**Analyzing an associate network and an indirect evidence network to discover Martha “Patsy” (McNabb) Wynkoop’s father and to explore his pedigree**
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**Abstract:** Discovering who an ancestor or research subject associated with can lead to genealogical relatives and a better understanding of the research subject. Genealogists can learn from informal business organization networks to navigate a genealogical associate network. There may also be a network of interrelated evidence, especially of indirect evidence. Research that combines associate network analysis and evidence network analysis may be useful in solving difficult genealogical problems. Applying associate network and evidence network methodologies, as well as the Genealogical Proof Standard, this article uses indirect evidence to discover the father of Martha “Patsy” (McNabb) Wynkoop. The two candidates, James and William McNabb, both living in Loudoun County at the time of Martha’s birth, are discussed. Research on James’ associates enables backtracking an associate network to Chester County, Pennsylvania. Three Loudoun County William McNabbs are identified and separated. After discussing conflicting information, Martha McNabb’s father is identified as James. Data gathered during the search help identify his father and grandfather.

**Introduction**

This is a case study that shows the interaction between associate network analysis and indirect evidence web tracing to solve a genealogical problem for which no known direct evidence exists. Sources such as wills, final probate distributions, land sales after a man’s death, and birth and baptism records are commonly used as direct evidence to prove paternity. But for Martha “Patsy” (McNabb) Wynkoop, no such sources have been found. Tracing associates and indirect evidence networks can uncover multiple like-named people, and help separate them. Similarly, these methods may be required to avoid splitting one person into two. Both challenges arise during a search for Patsy McNabb’s father.

**Methodology**

This article builds on four methodologies. The Genealogical Proof Standard (GPS), evidence linkage analysis, the FAN principle, and business organizational network analysis are all essential in the case study that follows. While not universally adopted by genealogists, the GPS offers a sound guideline that emphasizes important points about searching for sources, citing sources, analyzing and correlating information, resolving conflicting evidence, and writing valid conclusions.\(^1\) It is particularly applicable where a proof narrative depends on indirect evidence which requires reasoning and careful correlation of pieces of evidence that, when considered in isolation, seem disconnected. The GPS makes obsolete the older preponderance of evidence standard used in civil legal suits in which the greater weight of evidence supports a particular argument or statement.\(^2\) More applicable to genealogy, the GPS provides a greater degree of certitude than the preponderance of evidence model.

Linkage analysis involves combining evidence to prove identity.\(^3\) This is critical to avoid conflating same-named individuals, and also to avoid splitting an individual into two or more people.

Associate research, sometimes called cluster research, refers to the “A” of the FAN (friends, associates, neighbors) principle coined by Elizabeth Shown Mills\(^4\) and practiced by experienced genealogists. (Two recent examples are those by Rachal Mills Lennon\(^5\) and Erick Montgomery.\(^6\)) In
this article, the word “associates” is used more broadly to include friends and neighbors and builds on the cluster approach in two ways. It explores concentric rings, or a network, of associates, and also the interconnection of associate and indirect evidence networks. Genealogists limit the value of associate research if they view each associate in isolation. Associates often form an informal network. When direct evidence for a research subject’s parents cannot be discovered, experienced genealogists often engage in collateral research of siblings for whom direct evidence of parents may exist. Another approach is to identify associates in the hope that one is a relative. In genealogy, one can trace an associate network to learn about an ancestor or research subject. A person often had associates who were interlinked in some ways– members of the same church, business partners, neighbors, members of a military unit, and, of course, family. Associates are not simply isolated people but form a network. Competent genealogists will search for the reasons, explanations, and origins of the associations. A fruitful way to do associate research is to track the network in different directions to include not just associates but associates of associates. They will follow a webbed network of associates. Analyzing an associate network may lead to discovery of biological relatives and other vital data of traditional genealogical interest, and may also deepen understanding of the context and life of a research subject.

Business organizational analysis may inform associate network research. Most often, those who work in mid-sized and large companies use formal organization charts to understand things such as reporting structure, formal decision-making, and responsibility for performance evaluation. This chain-of-command perspective usually reflects vertical formal accountability that is established top-down. However, this approach overlooks the realities of information flows and influence paths. More perceptive managers and executives pay attention to informal networks as social phenomena encompassing influence paths and social knowledge relationships. They examine, map, and analyze who people approach for answers to technical questions and for opinions about ideas. Who trusts whom? How do rumors travel and how does gossip spread? Who goes to lunch together, and who shares social activities? This kind of analysis has far-reaching practical consequences for business. The principles are also useful in genealogy even if the benefits differ. In business, one knows in advance the formal organizational structure, and one can study interactions, the social life of information, and influence paths to understand and better manage informal organizational networks. To apply this to genealogy, I noted personal interactions and sketched out an inferred associate network. After analyzing the associate network, I formed hypotheses about family relations, and tested them against evidence before drawing conclusions about the relations discussed in the case study.

While conducting associate research, one often encounters another network— that of interconnected indirect evidence. Evidence may form a web in two senses. First, a genealogist will correlate the accumulated indirect evidence to build a proof of who the parents were, for example. This includes adequately explaining conflicting information. Thus, the genealogist creates a web of indirect evidence in his/her logic of a proof argument; that is, in the thinking and reasoning of the genealogist. Second, careful attention to sources and information contained in them will reveal that the indirect evidence itself forms a network that can be traced. Evidence in this case is not a collection of distinct and disconnected pieces, but a string like pearls that form a necklace. Yet it is also not just a linearly plotted string that precisely parallels the proof argument, but an interwoven web that can be followed prior to producing a proof narrative. Understanding the linkages or the reasons for linkages of evidence, combined with the genealogical reasoning that connects multiple pieces of indirect evidence to solve a problem, may lead to genealogical puzzle breakthroughs. Thus, indirect evidence is interwoven and also takes shape in the thinking of a genealogist aware of how the evidence forms a constellation that cross-infoms, resulting in accumulated and correlated information that solves problems.

The most insightful and successful research may be obtained by letting the evidence guide the two interrelated networks. Using associate network analysis and indirect evidence network analysis together enhances the likelihood of achieving the research goal, speeds the search, and deepens the understanding of the research subject. That is because the two networks interact – associates lead the researcher to indirect evidence, and indirect evidence leads to associates.

**Martha “Patsy” (McNabb) Wynkoop**

Patsy McNabb married Jacob Wynekoop in Loudoun County, Virginia, United States, on 16 January 1820. They were tabulated there in the 1820 census with one boy under ten years old just two lines before Jacob’s father, Cornelius Winecupp. (For the relationship between Jacob and Cornelius Wynekoop, see the transcription of the Cornelius Wynekoop Bible, submitted with the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) membership application of Margaret Elizabeth V. E. Wynekoop Denham, and now bound after p. 68 in the DAR Library copy of Richard Wynkoop’s *Wynkoop Genealogy in the United States of America*.) They moved to Morgan County, Ohio, probably in the spring of 1830 (Jacob does not appear in tax records for 1829–30, but does appear in the 1830 census. He also appears in tax records for 1831). They settled in Manchester Township in section eight or seventeen near John Sears, who had married Ann McNabb in Loudoun County in 1798, and then “Paty” McNabb in Belmont County, Ohio in 1815. (Paty was a nickname for Martha. The two wives may have been sisters.)

---

*Spellings of names may vary throughout the article to reflect the spelling in the source under discussion.*
Patsy’s husband, Jacob Wynkoop, died in Morgan County, Ohio before 8 February 1842. Estate documents name his widow as Martha. (Patsy is a common diminutive for Martha.) Among the assets listed in Jacob Wynkoop’s estate was a three-quarter-acre tract in Morgan Township, Morgan County. It was there that Martha Wynkoop was listed with most of her children and grandchildren in the 1850 census. Mark Wyncoop, thirty-three years old, was listed first in the household after Martha, and it is reasonable to believe that he was the boy counted in the 1820 Loudoun County census. He was the only Wynkoop child who appears in the 1850 census not named in Jacob Wynkoop’s estate records, and this indicates that he was a child of Martha but not of Jacob. This is strengthened by an 1849 infirmary record referring to Mark’s unnamed mother. The 1850 census reports Martha’s age as fifty-five, which calculates to a birth year of 1794–95. No record of an earlier marriage of Martha McNabb has been found, nor does Martha appear in Loudoun County base-born records.

Harriett McNabb

Harriett McNabb is separately named in the 1820 Loudoun County census seventeen lines after Jacob Winicupp. She married Josiah Power in about 1825 (based on the calculated birth year of Eliza, the oldest child, who was twenty-four in the 1850 census). Josiah and Harriet (McNabb) Power migrated to Ohio, probably with Jacob Wynkoop and family. Those two families are listed adjacent to each other in the 1830 census and, based on research about all Manchester Township heads of household in 1830, it may be concluded that they lived very near or with each other. In 1831, Martha and Harriet were defendants in twin slander suits brought by John Sears. He alleged that they extra-legally accused him of stealing a horse and gossiped about it. The cases were settled out of court.

Josiah and Harriet Power moved to Washington County, Ohio, which adjoins Morgan County to the south, in about 1852. There they died and were buried. Harriet died on 13 May 1882, and her gravestone gives her age at death as eighty-three years, two months, and five days, which calculates to a birth date of 8 March 1799. Living near each other with the same surname in Virginia, migrating together from Virginia to Ohio, living next to each other in Ohio, being defendants in twin suits brought by plausibly their aunt’s husband, being born several years apart, and apparently owning land in Washington County, Ohio (Josiah Power bought land in the Rainbow Creek Allotment in 1853), suggest that Patsy and Harriet were sisters. Although this suggestion is genealogical, it is consistent with the close employee networks in business discussed above – the ways in which Patsy and Harriet were associated indicate an informal network perhaps based on a familial relation.

Introduction to the search for Martha’s father

In 1794 and 1795, the time when Martha was evidently born, the only adult male McNabbs known to have been living in Loudoun County were James and William. This is a conclusion reached after a reasonably exhaustive search of tax, militia, probate, marriage, church, deed, and other records, including court minute and order books, for those years and the years preceding and following. It is therefore reasonable to think that one of them was Martha’s father. After outlining what is known about each of them, a discussion of the evidence will conclude which one was her father.

James McNabb

James McNabb appears in the 1786 Loudoun County tithable list as sixteen or older and less than twenty-one. That calculates to a birth-year range of 1765–70. He appears in the 1787 personal property tax list as at least twenty-one, and so was born no later than 1766. Combining the two sources narrows the birth-year range to 1765–66. He appears in the 1810 census as forty-five or older, and so was born no later than 1765. Assuming all three sources are accurate, he was born in 1765. Thus, he was about thirty years old when Patsy was born, and about thirty-four when Harriet was born.

He appears in the 1783–86 tithable lists, all in the sixteen to twenty age range and all with William McNabb, presumably in the same household because they were counted on the same line entries. A birth year of 1765 is consistent with these tithable records if his birth month and day came after the effective date of the annual tithables. In 1785, James Hagerman was taxed together with them.

James McNabb in Loudoun County, Virginia

James McNabb appears in the 1787–1804, 1806–07, and 1809–12 personal property tax lists, all as twenty-one or older. He was not found in the 1805 personal property tax list. The 1808 personal property tax was not collected. He was fined for not appearing for militia service in 1801–02 and 1805–08. He appears in other Loudoun County records, as follows:

- 1785 – attended the Quaker wedding of Ann Sinclair and Samuel Gregg.
- 1787 – attended the Quaker wedding of Phebe Sinkler and Thomas Smith.
- 1788 – sued (together with William McNabb) by Robert Carter for payment of a debt due 22 May 1788.

1 I will use the more frequent spelling of Sinkler though many variants appear in records, including Sinklar, Sincler, and the more familiar Sinclair and St. Clair.
● 1792 – fathered a base-born child with Margaret Weeks, a single woman.41 (The male child was born on 21 March 1792.)
● 1798 – attested the age of Ann McNabb of Shelburne Parish, who married John Searse.42
● 1799 – witnessed for Laurence King, a plaintiff in a debt case against Simon Triplett, later one of James McNabb’s commanding officers in the militia.43
● 1801 – sold some possessions to pay off debt.44
● 1801–03 – was constable.45
● 1802 – executed a bond to Peter Stump for a debt to the estate of James Grigsby and for hiring a slave.46
● 1802 – witnessed Robert Sears selling a horse and farm items.47
● 1803 – John Kendrick was ordered to pay him for being a witness against James Swarts.48
● 1808–27 – requested and was granted an injunction against Peter Stump and then John Stump, successor executors of the estate of James Grigsby, for a disputed debt (injunction granted, 1808; case continued, 1809, 1810, 1811; defendant answered, 1812; injunction revived on John Stump, 1816; injunction dissolved then reinstated, 1819; injunction dissolved then continued, 1820; case continued, 1822; case dissolved, 14 February 1827).49
● 1809 – taxed with J. Brabham.50
● 1809 – became a co-debtor with John Sears on a note payable to Rachel Wilkison.51
● 1810 – appeared in the U.S. census.52
● 1814 – sued by Benjamin Hagerman, son of James Hagerman, for non-payment of a debt.53
● 1814 – gave a deposition in a will contest case.54
● 1820 – appeared in the U.S. census.55

A thorough search and analysis of data give no indication that there was more than one James McNabb in Loudoun County between 1783 and 1827. Three of his signatures are extant: subscribed on his request for the injunction against James Grigsby’s executor (1808),56 on the note payable co-signed by John Sears (1809),57 (the note was executed in Loudoun County, Virginia, and brought to Ohio); and on his deposition in the will contest case (1814).58 The signatures are in the same hand. It should be noted that the U.S. censuses for Virginia for 1790 and 1800 are not extant.

**Backtracking the McNabbs and related families to Chester County, Pennsylvania**

Up to this point, a number of James McNabb’s associates have been noted, including, alphabetically, J. Brabham, Robert Carter, James Grigsby, Benjamin Hagerman, James Hagerman, John Kendrick, Ann McNabb, Josiah Power, John Sears, Ann Sinkler, Phebe Sinkler, John Stump, Peter Stump, James Swarts, Simon Triplett, Margaret Weeks, Rachel Wilkinson, and Jacob Wynkoop. Any may be used as a starting point to analyze James McNabb’s network, with some yielding more extensive results than others. Focusing on the witnesses to the two Quaker weddings James McNabb attended in 1785 and 1787, one notes people with the surnames McNabb, Sinkler, and Gibson. They form a network that can be backtracked to Chester County, Pennsylvania. Among the witnesses to the 1785 wedding of Samuel Gregg and Ann Sinkler were James Hagerman, Esther Gibson, Phebe Gibson, and Ann Sinkler’s parents, James and Mary Sinkler (see Figure 1).59

James Hagerman, who lived with William and James McNabb also in 1785, reportedly married Abigail McNabb that year.60 Esther Gibson, originally Esther Sinkler, married Isaac Gibson in Chester County in 1761.61 Phebe Gibson, who married Joseph Gibson in Loudoun County in 1764, was formerly Phebe McNabb.62 Thus, three people who were McNabbs or married to a McNabb attended this Sinkler marriage ceremony. Research may discover the reason for the McNabb–Sinkler connection.

Attending the 1787 wedding of Thomas Smith and Phebe Sinkler were, as one would expect, Sinkler family members. They included the parents, James and Mary Sinkler (thus, Ann and Phebe were sisters), and Isaac and Esther Gibson.63 Isaac Gibson was a brother of Joseph. (Isaac Gibson’s father was Joseph64 and Joseph and Isaac were named as sons in the will of Joseph Gibson of West Nantmell Township in Chester County.)65 The parents of the Sinkler sisters who married in Loudoun County in 1785 and 1787 were married in Chester County. James Sinkler married Mary Patterson there in 1762.66 Among the attendees at the Sinkler–Patterson wedding were William McNabb and Edward Vernon,67 which provides two other connections between a McNabb and a Sinkler. Edward Vernon had married Mary McNabb (from West Caln Township) in Chester County in 1758.68 Edward Vernon attended the 1761 Gibson–Sinkler wedding in yet another McNabb–Sinkler association.69 The wedding account of James Sinkler and Mary Patterson names the groom’s parents. They were William Sinkler, deceased by 1762, and Phebe, who attended the wedding.70 (Other evidence that James’ parents were William and Phebe is the sale of land by “William Sinclar and Phebe his wife” to “James Sinclar … son of the said William Sinclar and Phebe his wife.” The deed specifies that they were “of the Township of West Caln.”71) William Sinkler married Phebe Gleave in Chester County in 1709.72 William Sinkler was taxed in West Caln Township from 1722 to 1738.73 (A William Sinkler was taxed there in 1749–50 and a William Sinkler in 1753, but it is not known whether this was the same person or a son. The 1754 tax rates include a William Sinkler Junr.)
The explanation of the connection between the McNabbs and Sinklers is discovered during a search of other Chester County, Pennsylvania Quaker records. John McNabb was married to Esther Sinkler there by a justice in 1734. (Meeting minutes recorded that “John Fincher Junr was Instrumentall of Taking William Sinkler Daughter Esther away to be married unknown to her parents to one McNabb” and that “Francis Fincher kept company with John McNabb at ye time yt he stole Willm Sinklers Daughter Esther & went to ye Justice with them to ye marriage”). William Sinkler is named as the bride’s father in the account of the marriage arrangements (therefore, Esther and James Sinkler were siblings). John and Jane Fincher, as well as Francis Fincher, had assisted in taking Esther Sinkler from her home without her parents’ permission, and helped to arrange the wedding for which they were reprimanded by the Friends’ Monthly Meeting. Further research reveals that John Fincher’s bride had been Jane McNabb; they married
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in 1733 not long before the McNabb–Sinkler elopement. John McNabb was taxed in West Caln Township in 1734. He experienced financial difficulties, and requested assistance from the Quakers in 1738. He and his family moved to Philadelphia in 1748. William Sinkler also temporarily transferred to Philadelphia, and brought John McNabb’s wife (Sinkler’s daughter, Esther) and children, from Philadelphia back to Chester County, on 15 December 1748. A John McNabb died on 17 August 1748 and was buried in Philadelphia where he had moved earlier that year. The location and timing suggest that this is the same John McNabb, especially when his name is omitted in the account of William Sinkler returning with the rest of his family. Corroborating this in the form of negative evidence is that whereas John McNabb was taxed in West Caln Township of Chester County from 1735–40, he was not taxed there after that.

Figure 1 shows some of the interconnections of the eight marriages from 1708/09 to 1787 in Pennsylvania and Virginia. Although the upshot of this intertwining is genealogical, it follows the pattern frequently observed in businesses, in which sub-networks interact to reveal a powerful informal network in and around which much that occurs in the business world revolves.

Besides the eight marriages, other evidence of the Chester County–Loudoun County network is:

- James and Mary Sinkler, and daughter Phebe, whose wedding James McNabb later attended in 1787, transferred from Bradford Monthly Meeting (MM) in Chester County to Fairfax in Loudoun County, on 16 March 1764.
- John Sinkler transferred from Bradford Monthly Meeting to Fairfax on 13 June 1777.
- Phebe Sinkler transferred her Friends’ membership from Bradford Monthly Meeting to Fairfax on 13 June 1783.
- Isaac Nichols was granted a certificate of transfer from Kennett Monthly Meeting in Chester County to Fairfax on 11 April 1764; he married Rebecca Gibson in Loudoun County and bought Loudoun County land from his father, Thomas Nichols of Pennsylvania.

Thus, the McNabb–Sinkler–Gibson network began in Chester County, Pennsylvania with the 1734 marriage of John McNabb and Esther Sinkler. Many of the network members moved to Loudoun County, Virginia. They were not only neighbors and fellow Friends, but intermarried. This explains the many ties that followed these families from Pennsylvania to Virginia to Ohio.

**William McNabb(s)**

William McNabb was cited by the Bradford Monthly Meeting for having “carnal knowledge before marriage” with the woman he eventually married. (“William McNabb disowned for marriage out to one not in unity with us, &c.” The “&c.” was that he had relations with his wife before marriage.) This was first noted on 13 November 1761, perhaps after the birth of a child or at a clear sign of pregnancy. His prior membership in the Bradford Monthly Meeting suggests a relation to the Chester County McNabbs already noted. This suggestion is confirmed by the appearance of both John McNabb and William McNabb in the same township of West Caln, where 133 men were taxed in 1762. William first appears in tax records there in 1762, coincident with his marriage and perhaps attainment of the age of twenty-one. Other evidence that this William is identical to the William McNabb who appears in Loudoun County in the 1760s and 1770s is his close association with the network Sinkler family. In addition to attending the 1761 Gibson–Sinkler wedding, William McNabb of Loudoun County was named as co-responsible for a debt incurred with John Sinclair, originally due in 1771. Early Loudoun County road records show that this William McNabb lived in the vicinity of Simon Triplett, who was later a militia commanding officer. His marriage in 1761 or 1762, and the 1762 tax record, suggest he may have been about twenty-one years old, and if that is correct, he was born in c.1740.

William McNabb was taxed in West Caln Township of Chester County, Pennsylvania in 1762–64, and appears on Loudoun County, Virginia tithable lists in 1767–75, 1779–80, and 1783–86. He appears in personal property lists in 1782–1802, and 1804. He appears in militia lists in 1801, 1803, 1805, 1809, and possibly in 1800 which lists a Sergeant McNabb. He lived on a Loudoun County plantation in the early 1770s, and is mentioned in road order records from 1772–75, including belonging to a road route viewing group in 1774. As noted earlier, neither the 1790 nor the 1800 U.S. censuses for Virginia have survived. Events mentioning William McNabb are listed in chronological order:

- 1761 – cited for pre-marital relations (Chester County).
- 1762 – disowned by Bradford Monthly Meeting.
- 1771 – mercantile debt due.
- 1772 – appointed to view planned road.
- 1773 – road work planned near his plantation.
- 1774 – ordered to view road.
- 1775 – a road was planned through his plantation.
- 1775 – bought horses and spoons.
- 1786 – sued by Robert Carter.
- 1788 – sued by James Dougherty.
• 1788 – sued by Robert Carter.\textsuperscript{110}
• 1788 – sold farm items and household items to Simon Triplett.\textsuperscript{111}
• 1792 – cared for James’ base-born child.\textsuperscript{112}
• 1800 – gave deposition that a horse bit Gideon Cummings when Cummings was a boy.\textsuperscript{113}
• 1810 – census.\textsuperscript{114}
• 1810–11 – moved to Ohio.\textsuperscript{115}
• 1819 – gave deposition regarding James Hagerman’s Revolutionary War service.\textsuperscript{116}
• 1810–20 – became indebted to Thomas Sears (Belmont County, Ohio).\textsuperscript{117} (After the death of William Smith, an 1824 inventory included a debt due on a $5 note to Thomas Sears, likely relative of John Sears, from William McNabb. That note had been executed years earlier because by 1820, William had moved to Morgan County.)
• 1822 – voted (Manchester Township, Morgan County, Ohio).\textsuperscript{118}
• 1827 – patented Brookfield Township land.\textsuperscript{119}
• 1832 – was sick.\textsuperscript{120}
• 1832–35 – died.\textsuperscript{121}

An important question to answer when considering these events, transactions, and appearances is whether they should be attributed to one man or to two. Table 1 compares these two possibilities. The second column shows the age of William for selected events, assuming one William participated in all of the itemized events. Columns three and four show ages of two men, assuming one was born c.1740 and the other c.1761.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>One William</th>
<th>Two Williams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1761 – Chester County birth of child</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1771 – mercantile debt due</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798 – Ann’s age attested (she born c.1780)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58 (dead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809 – militia</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810 – four children under ten years old</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810–11 – move to Ohio</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820 – move to Morgan County, Ohio</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832–35 – death</td>
<td>92–95</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several points appear to support believing that these records might pertain to two separate people.

1. It seems more reasonable that a man would serve in the militia at age forty-eight than at sixty-nine. Though the age range for participation in militia service varied over the years, under the U.S. Militia Act of 1792 the age range was eighteen or older and under forty-five.\textsuperscript{122} If this Act were adhered to, William McNabb would not have been born before 1764 because he was required to appear for service in 1809. However, earlier Virginia laws required militia service up until a man turned fifty, so if those earlier laws were followed in 1809, it is possible that William was as old as forty-nine and thus born no earlier than 1759.\textsuperscript{123} As mentioned, according to the 1810 U.S. census he was forty-five years old or more, thus born no later than 1765.\textsuperscript{124} He was at least twenty-one in the 1786 tithables list, thus born no later than 1765.\textsuperscript{125} Combining these sources, he may have been born in the range 1759–64, say c.1761. One might speculate that if there were a child conceived by William McNabb in 1761 in Chester County, the child may have been named William after his father. If so, a birth year of c.1761 fits.

2. It seems more likely that the father of four children under ten years old as indicated in the 1810 U.S. census was forty-nine than seventy.

3. James McNabb attested the age of Ann McNabb in 1798 as she was about to marry John Sears.\textsuperscript{126} This might make one believe either that James was her father or that her father had died prior to her marriage. Ann must have been at least twenty-one to marry by attestation rather than by consent.\textsuperscript{127} Yet she must have been quite young, say twenty-one, to require age attestation. Thus, Ann’s birth year was c.1777. It is unlikely that James was Ann’s father because he would have been about twelve years old at the time of her birth. Another reason to believe this is that James McNabb was always listed living with William McNabb through 1791. James was first listed in a separate household in 1792, the year of Salathiel’s birth, suggesting that Salathiel was his first-born child; that is, that he founded a separate household to raise his family. These reasons lead one to believe that James was not Ann’s father. A William, whether one born c.1740 or one born c.1761, was alive in 1798, based on more than several records already cited. But no William attested to Ann’s age, perhaps suggesting that an older William, Ann’s father,
had died prior to 1798. This would argue for two William McNabbs. With this line of thought, James McNabb attested to Ann’s age because her father had died.

However, there are a number of difficulties with the logic in these three points, and some of them include unsubstantiated speculations. Critically, none proves that there were two Williams. It is possible that William McNabb served in the militia to age sixty-nine, as improbable as that might seem. It is possible that he fathered four children in his sixties or it may be that the four younger children in his 1810 household were not his biological children. Perhaps James McNabb attested to Ann’s age because he was an older brother or because her father, William, was unable or indisposed to do so. It is possible that a man in his seventies would move twice.

If one examines the information in the sources carefully by tracing the indirect evidence web, the evidence is very good that all of the records cited thus far for William McNabb between 1761 and 1835 relate to one unique identity, one person. The identity of the William McNabb in West Caln Township of Chester County and Loudoun County was evidenced earlier. An undated source located in the British National Archives corroborates the evidence that these data are for one William. The source pertains to American loyalist claims that documented losses sustained by people loyal to the British crown during the American Revolutionary War. Edmund J. Lee documented records pertaining to Loudoun County, Virginia. Included is a William McNabb–John Sinclair debt of 8 pounds, 2 shillings, and 4 pence due on 1 June 1771. Although this document is undated, some events in it help narrow the year range when data for the report were gathered.

- Sinclair died about fifteen years earlier. He died in 1792. That results in a report year estimate of 1807.
- Thomas Winn was said to have moved to Kentucky fourteen years earlier. Reportedly, he moved there in 1784, resulting in a report year of 1798.
- Moses Hall Jr. was said to have moved to Redstone, Pennsylvania eighteen years earlier. Reportedly, he moved there in 1785, resulting in a report year of 1803.
- Edmund J. Lee was born in 1772 so reached the age of twenty-one in 1793.

William McNabb was alive in Loudoun County at the time Edmund J. Lee gathered data for his mercantile debt report. Based on the events listed above, one may narrow the year range when data for the report were gathered to between 1793 and 1807. Thus the William who incurred a debt due in 1771, and hence was born no later than 1750, was still living in Loudoun County at least as late as 1793 and probably 1802. The identity of this William McNabb with the one in Ohio is also established. The 1809 militia fine incurred by William McNabb was uncollectible in 1811 because he had "remd [removed] to the Ohio." Thus, William McNabb moved to Ohio in 1810 (after being tabulated in the census) or 1811. While in Belmont County, Ohio, he became indebted to Thomas Sears, reportedly related to John Sears. He also gave a deposition there in 1819, solemnly affirming (thereby perhaps indicating Quaker beliefs, in contrast with another deponent, Anthony Ethell, who "made oath") that according to "the best of his recollection," James Hagerman, with whom he had lived in 1785 and who reportedly married Abigail McNabb in about 1785, had enlisted in 1775 for service in the Revolutionary War. Interestingly, the justice of the peace who certified the deposition was named William Sinclair. According to an affidavit filed in Belmont County by Mahlon Hatcher in 1832, William McNabb, the 1819 deponent, was "now of Morgan County." Also in 1832, John Sears referred to William McNabb as living but sick. James Hagerman referred to William McNab on 21 September 1835 as "now decd" [deceased]. Thus, the evidence is compelling that one William McNabb was born c.1740 in Chester County, was disowned by the Quakers there in 1762, moved to Loudoun County in the mid or late 1760s, moved to Belmont County, Ohio in 1810 or 1811, and then in the early 1820s moved to Morgan County, Ohio where he died between 1832 and 1835.

**William McNabb (born c.1777)**

Another William McNabb lived in Loudoun County, and was the son of William McNabb born c.1740. This relation is proved by examining the personal property lists from 1798 to 1805. The lists from 1798–1802 and 1804 include William and "son William" in the same entry. The 1803 personal property tax list includes only "William Jr." The 1805 personal property tax list is less clear because it lists "William McNabb son." This might be understood as only the son or as William and son. The 1797 personal property tax list does not include son William, which suggests that son William had not yet attained the age of twenty-one. The 1798 tax list includes "William McNab & son William" in the column for those twenty-one or older. Son William was listed in 1799 as at least twenty-one years old. Thus, son William was born in 1776 or 1777, say 1777, and this implies his father would have been about thirty-seven when the son was born.

William (born c.1777) may have lived with his father William (born c.1740) in 1810. In that census, the younger William would have been about thirty-three, and the older one about seventy. The age range of males tabulated in the William McNab household is consistent with both living in the same household. Both a William Sr. and a William Jr. reportedly voted in Manchester Township of Morgan County on 3 August...
1822.\textsuperscript{149} William Sr. was likely the one born c.1740, and William Jr. was likely the son born c.1777. William, born c.1777, is the one living next to John Sears in 1820.\textsuperscript{150} (the oldest male was between twenty-seven and forty-five years old, thus born 1774–93. The William McNabb born c.1740 has not been found in the 1820 census), but William (born c.1740) is plausibly the elderly male living in John Sears’ household in 1830.\textsuperscript{151} (The oldest male was ninety to one hundred years old, thus born 1729–40.)

**William (born 1795–1801)**

There was a third William McNabb in Loudoun County, who in at least some records is distinguished by the middle initial H. One such record is of William H. McNabb buying a stove and pipe in Loudoun County in 1823.\textsuperscript{152} It has already been documented that the two William McNabbs just discussed (father and son born c.1740 and c.1777, respectively) were in Morgan County by that time. Thus, at least as of 1823, the third William McNabb can be separated from the others both by his middle initial (in some cases) and by where he resided at various times. He has not been found in the 1820 census. He was likely still living in Loudoun County in 1830. At that time, a William McNabb, aged thirty to forty, with no middle initial, lived in Cameron Township (he lived in the vicinity of a Swarts and a Hagerman).\textsuperscript{153} That calculates to a birth year of 1789–1800, and this is a third factor that can be used to distinguish him from the other William McNabbs. He appears in Morgan County, Ohio census records in 1840 (in Morgan Township, with no initial H., aged forty to fifty, and so born 1789–1800), listed immediately next to Jacob (and presumably Martha) Wynkoop, suggesting a possible familial relationship.\textsuperscript{154} He appears there in 1850 (in Malta, with no middle initial, aged fifty-three, so born 1796–97), and in 1860 (in Manchester Township, with the initial H., aged sixty-five, and so born 1794–95).\textsuperscript{155} He was also tabulated in 1880 in Manchester Township with the middle initial H., aged seventy-nine, and so born 1800–01.\textsuperscript{156} (The only 1870 candidate found in the census is Wm H. McNabb, age 69, retired farmer, born in Virginia, living with Sarah McNabb, age 22, born in Ohio.\textsuperscript{157} William H. McNabb did have a daughter, Sarah, aged 12 in the 1860 census.) Whichever is his correct birth year, he could not have been the father of Patsy or Harriet. That he was born between 1795 and 1801 (within a few years of Patsy and Harriet), was listed next to Jacob and Patsy Wynkoop in 1840, and previously lived in Loudoun County suggest that he was a brother of Patsy and Harriet. This, in turn, suggests that James was their father because William (born c.1740) had a son, William (born c.1777) still living in the nineteenth century, and so would not have been the father of another William, William H., born 1795–1801.

**Who was Martha “Patsy” (McNabb) Wynkoop’s father?**

There are other reasons to conclude that James McNabb was Martha’s father. The 1810 census data enable identifying James as the probable father. He, but not William McNabb (born c.1740), had females in his household (presumably his daughters) whose ages fit the range for Martha and Harriet (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. 1810 census data.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William\textsuperscript{158}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James\textsuperscript{159}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1810, Patsy would have been fifteen or sixteen years old, and Harriet would have been eleven. Thus, both should have been counted in the column for females 11–16. James had two females in his household in that age range, while William had none. This combines indirect evidence (James) with negative evidence (William) to support the identification, and provides further support for concluding that Martha “Patsy” and Harriet were sisters.

Although William moved to Ohio in 1810 or 1811, James remained in Loudoun County where he was enumerated in 1820. He may have died there in about 1827 when the legal case of long duration involving an alleged debt due to the estate of James Grigsby was finally dissolved.\textsuperscript{160} He does not appear in the Loudoun County U.S. census of 1830.

Because Patsy married in Loudoun County in early 1820, and she and her husband, Jacob Wynkoop, remained there until 1830, she stayed in the same location as James, and did not move with William to Ohio until three years after James apparently died. Similarly, Harriet McNabb was separately enumerated alone in Loudoun County in 1820. James McNabb appears in Shelburne Parish of Loudoun County, and Harriett McNabb appears on the pair of pages prior as does Jacob Winecupp.\textsuperscript{161}

William McNabb (born c.1777) was in Morgan County, Manchester Township in 1820,\textsuperscript{162} and he and his father reportedly voted there in 1822.\textsuperscript{163} In about 1826, William (born c.1777) moved to Brookfield Township which borders Manchester Township to the east.\textsuperscript{164} John Sears signed the patent application for (probably the elder) William McNabb for Brookfield Township land in 1827 (by then, William Sr. was about eighty-seven, and perhaps unable to travel to the land office)\textsuperscript{165} and the younger William was tabulated there in the 1830 census.\textsuperscript{166} Thus, the
McNabb sisters only moved closer to plausibly their aunt Martha and also William after James died. (One may entertain the possibility that Martha (McNabb) Wynkoop was named after her aunt Martha (McNabb) Sears.)

In 1840, William (born c.1777) still lived in Brookfield Township, while Josiah and Harriet (McNabb) Power remained in Manchester Township near John M. Sears and Martha (McNabb) Sears. By then, Jacob Wincoope and his wife had moved to Morgan Township, and were tabulated immediately before Wm McNab, whom again it is suggested was Martha Wynkoop’s brother. By 1860, John Sears’ wife Martha was a widow, then living with this same younger William H. McNabb in Manchester Township. In summary, Patsy and Harriet McNabb lived closer to James than to William as long as James was alive, and only then close to Martha Sears and William. These are indirect evidence of behaviors corroborating that James was the likely father and not William.

Finally, it is possible that Jacob Wynkoop and Martha McNabb named their first son James after his maternal grandfather. There were no known Wynkoop relatives named James. Up until Jacob’s marriage with Patsy, the Wynkoops intermarried with people of Dutch descent, and gave their children Dutch names. The McNabbs gave their children names common in England and Ireland.

**Association with Rachel Wilkinson**

Rachel Wilkinson is another valuable starting point for network analysis. James McNabb’s association with her further strengthens the evidence that he was Martha (McNabb) Wynkoop’s father. Rachel Wilkinson, born Hanks, married Joseph Wilkinson probably in about 1792 or shortly before, in Loudoun County. Joseph died in about 1800. Widow Rachel was enumerated in 1810 five lines after James McNabb. That was neither the first nor the last association with James McNabb. Rachel Hanks was a Quaker who requested membership in the Fairfax Friends Monthly Meeting in Loudoun County in May 1782. She had moved with her father, William Hanks, from Anne Arundel County, Maryland, between 1762 and 1764. Rachel Wilkinson, “formerly Hanks,” was removed from Quaker membership in February 1792 because she had married “out of unity” but especially because she had lived with her husband (“disreputably”) prior to their marriage.

As mentioned earlier, James McNabb was also associated with the Quakers though there is no known evidence that he was ever a member. He witnessed two Quaker weddings, one in 1785 and the other in 1787. Thus, both James McNabb and Rachel Wilkinson had ties to the Quakers.

In 1809, Rachel Wilkerson loaned $44 to John Seares and Jas McNabb. The note, dated 9 December 1809, was executed in Loudoun County, and witnessed by network member Jno Combs who was tabulated one line before Rachel Wilkerson in the 1810 census. Each of the debtors was responsible for the entire debt (“we bind ourselves, our heirs, etc., jointly severally and firmly”) if either could not repay. The note was due on 25 December 1810. In this instance, a financial transaction was executed among associates, an example of a family network and an informal business network coinciding. In 1814, Rachel Wilkinson was deposed as a witness in a contested will case that concluded in 1820 in Loudoun County. The case involved the will of Alexander McMullen whom some alleged was not mentally capable of understanding his will made in his old age. Alexander’s wife, Elizabeth, was Rachel’s sister. James McNabb was deposed in the same probate case.

At some point, perhaps accompanying the McNabb sisters in 1830, Rachel Wilkinson moved to Morgan County, Ohio, and resided in Manchester Township. She died in or before May 1831. After her death, Josiah Power was appointed estate administrator, indicative of a close relationship between Rachel and Josiah, or more likely Harriet (McNabb) Power. This behavioral association was a continuation of the pattern observed between Rachel Wilkinson and James McNabb. The estate administration spawned a court case between a member of the Power family and John Sears (the first of two 1831 court cases opposing John Sears and the Powers). Administrator Josiah Power alleged that John Sears still owed the money on the 1809 note which Rachel brought with her to Ohio, twenty-one years after it was executed, and twenty years after it was due. John Sears asked for a delay in the case because he wanted to call William McNabb as a witness. (John Sears swore that “William McNabb is a material witness in the above cause without whose testimony he cannot safely go to trial. That said McNabb is now sick & unable to attend this court.”)

The Wilkinson name shows up in the associate network traced earlier:

- Susanna Wilkinson attended the 1761 Isaac Gibson–Esther Sinkler Chester County wedding.
- Mary Wilkinson attended the 1762 James Sinkler–Mary Patterson Chester County wedding.
- Evan Wilkinson attended the 1758 Edward Vernon–Mary McNabb Chester County wedding.

There is good indirect evidence that Evan Wilkinson married Margaret Sinkler in Chester County in 1743 or 1744. Margaret Wilkinson attended the Vernon-McNabb 1758 wedding, as did Evan Wilkinson. At a Caln Preparative Meeting on 18 August 1743, single Margaret Sinkler was cited for having had “carnal knowledge” with a man, and having had a child with him. At the Bradford Monthly Meeting on 21 June 1744, a confession document of Margaret Wilkeson was presented at West Caln. By that time Joseph Wilkinson, the only other known male Wilkinson in the
geographic area, was married so he cannot have been her husband.\textsuperscript{197} Evan Wilkinson lived in West Caln Township of Chester County, where he was taxed in 1737, 1740, 1753, and 1762–63.\textsuperscript{198} Evan Wilkinson moved to Loudoun County, Virginia, where a road was planned to his plantation.\textsuperscript{199} He also served on a jury there.\textsuperscript{200} He died there, probably in 1780.\textsuperscript{201} Joseph and Evan may have been brothers. Joseph immigrated in 1737 from Ballynacree, County Antrim, Ireland.\textsuperscript{202} Evan immigrated in 1736 from the same place.\textsuperscript{203} (Also, Evan Wilkinson witnessed the 1740 marriage of Joseph Wilkinson and Elizabeth Fisher.\textsuperscript{204}) Earlier, Evan Wilkinson was named for not repaying a debt to William Sinkler.\textsuperscript{205} Evan witnessed the will of George Sinkler (of West Caln Township) in Chester County.\textsuperscript{206} Thus, the Wilkinsons were part of the large family network.

**Relation of James, William, and John McNabb**

Though no direct evidence determines the relationship between William and James McNabb, the indirect evidence web suggests James was a son of William. William is the only male McNabb old enough to have been James’ father in any known Loudoun County record of the time. They were listed together in tithable lists from 1783 to 1786 when James was eighteen to twenty-one years old, and in personal property tax lists from 1787–91. After that, they were listed in separate households but paid on the same days (1793 – 18 June;\textsuperscript{207} 1794 – 2 October;\textsuperscript{208} 1795 – 15 June;\textsuperscript{209} and 1796 – 13 August).\textsuperscript{210}

Other events and transactions brought them together:

- They were co-defendants in a debt suit.\textsuperscript{211}
- William temporarily cared for James’ base-born child before responsibility was given to James by the court.\textsuperscript{212}
- They were both fined in 1801 for not appearing for militia service.\textsuperscript{213}
- When an 1831 suit was brought against John Sears on a debt for a Loudoun County note (the co-debtor was James McNabb, then deceased); Sears wanted to call William as a material witness.\textsuperscript{214}

The accumulation of evidence suggests that William was James’ father. Also, Chester County evidence suggests that William’s parents were John McNabb and Esther (Sinkler) McNabb. William was first taxed there in West Caln Township in 1762. It was that year or possibly 1761 that William married. Bolstering the evidence is the fact that John and William were Quaker members of the Bradford Monthly Meeting, and lived in the same township as the Sinklers,\textsuperscript{215} who were also members of the Bradford Monthly Meeting. That James attended Sinkler weddings in Loudoun County in 1785 and 1787, and that there were many McNabb–Sinkler associations, are explained by the three generations of McNabbs – John McNabb and Esther Sinkler, William McNabb, and James McNabb. **Figure 2** shows an indirect evidence web framework beginning with James McNabb's

![Figure 2. Indirect evidence web trace framework.](image-url)
attendance at the two Loudoun County Quaker weddings, and ending with the likely descendancy from John to William to James McNabb. Figure 3 shows the ancestral linkages in a partial family tree. It should be noted that the James McNabb who appears in Chester County tax records (1747–50, and 1762) is clearly a different person – he was an adult in Pennsylvania before Patsy’s father was born.\textsuperscript{216}

![Partial Family Tree](image)

**Figure 3. McNabb and Sinkler partial family tree.**

### Conclusion

There is no known direct evidence naming James McNabb as the father of Martha “Patsy” McNabb or for that matter of any child other than base-born son, Salathiel, born in 1792 from a liaison with Margaret Weeks.\textsuperscript{217} Even so, a web of indirect evidence and network analysis form a convincing argument that James, not William, was Martha’s father. Network analysis is informed by applying lessons learned from informal networks that exist in business organizations. An added benefit is that by carefully working through the web of indirect evidence it is possible to reconstruct relations and separate identities of three William McNabbs in Loudoun County, and to trace the networked families back to Chester County, Pennsylvania. From there, one is able to combine other indirect evidence to show that William McNabb was likely James McNabb’s father, and that John McNabb was likely William McNabb’s father. This problem was solved by tracing both an associate network and an evidence network. Learning why that person was associated with the research subject or ancestor, and tracing evidence related to the associate, ultimately expands to become an associate network and an evidence network. The two methods work together to unfold a narrative including close relations across time and different geographic locations.
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