

Michael Macdonald
38 Mayfield Road,
South Croydon
CR2 0BE
0208 651 2734
michael@gmac38.fsnet.co.uk

8 December 2005

Dear Basil,

I was delighted to receive your letter of 22 November and enclosures. I am sorry to have taken a while to reply, but I think I can answer at least some of your questions. I'll take them in the same order as in your letter.

I think your idea of sending the original of *Bohemian Reminiscences* to the South African Museum is excellent. I also like the idea of its being published, preferably in the edited version with photographs, but I'm very much a computer novice, alas, and I can't afford to have it published professionally.

The extract of dates from Jem's Anniversary Book was typed by myself from the original, which Dorette very kindly sent me and which I still have: a bit battered but in reasonable shape.

The copy of the photograph from Dorette's folder is very interesting. A young woman of perhaps thirty years or so, with strong intelligent features. The only certain photo we have of Jem in her younger days is the sepia one I enclose, which is in my edited version of *The Rems*. Not an instant match, but do I detect a similarity in the line of the nose and perhaps the ear? The hair, too, could be consistent. It was taken in London, which suggested to me that it might have been taken between 1879 - 1881 when Jem and Willie moved to England with their two young children (a third having died at six months). The picture you sent me was taken in Cape Town, Jem having had two more children. They arrived there in early autumn 1881, but evidently moved on early in 1882. That would be quite a change of appearance in a very short time - 2 to 3 years. Tessa, to whom I sent a copy, instinctively (intuitively) thought it could be Jem. I've been mulling it on and off for several days, and today something clicked. Jem went to London for her "bohemian experience" in 1872, aged 20, hence the smart clothes and the jewellery. If that's when the photo was taken, as seems likely, Jem ten years later and after five children might well look a bit different. I haven't seen this picture before, so perhaps it's surprising that Dorette didn't mention it to me. But as she sent me the *Rems* and the diary all of 30 years ago, she might well have thought she had sent me a copy. Very interesting and I for one would include that in the *Rems* as a very possible likeness

of Jem. Basil, could I ask you for a copy of the photo itself? I should be most grateful.

The Andrew Blair Carmichael portrait is in our family too (my brother was christened Andrew Blair). I did quite a bit of research myself, but that was 30 years ago. My recollection is that Jem's husband drew up the tree that I'm enclosing. There were several Andrew Blairs, but the chap in the picture is almost certainly Jem's grandfather, Andrew Blair Carmichael, born 1782, Registrar of the Court of Exchequer, married Jane Calbeck.

I've been through my collection of photographic portraits, but I'm afraid I can't turn up anyone to match the couple(s) in the lockets. To me, looking at the shapes of the skulls, they could well be the same couple 20 years apart - 1860s to 1880s? Could it be someone on the Hughes side?

I'm enclosing copies of some family material which I hope will be helpful:

- a Carmichael family tree.
- for easier reading, Jem's line of descent from an Andrew Carmichael born in 1668, down to my generation;
- a Woolley family tree, covering the same ground;
- a Kay family tree;
- Shylie & Arthur Beck's line;
- Ina & George Moore's line;
- the 'Later Kays' in a different format, which brings the Kay line up to date.
- a note on Jamesina's name.

I cannot recall having seen any tree with white lettering on black. Neither have I seen a Hughes family history, though I should very much like to if possible. I'm slightly handicapped in producing trees, in that my package can cope with "only" 750 names. Over time I have had to delete some people, having recorded them on paper, in order to make way for new finds. And the software package is good, but not very flexible.

There is indeed a huge amount of genealogical information on the internet, and interest. As to the Woolleys, I researched births and deaths registers, tho' the Staffs birth register had a gap covering a long period of years just as it was getting exciting. I also used the Latter Day Saints (IGI) research material which can be found in good libraries. There are many websites which provide openings to all sorts of family research material. For example:

www.familysearch.org - the IGI

www.genuki.org.uk

www.genforum.com -probably ties in with genuki

www.rootsweb.com

www.cyndislist.com - claims to have 95,000+ links to genealogy research on the net.

These will be good for starting and for leading on to more and more material. There are also Family websites. I think I recall a Carmichael one, but not a Woolley. I'm sorry I can't be more explicit, but I haven't done any real research on the web for years now, and I should practically have to start all over again. It can be frustrating, but persistence can bring exciting finds. And there are millions of people out there only too happy to exchange information.

Can you bear an anecdote? I was researching my great-great-uncle Moore McDonald in Boston, died in 1872, knowing the names of his children but nothing beyond that. In November 2003 I left a note about him on a website notice board and forgot about it. Two years later almost to the day I received an email from a lady in Boston, a descendant of Moore's fifth child, saying she had just seen my notice and asking if she had found the right Moore! She had! So exciting!

Best wishes

Michael