
EVIDENCE ANALYSIS PART II

RESEARCH QUESTION & BACKGROUND

Who was the father of Eliza Leonora “Nora” Castle, wife of John Barnett (1873-1900), who was born 22 June 1872, died 26 March 1961, and is buried in Hillside Memorial Gardens at Snyder, Scurry County, Texas?

John W. Barnett and Eliza Leonora Castle were married 28 November 1893 in Fannin County, Texas. They had three children: George Thomas (b. 1894), Bertha Lillian (b. 1897), and John W. (b. 1900). John W. [elder] died 16 March 1900 in Fannin County, Texas, and Eliza remarried to John T. Davis on 3 September 1909. They had one known child: Loretta Jane Davis (b. 1910-11). By 1920 John T. and Eliza had separated, and Eliza reverted to using the Barnett surname. Eliza's 1910, 1920, and 1930 census enumerations report her father's birthplace as U.S., Texas, and Mississippi, respectively.

SOURCES & EVIDENCE ANALYSIS

SOURCE 1: 1961 DEATH CERTIFICATE – ELIZA LEONORA BARNETT¹

INFORMATION	INFORMANT	INFORMATION TYPE	EVIDENCE
Name: Eliza Leonora Barnett	Attending physician	Primary – The attending physician would have had first-hand knowledge of the patient's name, place of death, and cause of death	Useful for establishing identity (the record belongs to the research subject) and for correlation
Place of death: Snyder Nursing Home, Snyder, Scurry County, TX			
Date of death: 26 March 1961			
Residence: Route #3 Big Springs Highway (inside city limits), Snyder, Scurry County, TX	“Mrs. John W. Voss (daughter)”	Primary – Eliza's daughter would be expected to have first-hand knowledge of her mother's address and marital status	
Marital status: Widowed			
Date of birth: 22 June 1872		Secondary – Eliza's daughter could not have been present at her birth	
Place of birth: Clarksville, TX			

¹ Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Vital Statistics, death certificate, state file no. 17738 (1961), Eliza Leonora Barnett, Snyder, Scurry County, Texas; database with images, “Texas, U.S., Death Certificates, 1903-1982, *Ancestry* (<https://www.ancestry.com/discoveryui-content/view/23936457:2272> : accessed 8 January 2023).

INFORMATION	INFORMANT	INFORMATION TYPE	EVIDENCE
Age: 88		Primary – Eliza’s daughter would be expected to have a general idea of her mother’s age	
Father: George Washington Castle		Secondary – It is unknown whether Eliza’s daughter personally knew her grandparents or was reporting what she had been told.	Direct – Answers the research question directly; Eliza Leonora Barnett was the daughter of George Washington Castle
Mother: Sarah Jane Harrison			Useful for establishing identity and for correlation
Burial: Hillside Memorial Garden, Snyder, Scurry County, TX	N. Gaither Bell (funeral director)	Primary – The funeral director had first-hand knowledge of where he provided the burial services	

In-depth Analysis:

BACKGROUND: In Texas, the statewide requirement for registration of deaths began in 1903.² The primary purpose of the death certificate is to serve as the official government record of an individual’s date, time, place, and cause of **death**. As such, it carries a great deal of weight for the specifics surrounding the death itself and place of burial, which are almost always primary information. Any other information must be carefully analyzed for reliability based on who the informant was and what their relationship to the deceased was and whether they likely had firsthand knowledge of the information they reported.

SOURCE: Original. The certificate on file is either the original or a duplicate original created at the same time. It is a record created for government purposes by officials whose job it was to accurately collect and record information. It was created within two days of the death (signed by the physician on 28 March 1961), received by the registrar on the 28th, and received by the Department of Health on 10 April 1961. The form it was viewed in is a digital image accessed online at *Ancestry.com*. In general, if we exercise reasonable caution, such copies can be treated the same as originals.³

Physical Source: The certificate itself is a preprinted form provided by the Texas Department of Health Bureau of Vital Statistics, filled in with both typed and handwritten information. Its appearance is consistent with those around it on the same film, and it is similar in

² Wendy Bebout Elliott, “Texas,” in Alice Eichholz, editor, *Red Book: American State, County, and Town Sources*, 3rd ed. (Provo, Utah: Ancestry, 2004), page 641-665, particularly 642.

³ Elizabeth Shown Mills, “Quick Lesson 10: Original Records, Image Copies, and Derivatives,” *Evidence Explained: Historical Analysis, Citation & Source Usage* (<https://www.evidenceexplained.com/content/quicklesson-10-original-records-image-copies-and-derivatives> : accessed 10 January 2023).

format and content to most U.S. death certificates of the time period. Except for the attending physician's signature, all typing and handwriting are legible. The handwriting appears to be from three different individuals: 1) The attending physician; 2) The funeral director, N. Gaither Bell; 3) The registrar, Anita Payne. The certificate shows no tears or other damage, and all information is clearly visible. There are no obvious signs of alteration of the document. A stamped number, "17738" appears in the upper right corner. It bears a stamp in the right lower quadrant stating that it was received by the Texas Department of Health Bureau of Vital Statistics on 10 April 1961.

Digital Source: The source examined is a digital image viewed online at *Ancestry.com*. The image includes the entire front of the certificate, including the margins, all the way to the edge of the paper. No cropping or obvious signs of alteration are noted. It is in clear focus and is neither under- nor over-exposed.

Chain of Custody: *Ancestry.com* is a well-known and well-respected major international for-profit provider of access to digitized records for family history research. *Ancestry* cites the Texas Department of State Health Services, Austin, Texas, as its source for this death certificate. It is unclear if the health department provided microfilm or digital images to *Ancestry*, or if *Ancestry* filmed them at the health department. In any event, the certificates likely never left the custody of the health department before being filmed.

INFORMATION: At least three individuals provided information for the death certificate: 1) The attending physician, who provided primary information for the place, date, time, and cause of death 2) The funeral director, who provided primary information regarding the burial place. 3) Loretta Jane (Davis) Voss (AKA Mrs. John W. Voss), who was Eliza's daughter from her second marriage. She provided information regarding Eliza's birth date and place, residence, marital status, and parents' names. Loretta can reasonably be expected to have had firsthand knowledge of Eliza's residence and marital status, but not of her own mother's birth. The birth information is therefore secondary. Loretta may or may not have known her grandparents personally before they died, therefore determining for sure whether that information is primary or secondary is not possible. In *The Researcher's Guide to American Genealogy*, Val D. Greenwood states that, "The date and place of birth and the **names of parents** as given on the death certificate of an elderly person are strictly secondary evidence."⁴ [emphasis added]

RELIABILITY: Because of the distinction between primary and secondary information items, death certificates are generally very reliable for the details of the date, place, and cause of death and the place of burial. All the other information must be carefully considered based on who the informant was and what likelihood they had of having firsthand information and being reliable informants.

EVIDENCE: Direct. This document directly states that Eliza Leonora (Castle) Barnett's father was George Washington Barnett.

⁴ Val D. Greenwood, *The Researcher's Guide to American Genealogy*, 4th ed. (Baltimore, Maryland: Genealogical Publishing Co., 2017), 311.

However, the informant for George’s name was Eliza’s daughter, who may or may not have personally known her grandparents. If she did, she would have known them by their names and the information would be considered primary. If not, she was told their names by someone else, and the information would be **secondary**. The conservative approach chosen by this researcher is to assume the latter and seek correlation with other sources.

SOURCE 2: 1880 CENSUS – G. W. CASTLE HOUSEHOLD⁵

INFORMATION	INFORMANT	INFORMATION TYPE	EVIDENCE
Residence: Precinct 5, Fannin County, TX	T. M. Coulter, enumerator	Primary – The census enumerator had first-hand knowledge of the jurisdiction in which he was working	Useful for establishing identity and for correlation
R. F. Castle , M, 39, head [inferred], b. AL, Single, Farmer; Father b. SC, Mother b. NC	Unknown	Undetermined	Possible brother of G. W.; useful for establishing identity and for correlation
G.W. Castle , M, 36, head [inferred], b. AL [calculated birth date abt. 1843-44] Married Farmer Father b. SC; Mother b. NC	Unknown – May have been R. F. Castle, G. W. Castle, S. J. Castle, or a neighbor.	Undetermined - Unless the informant is known, it is impossible to determine whether the information is primary or secondary.	Requires correlation with other sources to determine that G. W., George W., and George Washington Castle are all the same man.
S. J. Castle , F, 36, wife, b. AL Father b. SC; Mother b. NC			Evidence that G. W. and S. J. were married as of 17 June 1880
M. A. Castle , F, 10, daughter, b. TX Father b. AL; Mother b. AL			Evidence that G. W. and S. J. may have been married by 1869 (1 yr pre-birth of M. A) Useful for establishing identity and for correlation
E. L. Castle , F, 8, daughter, b. TX			Direct – Directly states that E. L. Castle

⁵ 1880 U.S. census, Fannin County, Texas, population schedule, Precinct 5, enumeration district (ED) 28, pg. 44 (penned), dwelling 271, family 297, line 2, G. W. Castle; database with images, “1880 United States Federal Census,” *Ancestry* (<https://www.ancestry.com/discoveryui-content/view/10734560:6742> : accessed 10 January 2023), image 44 of 62; citing NARA microfilm publication T9, roll 1303. Note that G. W. Castle’s family is enumerated in the same dwelling as R. F. Castle male, age 31 [37? 39?], who is also inferred to be the head of a family because the relationship column is left blank for both he and G. W. The enumerator does not appear to have correctly used the column for “family number” on this or surrounding pages.

INFORMATION	INFORMANT	INFORMATION TYPE	EVIDENCE
Father b. AL; Mother b. AL			was the daughter of G. W. Castle, who was born about 1843-44 in AL, but this must be correlated with other information to determine that E. L. is the research subject, and that G. W., George W. and George Washington Castle are all the same man.
W. O. Castle, M, 5, son, b. TX Father b. AL; Mother b. AL			Evidence of family structure, useful for establishing identity and for correlation
G. T. Castle, M, 3, son, b. TX Father b. AL; Mother b. AL			

In-depth Analysis:

BACKGROUND: The Constitution of the United States requires that a census of the population be conducted “...in such Manner as they [Congress] shall by Law direct” every ten years for purposes of determining apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives and for taxation.⁶ Providing census information is required by law, and refusal to do so is punishable by a fine.⁷ Since 1790, Congress has enacted a new law every ten years to specify how the census will be conducted and what information will be included.⁸ In 1880, two additions to the information collected that are of particular interest to genealogists were made: 1) Each individual’s relationship to the head of the household in which they were enumerated, and 2) The birthplace of the father and mother of each individual.⁹

SOURCE: Original or derivative. There is debate among genealogists over exactly how many times the information collected by census enumerators was copied, and which “copies” or “originals” wound up where. Unknown author(s) have included an unsourced statement in the *FamilySearch* Research Wiki, “United States Census Historical Background,” stating that “...three copies of most federal censuses were created. The local census taker first created a draft copy as he walked from house to house to question the

⁶ Congressional Research Service, *Constitution of the United States: Analysis and Interpretation* (<https://constitution.congress.gov/about/constitution-annotated/> : accessed 13 January 2023) > U.S. Constitution > Article I, Section 2, para. 3.

⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, *Measuring America: The Decennial censuses from 1790 to 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002), 18.

⁸ William Dollarhide, *The Census Book: Facts, Schedules & Worksheets for the U.S. Federal Censuses* (Orting, Washington: Family Roots Publishing, 2019), 12.

⁹ Val D. Greenwood, *The Researcher’s Guide to American Genealogy*, 4th ed. (Baltimore, Maryland: Genealogical Publishing Co., 2017), 382.

residents. He later copied by hand a second draft for the state, and a third copy for the federal government.”¹⁰ While it is convenient to make a broad generalized statement such as this, it is unfortunately short-sighted in the case of census records.

According to widely recognized genealogical records expert Loretto Dennis Szucs, from 1850-1870 the original census forms filled out by the enumerators were filed at the county courthouses and on display for public perusal. Two copies were made of those censuses; one was sent to the state or territory, and the other to the U.S. Census Office. In 1880 the procedure changed, and the originals were to be sent to the Census Office, with no provision for any copies to be made. For the purpose of public exhibition of the returns, enumerators were authorized to make a *list* of the name, age, sex, and color of every individual enumerated, and this shortened list was to be filed with the county court. Few, if any, of these lists survive.¹¹ In her chapter on census records, Szucs does not broach the subject of whether the enumerators worked first on a “draft copy,” or not.

Szucs’ statements are backed up by the actual instructions to the 1880 census enumerators:

In making the entries, whether of names or figures, upon the schedules, enumerators should be careful to write clearly and neatly, without interlineations, erasures, or blots, inasmuch as **no copy** of the schedules is provided to be made by the existing census law, and the **original schedules are to be returned to the census office at Washington** for examination and compilation.¹² [emphasis added]

The census form examined as part of this project is the actual population schedule form, and is therefore likely to be the form that was filed with the Census Office in Washington, D.C. Whether it can be strictly termed an “original” record or not appears debatable, since there is some belief that enumerators actually worked on a draft that they then copied onto the forms for the actual submission. Even if that were the case, it would be classified as a “duplicate original” made at the same time as the original. As such, it preserves the original content (and likely the form), and could be treated as an original.¹³ If the physical record is deemed an original, then the

¹⁰ “United States Census Historical Background,” *FamilySearch Research Wiki*

(https://www.familysearch.org/en/wiki/United_States_Census_Historical_Background : accessed 13 January 2023), para. 3.

¹¹ Loretto Dennis Szucs, “Research in Census Records,” in Loretto Dennis Szucs and Sandra Hargreaves Luebking, editors, *The Source: A Guidebook of American Genealogy*, revised edition (Salt Lake City, Utah: Ancestry, 1997), 103-146, particularly 106-107.

¹² United States Department of Interior, Census Office, 1880 U.S. census enumerator instructions; PDF, United States Census Bureau, *Census.gov* (<https://www.census.gov/history/pdf/1880enumerator-instructions.pdf> : accessed 10 January 2023), digital page 5, Care in Filing Schedules.

¹³ Elizabeth Shown Mills, “QuickLesson 10: Original Records, Image Copies, and Derivatives,” *Evidence Explained: Historical Analysis, Citation & Source Usage* (<https://www.evidenceexplained.com/content/quicklesson-10-original-records-image-copies-and-derivatives> : accessed 10 January 2023).

digital image format in which it was accessed could be treated as an original, as well.¹⁴

Arguing over whether the form we have access to via digital images is truly the “original” or not seems to verge on “splitting hairs.” It is, simply, the most original form in existence. As with all sources, whether original or not, there is a chance that errors exist within it, and the secondary nature of almost all the information found in it dictates that we use that information with caution and seek correlation, regardless of its status as an **original or derivative source**.

Physical Source: The census page on which George’s household is enumerated is without missing areas or obliterated writing. There is one small tear which appears to have been repaired with tape at the bottom left area of the page in the margin. While it does obscure a small portion of the notes to the enumerator regarding how the questions were to be asked and information recorded, it does not affect any of the actual recorded information. The enumerator’s handwriting is legible, but some letters are difficult to distinguish without internal comparison. The only evidence of changes that may have been made after the document was created are checkmarks in column 14 (unemployment question) for some entries. They appear to possibly indicate which individuals were the heads of families, but this is not certain and nothing in the 1880 instructions to enumerators instructs that heads of families should be indicated in this way.¹⁵ Census schedules often include all manner of annotations, markings, and comments made after the fact that may have been made by the enumerator or census bureau clerks for tabulation and statistical purposes. Their meanings cannot be explicitly understood by us.¹⁶ This enumerator chose to record only initials for many of the residents he enumerated.

Digital Source: The image is in clear focus and not under- or over-exposed. It is very easily readable. It includes the entire page of the census, all the way out to the page edges. There is no evidence of cropping and no obvious evidence of alteration after creation

Chain of custody: The image accessed is a digitized copy of the microfilm made by NARA of the original or duplicate original form, viewed online at *Ancestry*. *Ancestry.com* is a well-known and well-respected major international for-profit provider of access to digitized records for family history research.

INFORMATION: Undetermined. According to the instructions provided to the 1880 census enumerators: “It is further provided by law that in case no person shall be found at the usual place of abode of such family, or individual living out of a family, competent to answer the inquiries made in compliance with the requirements of the act, then it shall be lawful for the enumerator to obtain the required information, as nearly as may be practicable, from the family or families, or person or persons, living nearest to such place

¹⁴ Elizabeth Shown Mills, “Quick Lesson 10: Original Records, Image Copies, and Derivatives,” *Evidence Explained: Historical Analysis, Citation & Source Usage* (<https://www.evidenceexplained.com/content/quicklesson-10-original-records-image-copies-and-derivatives> : accessed 10 January 2023).

¹⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, *Measuring America: The Decennial censuses from 1790 to 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002), 17-21.

¹⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, *Measuring America: The Decennial censuses from 1790 to 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002), 125.

of abode.”¹⁷

Informants were not indicated in census enumerations until 1940.¹⁸ Until that time, the informants may have been the heads of household, other family members, neighbors, or even less-informed individuals who were simply supplying guesses. We can therefore make no assumption about who supplied the information about George’s household. Without knowing the identity of the informant, a determination of whether the information they provided was primary or secondary information cannot be made.

RELIABILITY: Supplying accurate information for the census is expected, but experience tells us that informants can and do provide inaccurate information, either by design or carelessness. Aside from this and the difficulty posed by unknown informants (discussed above) inaccuracies in recordation and copying by enumerators add another layer of possible error-introduction. Bridget Sunderlin, CG has written a very informative article about the reliability of information found in the US census population schedules.¹⁹ In it, she cautions us to seek other sources to corroborate all information found in the census, except residency. All the information regarding George and Maria other than residence, including their ages and birthplaces, should be corroborated with evidence from other sources.

EVIDENCE: Direct evidence that the father of “E. L.” Castle was the daughter of “G. W.” Castle, but since only initials were recorded for the members of this household, the evidence still requires correlation with other sources showing the family structure to determine if “E. L.” stands for Eliza Leonora and that she is the same person as the research subject, and that “G. W.” stands for George Washington. The fact that the **information** must also be considered **secondary** reinforces the need to carefully consider the evidence here in relation to all other evidence found.

SOURCE 3: 1927 OBITUARY – GEORGE W. CASTLE²⁰

INFORMATION	INFORMANT	INFORMATION TYPE	EVIDENCE
George W. Castle of Bagby	Unknown	Undetermined – Since the	Direct – Answers the research question directly;

¹⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, *Measuring America: The Decennial censuses from 1790 to 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 2002), 18.

¹⁸ Gena Philbert Ortega, "Genealogy 101: #17 The 1940 U.S. Census," blog post 7 April 2017, *GenealogyBank.com* (<https://blog.genealogybank.com/genealogy-101-17-the-1940-u-s-census.html> : accessed 6 January 2023), What Are some of the Differences You'll Find in the 1940 Census?, para 3.

¹⁹ Bridget M. Sunderlin, “Why You Should Never Rely on ‘Facts’ You Find in the Census, and What to do Instead,” *Family History Daily* (<https://familyhistorydaily.com/genealogy-help-and-how-to/verify-us-census-facts/> : accessed 6 January 2023).

²⁰ "Passing of Another Confederate Veteran," *The Ladonia (Texas) News*, 9 December 1927, Friday, p. 1., col. 5 ; digital images, University of North Texas Libraries, "Texas Digital Newspaper Program," *The Portal to Texas History* (<https://texashistory.unt.edu/explore/collections/TDNP/> : accessed 11 January 2023) > Explore Holdings > Resource Types > Newspaper > U.S. States > Texas > Serial/Series Titles > "Ladonia" > The Ladonia News > Years > 1927 > Months > December > Days > 9th; citing Bonham Public Library, Fannin County Area Newspaper Collection.

INFORMATION	INFORMANT	INFORMATION TYPE	EVIDENCE
[Fannin County, TX], age 84 [calculated birth date abt. 1843] Died 29 November 1927 Six surviving children: Two daughters: Mrs. Billy Porter, Bagby Mrs. Nora Barnett , Windom Four sons: W. O. Castle, [Bagby?] O. B. Castle, Bagby Geo. Castle, OK Gene Castle, Dallas		informant is not known, a determination of primary or secondary information cannot be made.	Mrs. Nora Barnett of Windom [Fannin County, TX] was a child of George W. Castle of Bagby [Fannin County, TX], who was born about 1843, died 29 November 1927 in Fannin County, Texas, and is buried in Oak Ridge Cemetery. Names of the other surviving children are useful for establishing identity and correlation
Burial: Oak Ridge Cemetery [Fannin County, TX]			Useful for establishing identity and correlation

In-depth Analysis:

BACKGROUND: Obituaries may be written by family members, by newspaper or funeral home staff based on information gathered from family members and possibly other sources, and possibly by some other author(s). Even if they were written by a family member or funeral home staff, they may be edited by newspaper staff before publication. Families may or may not have been required to pay for the privilege of having their loved one’s obituary published.²¹ *The Ladonia News* was a weekly newspaper carrying local and national news and advertising, published every Friday from as early as 1883 until at least 1963.²²

SOURCE: Authored work. It contains both facts and commentary. Both the author and the informant(s) are unknown. Some researchers classify obituaries as original sources, but since it is not an official record this researcher chooses to classify it as an authored work that requires more vetting of the information contained in it and correlation with other sources.

Digital Source: The source examined is a digital image of the newspaper page (front page of the issue) containing George W.

²¹ Gena Philbert Ortega, “Using Obituaries for Genealogy: FAQ,” blog article, 23 June 2016, in *GenealogyBank* (<https://blog.genealogybank.com/using-obituaries-for-genealogy-faq.html> : accessed 10 January 2023), Did my ancestor’s family have to pay for an obituary?

²² Library of Congress, *ChroniclingAmerica* (<https://chroniclingamerica.loc.gov> : accessed 10 January 2023) > Search U.S. Newspaper Directory, 1690-Present > Texas > Fannin > Ladonia > 1690-2023. Also, “Texas Digital Newspaper Program,” *The Portal to Texas History* (<https://texashistory.unt.edu> : accessed 10 January 2023) > Explore > Collections > Texas Digital Newspaper Program > Titles > “L” > The Ladonia News.

Castle's obituary. The Bonham (Fannin County) public library holds the collection in which the issue is located and provided the collection to the *Portal to Texas History*, which is a digital repository hosted by the University of North Texas Libraries. The images provided on the website were digitized from 35 mm microfilm. The image is not cropped; it includes the entire front page of the newspaper, all the way out to the edges of the page. Legibility is generally good, but there are areas of over-exposure that make it difficult to read some of the content. This is not the case for the obituary in question. It is in clear focus and easily readable. There is no obvious evidence of alteration of the image.

Physical Source: Examination of other issues before and after the 9 December issue reveal that 8 pages was the standard length of each issue in 1927. The issue of interest appears intact (all 8 pages are included), without missing, torn, or otherwise damaged sections. The page on which the obituary appears is without tears or other damage. There are no markings or obvious signs of alteration. George's obituary appeared in the newspaper only ten days after his 29 November death. It conforms to the usual format for obituaries in this country, providing some minimal biographical information and listing the date of death, place of burial, and surviving family members. There is no photograph included.

INFORMATION: Undetermined. We can almost never say for sure who the author or the informant(s) were for an obituary.²³ While common sense and experience suggest that the information was probably supplied by one or more of George's children, we cannot know for sure. For that reason, it is impossible determine whether the information contained in the obituary is primary or secondary information. The best policy is to use the information found in the obituary for clues to finding other sources and evidence to correlate with that found in other sources.²⁴

RELIABILITY: In practice, obituaries tend to be fairly reliable for the names of surviving family members but less so for other details such as parentage and birth particulars of the deceased, and their pre-adulthood biographical information.

EVIDENCE: Direct. The obituary directly states that Eliza Leonora "Nora" (Castle) Barnett was a daughter of George W. Castle, but with no way to determine the informant or their likelihood of having firsthand knowledge, the evidence is only useful if correlated with that found in other sources.

²³ Gena Philbert Ortega, "Using Obituaries for Genealogy: FAQ," blog article, 23 June 2016, in *GenealogyBank* (<https://blog.genealogybank.com/using-obituaries-for-genealogy-faq.html> : accessed 10 January 2023), Does an obituary provide all I need to know about my ancestor's death?

²⁴ Gena Philbert Ortega, "Using Obituaries for Genealogy: FAQ," blog article, 23 June 2016, in *GenealogyBank* (<https://blog.genealogybank.com/using-obituaries-for-genealogy-faq.html> : accessed 10 January 2023), Does an obituary provide all I need to know about my ancestor's death?