Additional Information Regarding

Our Monk Family in England

Richard Monk
July 4, 2006

Over the years, there has been much interest in our family concerning Charles Monk's family in England. We have made some recent progress in this research that I want to tell the family about. I have published some of these earlier, but am including them here again for completeness as well as for background on more recent findings.

Who was Charles Monk's mother?

The first major problem that we have to recognize about Charles' family is that we're not one hundred percent sure who his mother was. The confusion arises from the fact that his mother's name is recorded differently in different records. In the censuses (1841, 1851, 1861 and 1871) her name was recorded as "Sarah Monk." In the church records for Longparish (parish registers and bishop's transcripts) it is recorded as "Sarah Monk" and as "Mary Munk" (see Appendix I: William Monk Family Group Sheet). In 1821, William Monk was married to Sarah Ann Beare of Hurstbourne Priors in the same parish. Sarah Ann's christening has been identified as occurring on 29 May 1796, also in Hurstbourne Priors. There are other records (discussed below) where Charles' mother was called "Sarah Monk."

So how do we reconcile these discrepancies? The "Law of Parsimony" (Occam's Razor) suggests that we should look for the simplest possible explanation– that a simple explanation is more likely than a more complex one. While this is not a hard-and-fast rule, it is a good advice.

In the past, it has been postulated that the explanation to the discrepancies in the records can be explained this way: William Monk married Sarah Ann Beare in 1821. She then bore him at least one child (Charles Monk: born 1825, died 1826) and died. (I say at least one child because there are two additional children who were buried in Longparish at this time, but we don't know for certain that they are children of William Monk and his wife. They will be discussed later in this article.) Following Sarah (Beare) Monk's death, it is suggested, William remarried a woman named "Mary" who bore him three additional children (Jane, Charles and Elizabeth). She then would have died, leaving William free to marry again, this time to a second woman named "Sarah" who appears with the family in all the censuses. It has even been suggested that William's second

wife (Mary) was Sarah Ann Beare's sister, Mary Ann, but there is absolutely no evidence for this.

The problem with the scenario outlined above (besides its being so convoluted and confusing) is that there is no proof. Besides William's marriage to Sarah Ann Beare, it assumes two additional marriages and two deaths– none of which have ever been found. Furthermore, the information in all the censuses as well as information about Sarah Monk's institutionalization (discussed below) and death exactly matches vital data (birth place and age) for Sarah Ann Beare. Finally, it has been noted that Charles Monk referred to his mother both as "Sarah" and as "Mary." Certainly, he knew who his mother was. Charles had the temple work done for Sarah Ann Beare but not for any woman named "Mary" except his aunt, Mary Monk, who married Charles White in 1819.

Under the scenario described, Sarah Ann Beare would have been the first wife of Charles' father, William. Charles' mother (Mary) would have been William's second wife. Thus, Charles would not have known Sarah; technically, she would not even have been his step-mother since she would have died before he was born.

The solution to this conundrum is found in an observation that we have made and have had confirmed repeatedly by genealogists, including staff at the Family History Library in Salt Lake: namely, that "Mary" is an accepted (though uncommon) nickname for "Sarah." There are proven instances where this was the case and although there's no absolute proof that Sarah (Beare) Monk used the nickname "Mary," there's no evidence that she didn't (i.e., proof for the scenario previously described). In fact, the evidence supports this assumption. The only occurrence of the name "Mary Munk" is in the parish register for the christenings of Jane, Charles (born 1832) and Elizabeth. The person recording the christenings would probably have been on friendly terms with the family and therefore accustomed to using the nickname. In every other instance (i.e., official records like the censuses), her name is recorded as "Sarah."

The use of the nickname "Mary" by Sarah Ann Beare is a simple explanation for the contradictory information we have found in the various records. It requires only one assumption (as opposed to at least four assumptions under the other scenario). As I suggested earlier, Occam's Razor requires us to use the simplest explanation possible until evidence is found to support a more complex explanation. The strongest evidence, however, to support this assumption (the nickname) is that it eliminates two major weaknesses in the remarriage scenario: (1) that Sarah (William's third wife) was exactly the same age and was from the same town as his first wife, Sarah Ann Beare, and (2) that Charles Monk had the temple work done for his father's first wife, a woman who was unknown and no relation to Charles himself, but not for his own mother or true step-mother (William's alleged third wife, Sarah, the woman who would have raised him).

Taken as a whole, I believe the evidence given is adequate to allow us to disregard the remarriage theory once and for all and to accept Sarah Ann Beare as William Monk's one and only wife and the mother of all his children.

What became of Sarah Ann (Beare) Monk?

Until recently, I wondered why Sarah Ann Beare (Sarah Monk) died and was buried in Fareham, Hampshire, England. This is information that existed in our family's genealogy files that have been passed down through the generations. In 2002, I sent for Sarah's death certificate and confirmed that she did indeed die in Fareham (Appendix II: Death Certificate for Sarah Monk). However, I noted that the death certificate listed the place of death as the Hampshire County Lunatic Asylum.

As a matter of curiosity, I posted a request for information about the Fareham Asylum to an online genealogy forum. A short time later, I was rewarded with a reply from a woman in England who was working on a PhD project wherein she was gathering family stories and information regarding patients of that asylum. She asked if I would be willing to share information about Sarah and her family. I responded by telling her everything I knew and in return, she visited the Hampshire County Records Office and looked up everything she could find about Sarah's hospitalization and death. As it turns out, Sarah was in the Asylum at Fareham not once, but twice. The first time, she was admitted in November 1858 and discharged as "recovered" after five years. She then lived at home in Longparish for nine years whereupon she was again admitted to the Asylum (in 1873) and died a few months later.

Included in the information about Sarah's case there were several items that I found particularly interesting. These are:

1. She was a caring, motherly woman as evidenced by a statement implying that she took it upon herself to care for a young child by the name of Jane Jack.
2. Sarah's husband, William, was "very fond of his wife."
3. She had blue eyes and "scant" grey hair.
4. Her condition was described as dementia and, it was noted, was hereditary– her father and granddaughter also suffered from the condition (*though I suspect that "granddaughter" is a transcription error since she had no granddaughters in 1858*).
5. Her condition was described as being caused by "religious excitement." (*Note that she was first admitted to the asylum just 4 years after Charles and Emma joined the LDS church and emigrated to America. Coincidence?*)

6. Her religion was Baptist, not Anglican.
7. The married name of her daughter, Elizabeth, was Peddie.
8. Sarah's age and birthplace *exactly* match that of William's wife, Sarah Ann Beare. (*This has been discussed previously.*)

What became of Charles' sister, Elizabeth?

I have included copies of the information about Sarah's case in Appendix III. From a genealogical standpoint, the most important bit of information obtained from these records is the married name of Charles Monk's sister, Elizabeth. Better yet, it is a name that is very uncommon in southern England: Peddie. As a result, the family was quite easily found in the 1881 census. At that time, Elizabeth's family consisted of her husband, Charles Peddie, and her two sons, William Charles (age 8) and Robert John (age 5). See Appendix I: Peddie Family Group Sheet for details. Since the sons were both born after 1871 and because I could not find the family in the 1871 census, I assumed that Charles Peddie and Elizabeth Monk were married shortly before William Charles' birth in 1872. However, I was unable to locate their marriage certificate. Recently, however, I found Charles and Elizabeth Peddie (married) in the 1861 census. At that time, they already had one child, Eliza Jane, born in 1860. I have now located their marriage certificate which states that they were married on 4 September 1860. (See Appendix II: Marriage Certificate for Elizabeth Monk. *Note that Eliza Jane's birth certificate records her mother's name as "Elizabeth Peddie, formerly Monk." even though the marriage was 3½ months after Eliza Jane's birth on 13 May 1860.*) I have now located five children for this couple: Eliza Jane, Marian Augusta, Mary Ann, William Charles and Robert John. Note (2010): I have now found an additional child, Evelyn Elizabeth, born 1865.

Another interesting observation is that Elizabeth and Charles Peddie, like Charles and Emma Monk, were associated with the royal household. Four of their five children were born near Windsor and Charles Peddie was described first as a soldier (1851) then as a member of the Royal Horse Guard (1861) and finally as a Chelsea Pensioner (1881).

What became of Charles' sister, Jane?

Throughout this period of discovering more about Charles Monk's parents and younger sister, Elizabeth, I have been unable to learn anything about his older sister, Jane. This has bothered me quite a bit and I have felt compelled to find her family. The last known fact I had for her was that she was working as a servant in Beauworth, Hampshire, at the time of the 1851 census. I did not have any information regarding her marriage or death and I knew that's what I needed.

In recent years, there has been a project (called "Free BMD") to digitally index the entire Civil Registration Index (aka BMD Index) for England and Wales and make it available online. I have watched this project avidly over the years hoping that it would give me the information I needed, but by itself it hasn't. However, in addition to the BMD indexing project (found online at http://freebmd.rootsweb.com), Ancestry.com has an ongoing project to digitize census (and other) records. From the census records (1861, 1871, 1881, and 1891), I compiled a list of all the married women named Jane in England who were born in Longparish at about the same time as Jane Monk. I then cross-referenced each Jane from the censuses with marriage entries in the BMD Index to find each woman's maiden name and was able to rule out all individuals but one. I sent for that marriage certificate and confirmed that it is, indeed, the marriage for our Jane Monk (see Appendix II: Marriage Certificate for Jane Monk).

We now know that Jane Monk married Frederick Field on 16 August 1858 and that they had two sons: Frederick William (born 1866) and Herbert (born 1869). There may be additional children, but I'm having trouble identifying them: the family moved quite often because Frederick was in the military. (See Appendix I: Field Family Group Sheet for additional details on the family.)

The interesting thing about my search for Jane Monk's marriage is that I had the vital clue over four years ago but didn't recognize it. Included in the information sent to me about Sarah Ann Beare's case at the Fareham Asylum was an entry near the 9 May 1874 casebook entry that said the married name of her other daughter (Jane) might be "Field." At that time, I looked briefly for her marriage to a man named Field, but soon gave up, thinking that it was too much to ask that the married names of both daughters would be included in the case notes. The researcher who did the lookup for me in England agreed, stating that the chances of getting one daughter's married name were low (though we did get Elizabeth's married name) and that the chances of getting the married names of both daughters were nearly negligible.

Who are William and Walter Monk?

The next question about Charles Monk's family in England is the issue of parentage for William (buried 1822) and Walter (buried 1830). The church records for Longparish do not include christening entries for either of these children. However, since William Monk's family is the only Monk family of child-bearing age in Longparish at the time, it is assumed that they are, indeed, children of William Monk and Sarah Ann Beare. This assumption is supported by the fact that their ages fit perfectly among William's other children. William's burial was in November, 1822; he was recorded as 1 year old. This would put his birth in 1821; William and Sarah were married in January of 1821. Walter's burial is in March, 1830 and his age recorded simply as "infant" implying

that he was less than one year old. Jane was born in 1828 and Charles was born in 1832, so Walter's birth in 1830 would fit perfectly between Charles and Elizabeth.

One thing to point out is that William's name was recorded differently in the parish register and the bishop's transcript. In the parish register, he is "William Monk of Andover" and in the bishop's transcript he is "William Andover Monk." The assumption is that the parish register is correct since it was written first. Bishop's transcripts are just that: a transcript of the parish register and a transcription error there is much more likely than a correction (of an error in the parish register) so it is assumed that William did not have a middle name. Additionally, it is has been observed that middle names were quite rare in early 19th century England. It will be necessary to search surrounding parishes, particularly Andover, for the christenings of William and Walter in order to give more support to the assumption that they actually belong in William and Sarah's family.

Who was Charles Monk's great-grandfather, William Monk?

Finally, here is a recap of research done about six years ago wherein the ancestry of Charles Monk was extended 5 additional generations.

In 2000, I received an email from a man in Germany (Andrew Gough) who was researching the Monke family in Hampshire, England. He informed me that he had a copy of the deed for the sale of a piece of property in Whitchurch, Hampshire, in 1717. It listed William Monke as one of the sellers (the others were his mother, Ann, and brother, Joseph). Andrew wondered if this person was the father of our William, whom we have listed as being born about 1728. This connection would place the Monke family in Whitchurch where a William Monk was born in 1717. To make a long story short, we confirmed that the person named in the deed was the father of our William Monk and that he (our William Monk) was born in 1717, not 1728. We located additional information about him, including a first marriage to Ann Phillis, before his marriage to Ann Carter, and extended his ancestry back five generations (see Appendix IV: Genealogy of William Monk). The two earliest generations are tentative at this point; it *appears* that our line goes through these people, but we don't have the proof necessary to firmly support the link. Looking at the pedigree chart, you also may have noticed that I have extended Ann Carter's line two additional generations.

Conclusion

I feel very fortunate to be involved in this work. I know that these people want to be "found" and that I have been directed in this effort. In cases where I was unable to find the necessary information, it was provided to me by others (e.g., the property deed that linked William to the Monk family in Whitchurch).

A GEDCOM file of all the individuals discussed in this summary is available; write to me at monkr63@hotmail.com to request a copy. I plan to post periodic updates about continued efforts in this research on the Internet. The web address is www.monkfamily.org/research/monk.htm. I will also post copies of certificates and other pertinent documents that support this research on the web site.