

By referring again to George, the son of Evan, we observe an interval of nine years between the births of his sons George and Maverick. It will be admitted that during that period—1685 to 1694—another son *might* have been b., and that son *might* have been William of Hardwick, b. 1687. In this case William of Newton is thrown out entirely. But it appears to us that the probabilities of William of Newton having been the father of William of Hardwick are too strong to be thrown aside. Accepting his right to a position in the line, then it would seem more probable that William of Newton was a brother of the first George and a son of Evan,—not an unreasonable supposition, as the latter is known to have had other children. This will be made more plain by placing the two families in parallel lines. Thus, on the first theory:—

b. 1600,	} Peter, ³ b. 1682; Moses, ⁴ b. 1712; Isaiah, ⁵ b. 1749.
Evan, ¹ Geo., ² b. 1640,	
d. 1661.	

This scheme leaves William of Newton out of consideration, and his son, William, b. the same year as William of Hardwick, unaccounted for. On this plan also the grandparents of Isaiah and Dr. William would have been brothers.

On the other hand, admitting the claims of William of Newton, then we have:—

b. 1600,	} George, ² b. 1640; Peter, ³ b. 1682; Moses, ⁴ b. 1702; Isaiah, ⁵ b. 1749.
Evan, ¹	
d. 1661.	

In this case William of Hardwick and Peter would have been cousins instead of brothers, as in the former. In either case Evan Thomas would have been the progenitor of the families of both William of Hardwick and Isaiah Thomas. Should authentic records ever be discovered, we believe they will substantiate one or the other of these theories.