

RESEARCH THROUGH 31 JULY 2026

What the Records Will Bear

A proof-controlled history of the Staley, Konkle, Cash, and Turnes lines

Abstract

This history reaches farther than a list of names, but not as far as inherited family trees often claim. The surviving records establish a substantial American family structure across Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, South Carolina, and Arkansas. They prove several parent-child links directly. They support other links through strong, converging evidence. They also expose places where a familiar surname, a plausible migration, or a copied online pedigree has been mistaken for identity.

The central finding is simple: the American record is strongest where families left several kinds of evidence at once. A marriage entry, a census household, a child's birth record, a will, and a newspaper notice can reinforce one another. The chain becomes fragile when one record must carry a conclusion it was never designed to carry. A census before 1880 can place people in one household without calling them parents and children. A death certificate can name parents decades after childhood, but the informant may be wrong. A pension deposition can describe a migration and a sibling group while still failing to identify which same-named man belonged to the direct line.

The Staley line supplies the deepest and most difficult example. Daniel Lawrence Staley is connected to Stephen Staley and Ann H. Gardner by an unusual pair of Wayne County birth-register entries. One register names Daniel and his father. The other records a conflicting child name on the same birth date but supplies the mother, Anna H. Staley. The conflict does not disappear. It becomes part of the proof: the two entries, read with the household sequence, establish the family more responsibly than either entry could alone. Stephen and Ann's movement from Ohio to West Virginia and then toward Arkansas is supported by marriage, census, newspaper, cemetery, and obituary evidence. Earlier, Jacob Staley's 1793 Berkeley County will directly names a son Stephen. Between those anchors lies a strong but not direct Wayne County heir-and-partition argument. Beyond Jacob lies a real York County corridor whose identity conflicts remain unresolved.

The European work produced genuine original-record findings, but not the transatlantic bridge that public trees imply. A 1732 Stähli baptism entry at Gundershoffen is dated 20 January, correcting a long-repeated 30 January variant. The 1709 Gundershoffen entry names a child Jacob, not Hans Jacob or Johann Jacob, and does not give his mother's maiden surname. At Meiringen, Melcher Stäli married Madle Stydler on 15 February 1672, and their son Hans was baptized on 9 June 1673. The register does not call that child Johann Jakob. These are real people and real events. The records do not yet prove that they form the claimed chain to Jacob Staley of Berkeley County.

The Konkle line is comparatively stable through Floyd, Edwin, Simon, and Cornelia. Simon's 1905 death record identifies Christian G. Konkle and Mary as his parents, but the relationship is not proof-closed because a lifetime or near-lifetime source has not corroborated it and Simon appears in the Wildman

household in 1850. The Cash line is proved through John W. Cash as Henry Cash's son, while Henry's placement with Sidney or Cidey and Mary remains a working hypothesis because the 1850 and 1860 censuses do not state relationships. The Turnes line is proved through Wirt or Wert Turnes to Henry and Louisa and directly identifies Aaron as Henry's parent. Pleasant Turnes's marriage record strengthens Mary as the likely mother within the household cluster, but it does not directly name her as Henry's mother.

This paper therefore presents a family history with visible proof horizons. It treats a limit as a finding, not an embarrassment. The purpose of the standard is not to make the family smaller. It is to keep each life attached to the evidence that actually belongs to it.

The claim that governs this history

Genealogy becomes most persuasive at the exact point where it refuses to pretend. A record may prove an event, identify a relationship, support an inference, expose a conflict, or show that a search route has gone cold. Those are different results. They should sound different on the page.

This paper uses seven proof labels. **Proved** means that a direct record states the relationship or that independent records converge so tightly that no reasonable competing identity remains. **Strong indirect evidence** means that several facts fit one relationship, but the record set still lacks a direct statement. **Identified but not closed** means that one direct source names the relationship, while the source's distance from the event or an unresolved conflict requires corroboration. **Working hypothesis** means that the proposed relationship is plausible and research-worthy but should not be placed in a fact narrative. **Conflict** marks two or more pieces of evidence that cannot yet be harmonized. **Negative control** marks a source that helps keep the wrong person or family out of the line. **Open boundary** names the place where the current evidence stops.

These labels are not grades assigned to ancestors. They describe the condition of the evidence. A person does not become less real because a courthouse burned, a clerk omitted a relationship, or a register survives only in difficult handwriting. Nor does a confident online tree make a relationship more real. The label belongs to the proof, not the life.

The evidence also has a hierarchy, but no single record type wins every argument. A will that says "my son" usually carries direct relationship evidence. A census relationship column can do the same after the federal schedules began recording relationships to the head of household. Earlier censuses can show co-residence but not kinship. A marriage record may name parents, or it may only prove the marriage. A death record can preserve parent names that exist nowhere else, yet the informant often

spoke many decades after the birth. Newspapers can fix a family in a place, connect an event to a social network, or reveal a migration. They can also repeat rumor. Compiled trees are useful maps to possible sources. They are not the sources they point toward.

The method used here is correlation. Names, ages, spouses, children, places, occupations, property, informants, and chronology are tested together. Variant spellings are accepted only when the surrounding identity remains stable. Stephen Staley can appear as Story or Storey because the same wife, children, ages, and Wayne County setting hold the household together. Simon Konkle can appear as Conkle or Kenkel when the parent fields and household sequence agree. Wirt can appear as Wert, and Turnes as Turns or Turner, when spouse, parents, date, and place converge. The surname alone never carries the merge.

The method also asks what a record does *not* say. The 1850 census does not say that every child-shaped person in a household was a son or daughter. The 1891 notice that Stephen Staley's family went west does not name Arkansas. A military roster does not prove kinship between two soldiers. The Gundershoffer register does not contain a hidden "Hans" merely because a later profile uses the compound name Hans Jacob. Absence of a word can be consequential when the claim depends on that word.

Finally, the work keeps the direct line separate from the social field around it. Brothers, in-laws, neighbors, sureties, witnesses, co-heirs, church members, and soldiers in the same company often explain how a family moved and whom it trusted. This is sometimes called family, associates, and neighbors research. The principle is older than the acronym: people leave records in groups. Yet a group is not a pedigree. Collateral evidence can identify the right household or disprove the wrong one. It cannot be made to say "parent" when it says only "neighbor," "brother," "surety," or "co-party."

The result is a history with different degrees of resolution. Some sections read like a settled narrative. Others read like the edge of a map. Both belong here because both describe what the records will bear.

A reader's map of the findings

The Staley line has three different evidentiary zones. From Daniel Lawrence Staley back through Stephen and Ann, the family is proof-ready by correlation. The records contain a real conflict at Daniel's birth, but the conflict is bounded and explained. From Stephen S. back to the older Stephen and Mary, the evidence is strong and indirect. The household placement, later identity, and Wayne County estate network converge, while a direct "son" or heir-basis statement remains missing. At Jacob of Berkeley, the evidence becomes direct again because his will names a son Stephen. Beyond Jacob, the proof status falls to working hypothesis. York and Berkeley records describe an authentic migration and property corridor, yet they do not reconcile the same-named men or the wives Elizabeth and Catharine.

The late pension review sharpened that boundary. Earlier derivative descriptions made it easy to imagine one patriarchal family leaving Pennsylvania for Berkeley County. The original W6194 pages instead give Peter's own detailed residence history and Daniel's direct statement that Peter was his brother. W6179 preserves Daniel's description of a father Jacob and brothers Jacob and Peter, alongside Barbara's marriage statement. These are strong family records. They still do not carry the identifiers needed to make Daniel's father the 1793 testator. The new evidence made the network clearer and the merge less automatic.

The late collateral work also changed the texture of the Staley story. The 1853 newspaper notice independently confirmed Stephen and Ann's marriage in the language of their community. The 1891 Ceredo notice caught the family in motion. The 1906 Arkansas material and cemetery controls established the endpoint. Wayne County obituaries, reunion items, marriage records, and death certificates mapped siblings and associates while exposing same-name hazards. This work did not transform an indirect parentage link into a direct one. It made the family around that link more visible and the remaining source target more exact.

The European record work produced the clearest revision to inherited names. The Meiringen register does not record Johann Jakob in 1673. It records Hans. The Gundershoffen register in 1709 does not independently record Hans Jacob. It records Jacob. The 1732 date is the twentieth. These findings do not disprove every possibility behind the compound names. They do remove the original registers as simple proof of those forms. A future argument must now explain the name changes instead of assuming them.

For the Konkle line, the proof is strongest from Floyd through Edwin to Simon and Cornelia. Direct parent fields repeat across birth and marriage records. Census households connect childhood and adulthood. Simon's occupation as a house and carriage painter adds a credible historical detail between enumerations. The open boundary begins at Christian and Mary. Simon's death record names them, so the pair is more than a speculative tree attachment. The 1850 Wildman placement and the absence of lifetime corroboration keep the relationship from proof closure.

The Wayne County, Ohio, library search narrowed rather than solved that problem. A defined index contained no Konkle surname in its wills, estates, and guardianships for the relevant period. Tax materials showed variant-name households in the county. This combination warns against two opposite mistakes: declaring the parents proved from the death record alone, or declaring them absent because one index was negative. The next useful evidence must explain Simon's childhood placement or connect him to Christian and Mary through land, probate, court, church, or another near-contemporary record.

The Cash line is secure through Allan to John W. and then to Henry. Parent fields and relationship columns say what the proof requires. The earlier Henry-to-Sidney/Cidey-and-Mary link remains a working hypothesis. Two household placements make the hypothesis strong enough to guide research. The pre-relationship-column censuses cannot finish it. A probate or deed record may do so because the 1897 administration reference points toward an estate context.

The Turnes line is secure through Ellen, Clarence, Wirt, and Henry and Louisa. Aaron is directly named as Henry's parent. The 1850 household and Pleasant's marriage record make Mary a strong maternal candidate. Pleasant's shared military company with Henry adds adult association to childhood co-residence. Still, the direct source names Mary as Pleasant's mother, not Henry's. The distinction leaves one precise gap instead of a vague uncertainty.

Across all four lines, the findings can be reduced to five governing conclusions:

1. **The later American generations are substantially documented.** Vital records, censuses, wills, and marriage registers carry most of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century relationships with direct or tightly correlated evidence.
2. **The hardest American gaps occur where records name groups but not relationships.** Wayne partition parties, pre-1880 census households, and collateral clusters create strong arguments while withholding the decisive word.
3. **Same-name control is not optional.** The wrong Civil War Stephen, several York Jacobs, a separate Henry Cash, and overlapping Staley spouse clusters show how quickly a plausible record can enter the wrong life.
4. **Original European registers corrected the tree without completing it.** They fixed dates and recorded names, but they supplied no York-to-Berkeley or transatlantic identity bridge.
5. **Every open boundary now has a source-shaped target.** The next step is not more volume. It is a relationship-bearing court paper, deed, probate file, church record, or paleographic reading capable of deciding the specific question.

This map lets a reader enter the paper without flattening its conclusions. "Proved" appears where a relationship field, will, or compelling correlation supports it. "Open" appears where the evidence genuinely ends. The historical narrative proceeds through both.

Part I — The Staley line in America

A child appears twice in the record

Daniel Lawrence Staley's birth is the best place to begin because the proof contains a contradiction. A later indexed Wayne County birth register records Daniel Lawrence Staley, born 2 November 1881. It names Stephen Staley as his father. A second register entry for the same date names a child Donald L. Staley and supplies Stephen Staley and Anna H. Staley as the parents. The records do not agree on the child's given name. They agree on the date, surname, father, county, and family context. Later records consistently identify the adult as Daniel Lawrence Staley. Read together, the pair supplies what neither entry supplies alone: the direct-line child's name and the identity of both parents. [E01](#) [E02](#)

The responsible conclusion is not that the Donald entry should be ignored. It is that the clerk or later copying process produced a name conflict inside an otherwise coherent registration pair. A proof argument becomes stronger when it explains the discordant evidence rather than selecting the convenient half. The records establish Daniel as a child of Stephen and Ann or Anna H. Staley by correlation. The conclusion remains inspectable because the two full register pages are reproduced in the document gallery.

Daniel's parents had married more than 28 years earlier. Lawrence County, Ohio, marriage entry 269 records Stephen Staley and Ann H. Gardner marrying on 5 June 1853. A notice in the *Spirit of the Times* nine days later independently reports that Stephen Staley married "Phelinda A. H. Gardner" on the fifth. The expanded given name in the newspaper is unusual, but the date, groom, Gardner surname, and local setting match the official entry. The marriage is proved. The record does not name Stephen's parents. [E03](#)

The marriage starts a household sequence. In 1860 Stephen and Ann were in Rome Township, Lawrence County, Ohio. By 1870 they were in Ceredo, Wayne County, West Virginia. Their children, ages, and birthplaces trace a family that crossed the Ohio River rather than appearing as a new household with the same names. The 1880 enumerator wrote the surname as Story or Storey in Butler District, Wayne County. Ann and the children anchor the identity. The spelling changes; the family does not. [E05](#) [E06](#) [E07](#)

This sequence matters because a surname is never evidence in isolation. Staley, Stayley, Stailey, Staily, Storey, Story, Stähli, and Stehly can represent the same family in one record set and entirely different families in another. Here the variant is controlled by wife, children, place, and chronology. Later in York and Berkeley Counties, those same spelling freedoms become dangerous because several Jacob and Peter households overlap. The standard must therefore be local: accept a variant when the full identity holds; reject a merge when only the sound of the name agrees.

Marriage, work, and movement made a family visible

Census schedules show location and household form, but newspapers give motion. On 16 December 1891, the White's Creek column of *The Ceredo Advance* reported that Stephen Staley and his family had left the previous Thursday "to seek their fortune in the far west." The brief item is ordinary community news. That is why it matters. It catches the family at the moment of departure, before later memorials compressed the movement into a birthplace and a death place. **E08**

The item does not name Arkansas. It becomes migration evidence only when correlated with the destination record. Stephen and Ann appear in the Pine Log Cemetery record near Brookland, Craighead County, Arkansas. A Jonesboro newspaper notice in January 1906 places Steven or Stephen Staley's funeral in the granddaughter network that fits the known family. An Arkansas census and the households of adult children support the same endpoint. Together, the records turn "far west" from a literary phrase into a documented movement from Wayne County to northeastern Arkansas. **E09**

Ann died in 1895. Stephen died in January 1906. The gravestone and cemetery survey preserve their dates, but those endpoint records do not supply Stephen's parents. They are identity and migration evidence. Their proper role is to close the adult life that began in the Ohio marriage record and continued through the Wayne County household. A memorial link that names parents may be useful as a clue, but the stone itself cannot testify to words it does not contain.

The Arkansas move also helps eliminate a seductive military mistake. A same-named Stephen Staley served in Company A of the 89th Ohio Infantry. Ohio's official roster says that soldier enlisted in 1862, was captured at Chickamauga, and died in a Confederate prison at Danville, Virginia, in December 1863. The family man documented in the 1870 and 1880 Wayne County households and later in Arkansas could not be that soldier. Same name, compatible region, and Civil War age are not enough. The death date makes the separation decisive.

The 1903 and 1905 Wayne County juror or payment entries pose a subtler problem. They name Stephen Staley while the target man was approaching his Arkansas death. A 1913 Wayne record names a Stephen after the target's death and proves that at least one same-named person remained in the

county. The later identity control prevents the attractive but unsupported claim that every Wayne civic entry belonged to the Arkansas ancestor. Records can describe a community without describing the direct line.

The Wayne County parentage question remains strong but indirect

Stephen S. Staley, born in 1824, appears as a younger person in the 1850 Wayne County household of Stephen and Mary Staley. The placement fits a son. It does not say "son." The federal census did not record relationships in 1850, and the household alone cannot close the link. **E04**

The stronger case comes from what happened after the older Stephen's death. Wayne County estate-share and partition deeds gathered a network of Staley parties around the deceased man's land. Joseph Staley, Solomon and Nancy Staley, Elisha and Rutha Staley, Peyton Staley, and other parties appear in transactions involving shares or interests in the estate. The deeds establish that the participants belonged to a property and heir-class network. They do not all explain the basis of each share. In particular, no inspected record directly calls Stephen S. a son or sets out an heir schedule that assigns his interest by name. **E10**

The evidence nevertheless converges. Stephen S. was in the older Stephen and Mary household at the right age. He remained in the same Wayne County community. The estate and partition network contains the surnames and households expected around the older couple's children. Stephen S.'s 1853 marriage, later census sequence, and adult family provide a continuous identity. The most responsible description is **strong indirect evidence that places Stephen S. in the child or heir-class of Stephen Staley Jr. and Mary**. It is not a direct-record parent-child proof.

That sentence is deliberately narrower than some earlier family summaries. "High confidence" can describe the overall inference, but it should not be mistaken for a quoted relationship. The missing document is specific: a chancery bill, commissioner's report, court order, probate list, or partition statement that names the parties and explains their relationships or share bases. Until it appears, the direct line crosses this generation on a strong indirect bridge.

Collateral records help map the bridge without closing it. The 1919 death certificate of Barbara Ann Staley names her father as Steven Staley and her mother as Barbara A. Staley. The informant was Allen Staley, and the certificate was created many decades after Barbara's birth. It is a real parent-field record, but its names do not fit a simplified Stephen-and-Mary child list without further explanation. The certificate should therefore be preserved as a conflict and research lead, not forced into the direct line. **E11**

Creed Staley's 1918 obituary performs a different job. It describes a Wayne County man with a wife, son, four daughters, siblings, a Baptist church, and a long local life. Peyton Staley's obituary, reunion notice, and farm-sale notices similarly illuminate the community. These records show that the Staley network was large, socially visible, and persistent. They are valuable because partition parties were people before they were names in a deed. They do not, by themselves, identify the target ancestor's parents. **E12**

The same caution applies to a 1911 newspaper item in which Station Staley called on "Uncle Peyton Staley." The kinship word is direct for the two people in that item, but it does not automatically identify Station within the direct-line household or explain Peyton's relation to Stephen S. Each collateral relationship must be attached to the people actually named.

The result at Wayne County is neither failure nor finality. It is an accurately drawn proof horizon. The family of Stephen and Mary can be reconstructed in substantial part. Stephen S. belongs in that network with strong confidence. The missing direct statement still matters because it is the difference between a likely child and a documented son.

Jacob's 1793 will is the eighteenth-century anchor

The record becomes direct again with Jacob Staley of Berkeley County. In a will dated 26 August 1793, Jacob named his wife Catharine and his sons Jacob, Peter, John, Stephen, and Daniel. He also named daughters Sarah Fisher and Catherine Strayer, made provisions affecting Sarah's children, and appointed sons Jacob and Peter as executors. The will is relationship-bearing evidence. It proves that this Jacob had a son Stephen. **E14**

The will does not prove that the named Stephen was the same Stephen who later appears in the Cabell and Wayne County network. That identity rests on the surrounding migration and family evidence. The chronology is plausible: an adult or near-adult son in 1793 could be the older man whose family later occupied the lower Ohio and Guyandotte region. Probate, land, and household records track a Staley network moving west within Virginia. Still, identity over time must be distinguished from the bare relationship in the will. The document proves "a son Stephen." The broader packet strongly supports the direct-line identification.

Jacob's will also fixes his wife's given name as Catharine. It does not give her maiden name. The frequently copied "Catharine Elizabeth Goering" form therefore exceeds the will. Searches of Goering, Gering, Geringer, and related York records found several real families, but no inspected record connected a Catharine or Elizabeth Goering to Jacob Staley of Berkeley County. Some records instead documented other wives of same-named Jacob men. The correct public statement is **Catharine, maiden name unproved.**

The will gives the family a solid American anchor, but it also creates the question that has shaped much of the deeper research: was Jacob of Berkeley the same man as a Jacob Staley or Stealy in York County, Pennsylvania? The evidence shows a corridor. It does not yet prove the traveler.

Part II — The York and Berkeley problem

The pension files describe a migration network, not one simple Jacob

Two Revolutionary War pension files, W6194 and W6179, contain some of the most valuable testimony in the project. They are valuable partly because they complicate the story.

In W6194, Peter Staley declared in Jefferson County on 15 July 1833 that he was 79 years old and had been born in Pennsylvania in 1754. He described service from York County in 1776. After discharge, he said, he lived about 18 months in York County, about 41 years in Berkeley County, about 16 years in Frederick County, Maryland, returned to Berkeley, and moved to Jefferson County in 1833. The sequence is unusually specific. It places a Staley man of the correct generation on the York-to-Berkeley route and gives the route duration. **E15**

The file also contains relationship evidence. On 7 November 1839, Daniel Staley certified that Peter was his brother and that Margaret was Peter's widow. A copied Berkeley County marriage bond for Peter Stayley and Margaret Hummer names Jacob Stayley as a co-bound party or surety. The pension papers correct Peter's death date to 16 July 1837 and clarify that a later route involving Henry Berry led to Shepherdstown, Virginia. These details are not decorative. They keep later researchers from building arguments on a misread date or place. **E16**

W6194 therefore proves a Peter-Daniel sibling relationship and a substantial migration history. It places a Jacob in the Peter marriage-bond context. It does not say that the Jacob on that bond was the 1793 testator, nor does it identify the siblings' father in the cited certification. The file supports the corridor more strongly than the identity.

W6179 introduces a separate Jacob-and-Barbara story. Barbara Staley stated that she married Jacob Staley in Shepherdstown, Berkeley County. Daniel Staley testified that Jacob Staley was his father and that Jacob Jr. and Peter were his brothers. He further described the father and brother Jacob moving from Pennsylvania to Berkeley before Yorktown. This is direct testimony about Daniel's family as he understood it. **E17**

The difficulty is the spouse. The direct-line Berkeley will names Catharine as the testator's wife. W6179 centers on a Jacob married to Barbara. No inspected record proves that Barbara preceded or followed Catharine as wife of the same man. No record demonstrates that Daniel's father in the deposition was the 1793 testator. The people may be related. They may even belong to the same broad migration. The evidence does not authorize collapsing the households.

This distinction matters because pension testimony is often treated as a shortcut through missing eighteenth-century records. It can be powerful. It can also preserve memories of several men with the same name. Daniel's words deserve to be read precisely: father Jacob; brothers Jacob and Peter; a Pennsylvania-to-Berkeley movement. They do not supply a probate identifier, a land description, or a wife named Catharine. The testimony should guide a record search, not override the conflict.

The pension files also change the historical texture of the line. The move from York to Berkeley was not an abstract arrow on a pedigree. Peter described it as a sequence of residences spanning decades. The family operated inside a borderland of counties whose jurisdictions changed while people crossed the Potomac and Shenandoah corridors for land, marriage, military service, and kin. That mobility explains why evidence appears in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland. It does not make every Staley in those places one family.

York County contains several Staley households

The York records are most useful when they prevent a merge. York Deed Book 2B, pages 60 through 62, records a 1782 transaction involving the estate of a deceased Jacob Stealley of Germany Township. Christoffel Stealley appears as administrator and eldest son. John is named as heir and legatee. Joseph is a legatee. An unnamed widow receives annual support for life. This is a well-defined family group. It is not the group named in the 1793 Berkeley will. **E18**

The deed does not prove that the Germany Township family was unrelated to the Chanceford or Berkeley people. It proves that a deceased Jacob with known heirs existed in York County and must be kept separate until evidence connects him. This is what a negative identity control does: it gives the wrong merge enough detail to remain visibly wrong.

Other York records add more same-name controls. A 1771 deed names Jacob Stehley of Germany Township and wife Anna. A 1772 estate cluster involves Jacob Stealy and widow Eva. Administration-bond indexes show Andrew Stailey in Chanceford in 1794 and Jacob Stehly in Germany Township in 1796. These entries warn against treating "Jacob Staley of York County" as one person. Townships, spouses, estate dates, and heirs must travel with the name.

The Chanceford evidence is nevertheless substantial. Tax and land records place Staley or Stealy men in the township. A copied survey for Michael Witman, made in 1793, uses Jacob Stealy as a boundary label. Church and estate materials place Staley variants in the same local network. Revolutionary War roster evidence names a Jacob Staley in York County service. Each fact makes a York origin for some Berkeley Staleys more plausible. None, alone, identifies the 1793 testator.

York Deed Book 2G creates the sharpest bridge and the sharpest conflict. The Peter Staily estate deeds involve York or Chanceford land and Berkeley-resident Staley parties. They demonstrate that a family and property network crossed the colonial or state boundary. Yet one of the relevant records associates Jacob with wife Elizabeth, while the Berkeley will names wife Catharine. The two women cannot be merged by adding a middle name. **E19**

Several explanations remain possible. There may have been two Jacob men. One man may have married twice. A clerk may have recorded a wife, widow, dower holder, or co-party whose legal position has been misunderstood. The deeds may concern a collateral Jacob rather than the testator. Each explanation predicts different evidence. A remarriage should leave a death, marriage, dower, or acknowledgment sequence. Two men should separate in tax, land, probate, or residence records. A collateral relationship should emerge through heirs, grantors, or repeated neighbors.

Until one of those predictions is met, the conclusion remains **working hypothesis — not proved**: Berkeley Jacob may be the same person as, or closely connected to, the York/Chanceford Peter-estate Jacob, but the current evidence does not reconcile Elizabeth and Catharine.

That boundary protects more than one name. If the wrong Jacob is merged at this point, every earlier generation attached to him becomes unreliable. A false eighteenth-century bridge can carry a pedigree across an ocean with the appearance of precision. The dates may line up. The names may look German or Swiss. The error remains structural.

The American conclusion is stronger for stopping where it does

The direct line through Jacob's son Stephen has genuine evidentiary weight. Jacob's will is direct. The later Virginia-to-West Virginia family network is coherent. The Wayne County link to Stephen S. is strong indirect evidence, and the Stephen-and-Ann-to-Daniel link is proof-ready by correlation. None of that depends on proving the York identity.

This is an important consequence. The unproved earlier bridge does not erase the documented later family. Genealogical uncertainty is not contagious when claims are separated correctly. Jacob of Berkeley can remain a proved father of Stephen even if his own parents, birthplace, and pre-Berkeley identity remain unknown.

The same principle applies to the name Goering. The research reviewed York Goering and Geringer records, original deeds, probate abstracts, church-register derivatives, and compiled claims. It found real people named Jacob and Elizabeth Goering, Joseph and Mary Geringer, and other households. It did not find a relationship-bearing record that made Catharine, wife of the Berkeley testator, a Goering. A negative result across targeted records weakens the copied claim. It does not prove that no such relationship ever existed. The maiden name remains unproved.

The highest-value future American source is not another broad surname search. It is a record that can distinguish or connect the Jacob households: Berkeley County Deed Book G around page 410; related deeds, dower acknowledgments, tax lists, probate files, or church registers from roughly 1783 through 1795; or an original York record that names a Berkeley residence and a specific spouse or child. The research question is no longer "Can another Jacob be found?" Many have been found. The question is "Which record makes two identities one, or proves that they must remain two?"

Part III — Europe: real records, missing bridge

The 1732 record corrects a date, not an ancestry

The European inquiry began with a widely copied profile: a Johan or Johann Jacob Stähli born or baptized at Gundershoffen in Alsace on 20 or 30 January 1732, son of Hans Jacob Stähli and Anna Eva, later identified as Jacob Staley of York and Berkeley Counties. The profile offered enough detail to test. The original Protestant register was located.

Image 114 of the Gundershoffen register contains entry 36, marked Stähli in the margin. The opening date reads 20 January 1732. The original therefore resolves the derivative date conflict in favor of the twentieth, not the thirtieth. That is a material correction. The remainder of the handwriting still requires a full independent paleographic transcription before every name and relationship can be stated confidently. **E20**

The record proves that a Stähli event occurred in the Gundershoffen register on that date. It does not prove that the child became a York County taxpayer, a Berkeley County testator, or the husband of Catharine. No passenger record, naturalization, church transfer, military statement, land record, or probate relationship has been found that carries this person across the Atlantic and into the American identity.

The distinction between event and identity is the heart of the European problem. A baptism can prove a child belonged to named parents at a place and time. It cannot prove every later life assigned to that child. The more distant the proposed move, the more identity evidence is needed. Gundershoffen to York and Berkeley is not impossible. It is simply unproved.

The 1709 record says Jacob

The next generation on the copied tree was said to be Hans Jacob Stähli, born in 1709, child of Johann Jakob Stähli and Magdalena Huggler. The original Gundershoffen baptism entry changes the wording of that claim.

The register records a son born 23 July and baptized 28 July 1709 to Jacob Stähli and his wife Magdalena. The child's naming clause gives **Jacob**. No additional Hans or Johann is independently visible. The entry does not state Magdalena's maiden surname. It therefore supports Jacob Stähli, son of Jacob and Magdalena, not the compound-name and maiden-name package that later profiles display. **E21**

This is not a trivial spelling dispute. Hans, Johann, and Jacob can coexist in German-speaking records, and compound names can be shortened in use. But a later tree cannot donate an unrecorded given name to an original entry and then cite the entry as proof of that name. The correct statement begins with the register: Jacob. A proposed Hans Jacob identity requires evidence outside this naming clause.

The same rule applies to Magdalena Huggler. The entry identifies Magdalena as the father's wife. It does not give Huggler. A separate marriage record could establish the maiden name and connect the couple, but the claimed 1695 Meiringen marriage has not been read confidently in the original register.

Meiringen proves a marriage and a son named Hans

The Bern state archive made it possible to inspect the Meiringen registers directly without republishing restricted FamilySearch imagery. In K Meiringen 19, the marriage register for 1672 begins on manuscript folio 25. Item 6, under the 15 February heading and marked with the equivalent of “same day,” reads Melcher Stäli and Madle Stydler. The event is direct evidence for their marriage on 15 February 1672. **E22**

In K Meiringen 6, the baptism register for 1673 contains an entry under the 9 June heading. The legible clause reads: “Melcher Stäli und Madle Stydler ein sohn Hans”—a son Hans to Melcher Stäli and Madle Stydler. The sponsor names are not clear enough in the scan for a confident full transcription. The child's recorded name is Hans. **E23**

These two records establish a couple and a child. They do not establish the child's later identity as Johann Jakob Stähli. The difference matters because the copied pedigree depends on that equation. Hans may have used another name later. There may be another record. A compound-name convention may be involved. Those are hypotheses. The original baptism entry itself does not close them.

The project also tested the claimed 1695 Meiringen marriage of the next couple. The official register's complete 1695 page span was located and inspected. No Stähli-Huggler couple could be read with confidence. The handwriting is difficult, so the result is not proof that the marriage is absent. It is an **open boundary**: the claimed event remains unproved, and a qualified paleographic review may still find or reject it. **E24**

A separate locator correction moved a 1700 Leni record from Meiringen to Brienz. That correction prevents research in the wrong parish. The exact original image remains restricted to FamilySearch affiliate-center access, so the event has not been promoted into the proved chain. £25

What the online tree contributed—and what it could not

The online tree was useful as a route map. It supplied person identifiers, claimed dates, parishes, and source hints. Those clues led to the 1732 and 1709 Gundershoffen images and the 1672 and 1673 Meiringen registers. In that sense, the tree did real research work.

It also demonstrated why source attachment counts can mislead. The source inventory for the 1673 profile included indexed attachments that named the adult as Hans or Hanss. Compound forms such as Johann Jakob appeared in change history and profile assertions rather than in the examined attachment titles. A tree can accumulate many sources around a person while the specific identity claim remains unattached.

The original registers now support four bounded statements:

- Melcher Stäli married Madle Stydler at Meiringen on 15 February 1672.
- Their son Hans was baptized there on 9 June 1673.
- Jacob, son of Jacob Stähli and Magdalena, was born 23 July and baptized at Gundershoffen on 28 July 1709.
- A Stähli entry in the Gundershoffen register is dated 20 January 1732.

The records do **not** yet support three necessary identity equations: Hans of 1673 equals the later Johann Jakob; Jacob of 1709 equals a Hans Jacob whose mother was Magdalena Huggler; and the 1732 Gundershoffen child equals Jacob Staley of York and Berkeley. Without those equations, Europe remains documented context and a promising research line, not proved ancestry.

The humane consequence of this restraint is easy to miss. The people in the Swiss and Alsatian registers deserve identities that belong to them. Turning Hans into Johann Jakob because a modern tree needs the name does not honor the family. It replaces a difficult person with a convenient one.

Part IV — The Konkle line

The Michigan records carry the line back to Indiana

The Konkle evidence has a different shape from the early Staley evidence. Parent fields appear repeatedly, household continuity is strong, and the surname variants can be controlled across a smaller number of places. The line is proof-ready from Floyd through Edwin to Simon and Cornelia. The open question begins with Simon's parents.

Floyd appears as Floyd Earl Kenkel in a Michigan birth record dated 9 June 1909 at Jackson. The record names Edwin L. Kenkel and Ida M. Salesbury as his parents. In 1927, Floyd Konkle's marriage record names Edwin L. Konkle and Ida Salisbury again. The shift from Kenkel to Konkle and Salesbury to Salisbury is phonetic and clerical, not evidence of different families. The repeated parent pair, birth details, and later household sequence establish the identity. [E26](#) [E27](#)

Floyd's childhood records place him with Edwin and Ida. Those censuses do useful continuity work, but the direct proof comes from the birth and marriage parent fields. This distinction keeps the argument efficient. A census need not be asked to prove what two vital records already state directly. It instead shows that the named child lived in the expected family and survived into the adult identity.

Edwin's own marriage moves the line into Indiana. On 24 May 1890, Edwin L. Konkle married Ida M. Salisbury in Jackson, Michigan. The record names his parents as Simon K. Konkle and Cornelia Andrews. Earlier Noble County censuses place Edwin or Edward in Simon and Cornelia's household. Later Michigan records carry the same man into marriage and fatherhood. The Edwin/Edward variant is controlled by age, parents, birthplace, spouse, and migration. [E28](#)

The family path therefore runs from Albion, Indiana, to Jackson and then the Calhoun County area of Michigan. It is a movement visible in ordinary records: a child's place of birth, a marriage jurisdiction, a census birthplace, and an adult household. No single document tells the migration story. The sequence does.

Simon and Cornelia built a life in Albion

Simon Konkle married Cornelia G. Andrews in Noble County on 17 March 1860. The Indiana marriage record proves the event. Federal censuses in 1860, 1870, 1880, and 1900 hold the couple in the Albion area. The 1900 schedule reports that they had been married for 40 years, matching the 1860 ceremony. **E29 E30**

The household sequence does more than connect a groom to an older man. It gives the family a durable local setting. Children grow older in the expected order. The adults' birthplaces remain broadly consistent. Simon's name shifts between Simon, Simeon, and Simon K.; Cornelia may be indexed under distorted forms. The surrounding family corrects the index.

A business directory in the 1874 *Historical Atlas of Noble County* adds a concrete fact that censuses leave vague. Under Albion, the directory lists "S. K. KONKLE, House and Carriage Painter." The entry places Simon inside the town's working economy between the 1870 and 1880 censuses. He was not only a household head. He painted the objects that moved people and goods through the county. **E34**

The phrase "house and carriage painter" describes a trade with both practical and visible consequences. A carriage finish protected wood and announced the owner's care or status. A house painter worked on the public face of a growing town. The atlas surrounds Simon's entry with blacksmiths, carpenters, merchants, millers, physicians, and printers. It locates him in a network of skilled labor rather than in an abstract demographic category.

The directory proves occupation and community placement. It does not name Simon's wife, children, or parents. Its evidentiary limit is part of its value. Because the marriage and census records carry the kinship, the directory can be allowed to do the work it does best: make the ancestor's daily world more visible.

Local obituary and cemetery controls support the Simon-and-Cornelia family identity. They should not be used to extend the pedigree without direct evidence. A local history can preserve names and community memory that lead to original records, but publication date and unknown informants affect its weight. The strongest Konkle links remain the vital records and multi-census sequence.

Simon's parents are named once, late

Simon's 1905 Michigan death record names his father as Christian G. Konkle and his mother as Mary Konkle. This is a direct parent-field statement. It moves Christian and Mary beyond a bare online-tree assertion. It does not, by itself, close the proof. **E31**

The record was created at Simon's death, roughly seven decades after his birth. The informant's identity and knowledge matter. A death certificate can preserve accurate family information, especially when a close relative supplied it. It can also compress, misspell, or misremember a parent. The project has not yet found a birth, baptism, guardianship, probate, deed, or near-contemporary household record that independently names Christian and Mary as Simon's parents.

The 1850 census makes the missing corroboration more important. Fourteen-year-old Simon Conkle, born in Ohio, appears in the Noble County household of Stephen and Mary A. Wildman. He is not enumerated with Christian and Mary Konkle. The census states no relationship. Simon may have been a relative, ward, worker, step-relative, or child living with kin. The placement is evidence of residence, not an explanation. **E32**

Mary Ann Konkle Wildman provides a plausible kinship clue. Later compiled and memorial sources associate that surname with Stephen Wildman's wife. If Mary Ann belonged to Simon's family, the 1850 household may reflect kin care, apprenticeship, orphaning, or ordinary family placement. Yet Mary Ann's exact relationship to Simon has not been proved in an original relationship-bearing source. The clue explains why the household deserves attention. It does not close it.

A targeted Wayne County, Ohio, library review narrowed the search. No Konkle surname was found in the county's 1812-1851 will, estate, or guardianship index. The library also supplied 1826 tax context for Mary Kinkler, Samuel Kinkler, and George Conkle. This is a mixed result: no indexed probate or guardianship hit for the target surname, but evidence that variant or related Konkle households were present in the county. **E33**

The negative cannot support "there was no estate" or "Simon had no guardian." The index may omit records, names may appear under other spellings, and land or court files may carry the relationship outside probate. The tax entries also do not identify Christian, Mary, or Simon. They refine the locality and variant search.

The responsible Konkle conclusion is therefore layered:

- Floyd Earl or Edwin Konkle/Kenkel is proved as a child of Edwin L. Konkle/Kenkel and Ida M. Salisbury/Salesbury.
- Edwin is proved as a child of Simon K. Konkle and Cornelia G. Andrews.
- Simon and Cornelia's marriage and adult family are proved through marriage and census correlation.
- Christian G. Konkle and Mary are **identified but not proof-closed** as Simon's parents by his death record.

- Simon's 1850 Wildman placement and the Wayne County negative search define the next proof question.

The maiden name "Mary Dale" should not enter the fact narrative. It appears in compiled material without a supporting original record. The same exclusion applies to geographically plausible Christian Konkle candidates in Wisconsin or elsewhere. A matching name is a search target until a relationship-bearing record makes it family.

Part V — The Cash line

The public history starts with deceased anchors

The Cash research begins behind a privacy boundary. Living descendants connect the line to the present, but their names, dates, and records do not belong in a public historical paper. The narrative therefore starts with deceased adults whose records can be discussed without exposing a living person's identity.

A Virginia marriage record for Allan Heath Cash Jr. names Allan Heath Cash and Aileen Kendall Biggerstaff as his parents. This is direct parent-field evidence for the deceased anchor. The relationship is stated by the record rather than inferred from a household. **E35**

The next link rests on two censuses. In 1920, Allen H. Cash, age 15, appears as a son in the household of John W. and Nannie L. Cash. In 1930, Allen H. Cash, age 25, again appears as their son. The repetition controls the spelling and age progression. One census states the relationship; the second confirms that the same adult son remained in the family household. **E36**

John W. Cash's connection to the previous generation is even more direct. In 1880, eight-year-old John Cash appears in Henry Cash's Spartanburg County household with the relationship "son." The census relationship column performs the exact work needed. Later name expansion to John William and the adult John-and-Nannie household can be correlated through place, age, spouse, and children. **E37**

These links make the line through Allan, John, and Henry proof-ready. They also illustrate why relationship columns matter. If the same household appeared in 1850, the people might look like a family but the schedule would not say so. That is precisely the problem at the next generation.

Henry's childhood household is not yet a parentage proof

In the 1850 Spartanburg County census, Henry Cash, age 6, appears in the household of Cidey and Mary Cash. In 1860, Henry, age 17, appears with Sidney and Mary Cash. The ages, county, household structure, and Cidey/Sidney variant strongly suggest the same family. They make Sidney or Cidey and Mary the leading parentage hypothesis. Neither census states relationships. **E38**

The difference between “was in the household of” and “was the son of” is small in ordinary conversation and large in proof. Children often lived with parents. They also lived with grandparents, siblings, guardians, employers, or unrelated households. A repeated childhood placement strengthens the inference but does not convert the schedule into a relationship record.

Adult continuity supports the identity without closing the parents. In 1870, Henry and Ceany Cash headed a White Plains household. In 1880, Henry's family included John as a son. An 1897 administration-bond reference creates a route to probate or estate papers that may name heirs or land. The preserved image is an access lead, not yet an heir list. **E39**

The best next source would connect the household sequence to a relationship statement: Sidney or Mary's probate, a deed naming Henry as heir, a guardianship, a family Bible with verifiable provenance, a church record, or Henry's own record naming parents. Until such evidence appears, the line should read:

Working hypothesis — not proved: Henry Cash was likely a child of Sidney/Sydney/Cidey Cash and Mary, based on the 1850 and 1860 same-household sequence. The censuses do not state the relationship.

A 1919 South Carolina death record for a Black or Colored Henry Cash functions as a negative control. It belongs to a different man and should not be merged with the White Spartanburg household merely because name, county, and approximate generation overlap. Race classification, family fields, and identity context separate the records. Excluding that record protects both men from being made into one.

The Cash story is geographically compact compared with the Staley migration. Its difficulty comes from record form rather than distance. The family remained in Spartanburg County long enough for repeated households to appear, but the crucial censuses predate relationship columns. Stability of place increases confidence. It does not supply the missing word.

Part VI — The Turnes line

Variant spellings hold when the family holds

The public Turnes narrative also begins at a deceased anchor. Ellen Kaye Turnes's Virginia marriage record names Clarence Elwood Turnes and Alma Virginia Williams as her parents. Clarence's 1936 marriage record names Wirt Henry Turnes and Rosa B. Bryant as his parents. The records establish two links directly while the living generation remains outside the public account. **E40**

The next generation appears under Wirt, Wert, and occasionally a misread West; the surname appears as Turnes, Turns, and Turner. A 1902 Appomattox County marriage register for Wert H. Turner and Rosa B. Bryant names Henry C. Turner as a parent. The 1880 Charlotte County census places Wirt H. Turns with father Henry Turns and mother Louisa W. Turns in the Rosser household. Spouse, parents, county, age, and chronology converge. The variants describe one person. **E41**

Louisa's Rosser identity is supported by the household context and later family records. The 1880 arrangement in the Rosser home is socially informative: a married couple and children could live inside or beside the wife's family network. The record gives relationships within the immediate household but must still be read with the enumerator's structure. It supports Wirt's parents more strongly than it explains every Rosser relationship.

The Turnes variants demonstrate the difference between flexible spelling and flexible identity. Clerks often wrote what they heard. A family moving among Campbell, Charlotte, and Appomattox Counties could accumulate several forms. The solution is not to insist on one modern spelling. It is to demand the same surrounding people and chronology whenever the spelling changes.

Aaron is named; Mary is inferred through a sibling cluster

Henry C. or Henry Clay Turnes married Isabel Beasley in Appomattox County on 13 January 1908. The register names Aaron Turnes as Henry's parent. This is direct evidence for Aaron. It does not name Henry's mother. It also does not identify Aaron's parents. The link is therefore **identified but not closed** at the Aaron generation. **E42**

The 1850 Campbell County census supplies the childhood context. Henry Turnes, age 5, appears in the household of Aron and Mary Turnes with Pleasant, Samuel, and Alfred. The ages and later records fit a family. The schedule does not state relationships. Mary is the adult woman in the household, not automatically the mother of every child. **E43**

Pleasant's later record strengthens the inference. On 22 December 1864, Pleasant A. Turns married Mary F. Bagby. The surviving burned-years marriage compilation names his parents as Aaron and Mary. This directly proves Aaron and Mary as Pleasant's parents. Because Pleasant and Henry appear in the same 1850 household, the record supports a sibling cluster. It still does not directly call Mary Henry's mother. **E44**

The conclusion can be stated precisely. Aaron is directly identified as Henry's parent. Mary is a strengthened working conclusion as Henry's mother because she was the adult woman in the 1850 household and is directly named as Pleasant's mother. The missing source is one that names Mary in relation to Henry: Henry's birth or baptism, a second marriage record, a death record with informed parent fields, probate, deed, guardianship, pension, or court testimony.

This distinction is not hair-splitting. If Aaron had children by more than one wife, or if Mary was a stepmother, the household and Pleasant's record would look much as they do now. A direct Henry-to-Mary source would decide the matter. Until then, the family cluster is strong but the maternal link remains indirect.

Military records add biography and test a family story

Henry's Confederate service record appears under Tornes and Turnes variants in Company H, 2nd Virginia Cavalry. The cards say he enlisted at Verdierville on 25 September 1863. Later rolls mark him absent sick or in hospital. A prisoner-of-war or parole card places H. Turnes at Appomattox Court House on 9 April 1865. **E45**

The National Park Service parole list independently names Henry Clay Turnes and Pleasant Andrew Turnes in the same company. Shared unit and surrender context reinforce the idea that the two men in the 1850 household remained associated as adults. Military service alone does not prove that they were brothers. Combined with Pleasant's parent record and the childhood household, it strengthens the cluster. **E46**

The service chronology also tests an inherited wound story. Family notes placed Henry at the Battle of Kelly's Ford and associated him with a wound there. The battle occurred on 17 March 1863. Henry's service record says he enlisted on 25 September 1863, more than six months later. The preserved eight-card record contains no Kelly's Ford wound card.

The evidence does not prove that Henry was never wounded or never present near Kelly's Ford at another time. It does show that the story, as dated and phrased, conflicts with his documented enlistment. The proper wording is **disfavored and unproved as written**. A pension, hospital register, disability examination, or separate service record could revise that conclusion. Until then, the record supports later sickness and hospitalization, not the specific battle claim.

War records can tempt a family history toward drama. The quieter fact is more exact. A young man enlisted in 1863, remained present through early 1864, was later absent sick, and was paroled when the army surrendered. Pleasant passed through the same military structure. Their service added a second adult association to a household first seen 15 years earlier.

Repository guidance changed the route, not the proof

The Library of Virginia responded to the targeted Turnes inquiry with process and access guidance. It did not supply a record image, an index hit, or a parentage statement. The reply defined how a paid personal-property-tax search or county-record request could proceed. It did not change a genealogical claim. **E47**

This is worth stating because research correspondence can look like progress even when no evidence arrives. A useful repository response may identify reels, jurisdictions, fees, and limitations. That changes the next action. It does not become a citation for a relationship.

The Turnes boundary now has a focused target. Campbell County tax, deed, probate, guardianship, court, and church records from the period around the 1850 household could track Aaron's residence and male children. Appomattox records after the county's formation may show Pleasant or Henry receiving land, acting for an estate, or identifying kin. The correct search is a household reconstruction across jurisdictions, not another broad web search for "Aaron Turnes parents."

The current Turnes line is therefore strong through Wirt to Henry and Louisa. Aaron is directly identified as Henry's parent. Mary is strongly supported within the sibling cluster but not directly proved as Henry's mother. Aaron's own origins remain open.

Part VII — Four lines, four proof horizons

The strongest links use different kinds of evidence

The four lines do not advance at the same pace because they do not survive in the same records. The Staley proof depends on probate, land, household, newspapers, and a paired birth-register conflict. The Konkle proof depends heavily on parent fields and census continuity. The Cash line turns on the presence or absence of census relationship columns. The Turnes line combines marriage parent fields with a sibling cluster and military context.

That variety prevents a mechanical standard. “Three sources” is not a proof rule if all three sources copied one error. One direct will can prove more than ten derivative trees. Conversely, one death certificate may need corroboration when it names parents long after the birth. The question is not how many records exist. It is whether the records are independent, informed, and capable of supporting the claim.

The Daniel Lawrence Staley case shows correlation at its best. Two register entries conflict on the child's name. If the indexed Daniel entry were read alone, the mother would be missing. If the Donald entry were read alone, the wrong child name would enter the line. Household and later-life evidence identify Daniel, while the paired date and parents show how the entries belong together. The proof does not require pretending that Donald was a harmless spelling variant. It requires naming the clerical problem.

The Simon Konkle case shows why a direct statement can remain open. The 1905 death record names Christian and Mary. That is more than a clue. Yet it was created at the far end of Simon's life, and his 1850 placement with the Wildmans lacks an explanation. A lifetime record could make the parent pair secure or reveal that the death informant compressed a more complicated relationship.

The Henry Cash case is the inverse. No direct parent statement has been found, but two censuses place Henry with the same Sidney/Cidey and Mary household across a decade. The sequence is strong. The record form is weak for kinship. The evidence supports a working hypothesis rather than a parentage statement.

The Henry Turnes case combines both forms. A late marriage record directly names Aaron. A childhood census places Henry with Aron and Mary. Pleasant's marriage directly names Aaron and Mary as *his* parents. The cluster makes Mary likely for Henry, but the one missing relationship remains visible.

These are not inconsistencies in the standard. They are applications of one standard to different evidence. State what the source says. Correlate what independent sources allow. Keep the unresolved term unresolved.

Migration is proved in stages

Family histories often draw migration as a clean line between birth and death places. The records here show movement as a series of departures, pauses, and jurisdiction changes.

The Staley route is the longest. The proven American anchor stands in Berkeley County in 1793, when that county was in Virginia. The family network later appears in Cabell and Wayne Counties along the Ohio River and its tributaries. Stephen and Ann married across the river in Lawrence County, Ohio, in 1853. They returned to Wayne County, where the surname briefly became Storey in the census. A local newspaper saw the family leave in 1891. Arkansas records preserve the destination and death. Daniel Lawrence later carried the line to Michigan.

Each stage requires its own evidence. The Lawrence County marriage does not prove residence in Arkansas. The Ceredo newspaper does not prove the exact destination. The Arkansas endpoint does not prove the Berkeley origin. The route becomes credible because separate records close adjacent segments.

The proposed York-to-Berkeley segment remains different. Pension testimony makes the movement historically real for Peter and his kin. York estate and deed records show families and property crossing jurisdictions. The spouse conflict prevents assignment of that movement to the direct-line Jacob with the required confidence. A plausible route is not yet a proved traveler.

The Konkle route is shorter but still layered: an Ohio birth locality tradition for Simon, an 1850 placement in Noble County, a long adult life in Albion, and descendants in Jackson and Calhoun Counties, Michigan. The directory entry gives Simon an occupation during the Indiana phase. Edwin's marriage and Floyd's birth show the Michigan phase. The missing part is the childhood transition from Christian and Mary—if those are indeed the parents—to the Wildman household and Indiana.

The Cash line remains largely within Spartanburg County. Geographic continuity helps control identity, but it can create its own false confidence. When several men with the same common name live in one county, place no longer distinguishes them. The separate 1919 Henry Cash death record is therefore important as a negative control.

The Turnes line moves inside south-central Virginia as county boundaries and family residences shift among Campbell, Charlotte, and Appomattox. Military service briefly carries Henry and Pleasant through a wider landscape, ending at Appomattox. Their shared company matters most when read beside the household and marriage records.

Migration, then, is not one claim. It is a chain of identity claims. The chain is only as strong as the least explained crossing.

Negative evidence is useful only when the search was capable of finding the answer

The project recorded many searches that found nothing. Most are not proof. A search-engine result can fail because of spelling, indexing, access restrictions, or a page that was never digitized. An absent online hit says little about an eighteenth-century person.

Negative evidence gains weight when the repository, collection, place, dates, name variants, and coverage are known. The Wayne County library's review of a defined will, estate, and guardianship index is meaningful because the search scope is identifiable. It narrows one route for Simon Konkle. It still cannot exclude unindexed court, land, tax, church, or family records.

The Meiringen 1695 inspection has an even narrower limit. The entire annual span was located. The handwriting remains difficult. Failure to read the claimed couple is not proof that the entry is absent because the searcher's ability to recognize every spelling and hand was incomplete. The correct result is "not confidently located," not "no marriage occurred."

The 1732 date conflict is different. The original number can be seen. The record is capable of deciding between 20 and 30, and it reads 20. Here the original supplies positive evidence that resolves the negative choice.

Same-name controls also operate as negative evidence. The Ohio soldier who died in 1863 cannot be the Stephen who headed a Wayne County household in 1870. The Germany Township Jacob estate cannot be silently substituted for the Berkeley testator because its heirs, place, and chronology define another cluster. The Black Henry Cash in the 1919 death record should not be absorbed into a White family line. These exclusions are not side notes. They protect the identities that remain.

Collateral lives give the direct line its world

A direct-line chart can imply that history moved from father to son in a narrow corridor. The records show something more social. Property passed through groups of heirs. Marriage bonds required sureties. Families lived with in-laws. Siblings served in the same military company. Local newspapers reported reunions, visitors, funerals, departures, jurors, and farm sales.

Joseph Stailey and Margareth Highsey's 1832 marriage return does not name Joseph's parents. It does establish a collateral couple in Cabell County whose identity can be tracked separately from similar names. The original book image also reminds the reader how records were made: several returns copied together, handwriting fading across a photographed page, names rendered by clerks whose spelling was functional rather than fixed. **E13**

Creed Staley's obituary is not a parentage document, but it shows a man embedded in church and family. Barbara Ann Staley's death certificate does not fit neatly into the inherited child list, so it expands the question rather than the pedigree. Peyton's reunion gathered a living kin network around a 92nd birthday. These records make the Wayne partition parties less abstract while preserving the line between biography and proof.

Simon Konkle's directory entry does similar work. His parents are not on the page. His trade is. The record places him among the people who built, painted, repaired, sold, healed, taught, and printed for Albion. An ancestor who appears only as a relationship field is genealogically useful and historically thin. Occupational and community records restore some of the life without pretending to solve parentage.

Pleasant Turnes's marriage and service records show why collateral work can strengthen a direct-line argument. Pleasant appears with Henry in childhood, names Aaron and Mary as his parents, and serves in the same company as Henry. No single fact calls the men brothers. Together they make that interpretation substantially more likely. The proof stops one word short of direct.

Collateral research is therefore not a detour. It is often the way identity is controlled. Its discipline lies in refusing to convert association into descent.

Part VIII — Method, privacy, and stewardship

The source corpus remains larger than this paper

This paper is a reader-facing synthesis. It is not the source archive. The underlying project preserves original images where access and rights allowed, source notes, transcripts, manifests, checksums, browser captures, matrices, correspondence, and independent review records. Each evidence entry on this site has at least one preserved internal artifact behind its public-safe citation.

That distinction matters because prose is lossy. A sentence that says “the record names Aaron” cannot preserve the handwriting, column structure, adjacent entries, image quality, repository metadata, and acquisition history of the source itself. The archive keeps those layers. The paper explains why they matter.

The document gallery follows the same rule. It includes 10 exhibits whose public release is supportable from state archive, Library of Congress, Internet Archive, and official Bern archive sources. It excludes authenticated images obtained from FamilySearch, Ancestry, Newspapers.com, and Fold3, even where those records are discussed. The absence of an image on the site does not mean the evidence was not inspected. It means access and republication are different permissions.

Each gallery caption states what the image proves and what it does not. The two Wayne birth registers show why an evidentiary conflict must remain visible. The newspaper crops show a marriage and a departure but do not name parents or destination. The Bern register pages show the actual entries and their difficult hands. The Barbara Ann certificate and Joseph marriage page are collateral controls. The Noble County directory restores Simon's occupation.

Privacy changes where the public narrative begins

The Cash and Turnes lines connect to living people. A complete private proof package may need recent birth, marriage, or census records to establish that connection. A public history does not need to display those details. The public narratives begin with deceased anchors and omit living names, exact dates, addresses, account information, and private correspondence.

This is not an evidentiary concession. Privacy and proof answer different questions. A relationship can be documented privately while the public paper starts one generation later. The historical argument remains complete for the period it claims to cover.

The site also omits repository email addresses, message identifiers, authenticated session metadata, credentials, internal file paths, and payment details. Public citations name the record, jurisdiction, date, repository, collection, and locator when safe. The evidence ledger used to build the site retains the internal artifact map outside the published directory.

The same restraint applies to modern memorial photographs. A gravestone may be publicly viewable while the photograph remains copyrighted by its contributor. The paper cites the cemetery evidence but does not republish those images. Public availability is not a blanket license.

Conflicts are preserved as research assets

Several conflicts in this history could be made to disappear with a quiet editorial choice. Daniel could be selected over Donald. Catharine Elizabeth could be treated as one person bridging the York spouse conflict. Hans could be expanded to Johann Jakob. Mary could be declared Henry Turnes's mother because she occupies the expected place in the household. Each choice would make the pedigree cleaner.

It would also make the research weaker.

A conflict is information about the source system. The Daniel/Donald pair may reflect a copied register, delayed indexing, or clerk error. The Elizabeth/Catharine problem may reveal two Jacob men or a remarriage. The Hans/Johann Jakob mismatch may expose a tree merge. The Mary question may preserve a stepfamily or simply the limits of the 1850 census. Keeping the conflict visible allows a later record to solve the right problem.

The project therefore uses conflict as a queue, not a verdict. Each unresolved point has an upgrade condition:

- Stephen S. Staley becomes directly proved as a son when a relationship-bearing Wayne probate, chancery, or partition record says so.
- Berkeley Jacob merges with a York Jacob only when a deed, tax sequence, probate, church record, or equivalent evidence reconciles identity and spouse.
- The European chain advances only when original or near-original records connect the people across names, parishes, and migration.

- Christian and Mary Konkle become proof-closed as Simon's parents when a lifetime or well-corroborated relationship source explains the Wildman placement.
- Sidney/Cidey and Mary Cash become Henry's proved parents when a relationship-bearing record states or compels that conclusion.
- Mary becomes Henry Turnes's proved mother when a source connects her directly to Henry, not only to Pleasant and the household.

These conditions make future research falsifiable. A new source can meet the test, contradict it, or leave it unchanged. The conclusion does not rise merely because more pages have been searched.

The images change how the argument can be judged

A transcription is an interpretation. Even a careful one chooses where a name begins, whether a letter is an *n* or an *u*, how a date heading applies to the entries below it, and which marks are meaningful. The gallery therefore does more than decorate the paper. It allows a reader to inspect the distance between the claim and the page.

The two Wayne County birth-register images make this especially clear. The later indexed volume presents Daniel Lawrence in a clean typed or typewritten structure. It supplies the father and an informant but leaves the mother's field unhelpful for the proof question. The contemporaneous handwritten volume is harder to read and records Donald L. on the same date. It carries the parents across facing columns. A narrative that reproduced only the cleaner Daniel line would conceal the reason correlation was required.

The newspaper crops reveal another limit. The 1853 marriage notice occupies only a few lines among local announcements. Its print is imperfect, and the bride's given names are not identical to the marriage-book form. The 1891 departure item is similarly small. Neither source was created to preserve a genealogy. Their value comes from proximity to the events and agreement with independent records. Seeing their scale restores proportion: decisive historical clues can survive in ordinary type.

The Noble County directory page works in the opposite direction. Simon's entry is easy to overlook because it appears among dozens of tradespeople in several columns. The whole page matters. A tight crop could prove the wording but erase the occupational community around him. The gallery preserves the page so the reader can see both the entry and the town economy in which it appeared.

The Meiringen pages show why paleographic humility is necessary. Names sit inside dense seventeenth-century hands, headings change language or abbreviation, and ink weight varies. On the marriage page, item numbers and the repeated-date convention control the event. On the baptism page, the 9 June heading governs the entry below. The legible family clause supports Hans. Sponsor names remain uncertain. A complete-looking transcription would be less honest than a partial one with a visible boundary.

The Barbara Ann Staley death certificate shows a different kind of uncertainty. The form is modern, the relationship fields are labeled, and the handwriting is largely legible. The question is not what the record says. The question is whether the informant knew the facts and whether the named parents belong to the expected family cluster. Image clarity does not guarantee genealogical accuracy.

The Joseph Stailey marriage page illustrates source construction. The image is a photographed spread containing several ministerial returns and official notes. Joseph and Margareth's line is one act among many. The record proves the marriage because the clerk or minister recorded it. It does not become a parentage source merely because the surname resembles people in a nearby estate.

For these reasons, image review and textual analysis must remain paired. An image without a citation can become a visual anecdote. A citation without the image can hide a misreading. The public gallery offers 10 safe examples. The private corpus retains the restricted originals and surrounding pages needed for a full audit.

A chronology can show sequence without claiming descent

The chronology on this site combines events from different lines because time reveals patterns that a pedigree conceals. In 1672 and 1673, Meiringen records a marriage and a baptism. In 1709 and 1732, Gundershoffen records Stähli events. Those dates precede the proven American anchor, but chronology alone does not connect them.

In 1793, Jacob's Berkeley will names his family. In the 1830s, pension testimony looks backward to Revolutionary service and migration while current marriage records document collateral Staleys in western Virginia. In 1850, three separate proof problems appear in federal households: Stephen S. with Stephen and Mary, Simon Conkle with the Wildmans, and Henry Turnes with Aron and Mary. The same census year creates three strong placements and three warnings against implied relationships.

The 1853 Staley marriage, 1860 Konkle marriage, 1864 Pleasant Turnes marriage, and 1880 relationship-column records then add direct statements. By 1891, a newspaper captures the Staley departure west. By 1905 and 1908, death and marriage parent fields reach back toward Christian

Konkle and Aaron Turnes. By 1919, Barbara Ann's death certificate introduces a collateral conflict. The record set grows more explicit over time, but later information is often farther from childhood events.

Chronology therefore performs two jobs. It tests whether a proposed identity is possible, as in the Civil War Stephen separation. It also shows the changing capacity of record systems. A 1793 will can name children directly. An 1850 census cannot. An 1880 census can state "son." A twentieth-century death certificate can name parents while depending on an informant's memory. Time changes both the family and the evidence available to describe it.

Conclusion — The line ends where responsibility begins

The research establishes a large, credible family history. It proves Daniel Lawrence Staley's parents by explaining a birth-register conflict. It follows Stephen and Ann from an Ohio marriage through Wayne County and into Arkansas. It anchors the eighteenth-century Staley line in Jacob's Berkeley County will. It proves the Konkle line through Floyd, Edwin, Simon, and Cornelia. It carries the Cash line through John as Henry's stated son. It carries the Turnes line through Wirt to Henry and Louisa and directly identifies Aaron as Henry's parent.

The same research refuses several inherited extensions. The Wayne partition network has not yet yielded a direct statement that Stephen S. was Stephen Jr.'s son. York and Berkeley records have not reconciled Jacob with wife Elizabeth and Jacob with wife Catharine. No source has proved Catharine's maiden name as Goering. The Swiss and Alsatian registers document real Stähli events but do not connect their people to the American testator. Simon Konkle's death record names Christian and Mary, but the parentage remains open to lifetime corroboration. The Cash and Turnes household inferences remain one relationship short of direct proof.

That mixed result is not a compromise between belief and skepticism. It is the shape of the surviving evidence.

Family history asks the dead to speak through records built for other purposes: a tax, a marriage license, a will, a military roll, a census visit, a death certificate, a line of community news. Those records are partial by design. The researcher's responsibility is to correlate them without making them confess more than they know.

The reward is not merely accuracy. A bounded history allows individual lives to remain distinct. The Ohio soldier who died in prison is not consumed by the Arkansas ancestor. The Germany Township Jacob keeps his own heirs. Hans remains Hans until another record proves otherwise. A collateral marriage or obituary can illuminate a family without being drafted into a pedigree it does not support.

The family extends beyond every open boundary. The paper does not claim otherwise. It claims something harder and more durable: this is how far the evidence carries the line today, these are the records beneath it, and these are the exact places where the next record must speak.

Evidence register

E01 · Daniel Lawrence Staley indexed birth-register entry

proved by correlation — The indexed Wayne County entry names Daniel Lawrence Staley and father Stephen Staley; it is one half of the paired-register proof of Daniel's parents.

West Virginia Archives and History, Vital Research Records, Wayne County indexed register of births, Daniel Lawrence Staley, 2 November 1881, image 583484/00395.

E02 · Donald L. Staley contemporaneous birth-register entry

proved by correlation — The contemporary Wayne County register records Donald L. Staley on the same date and names Stephen and Anna H. Staley; the name conflict is resolved by correlation, not concealment.

West Virginia Archives and History, Vital Research Records, Wayne County birth register, Donald L. Staley, 2 November 1881, image 583485/00202.

E03 · Stephen Staley and Ann H. Gardner marriage

proved — The Lawrence County marriage entry proves the marriage event; the contemporary newspaper notice independently reports the same couple and date.

Lawrence County, Ohio, marriage-book entry 269, Stephen Staley and Ann H. Gardner, 5 June 1853; corroborated by Spirit of the Times (Ironton), 14 June 1853, page 3.

E04 · Stephen and Mary Staley household in Wayne County

strong indirect evidence — The 1850 household places a younger Stephen with Stephen and Mary Staley, but the schedule supplies no relationship column.

1850 U.S. census, Wayne County, Virginia, District 66, dwelling 298, family 314, Stephen Staley household.

E05 • Stephen and Ann Staley household in Lawrence County

strong identity continuity — The 1860 household continues the married couple after the 1853 ceremony and begins the child cluster used for later identity correlation.

1860 U.S. census, Rome Township, Lawrence County, Ohio, Stephen Staley household.

E06 • Stephen and Ann Staley household in Ceredo

strong identity continuity — The 1870 record places the couple and their children back in Wayne County and supports the Ohio-to-West Virginia movement.

1870 U.S. census, Ceredo, Wayne County, West Virginia, Stephen Staley household.

E07 • Stephen Story/Storey household variant

strong identity continuity — Wife, children, ages, and place show that the Story/Storey household is the same family despite the surname spelling.

1880 U.S. census, Butler District, Wayne County, West Virginia, Stephen Story/Storey household.

E08 • The family leaves for the far west

strong migration clue — The White's Creek column reports that Stephen Staley and family left to seek their fortune in the far west; correlation with the Arkansas endpoint makes this a migration marker, not a destination proof by itself.

The Ceredo Advance (Ceredo, West Virginia), 16 December 1891, page 5, White's Creek column.

E09 • Stephen Staley's Arkansas endpoint

strong endpoint evidence — A Jonesboro newspaper funeral notice, a granddaughter network, and Pine Log cemetery evidence place the elder Stephen in Craighead County, Arkansas, at death.

The Sun (Jonesboro, Arkansas), 25 January 1906, page 3; Pine Log Cemetery survey and memorial controls.

E10 • Wayne County estate-share and partition network

strong indirect evidence — The deeds and partition-party network strongly place Stephen S. within the child or heir-class of Stephen Staley Jr.'s family, but no inspected record directly calls him a son.

Wayne County, Virginia/West Virginia, estate-share and partition deeds for the lands of Stephen Staley deceased, 1856-1868.

E11 • Barbara Ann Staley death certificate

conflict — The certificate names father Steven Staley and mother Barbara A. Staley, a useful collateral clue that conflicts with simplified child lists and requires informant-quality caution.

West Virginia Department of Health, death certificate of Barbara Ann Staley, Wayne County, 1 May 1919, register 2473.

E12 • Creed Staley obituary

collateral context — The obituary documents Creed Staley's local identity, church life, wife, son, and daughters; it illuminates the Wayne kin network without proving Stephen S.'s parentage.

The Wayne News (Wayne, West Virginia), 11 April 1918, page 1, 'Creed Staley Called by Death.'

E13 • Joseph Stailey and Margareth Highsey marriage control

collateral control — The Cabell County marriage return establishes a real Joseph Stailey/Margareth Highsey pair and helps separate collateral households; it does not name Joseph's parents.

Cabell County, Virginia, marriage return for Joseph Stailey and Margareth Highsey, 24 December 1832, image 559887/00050.

E14 • Jacob Staley of Berkeley County will

proved — Jacob's will names wife Catharine and sons Jacob, Peter, John, Stephen, and Daniel, plus daughters Sarah Fisher and Catherine Strayer; it proves son Stephen but not the testator's parents or European origin.

Berkeley County, Virginia, probate loose papers, will of Jacob Staley, dated 26 August 1793 and proved in 1793, images 353-354.

E15 • Peter Staley pension declaration W6194

strong network and migration evidence — Peter reported a 1754 Pennsylvania birth, York County service, and a York-to-Berkeley-to-Frederick-to-Berkeley/Jefferson residence sequence; the declaration does not identify Berkeley Jacob as the 1793 testator.

Revolutionary War pension file W6194, declaration of Peter Staley, Jefferson County, Virginia, 15 July 1833.

E16 • Daniel Staley testimony in W6194

proved collateral relationship — Daniel certified that Peter Staley was his brother and Margaret was Peter's widow; the file also preserves the Peter/Margaret marriage-bond copy with Jacob Stayley as co-bound surety.

Revolutionary War pension file W6194, certification of Daniel Staley, 7 November 1839, and Berkeley County marriage-bond copy.

E17 • Barbara and Daniel Staley testimony in W6179

conflict and collateral evidence — Barbara described her marriage to Jacob in Shepherdstown; Daniel described his father Jacob and brothers Jacob Jr. and Peter. This is a distinct Jacob-and-Barbara cluster and does not prove that Daniel's father was the direct-line 1793 Jacob whose will names Catharine.

Revolutionary War pension file W6179, widow declaration of Barbara Staley and deposition of Daniel Staley, 1833.

E18 • Separate Jacob Stealley estate in York County

negative identity control — York Deed Book 2B names Christoffel as eldest son and administrator of a deceased Jacob Stealley, John as heir and legatee, Joseph as legatee, and an unnamed widow; it proves a separate Germany Township estate cluster, not a Berkeley bridge.

York County, Pennsylvania, Deed Book 2B, pages 60-62, deed dated 22 January 1782 and recorded 11 June 1782.

E19 • Jacob and Elizabeth versus Jacob and Catharine

working hypothesis — The York/Peter-estate deeds create a real York-to-Berkeley corridor but name Jacob with Elizabeth, while the 1793 Berkeley will names Catharine. No source reconciles the spouses.

York County deed copies, Deed Book 2G, pages 140 and 519; compared with the 1793 Berkeley County will of Jacob Staley.

E20 • Gundershoffen Stähli baptism entry 36

original record; identity bridge open — The original register resolves the date as 20 January 1732, not 30 January; a full paleographic transcription and any bridge to York or Berkeley remain open.

Evangelische Kirche Gundershofen, Kirchenbuch 1682-1791, baptisms, FamilySearch DGS 008319947, image 114 of 775, entry 36, Stähli, 20 January 1732; filmed at Archives départementales du Bas-Rhin.

E21 • Gundershoffen baptism of Jacob Stähli

original record; claimed compound name not supported — The entry records Jacob, born 23 July and baptized 28 July 1709, to Jacob Stähli and Magdalena; it does not add Hans or Johann and does not give Magdalena's maiden surname.

Evangelische Kirche Gundershofen, baptism register, FamilySearch DGS 008319947, image 41 of 775, Jacob Stähli, 28 July 1709.

E22 • Meiringen marriage of Melcher Stäli and Madle Stydler

proved event — The official register records the couple at item 6 under the 15 February 1672 marriage heading; the event does not prove a later transnational identity chain.

Staatsarchiv des Kantons Bern, K Meiringen 19, marriage register 1664-1753, folio 25, item 6, 15 February 1672.

E23 • Meiringen baptism of Hans

proved event; identity bridge open — The register reads a son Hans of Melcher Stäli and Madle Stydler under 9 June 1673; it does not record Johann Jakob or prove Hans was the later profile person.

Staatsarchiv des Kantons Bern, K Meiringen 6, baptism register 1668-1703, manuscript page 56, 9 June 1673.

E24 • Meiringen claimed Stähli-Huggler marriage

open boundary — The complete 1695 page span was inspected, but no Stähli-Huggler couple could be read confidently. Difficult handwriting prevents treating that result as proof of absence.

Staatsarchiv des Kantons Bern, K Meiringen 19, marriage register, 1695 span, manuscript folios 66-67.

E25 • The Leni locator belongs to Brienz, not Meiringen

conflict corrected; image access open — Exact event locators corrected the parish attribution from Meiringen to Brienz; the original image remains affiliate-center gated.

FamilySearch exact event locator for the 1700 Leni Stähli record, Brienz parish collection; original image access restricted to an affiliate center.

E26 • Floyd Earl Kenkel/Konkle birth record

proved — The Michigan birth record names Edwin L. Kenkel and Ida M. Salesbury as Floyd's parents; later records control the spellings.

Michigan birth record for Floyd Earl Kenkel, Jackson, 9 June 1909, Michigan Birth Records 1867-1917.

E27 • Floyd Konkle marriage parent fields

proved — Floyd's Michigan marriage record repeats Edwin L. Konkle and Ida Salisbury as his parents, independently reinforcing the birth record.

Michigan marriage record for Floyd Konkle and Josephine Campbell, 11 November 1927.

E28 • Edwin L. Konkle and Ida M. Salisbury marriage

proved — The marriage record names Simon K. Konkle and Cornelia Andrews as Edwin's parents; census continuity connects the adult Edwin to their Indiana household.

Michigan county marriage record, Edwin L. Konkle and Ida M. Salisbury, Jackson, 24 May 1890.

E29 • Simon Konkle and Cornelia G. Andrews marriage

proved — The Noble County marriage record proves the couple's marriage and anchors the household sequence that follows.

Indiana marriage record, Simon Konkle and Cornelia G. Andrews, Noble County, 17 March 1860.

E30 • Simon and Cornelia household continuity

proved identity sequence — Four censuses and the 1900 forty-year marriage statement hold Simon and Cornelia together in Albion across spelling and indexing variants.

U.S. censuses, Noble County, Indiana, Simon and Cornelia Konkle households, 1860, 1870, 1880, and 1900.

E31 • Simon Kenton Konkle death record

identified but not closed — The death record names Christian G. Konkle and Mary Konkle as Simon's parents, but the late record lacks lifetime or near-lifetime corroboration.

Michigan death record for Simon Kenton Konkle, 1905, Michigan Death Records 1867-1952.

E32 • Simon Conkle in the Wildman household

placement clue — Simon, age 14, appears with Stephen and Mary A. Wildman rather than with Christian and Mary; the schedule does not state relationships.

1850 U.S. census, York Township, Noble County, Indiana, Stephen and Mary A. Wildman household, including Simon Conkle.

E33 • Wayne County library negative and tax context

negative search with positive context — The library found no Konkle surname in the 1812-1851 will, estate, or guardianship index; 1826 tax material placed Mary Kinkler, Samuel Kinkler, and George Conkle in the county. The negative narrows a route but proves no absence from all records.

Wayne County Public Library, targeted will/estate/guardianship index review and 1826 tax-list extracts, July 2026.

E34 • S. K. Konkle, house and carriage painter

proved occupation and community placement — The Noble County atlas business directory lists S. K. Konkle in Albion as a house and carriage painter; it identifies work and place, not parents.

Historical Atlas of Noble County, Indiana (1874), business directory, Albion, page 28, entry for S. K. Konkle.

E35 · Allan Heath Cash parent-field record

proved deceased anchor — A Virginia marriage record names Allan Heath Cash and Aileen Kendall Biggerstaff as the parents of Allan Heath Cash Jr.; living descendants are omitted from the public narrative.

Virginia Department of Health marriage record for Allan Heath Cash, certificate 1963040133.

E36 · Allan Cash in John W. and Nannie Cash household

proved — The 1920 and 1930 censuses both identify Allen/Allan H. Cash as a son of John W. and Nannie L. Cash.

1920 and 1930 U.S. censuses, Spartanburg County, South Carolina, John W. and Nannie L. Cash household.

E37 · John Cash as son of Henry Cash

proved — The relationship column directly identifies John, age 8, as Henry Cash's son.

1880 U.S. census, Spartanburg County, South Carolina, Henry Cash household, John Cash, relation son.

E38 · Henry Cash with Sidney/Cidey and Mary Cash

working hypothesis — Henry appears in the same household sequence with Cidey/Sidney and Mary in 1850 and 1860, but neither census states relationships.

1850 and 1860 U.S. censuses, Spartanburg County, South Carolina, Cidey/Sidney and Mary Cash households.

E39 · Adult Henry Cash identity and probate lead

strong continuity; open probate boundary — The 1870 Henry/Ceany household leads into the 1880 family; an 1897 administration-bond record points to probate but has not yielded an heir statement.

1870 U.S. census, White Plains, Spartanburg County, Henry and Ceany Cash; South Carolina administration-bond record for Henry Cash, 4 November 1897.

E40 • Ellen Kaye Turnes and Clarence Elwood Turnes parent fields

proved deceased anchors — Ellen's marriage record names Clarence Elwood Turnes and Alma Virginia Williams; Clarence's marriage record names Wirt Henry Turnes and Rosa B. Bryant. The public account starts with these deceased anchors.

Virginia marriage records for Ellen Kaye Turnes, 1963, and Clarence Elwood Turnes, 1936.

E41 • Wirt/Wert Turnes to Henry and Louisa

proved by correlation — The 1902 marriage register names Henry C. Turner as Wirt/Wert's parent; the 1880 census identifies Henry and Louisa as his father and mother. Spouse, place, age, and household control the spelling variants.

Appomattox County marriage register, Wert H. Turner and Rosa B. Bryant, 1902; 1880 U.S. census, Charlotte County, Virginia, Rosser/Turns household.

E42 • Henry C. Turnes names Aaron Turnes as parent

identified but not closed — Henry's Appomattox marriage register directly names Aaron Turnes as a parent; it does not name Henry's mother or Aaron's parents.

Appomattox County, Virginia, marriage register, Henry C. Turnes and Isabel Beasley, 13 January 1908.

E43 • Henry in Aron and Mary Turnes household

strong indirect evidence — Henry, age 5, appears with Aron, Mary, Pleasant, Samuel, and Alfred; the schedule does not state family relationships.

1850 U.S. census, Campbell County, Virginia, Aron and Mary Turnes household.

E44 • Pleasant Turns names Aaron and Mary as parents

proved for Pleasant; indirect for Henry — Pleasant's marriage row directly names Aaron and Mary; his shared 1850 household and military company with Henry strengthen the sibling cluster but do not directly name Henry's mother.

Appomattox County burned-years marriage compilation, Pleasant A. Turns and Mary F. Bagby, 22 December 1864.

E45 • Henry Clay Turnes service chronology

proved service; family wound story disfavored — The service record places enlistment after the Battle of Kelly's Ford, later marks Henry sick or hospitalized, and ends with Appomattox parole; it contains no Kelly's Ford wound card.

Compiled service record of Henry C. Tornes/Turnes, Company H, 2nd Virginia Cavalry, enlistment 25 September 1863 through Appomattox parole, 9 April 1865.

E46 • Henry and Pleasant on the Appomattox parole list

strong cluster evidence — The National Park Service list places Henry Clay Turnes and Pleasant Andrew Turnes in Company H, 2nd Virginia Cavalry; shared service supports the cluster but does not prove kinship alone.

National Park Service, Appomattox Court House, list of paroled soldiers, Henry Clay Turnes and Pleasant Andrew Turnes, Company H, 2nd Virginia Cavalry.

E47 • Library of Virginia response

process guidance; no source proof — The reply defined access and paid-search routes but supplied no record image, index hit, or relationship evidence; it changed the process, not the family conclusion.

Library of Virginia Archives Reference Services response concerning Campbell County Turnes tax and county-record research, July 2026.