel Shipley-Berry, and, possibly, Lucy Shipley-Hanks-Sparrow. It would seem, too, that Robert's³ sister Ruth³ - b. 1715 - was the wife of William⁴ Hanks - b. 1707 -, the son of Peter³ and Mary Bees Hanks.

I am, sorry to say, beginning to doubt Mrs. Hofmann's claim that William⁴ and Ruth Hanks had two other sons - John and Joseph - besides William⁵ - b. 1739. In all my digging I have never unearthed the least evidence of their ever having existed as citizens of Maryland and brothers of William. Of course John Hanks of Shenandoah Co., Va., and Joseph Hanks of Hampshire Co., Va., may prove to have been brothers of William, but just now there is nothing to prove who these two men were or where they came from. I feel sure that Mrs. Hofmann has only tradition to stand upon, for in all my correspondence with her (and I have written many) she has never quoted a record of them - only "it is said." Mrs. White found no evidence of them in Maryland, either, although she did find records supplementing and verifying all of Mrs. Hofmann's quoted records of William⁴ Hanks - b. 1707 - and William⁵ Hanks - b. 1739. Her discovery that William's⁴ wife was Ruth is most important, and the Friends' records found for me by Harriet T. Marine - those pertaining to William Hanks of West River Meeting and Fairfax Meeting, and Rachel (dan. of William⁵) of Fairfax - are also

very important; but you will notice that there is nothing, to date, to prove that a "John, born about 1735, in Md." or a "Joseph, born about 1737, in Md." ever really existed.

I am beginning to get "weakened," for with the elimination of Mrs. Hoffmann's Joseph, as well as my candidate Joseph - b. 1725, son of John and Sarah Hanks of Whitmarsh Twp., Pa. - who, it would seem, fathered a Sanctified whose marriage he attended in Berke Co., Pa., in 1791) the field is surely open to Barton's Joseph (b. 1725) of Richmond County, Va. Mrs. White wrote me from Alexandria, however, that after examining the records - photostats of them - in Richmond (city) she saw no reason for Barton's classifications; this was before she had been in Richmond County, though, and it may be that she found verification of every one of Dr. Barton's statements there. She has sent me no records since those sent during her first stay in Alexandria.

Now, about the copying which you so kindly suggested, my having a stenographer do and for which service you would like to pay; I have never minded the copying in the past; it has never crowded me, and my only

regret is that Mrs. White has not
sent me more to do. I don't
think that I have ever told you
that I am somewhat of an invalid,
with my time all my own, there-
fore as long as my copies are
legible - my poor wobbly figures
are certainly erratic - the making
of them is a fight with me, and
one which I am most jealous, as
well as zealous, of performing. When
my figures are, in addition to
being so ugly, illegible (if they are
not already that way to those
unfamiliar with my "style") I want
you to tell me so, frankly, and
then I'll have my husband's
stenographer do the work for us.
I know, Miss Tarbell, that such
an "understanding" woman as you
are will understand just how
this is.

Very Sincerely yours,
Myra Hank. P. Russell