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More and more in recent years, social historians have begun to work in the same field as genealogists. More than ever before the social historians have utilized the local, public records which have long been mined by genealogists, and have also employed the family histories turned out over the last century by the genealogists. This paper contends that these two groups of researchers still have much to learn from one another. In particular, this paper sets forth a research strategy which uses the methodology of genealogy to study the question of migration. The town of Lebanon, Connecticut, is used as the focus of the investigation, and we begin with a brief overview of the early history of eastern Connecticut and of Lebanon, itself.

In the years prior to King Philip's War, settlement in eastern Connecticut was limited to a single tier of towns along Long Island Sound, the sole exception being the inland settlement of Norwich. These towns from west to east were Saybrook (at the mouth of the Connecticut), Lyme, New London, and Stonington, with Norwich being founded to the north of New London in 1660. North of these towns, the land remained in Indian hands and in Indian control until after the conflict of 1675-6. With the defeat of Philip and his
allies, this land was claimed by Uncas, a Mohegan sachem, and his descendants, including his two sons Owaneco and Joshua. Uncas and the Mohegans had been the allies of the English, and because of this alliance were willing in the last quarter of the seventeenth century to make grants of this land to the men at whose sides they had fought.¹

In the last quarter of the seventeenth century, and into the eighteenth, eastern Connecticut was the scene of some colossal political and legal battles among the English for control of these lands. For the period from the end of Philip's War until the treaty of Utrecht in 1713, this region was the only extensive new area of settlement anywhere in New England and many adventurous spirits were attracted to the contest. The principal combatants were the Winthrops and their allies on one side, against the Fitches and Masons, local New London County magnates.² The Masons, because of their long tradition of military prowess, were able to deal easily with the Indians, gaining their confidence and convincing them to turn over huge tracts of land. But not everyone felt that the title to the land obtained by the Masons and their allies was good, or that any one man or small group of men should have control of so much territory. These struggles affected colonial politics for decades and, as we shall see, were reflected in squabbles over rights to land in Lebanon.
This was the context within which the settlement of eastern Connecticut took place. Uncas, Owaneco, Joshua and Abimilech, all members of the same Mohegan royal family, sold (and resold) extensive portions of their claimed territory in Connecticut, but the deeds were consistently vague and contradictory, leading inevitably to contention. One of the first of these grants was to a group of Norwich men for land directly to the north of Norwich. Settlement here began around 1689, and by 1692 the new town of Windham had been incorporated. The purchase and settlement of Colchester, to the southwest of Lebanon, went forward somewhat earlier than the purchase and settlement of Lebanon, the incorporation of Colchester taking place in 1698. Two other tracts were granted during these years, one to a group of men from Hartford and the other to men from Saybrook. These were to the north of Colchester and Lebanon, and migration in that direction did not commence until just after 1700. The Saybrook men's lands were incorporated in 1708 as Hebron. The Hartford men's purchase became Coventry, with full township privileges granted in 1711, only six years after Lebanon. In the meantime, Windham in 1702 had split in two, the southern portion of the town retaining the name Windham, and the northern portion becoming Mansfield. Thus, by 1705 Lebanon was bounded on the southeast by the older town of Norwich and was surrounded on all other sides by five towns.
This map approximates the original boundaries of Lebanon, showing the three major land purchases (Fitch's and Mason's Mile, Five Miles Square, Dewey and Clarke's Purchase) and the original neighboring towns (Norwich, Windham, Mansfield, Coventry, Bolton, Hebron, and Colchester). The numeral 1 indicates the region of the earliest homelot grants within the Five Miles Square, which developed into the present Lebanon Green; the numeral 2 indicates the location of the earliest homelot grants within the Dewey and Clarke Purchase, now the site of the village of Columbia.
of her own age; in an arc from west to east they were
Colchester, Hebron, Coventry, Mansfield and Windham. 5

Infiltration of the land northwest of Norwich that
would become Lebanon began slowly in the years after King
Philip’s War, and accelerated in the last decade of the
seventeenth century, with the Mohegan sachems conveying to
the Englishmen ever larger and larger pieces of real estate.
The earliest grants were made just over the Norwich line,
near Deep Brook; these were a handful of small tracts, one
or two hundred acres, given to men such as James Fitch, as a
reward for their various services both to the Indians and to
the government of Connecticut. 6

The first substantial grant in the region of interest
to us was the so-called Mile, given in 1687 by Owaneco to
Reverend James Fitch. This was a strip of land one mile
wide, adjacent to and paralleling the northwest boundary of
Norwich. The extent of the Mile from southwest to northeast
was originally thought to be five miles, but when later
surveyed was found to be closer to seven miles. 7

Before many years had passed, Fitch had deeded a
one-half interest in the Mile to his son-in-law (and
brother-in-law) Captain John Mason, thus giving rise to one
of the alternative names for the tract, Fitch’s and Mason’s
Mile. Small grants within the Mile were made by both Fitch
and Mason, frequently to other members of their family.
Since these grants were made in the 1690s, before Lebanon
was a functioning town, they are often recorded in the land registers of some other town, usually Norwich; not all of them were re-recorded when the Lebanon town book of land records was begun, early in 1700.  

In 1699, as the organization of Lebanon as a functioning town was reaching a climax, Fitch and Mason finally arranged for a complete survey and division of the Mile, which was divided into six sections, alternately assigned to Fitch and Mason. One of the results of this survey was that a grant made earlier by Fitch might fall within one of Mason's sections, or vice versa. This necessitated a number of deeds to sort out the confusion, not always successfully.

The next major acquisition of land within the future bounds of Lebanon was the so-called Five Miles Square. This was a vast tract of land, supposedly five miles on a side, northwest of the Mile and southwest of the Willimantic river, and the site of what would become Windham and Mansfield. The Five Miles Square was bought by four men who had been prominent in King Philip's War and in the affairs of Norwich and Stonington -- Captain Samuel Mason, Captain John Stanton, Captain Benjamin Brewster Senior, and John Birchard Senior. The sale was made in 1692 by Owaneco, but the claim was not made good until 1705, and for decades after that controversies over the boundaries of the Five Miles Square were in process.
Two of the more important documents for the early history of Lebanon are dated 1 November 1695 and give a hint at early struggles over control of the town, but we can only speculate about the precise nature of those conflicts. The four purchasers of the Five Miles Square apparently determined that they would lay out a town with a broad main street lined by narrow houselots for all the inhabitants, supplemented by further divisions behind the houselots or elsewhere within the Five Miles Square. The intent was to retain the compact form of village that was so highly desired by the Puritans. The initial grant to each individual, made on 1 November 1695, was forty-two acres in a long narrow strip, with one of the narrow ends facing on the main street running through the center of town. This feature of the plan was successfully accomplished and is still evident today in the long and broad green in the center of Lebanon.\textsuperscript{11}

During this early stage of planning, two men from the northwest appeared on the scene -- Josiah Dewey Senior of Westfield, Massachusetts, and John Woodward of Northampton, Massachusetts. By a process that is totally hidden from us, they obtained from the four purchasers of the Five Miles Square the rights to apportion ten of the forty-two acres allotments, along with all subsequent divisions and common rights; this portion of the Five Miles Square will henceforth be referred to as the Ten Allotments. Dewey and
Woodward were named in an instrument of 1 November along with five other men, all from the Northampton region, as the recipients of this grant, but Dewey and Woodward alone were to be responsible for the division of these allotments. This was done in December 1697, most of the grantees on that date also being from the Northampton region. This intrusion of Northampton men into the affairs of Norwich men was one of the crucial events in the formative period of Lebanon's history, as will be shown in more detail below.\(^\text{12}\)

The last major purchase within the bounds of Lebanon was made by Josiah Dewey and William Clarke, another Northamptonian, from Thomas Buckingham and John Clarke of Saybrook, who had obtained the original grant from the Indians. This was an irregularly shaped parcel of land adjoining the Five Miles Square on the northwest. Dewey and Clarke obtained this land late in 1699 and a year later were making substantial grants to their friends and relatives, emulating the purchasers of the Five Miles Square in attempting to lay out small houselots in a compact group, referred to in the early deeds as "Lebanon Village." This is the region that soon became known as Lebanon Crank, was set off as a separate parish in 1715, and in 1804 became the town of Columbia.\(^\text{13}\)

Settlement of the town proceeded slowly at first and accelerated toward the end of the 1690's, and the town
began to petition the General Court in Hartford for incorporation. The turning point came in January 1699/1700, when the four purchasers of the Five Miles Square deeded their vast grant to all the townsmen of Lebanon. This turned the larger part of the town into a widely-held propriety, rather than the private domain of a few absentee landlords. Captain Samuel Mason, acting for himself and his three partners, issued a steady stream of documents at the end of 1699 and the beginning of 1700, confirming to the town all the lands in the Five Miles Square, but at the same time reserving specified tracts for the original purchasers and reminding the new owners of certain agreements made some years earlier.14

In many ways, this act of January 1699/1700 would seem to mark the real beginning of Lebanon as an independent town. For example, examination of the first book of land records indicates that it was just at this time that William Clarke began a book for recording land transactions and other important documents regarding the town. The first twenty pages of the book (now in a jumbled order) attempt to gather all the crucial documents regarding the first acquisition from the Indians of the Five Miles Square and the Dewey and Clarke purchase (there is little here about the Mile), followed by fifty pages recording the earliest grants already made within the Five Miles Square.
But matters did not rest there. Many of the boundaries were uncertain, both between Lebanon and neighboring towns, and within Lebanon itself, between one tract and another. Controversies arising from these boundary problems and from uncertainties over the validity of the original purchase from the Indians found their way to the General Court, and it was not until 1705 that that body confirmed the original Indian purchases and put Lebanon on a more solid legal footing.15

This outline of the early years of Lebanon has been derived from accounts published, for the most part, more than a century ago. There is nothing new here. The remainder of this paper is an attempt to probe more deeply into the processes of the formation of Lebanon by looking closely at each of the individuals involved in that process.
NOTES


6. Hurd, op. cit., Chapter XLVIII, "Lebanon," pp. 480-9; a summary of the early major land grants in Lebanon is on page 481. This chapter on Lebanon is in fact a reprint of an earlier address by Orlo D. Hine and is the basic historical treatment of Lebanon. All later writings on Lebanon which were consulted merely draw on Hine for their brief treatment of Lebanon's early years and add nothing to Hine; see entries under Armstrong, Barber, Hine, Huntington and Stark in the general bibliography.

14. Lebanon Deeds 1:6, 8, 10.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Over the last two decades the historical study of the family, of economic activities, of political processes, has been revolutionized by the analysis of data on large numbers of individuals, data that had been infrequently exploited by earlier generations of historians. This investigation of the day-to-day life of the common man and woman was directed earliest and most often to the small communities of the colonial period, and especially to New England.

The two pioneers in these studies were Charles S. Grant and Sumner Chilton Powell. Grant undertook a careful analysis of the process of land acquisition in northwestern Connecticut, and particularly in the newly-formed town of Kent in Litchfield County. He began to use the earlier work of some genealogists in his investigations into the origins and kinship relations of the earliest settlers and land speculators in this town. His work, by showing that many of the earliest grantees of land did not settle in Kent, helped lay the groundwork for Bushman's later work on the transition from Puritan to Yankee. ¹

Powell delved even more deeply than did Grant into the individual personalities in his chosen community, Sudbury, Massachusetts. Powell wished to learn how English institutions, and in particular agricultural practices, were
transformed in their migration from Old England to New. He approached this problem by looking in great detail at a handful of the first settlers of Sudbury, and in considerably less detail at the lives of all the early settlers. For the latter persons, he relied mostly on previously published genealogical materials; but for the few lives that he followed closely, Powell ranged widely over the records of England, finding much on the activities of these men in their English communities before they came to New England.²

Thus, the very first men to focus on the individual New England community quickly learned to use many records and, in the case of Powell, used them in much the way that the genealogist would -- painstakingly building up a profile of the life of an ordinary man. But the investigators who followed a few years later, such as Kenneth Lockridge in his work on Dedham, Massachusetts, and Philip Greven on Andover, Massachusetts, followed a different course, drawing heavily on the work of such social historians as Goubert and Henri in France, and Wrigley and Laslett in England.³ While Lockridge and Greven and others who followed did not totally abandon the trail blazed by Grant and Powell, they did place their emphasis elsewhere. The aforementioned European social historians were the developers of the discipline of family reconstitution, the exhaustive extraction and manipulation of information from locally-generated registers of births (or baptisms), marriages, and deaths (or burials). Community
studies based on family reconstitution have shown great success in answering questions about demographics -- for instance about age at first marriage, birth intervals, or fertility levels.

While these studies have been very valuable and have added much to our knowledge of the times and places under study, the successes have not been complete. A striking example is one of the earliest -- Lockridge's investigation of the first century of the history of Dedham. Lockridge portrays this settlement as a "closed, corporate, utopian commune," repeatedly stressing the point that harmony prevailed among the townsmen from the very beginning of settlement. But a closer look at the first few years of settlement shows a different picture. The settlers of the first year or two wrote the town (civil) covenant and were in place before the arrival of another group of Englishmen, who became the founders of the church, and who in 1639 ratified the church covenant. Within another year or two after this, more than half of the original founders, the authors of the civil covenant, had left Dedham, presumably to join persons of a more kindred spirit. Lockridge missed this early conflict in the town because he did not follow carefully the career and migration pattern of each settler in Dedham, and because he did not properly interpret the records of the Dedham church.
A second example, more directly related to the inspirations of this paper but not so dependent on the technique of family reconstitution, is the work of James Walsh on the Great Awakening in Woodbury, Connecticut. Walsh made extensive use of the vital records of Woodbury and of published genealogies of families with branches in that town, to analyze the ages, wealth, marital status and other features of the population that experienced this religious revival. At an early point in his essay, Walsh bemoans the difficulty of analyzing persons or families who had arrived recently in the town of Woodbury, and in one footnote states that "it is impossible to tell whether immigrants were married, or if so, how many children they had...." 6

Although much of the application of family reconstitution, and the related utilization of genealogical materials, has been in the colonial period, the same methodology has great importance at all historical periods from which nominal records have survived. Thus, another example comes from the work of Bengt Ankarloo, who undertook a study of marriage in nineteenth century Essex County, Massachusetts. He utilized two data sources, the 1880 Federal census and the centrally recorded marriage records of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. By linking the marriage records to the appropriate families in the census, he hoped to answer questions about the changes in household composition in relation to the transition from the unmarried to the married
state. In a study of 501 couples, he was able to find only 246, or 49%, in the census. Ankarloo comments that "[un]til methods and resources for the tracing of the moving population, and the moving couples, have been found, conclusions must be based on the persistent minority."\(^7\)

Ankarloo's statement notwithstanding, there does exist a methodology that would have delivered each of these three scholars from his difficulties. This methodology consists of the techniques of the professional genealogist developed in this country over the last century or so, with its earliest achievements taking place in New England, and with its greatest proponent, Donald Lines Jacobus, working his whole life in New Haven, Connecticut, and frequently studying the very families that baffled Lockridge, Ankarloo and Walsh. The genealogist's techniques (to be described in more detail in the next chapter) have the advantage that they do not limit themselves to only one or a few sources in attempting to solve a given problem, and also that they do not limit themselves to the sources of only one town or region. Limitations of just this sort are what prevented Ankarloo from finding more than one-half of his sample members in the census, and to a lesser extent they also shackled Lockridge and Walsh.

The intent of the present paper is to employ the tools of the genealogist (not just the results of previous efforts of genealogical writers) to a particular problem,
and to show that results may be obtained, and questions answered, that cannot be obtained or answered by the established techniques of family reconstitution and its extensions. The methodology proposed herein is especially effective in studying migration, so the particular problem to be considered is the earliest migration to, and settlement of, Lebanon, Connecticut. The period studied will be from 1692, when the earliest deeds granting land in that area were passed, until 1705, when the town acquired full town privileges from the General Court. By examining the lives of all families resident in Lebanon during that time period, it should be possible to demonstrate the town of origin for at least ninety percent, well in excess of the accomplishments of Ankarloo or Walsh. At the same time, one would expect to unearth evidence which would delineate the extent of kin relations among the persons migrating to Lebanon and also any patterns to the way in which they settled into neighborhoods within the bounds of Lebanon.

Some explanation of the choice of Lebanon for this pilot study should be given. Some time ago, Jonathan Edwards's "Narrative of Surprising Conversions" caught my attention. This is an account of a small-scale revival movement which began in Northampton, Massachusetts, in 1734 and spread quickly to several other towns in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Of the towns which had participated in this smaller revival of 1734 and 1735, many had been first
settled only a few decades earlier and had among their earlier settlers a number of former residents of Northampton. This suggested an interesting possibility, namely, that this revival of 1734 and 1735 occurred where it did because of a network of communications based on continued kinship ties between past and present residents of Northampton.

As a small probe into this possible explanation of this revival, the town of Lebanon seemed a likely candidate, for two reasons -- because I had worked with the records of the town before, and because I knew the records to be relatively complete for the time period under investigation. Unfortunately, in order to answer the question about the relationships between extended kinship networks and religious revivals, one would have to study in great detail the records and families of Lebanon for nearly half a century from the town's founding in 1692 until the end of the revival in 1735. Such a study would be beyond the scope of a paper of this length, so the choice was made instead to limit the study to the first thirteen years of the town's existence, in order to demonstrate the possibilities of applying the techniques of the genealogist to the problems of the historian. For this reason little has been discovered during the course of this study which bears directly on the revival of 1735 and the other considerations which originally stimulated this project.
Since the intent of the method proposed here is to cover as wide a range of sources as possible in order to arrive at the best answer for each individual under consideration, we proceed now to an inventory of the records that exist for Lebanon, Connecticut, for the years from 1692 through 1705.

1. Vital Records -- The originals of the town vital records are not now extant. That which is available is a nineteenth century copy, apparently made by James Arnold at the time he was making transcripts of the vital records of many eastern Connecticut towns. These records have been alphabetized and are included in the Barbour collection at the Connecticut State Library. These records are not arranged in any of the usual ways -- either chronologically or family-by-family -- but are scattered about the pages of the volume in no logical order. For the purposes of this study, all entries in these vital records through December 31, 1705, have been extracted.

2. Church records -- The first Congregational church in Lebanon was organized late in 1700, and the records of the church date from that year. A microfilm copy of the church records may be found in the Connecticut State Library. The usual categories of entries are included (baptisms, admissions to communion, death and marriage), but unfortunately in the earlier years the year of event is
often all that one finds, although soon the day and month are included in the records as well. Again, all records through the end of 1705 have been extracted.

3. Land records -- Throughout Connecticut, land records are kept by the towns rather than by the counties, as in most other American jurisdictions. The Lebanon land records are on microfilm at the Connecticut State Library. The first volume covers our period and then some, as deeds at the end of Volume One were recorded in the early months of 1706. This entire volume has been abstracted. In many New England communities the proprietors' records were maintained separately from the later land transactions not involving the proprietors, but in Lebanon both types of records are thrown together in this one volume. There are indications that the records as they are now bound are not in their original order. For instance, an important deed transferring a large tract of land from the four original purchasers to the townsmen at large begins on what is now page sixteen and concludes on the top of page three.

4. Probate records -- In Connecticut probate districts are different from, and now smaller than, counties. In the years under consideration here, Lebanon fell within the New London probate district. Fortunately, at the Connecticut State Library there are "Inventory Control" books, compiled when the original probate files were transferred to the Archives. By searching this control
volume, it has been possible to identify all Lebanon estates probated by the end of 1705 -- only a handful. Of course, many more probate records generated in later years were studied in the course of this research, but a systematic search was made only for this early period.

5. County court records -- This category of records was not searched, since the dockets are arranged by plaintiff only, and no indication of residence is given. The volume of these records, combined with the inadequacies of indexing, made it impractical to review these records for the present study, but they should be included in any larger and more wide-ranging study of this nature.

Having identified those records which pertain to Lebanon for the thirteen years after 1692, and having abstracted them all, what is the next step?

First, the records are reviewed to obtain a master list of all individuals who resided in Lebanon in the years from 1692 to 1705. This list is the basis for all later analysis. The next step is to identify the point of origin of these people. In many cases this information will be found in these same early records. In particular, the land records will frequently give the last place of residence of the person before his move to Lebanon. In the remaining cases the existing genealogical literature was
searched for this information. In some cases the published material was of sufficient quality, and well enough documented, that further research was not necessary. In other cases, however, the published material was of dubious validity, and the clues provided by these sources were followed up with research at the supposed point of origin by searching the records of the indicated locality, especially the vital records.

Once the point of origin within New England was established, two other points were open for investigation -- time of migration and relation to other migrants. The earliest date of appearance on Lebanon records could not be taken for the date of arrival in town. Most original grants of land in Lebanon, and in other New England towns, were made when the individuals and families were still resident in an older town. In order to pinpoint the date of the move, records at both ends of the migration path must be inspected. By correlating the appearance and disappearance of the family on town, church and land records in both the town of origin and in Lebanon, it is possible in many cases to determine the exact year in which the family moved. In other cases we may narrow the time of migration to a span of two or three years. Demonstration of this technique will be found in the sketches in Chapter III.

Determination of the point of origin generally turned up information which allowed the exploration of kinship
networks. In the case of the migration of families, we are generally able to identify the wives of the migrants, and this frequently gives us an indication of relationship to other migrants. Further research in published sources allows us to expand these networks.

With the information above in hand, we may ask and attempt to answer a variety of questions about the settlement of Lebanon. First, what were the origins of these earliest settlers? Did most of them come from one other town in New England? Or did they come predominantly from two or three other towns? Or did they originate randomly, one from this town and one from that, in no particular pattern? Second, when did they arrive in Lebanon? Did they all come in the same year or over a number of years? If we find that there were two or three principal points of origin for the settlers, did those coming from one town move at the same time as those from a different town, or did they come at some other time? Third, what kinship relations held among the migrants? Did those sharing a common point of origin also share some tie of blood or marriage? Or did they simply join their neighbors, whether related or not, in making the move? Were there any relations of kinship between settlers migrating from one point in New England and those coming from some other, more distant place? Fourth, what were the patterns of settlement? Assuming that the settlers came from
only one or two different origins, did they mingle their homelots indiscriminately, or did they remain segregated based on ties developed at their last place of residence before coming to Lebanon?
NOTES


5. Robert C. Anderson, "Dedham's Earliest Years: Another Perspective" (unpublished MS).


CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Genealogy is a form of nominal record linkage, along with family reconstitution, prosopography and certain forms of family history.¹ These four varieties of record linkage are closely related, but there are important differences from one to another. In particular, a comparison between genealogy and family reconstitution looms important for our present purposes.

The first difference between family reconstitution and genealogy is that the former, as carried out by most practitioners, relies on only one or two types of record, when there may be several record types available. The classical varieties of family reconstitution look only at vital records, from either civil or ecclesiastical registers. Somewhat more sophisticated is the approach of Bengt Ankarloo, who ties together two sources -- marriage records and census records. But Ankarloo's low rate of success in linking records is typical of the more common attempts at family reconstitution.²

The genealogist, on the other hand, places no limits on the number or variety of sources that he consults, knowing that the crucial clue which will allow the linkage of records may appear anywhere. In order to make as many links as possible, therefore, the genealogist searches high and wide for information on any given individual or family.
A second difference is that the practitioner of family reconstitution generally works with large numbers of individuals, and is working toward a statistical result. Thus, he may be looking for the mean age at first marriage among males in a certain population. Under these circumstances, he has no particular interest in any one individual or family under study, but only in the aggregate totals that will lead to the statistical result. He can, therefore, allow a small but measurable percentage of error, knowing that within certain limits he will still obtain usable results.

For the genealogist, this approach is not permissible. From a strictly genealogical point of view, no rate of error is allowable. Because of this, each family and each person receives individual attention; each individual and each family has an importance of its own, for to the person whose ancestry is involved, even one linkage error generates problems.

Related to this last point is a third difference. The linkage rules of the practitioner of family reconstitution are arbitrary and applied rigidly to all cases. In some instances the linkage decisions are carried out by machine, using tables of rules, based on probabilities of certain linkages being acceptable and others not. This is the reason that a measurable rate of error occurs in family reconstitution, a rate higher than is acceptable to the genealogist.
The genealogist, on the other hand, uses more flexible rules and does not carry out his linkage operations by computer. The rules that the genealogist uses have been developed slowly over recent decades by a core group of more professional and scholarly genealogists. Unfortunately, many of the best genealogists have treated genealogical technique as something of a folk craft; the rules are implicit, are learned through experience, and are not passed on from generation to generation in coherent fashion. A new breed of genealogists is now at work, and this shortcoming is in the process of change. A manual on genealogical evidence has been published recently; this valuable volume advances the state of the art greatly, although much remains to be done. Nevertheless, the important difference remains, for the genealogist approaches each problem on its own merits, applying all that he has learned about the sources and about the society within which those sources have been generated, to reach his conclusions on each individual case.

An attempt will be made here to outline the analytic processes used by the genealogist in settling upon the identity of an individual, or in deciding whether or not the records for a given name refer to one individual, two, or more. The process of reaching genealogical decisions may be stated succinctly in two rules:

One: All genealogical conclusions must be based on accurately transcribed, carefully documented, and exhaustively analyzed records.
Two: There must be a sound and explicit reason for stating that any two records refer to the same individual.

In the first place, these two rules serve to maintain the proper separation between the record gathering process and the analytic stage. All too often, genealogists have related a newly-found record to this or that individual, before undertaking a careful analysis of the case. This can lead to a situation wherein the researcher has forgotten why this record was assigned to the given individual, thus causing long-standing confusion.

The first rule outlines the steps that must be taken with the individual records before they are combined with one another in the attempt to outline the career and genealogical connections of an individual. The standard admonitions of any elementary text in genealogy are incorporated in the demands for accurate transcription (or abstraction) and careful documentation. The third requirement of rule one, for exhaustive analysis, is one that is described only in a rudimentary way in most texts. This includes analysis of the chronological elements of a record, searching for internal errors, interpreting properly those instances where a double date is involved, and so on. The analysis would also include a study of onomastic evidence, legal interpretation, paleography, and other aspects of the record.
The second rule then becomes the critical step, for it is here that we move from analysis to synthesis. And it is here that the genealogist has been least explicit in articulating his techniques. What is intended here is that the genealogist be put constantly on his guard against linking any two records on insufficient grounds, and thus possibly at an early stage building a shaky foundation upon which much later analytic work would be built. The genealogist first looks for explicit statements that would lead to linkage, such as an event or element in one record being referred to in another. This happens most frequently in land records, when a later deed will cite a portion of an earlier deed, with volume and page reference, thus making the linkage a relatively easy and certain conclusion. More often, we do not encounter such explicit grounds for linkage, and the genealogist must fall back on more indirect arguments. These usually revolve around judgements of probability, for instance the probability that there would be more than one individual of a certain name in a certain town at a certain time. If the record contains merely this man's name, then there is not much that can be done. But if the record also refers to other circumstances in his life, such as his age, his father's name, his wife's name, and so on, then arguments can be built upon these additional elements.
In this dependence on rules of probability, genealogical argumentation looks like machine-based record linkage as used in some family reconstitution studies. The difference is that the machine-based studies must develop tables of probability for any given element to be included in the analysis, and the computers must rely on these tables slavishly, whereas the genealogist is only guided by the probabilities and uses a more flexible judgment in making linkage decisions.

Now for an example to try to make sense out of this long string of abstractions. This first example is taken not from the Lebanon material, but from a simpler situation in Dedham, Massachusetts, in the middle of the seventeenth century. One of the areas of research in colonial New England which requires careful attention to identity is the question of the franchise, and Dedham has been one of the testing grounds for some of the theories on the seventeenth-century franchise. In the course of a lengthy dispute on this issue, the question of identity is confronted directly by Katherine Brown in a response to her critics. The point at issue is whether the signers of a certain document were or were not over the age of twenty-four. Brown states, "My critics support their view by giving four examples of signers who were twenty-four years of age or over in 1665. But let us look at the four examples they cite: Hezekiah Gay had no house in 1664, did not start
paying taxes until 1666, was not on the 1666 list of town voters, and in 1669 he was on the town's list of single men. One wonders if this was the same Hezekiah who was born in 1640."4

A statement such as this inevitably challenges a genealogist. The name Hezekiah Gay appears only fourteen times in the early records of Dedham and Suffolk County. The first two are a birth and a baptism. On the third day of the fifth month in 1640, Hezekiah Gay, son of John and Joanna was born; on the twelfth day of the fifth month in 1640, "Hezekiah the sone of our sister wife to John Gay was baptised."5 Already we encounter an elementary linkage decision here. Do these two records refer to the same person? Noting that the name of the father is the same, and that the baptism takes place only nine days after the birth, we would be inclined to say that they do refer to the same person, but there is always the chance that there were two John Gays having children in Dedham at this time. An earlier entry in the Dedham church records shows that "our sister wife to John Gay" was in fact named Joanna, so this increases the probabilities; for these two records to refer to two individuals rather than one, we would now have to assume that there were two John Gays, both with wife Joanna, having children in Dedham at this time.6 We are saved finally by our overall knowledge of the Gay family, and of Dedham, in these early years. Analysis of all records in the middle of the seventeenth century has shown that there was
only one John Gay living at Dedham at this time, and it is finally this that allows us to say without serious doubt that the birth and baptism refer to the same Hezekiah.

A century later, this conclusion could not be reached so easily. The family had expanded greatly by the middle of the eighteenth century, to the point that there could easily be two or more John Gays, with wives of the same name, each with a growing family. Under these circumstances we would have to look further afield before we could reach this conclusion.

The remaining twelve records for the name Hezekiah Gay are five appearances on the Country Rate (1666, 1667, 1668 and twice in 1669), three on the Town Rate (1667, 1668 and 1669), signer of a 1665 petition, inclusion on a 1669 list of single people, a nuncupative will of 1669, and finally a death record in 1669.7 Aside from the birth and baptism, then, all records for a Hezekiah Gay fall within a five-year period, from 1665 to 1669, when the person born in 1640 would have been between twenty-five and twenty-nine years old. These records fall into a pattern, without contradictions which would lead one to believe that more than one individual was represented. The name appears regularly on tax lists for four consecutive years, and only once on any one list. This is not a pattern that would indicate more than one man of the name. The nuncupative will is dated 25 October 1669, and the death record is for 28 November 1669.
No record for an adult Hezekiah Gay appears in Dedham for many years after this. The nuncupative will adds more information, naming his father John and brother Nathaniel. Thus, the whole pattern is that of one individual, born in 1640, attaining his majority early in the 1660's and beginning to appear in the records at that time, and then disappearing from the records upon his death late in 1669.

To assume that these records refer to more than one man, we would have to assume another Gay family in town, or at least in eastern Massachusetts Bay, but as we have seen earlier, all other records indicated that the only Gay family in New England at this early date was that of John of Dedham and his wife Joanna. Again, at a later time in the history of Dedham and New England, when the family had proliferated and the total population was much higher, we could not reach this conclusion with the same assurance.

The conclusions regarding the number of men named Hezekiah Gay in early Dedham, and the genealogical connections of Hezekiah Gay, have been reached then by a process of comparing all known records bearing that name, to see whether or not they may be attributed to one individual, or to more than one. This comparison process was guided by an analysis of the self-consistency or self-contradiction of the various records, and also by a broader view of the particular family in question, the likelihood that more than one person of the same name might be around. These
likelihoods change with time and place and with family name.

Even after this analysis, we may not say with total assurance that we have reached the correct conclusion. There is always a residual doubt. Perhaps another Hezekiah Gay came from England and took up residence in Dedham, and perhaps some of the fourteen records refer to him rather than to the Hezekiah son of John and Joanna. We could argue, for instance, that the man who left a nuncupative will did not have his death recorded and that the death record is for a second Hezekiah who did not leave a will. But there is nothing in the records, not only of Hezekiah himself but of the whole Gay family, which indicates the need to postulate two Hezekiahs in this situation. At this point the genealogist falls back on that mainstay of logic, Occam's razor; one does not multiply hypotheses, or individuals, without reason.

The nuncupative will, apparently the only record among the fourteen which Katherine Brown did not see, was especially helpful here, since it explicitly stated many genealogical connections. Even so, the conclusion that the Hezekiah Gay of the 1665 petition was the same as the man born in 1640 could have been reached without that knowledge, on the same grounds as outlined above.

For our second example of the application of genealogical methodology, we shall take one of the names that
appears in the early Lebanon records, Jedediah Strong. This name appears several times in the land records, the first appearance being in early 1700. There are vital records as early as 1697, and church records from 1700. At first glance these would all appear to be the tracings of one man, since the designations Senior and Junior never appear as they normally would if two people of the same name were active in Lebanon. But upon closer examination we find that there were in fact two Jedediah Strongs, father and son, with the son being the settler, and the father remaining behind in Northampton.

The crucial document is a deed of 6 March 1701/2, in which Jedediah Strong of Northampton grants land to his son John Strong, place of residence not stated. When we compare this instrument with our other information on Jedediah Strong in Lebanon, we find no hint of a son John. The vital records and church records show several children born to Jedediah Strong and wife Abijah, beginning in 1697. When we look back to the Strong family in Northampton, we find a Jedediah with sons Jedediah and John, each of the latter two being born early enough to be acting as adults in the late 1690s and early 1700s. Furthermore, the description of the land in the deed mentioned above matches that in an earlier grant (13 December 1701) to Jedediah Strong of Northampton.

The two deeds just described, then, are the actions of the elder Jedediah, providing for his son John, who was
possibly not completely capable of caring for himself. John's will of 1709 names only a sister, a brother (Jedediah), and nephews, but no wife or children of his own. The remaining records in Lebanon mentioning Jedediah Strong are now consistent with one another and describe the career of one of the early settlers of Lebanon. The designations of Senior and Junior do not appear because, although both were active in Lebanon land transactions, only one was actually resident in the town. The inclusion in the deed of the place of residence of the two men was sufficient to distinguish between them.

This has been a relatively simple example of the recurring genealogical problem of "the name's the same." In some instances as many as seven or eight adult males of the same name will be simultaneously active in one town, and the researcher must be very careful in distinguishing among them. But no matter how simple or complicated the problem, the principles of resolution remain the same. In this case, the principles that are most employed are close attention to problems of chronology, broad investigation of the whole family and not just the individuals under immediate consideration, and, most generally, providing "a sound and explicit reason for stating that any two records refer to the same individual."
NOTES


CHAPTER III
CASE STUDIES

Within the scope of a study of this size, it would be impossible to give every detail of the investigation of each of the 137 individuals who had some association with Lebanon in these earliest years. Instead, a handful of these people have been chosen for closer scrutiny, both to show the varieties of careers of the men associated with Lebanon, and to demonstrate explicitly how the techniques of the genealogist allow one to arrive at reasonably accurate answers to the various questions that were posed at the end of Chapter I.

Analysis of all the individuals involved showed that there were three nuclei of migration: Norwich and related towns; Northampton and related towns; and Plymouth County in Massachusetts Bay Colony. From each of these sources, some men actually came to reside in Lebanon, while others were only absentee proprietors. For each of these four sources, at least one, and sometimes two, examples have been chosen to demonstrate the above points.

These case studies demonstrate a number of the points on methodology discussed in Chapter II. In the first place, a wide variety of sources has been consulted. In Lebanon, land records, church records, and vital records all come
under consideration. Published material on the various families, both in monographic form and in the periodical literature, has been searched, with something of value found for every family and individual being studied. Where possible, source material at the point of origin for these families has been investigated as well; for example, Dedham vital records were checked for Jonathan Metcalfe, Northampton vital records for William Clarke, and Windsor vital records for Josiah and John Loomis.

In the second place, there is no single arbitrary set of rules by which decisions were reached. In attempting to establish the date of migration, we are presented sometimes with the case of a clean break between the last record at the point of origin and the first record in Lebanon; this happens with Jonathan Metcalfe, and there is no difficulty in his case in reaching a conclusion on the date of migration. But with William Clarke the case is more difficult and different criteria must be applied, since many of his children are recorded both in Northampton and in Lebanon. Since we are not confronted with the same mix of records in any large number of cases, the rules for reaching a conclusion on date of migration, or any other question that we wish to answer, must remain flexible.

In the text of this chapter, sources will be cited only by type and location of records, so that the reader will see
in each example just what has contributed to the determination of place of origin and date or removal. Fuller citations, giving volume and page, will be found in Appendix I.

BENJAMIN BREWSTER

Benjamin Brewster was, along with Samuel Mason, John Stanton and John Birchard, one of the four original purchasers of the Five Miles Square, and like two of his colleagues (Mason and Stanton) he did not move to Lebanon. Brewster was born in Plymouth in the 1630s, son of Jonathan Brewster and grandson of William Brewster, the Mayflower passenger. Jonathan Brewster took part in the migration of Plymouth families to New London early in that town's history. Benjamin later resided in Norwich. He was active in military affairs, being Lieutenant of the New London troop as early as 1673 and active during King Philip's War; eventually he attained the rank of Captain, and it is in this guise that we meet him in the Lebanon records.

As Captain Benjamin Brewster, he appears on the list of grantees in the Five Miles Square on 1 November 1695, the recipient of two lots. He appears on other instruments involving the early history of the Five Miles Square before it was turned over to the entire group of proprietors of that tract of land; in all these transactions, however, he was probably never present, but was represented by Captain
Samuel Mason of Stonington. A search of Norwich or Stonington records might uncover a power of attorney from Brewster to Mason. Only two further mentions of Benjamin Brewster Senior appear on the Lebanon records. On 15 April 1701, Captain Benjamin Brewster of Norwich made a deed of gift to his son, Benjamin Brewster Junior of Lebanon, of one of his two lots in the Five Miles Square. On 3 May 1701 he makes a deed of gift to his son William Brewster of Lebanon of the other lot. In this way he closed out his land holdings in Lebanon and established two of his sons on this land. In fact, the two sons must have been residing on this land for many years prior to these paternal grants. [DEEDS]

EDWARD COLVER

Edward Colver was born about 1654, probably at New London, son of Edward Colver and Ann Ellis. He was active as a scout in King Philip's War and later attained the rank of Lieutenant. He married in 1681 in Norwich, where the births of his first eight children are recorded. He was granted a lot in the Five Miles Square in 1695 and appears frequently in land transactions as early as 9 February 1699/1700. [DEEDS; NORWICH VITAL RECORDS]

In this case we are assisted in narrowing down the time of migration by a study of the vital records. The last of his children to be recorded in Norwich was Sarah, born in
August of 1694; the first child recorded at Lebanon was Daniel, born 19 December 1698, followed by three more. This last date may be in error, since this child was baptized at Stonington on 3 July 1698; the baptism was a contemporary record, whereas the birth was probably recorded some years after the event, making the baptismal date more reliable. This would place Edward Colver's removal from Norwich to Lebanon in 1695, 1696 or 1697. [NORWICH VITAL RECORDS; STONINGTON CHURCH RECORDS]

There are various indications that Edward Colver was one of the earliest to actually settle in Lebanon. A deed of 9 August 1697 refers to land of Edward Colver in such a way that it would appear that Colver was already in residence. A deed of 7 December 1700 refers to "Colver's Old Bridge." The word "old" was used freely in the seventeenth century, but would indicate that the bridge had already been standing for some years. [DEEDS]

From this evidence, we will take Colver's date of arrival in Lebanon as 1696, the middle of the three years in which he might actually have come. He was very active in town affairs until his removal to the new town of Litchfield in the 1720s.

WILLIAM CLARKE

William Clarke was the last of the great purchasers to become involved with Lebanon. In 1700 he and Josiah Dewey
bought that tract of land which became Lebanon Crank and later Columbia. Clarke was born in Dorchester in 1656, only a few years before his family moved to the new town of Northampton. He married in Northampton in 1680 and had most of his family there. [NORTHAMPTON VITAL RECORDS]

His earliest appearance on the land records of Lebanon is on 2 May 1700, when he and Dewey make the purchase described above. But the Lebanon records of his marriages and children begin in 1680. Clearly there is some conflict with the Northampton records, and in this instance we have a more complicated case than that of Edward Colver, in which the vital records in one town begin after those in the earlier town have already ended. [DEEDS; LEBANON VITAL RECORDS]

Comparison of the Northampton and Lebanon vital records shows that all events are recorded in both towns through the birth of his son Gershom on 18 Nov. 1697; he was the second child by Clarke's second wife, Mary Smith. Three more children are found on the Lebanon records, the earliest being a daughter Mary born on 22 November 1699. This would indicate that the Clarke family had come to Lebanon in 1698 or 1699. [LEBANON AND NORTHAMPTON VITAL RECORDS]

Aside from his activities as purchaser of a large tract of Lebanon land, Clarke was one of the pillars of the Lebanon church at its founding on 27 November 1700. In addition, he was the first town clerk of Lebanon, and the
earliest volume of land records, both deeds and proprietors' records, is in his hand. As town clerk, he would also have kept the book of vital records, and this is undoubtedly why his family is recorded retroactively.

JOHN MASON

John Mason was born in Norwich about 1673, son of Captain John Mason, and grandson of the immigrant Major John Mason, the great Indian fighter. Through his connections with the Fitch family, he had secured for the Masons one half of the so-called Fitch's and Mason's Mile, the strip of land along the northwest border of Norwich which saw the earliest land grants and the earliest settlement in what would become Lebanon. Because of these landholdings, Mason was one of the most influential men in Lebanon in the earliest years. His name appears more frequently in the Lebanon land records than that of any other man, mostly as a grantor of his holdings in the Mile. [DEEDS]

The earliest deed for him in Lebanon calls him of Lebanon in April of 1699, when he was 26, and two years before his marriage. His oldest child is recorded at Lebanon in 1702, and many deeds of his are on record in the Lebanon books in 1700, 1701, 1702 and 1703. There are none for 1704, but in October of 1705 he is called of Stonington, where his later children are recorded. He was a resident of Lebanon, then, from 1699 (or perhaps slightly earlier) until 1704 or
early 1705. His departure probably stems from the resolution of land disputes in favor of his enemies. [DEEDS; LEBANON AND STONINGTON VITAL RECORDS]

JONATHAN METCALFE

Jonathan Metcalfe, son of Jonathan Metcalfe and Hannah Kenrick, was born in Dedham, Massachusetts Bay Colony, on the first of December 1676. He is the only resident of Lebanon at this early date to come from this part of Massachusetts, but the precision with which we may date his arrival invites the recording of his movements in some detail. [DEDHAM VITAL RECORDS]

In fact, two deeds are sufficient to place his migration quite precisely. On 29 September 1701 he purchases land in Lebanon and is called of Dedham in Massachusetts; barely two months later, on 8 December 1701, he purchases again in Lebanon and is now called of Lebanon. All later records refer to him as being of Lebanon. Thus from this evidence alone we may date his arrival in town to the autumn of 1701. At the time of the first of these two deeds he may already have brought his family to Lebanon, but chose in this earliest transaction to give his town of nativity, before settling down in his new home. Alternatively, he may have bought the land in late September, before returning to Dedham to pick up his new bride and their belongings for the move to Lebanon. In either case we may date the move within a very narrow span. [DEEDS]
Although not necessary in this case, we may still use the evidence of the vital records for corroboration. The marriage of Jonathan Metcalfe to Hannah Avery is recorded at Dedham on 15 January 1700/1, nine months prior to the first purchase in Lebanon. After this, there is no further record of this Jonathan or his family on Dedham books. The earliest appearance of the family on Lebanon vital records is 17 January 1701/2, slightly more than a month after the first record which calls Jonathan of Lebanon. Thus, all records are in complete agreement. [DEDHAM AND LEBANON VITAL RECORDS]

Jonathan lived out a full life and died in Lebanon on 5 March 1738/9, in his 63rd year. This age at death, in consonance with his date of birth, adds further soundness to the identification.

LOOMIS AND WARNER

To illustrate the families from Hartford and Windsor, a look at the Loomis/Warner connection will be useful. On 30 December 1700, Deacon John Loomis of Windsor purchased from Edward Colver half a lot in the Five Miles Square. John Loomis had been born in Windsor in November 1649, son of John and Elizabeth (Scott) Loomis. By his first wife, whose name is unknown, he had nine children, all born in Windsor between 1673 and 1692. Not long after the birth of the ninth
child, this unidentified first wife died, and John Loomis married Sarah (Boltwood) Warner, widow of Isaac Warner, who had moved from Hartford to Deerfield and died in 1691. [DEEDS; WINDSOR VITAL RECORDS]

In 1702 John Loomis was admitted to membership in the Lebanon church, and in the following year his wife Sarah was also admitted. In the earliest church records of Lebanon, baptisms and admissions are listed under the year, without indication of day or month. But comparison of baptisms with birth records shows that the baptisms were recorded in the order in which they occurred, so that position in the list would give a rough idea of whether an event took place early or late in the year. Applying this same finding to the church admissions, we find that John Loomis was fifth of six persons to be admitted to the Lebanon church in 1702, and therefore this event probably took place late in the year, say in the fourth quarter of 1702. [LEBANON CHURCH RECORDS]

Putting all this together, we find on this evidence alone that John Loomis was in Windsor on 30 December 1700, but in Lebanon in the latter part of 1702. Assuming that travel was restricted in the winter months, we would have to place the arrival of John Loomis and his family in Lebanon somewhere between spring of 1701 and fall of 1702.

Another immigrant to Lebanon about this time was Josiah Loomis, born in Windsor in February 1660/1, son of
Nathaniel and Elizabeth (Moore) Loomis, and first cousin of John above. His first appearance on the Lebanon records was on 30 January 1701/2, when he received from Josiah Dewey and William Clarke a grant in Lebanon Village; Josiah was styled "of Lebanon" at the time of this grant. If we again assume travel restrictions in winter, we would have to say that Josiah Loomis must have moved from Windsor to Lebanon no later than the fall of 1701. [DEEDS]

We noted above that John Loomis had married the widow Warner, so that the younger children of her first marriage probably accompanied the Loomis family to Lebanon, and indeed we do find that in 1705 Ichabod Warner begins to be active as he reaches his maturity. But we also find records in Lebanon of Abraham Warner, a first cousin of Ichabod. Although he never came to Lebanon, he appears on Lebanon records as Abraham Warner of Hartford, weaver, when receiving a grant of land at Lebanon Village on 15 December 1701. Still of Hartford, he disposed of this land on 17 July 1705. [DEEDS]

Although there may have been various reasons for these different individuals to become interested in Lebanon, there is a startling unity to these records. Deacon John Loomis starts the relationship in December of 1700, by purchasing land in Lebanon, and within a year his first cousin and his wife's nephew also buy land. We would be consistent with all
the facts if we claimed that Deacon John Loomis, with his children by his first marriage and his second wife's children by her first marriage, and also Josiah Loomis with his family, all came to Lebanon in 1701.

These case studies demonstrate clearly the differences between applying the techniques of genealogy to the questions at hand and applying the techniques of family reconstruction as developed in recent years. All 137 individuals associated with Lebanon between 1692 and 1705 have been subjected to the same sort of analysis as displayed in the case studies above. Brief summaries of the results of this analysis for each individual appear in Appendix I, where may be found also the source material in support of the above case studies.
The exhaustive search of all Lebanon records to the end of 1705 has produced a list of 137 individuals (most with families) who were associated in some way with Lebanon in those early years, either as settlers or as grantees of land, whether they came to reside in Lebanon or not. We are now ready to consider the first two of the questions posed at the end of Chapter I -- Where did these people come from? and When did they move to Lebanon?

Of the 137 men on the list, the last residence prior to association with Lebanon has been established for all but one. Examination of this list shows that during this first thirteen years of the existence of Lebanon, there were three focal sources for emigration to, or association with, Lebanon. These were, in order of chronological importance, the older settlements in New London County, a number of towns in the upper Connecticut River Valley (with emphasis on Northampton and Westfield), and the northern part of Plymouth County in the Province of Massachusetts Bay. Only six men could not be placed in or allied to one of these three groups -- less than five percent of the total. (Consult Table I for a statistical summary of the origins of this group of men. Appendix II lists the 137 men by town and also gives the date of arrival of those who came to Lebanon.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Origin</th>
<th>Number Associated with Lebanon, 1692-1705</th>
<th>Number Resident in Lebanon, 1692-1705</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deerfield</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saybrook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wethersfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killingworth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scituate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Compton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The town with the largest number of names on the list was Norwich, which is not surprising since the Lebanon lands bounded Norwich on the northwest. To the thirty-five men from Norwich should be added eighteen more from surrounding towns -- five from New London, six from Stonington and seven from the fledgling town of Windham, bordering Lebanon on the northeast. The early settlement of these four towns was closely related, and it is not surprising that they should all have participated in the settlement of Lebanon. To these names two more may be added, based on close kinship relations. Captain John Brown from Swansea, Massachusetts, had married Mary Mason, sister to Captain Samuel Mason of Stonington; and John Tuttle of New Haven had married Mary, daughter of John Burroughs of New London. New London County, then, contributed fifty-five of the 137 names on the list.

The town with the next largest number of individuals was Northampton, with twenty-three. Westfield, many early settlers of which were from Northampton, added ten more, and several other settlements in Hampshire County accounted for an additional sixteen (Springfield, Deerfield, Hadley, Hatfield, Enfield and Suffield). The two northernmost Connecticut river towns -- Windsor and Hartford -- contributed six and five, respectively. Although these towns were in a different colony, there had always been close ties of kinship between the two of them and the towns further north in Massachusetts. Finally, the one man from Killingworth, William Buell, was of a family originally from Windsor.
This map shows the town of Lebanon in relation to other early New England towns. The towns representing the three principal foci for migration to Lebanon have been underlined, and other towns sending families to Lebanon may also be found here.
Thus, the upper Connecticut River valley was responsible for sixty-one names on the roster of those associated with Lebanon in these early years.

The third cluster of names centers on the town of Duxbury in Plymouth County, Massachusetts Bay. Duxbury contributed seven individuals to the list, and from the neighboring Plymouth County towns of Bridgewater, Scituate, Marshfield and Plymouth came six more. Benjamin Woodworth, who came to Lebanon from Little Compton (then in Bristol County, Massachusetts), had formerly resided in Scituate. We have, then, a total of 14 from or associated with northern Plymouth County, the towns of Middleborough and Rochester in the southern part of the county not being represented.

Having enumerated these three groups of names on the list of 137, only seven names are left. Two are from Saybrook, one from Wethersfield, one from Boston, one from Gloucester, one from Dedham, and the origins of the last are unknown.

The significance of these statistics may be seen more clearly, perhaps, if we shift our focus momentarily and point out the places from which people associated with Lebanon did not come. There was no one from Maine or New Hampshire whatsoever. From the area of the old Massachusetts Bay Province (Essex, Middlesex and Suffolk Counties), we find only a scattered handful -- one each from Gloucester, Boston and Dedham -- and one of those (Rowland Powell of
Gloucester) probably had an intermediate residence, as yet undiscovered, somewhere in New London County. No one from Barnstable County or from the southern part of Plymouth County made the list, and the two from Bristol County are closely allied with one or another of the three principal clusters. No resident of Rhode Island became associated with Lebanon at this early date. Looking further west, there was no connection between Fairfield County and Lebanon, and the two individuals from New Haven County were, like their counterparts in Bristol County, associated with someone in one of the three clusters.

So we have reached our first conclusion based on our analysis of the list of those associated with Lebanon in its first thirteen years. Out of the total population of New England at the close of the seventeenth century, more than ninety-five percent of those who took an early interest in Lebanon were from one of three areas - New London County, the upper Connecticut River valley, and northern Plymouth County.

In the discussion to this point, we have looked at all those with an early relation to Lebanon, whether they eventually came or not. What if we narrow our field of view and look only at those who made a greater commitment, and came to take up residence on their Lebanon lands, for however short a time?
From Norwich, only nineteen of the thirty-five on our list came to live in Lebanon before the end of 1705, just barely more than half. For the four towns of New London County, the numbers are twenty-eight of fifty-three, again just barely more than half. Looking at Northampton, the difference is quite dramatic, for twenty of twenty-three moved to Lebanon, more than eighty percent. For the several towns of Hampshire County, forty-two of forty-nine made the move, again more than eighty percent. The numbers are sparser for the northern Plymouth County group, but five of the seven Duxbury individuals came, and eight of the total of fourteen.

We may now pass to the second major question which may be answered from the data at hand. When did these individuals actually make the move to Lebanon? The answer here can not be so precise as for the first question, since we frequently are faced with a spread of two or three years during which the move took place. Nevertheless, some patterns emerge.

The earliest arrivals were from the Norwich group. Such men as William Brewster, Edward Colver and the Calkins brothers were on Lebanon soil as early as 1695, 1696 or 1697. Caleb Chappell from New London, and Joseph Bradford and Exercise Conant from Windham, may also have come in these same years. But the bulk of those who made the move
from Norwich and its associated towns did not come until the 1699-1701 period, and a few came as late as 1703.

Here again, the Northampton group looks different. Fourteen of the twenty who made the trek to Lebanon did so in 1697 or 1698, and all twenty had arrived by 1701. From Westfield six of the eight came in the same years of 1697 and 1698, as did others from Springfield and Deerfield. The immigrants from the other Hampshire County towns, and from Windsor and Hartford, did not start arriving until 1701 and later.

Of the eight who came from northern Plymouth County (including Benjamin Woodworth), Joseph Wadsworth was the earliest, in 1701 or 1702, and the remaining seven moved in 1703 or 1704.

To summarize, the early settlement of Lebanon may be seen as the confluence of two quite dissimilar streams. The flow begins with a small trickle of families from Norwich and Windham in 1695, 1696 and 1697. In 1697 and 1698 this small beginning is overwhelmed by the arrival of more than twenty families from Northampton and vicinity. After 1698 the flow from the north diminishes, and the influx from Norwich resumes, but the balance henceforth will always be on the side of the Northampton group. Starting in 1701 or 1702 a third tributary arises, sending a small contribution of families from a few towns in the north of Plymouth County.
We turn now to the next set of questions posed in Chapter I, those relating to kinship networks. The biographical sketches in Appendix I contain much of the data needed to answer these questions, and the seven charts assembled in Appendix III illustrate some of the kinship networks uncovered in the course of this study.

The first, and in many ways one of the most striking, of the kinship networks to come into play in Lebanon history was the tangled skein of the Mason and Fitch families (Chart 1). These two families combined in the latter part of the seventeenth century to become the strongest political power in eastern Connecticut, bringing together the skills of the soldier and the minister. The chart presented here only demonstrates a portion of the interrelationships between the two families; to add other connections would have made the diagram incomprehensible. Two examples will suffice. Captain James Fitch, the most politically active member of the clan, married Elizabeth, another daughter of Major John Mason, thus becoming his own father's brother-in-law. When Elizabeth died in 1684, James Fitch took as his second wife Alice Bradford, widow of William Adams and elder sister of Joseph Bradford, the early settler of Lebanon. A peculiar feature
of this pedigree is that, aside from the connection to Bradford, there is no hint of a relationship with any other family among the Norwich group which became interested in Lebanon.

Two clusters of Norwich families are delineated on Charts 2 and 3. The first of these is a relatively small grouping, revolving around the children of William Fowler. Jonathan Fowler was in Norwich and then became an early settler of Windham. He died when that town was still young, leaving land in several neighboring towns. Somewhat later his sister and brother-in-law, John and Mercy Bill, came to Lebanon, but they were not followed by another couple who shared the same relationship, John and Abigail Elderkin. Not shown on this chart is a third brother, Mark, whose two sons, John and Thomas, came to Lebanon sometime between 1706 and 1710, indicating that these kinship networks continued to draw people into Lebanon beyond our cutoff date of 1705. Another network of about the same size among the Norwich men connects Edward Colver, John Burroughs and John Tuttle.

More important to the speculation in land, and eventual settlement, were the larger networks of which Chart 3 is an example. This demonstrates one of the great engines of kinship generation revealed by this study -- the marriage of a widower and a widow. Thomas Adgate and Mary (Marvin) Bushnell lost their spouses at about the same time and soon thereafter married one another. As so often happened in such
cases, two of the step-siblings, in this instance Richard Bushnell and Elizabeth Adgate, later married one another. Other marriages ensued, bringing in the Leffingwells and the Brewsters.

More distant relations between the Adgates and other families in our study could also be demonstrated, were the chart large enough. Two sisters of Thomas Adgate Junior married into the Huntington and Lothrop families, but the connections to the men who became associated with Lebanon are more distant than those shown in the diagram. If we admit relationships more distant than those displayed, the chart could be extended greatly.

Note that Chart 3 reinforces the statistics presented in the last chapter as only the two younger Brewsters actually took up their Lebanon lands, the rest merely holding the lands or selling them soon after they had been acquired. Other families that could be placed on charts of this type from Norwich would be Abell, Birchard, Calkins, Hyde and Royce.

The three figures illustrating Northampton families (Charts 4, 5 and 6) are even more remarkable than those for Norwich. In fact, these three are really one, for the Dewey family serves as a link between the Woodwards and the Lymans, and the Marsh family as a link between the Lymans
and the Websters. Again, as in Chart 3, the phenomenon of widower-widow marriages serves to link together large chunks of the population of the upper Connecticut River valley. In this set of three charts, we observe twenty-three men, all related to one another, and all of whom came to settle in Lebanon. In Northampton (and Westfield) the principal movers in the endeavor, the Deweys and the Woodwards, were at the center of a large web which accompanied and strengthened them.

The last pedigree (Chart 7) shows that the state of affairs among the smaller contingent from Plymouth County was quite different. Among the fourteen individuals in this cluster, this diagram delineates the only reasonably close kinship network found. But even this example (in which Richard Mann has married Stephen Tilden's first cousin once removed) pales by comparison with the Norwich and Northampton networks. Clearly, kinship was not a factor motivating the movement from northern Plymouth County.

This portion of the investigation demonstrates that kinship can be an important factor in migration and in the settlement of new towns, but that such relationships are not a necessary factor in these processes. Furthermore, differing sizes of kinship networks can influence migration and settlement activities, as illuminated by the differences between Norwich and Northampton.
CHAPTER VI
PATTERNS OF SETTLEMENT

One of the original purposes in undertaking this study was to answer questions about the manner in which the settlers distributed themselves over the landscape of Lebanon. Unfortunately, the survey as designed and executed does not provide sufficient date to resolve this matter.

True, we are able to make some broad statements about settlement patterns. The only lands granted in this period as houselots were in two relatively restricted parts of the town. First, there were the forty-two acre lots along the main street in the Five Miles Square. A few years later Josiah Dewey and William Clarke began their own series of grants of houselots in Lebanon Village, as it was then called. In this first decade of Lebanon's settlement, then, we will be fairly safe in saying that most of the population was concentrated in these two areas.

Furthermore, we can conclude that most of the residents in Lebanon Village had some Northampton connection, since Dewey and Clarke limited themselves almost exclusively to their relatives and former neighbors in doling out these lands. But in the Five Miles Square, the picture becomes more complicated. Recalling that Northampton men had gained some control of this region, in the Ten Allotments, we see
that for many of the inhabitants at this date we cannot say with any confidence whether they lived in Lebanon Village or in the Five Miles Square. Several of the recipients in the Ten Allotments also received grants at Lebanon Village, and without further evidence, we cannot tell which of these tracts of land they chose for their home.

In the original design of this study, I had hoped for more, though. Particularly, I sought to determine the relationship between point of origin and locality of settlement within Lebanon. The reason that sufficient information on this point was not collected was that the time span of the study was too short. In order to generate adequate information on this point, we need to study over several decades all the probates and large numbers of the deeds. The probate records, especially the inventories and the distributions of real estate, will frequently enumerate each parcel of land held by the decedent, and almost always will take note of any parcels with houses, barns or other structures. If we can locate this parcel of land accurately, then we are on our way to getting the answer to patterns of settlement. Deeds also occasionally recite a list of structures and other improvements on a piece of land being conveyed.

Another source of information that would help in this regard would be the church records, once additional parishes
were established. In the period down to 1705, and for some years beyond, there was only one church in Lebanon, and so membership in that church would tell us nothing about the location of that family's residence within the bounds of Lebanon. But within another two decades, there were three parishes, one at the center of town, one at Lebanon Village, and one between, called Goshen Parish. At that later date, membership in one or another of those ecclesiastical bodies, although not an infallible indicator, would be helpful in establishing site of residence.

The elucidation of patterns of settlement by the techniques advocated here is not impossible, but it is more difficult than answering the other questions. Covering a longer time span and more detailed extraction of land records would both be required to attain this goal, however.
CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in the preceding chapters allow us to make some broader statements about migration to and formation of the town of Lebanon. These statements may be compared against the conclusions of others, particularly Richard Bushman and Patricia Tracy, on related matters.

The first point to be noted is the marked difference between the participation in the early development of Lebanon of the two major groups -- those from Norwich and vicinity, as opposed to those from Northampton and vicinity. The breakdown of numbers in Chapter IV showed that although a larger number of Norwich men were associated with Lebanon in some way, the numbers actually coming to settle in Lebanon were much larger on the Northampton side. This contrast was strengthened by comparison of the charts of kinship developed in Chapter V. These demonstrated that the relationships among those coming from Northampton were much tighter and included more of the men involved than was the case with the Norwich men.

Related to this contrast is the formation of the first church in Lebanon. When the church was founded in November 1700, nine men were admitted initially as the pillars of the church.\(^1\) Seven of these men were from the Northampton group, and only two (John Baldwin and John Calkins) were from Norwich. In this connection it is certainly no accident that
Joseph Parsons, the first minister of Lebanon, was also from Northampton. This dominance of the church would seem to be a reflection of the greater cohesiveness of the Northampton group, as seen above.

One partial explanation for this difference among Norwich and Northampton men is that the former were active in land acquisition throughout eastern Connecticut during these years at the turn of the century, and were not necessarily interested in immediate removal to another town. The Bushnells, Adgates, Leffingwells and others close to them were especially active in speculative land transactions at this time.

By contrast the Northampton group had displayed many of the traits associated with the Puritan type. They acted as a tight-knit group, following the lead of Josiah Dewey and one or two other men, deciding to leave Northampton, Westfield, and neighboring communities in the course of only one or two summers (1698 and 1699), and taking the lead in forming the church upon their arrival in the new town. By arriving in such large numbers in such a short time, they swamped the smaller numbers of Norwich men who had arrived only a few years earlier, and in one motion became the dominant force in Lebanon affairs, a situation that would not be reversed by the later continued movement of Norwich men into town. In their mode of movement and participation in the formation of
Lebanon, the Northampton men are very much reminiscent of earlier town formation in New England, and even hark back to such early movements as that of the Dorchester group from Old to New England.

These differences between Norwich men and Northampton men are susceptible to more than one interpretation. One possibility is that we have uncovered another example of what Bushman has described as the transformation from Puritan to Yankee, with the Norwich men well along on the road to becoming Yankees, and the Northampton men having altered little from the Puritanism of their forebears. An alternative would be that the men from these two towns derived from groups that had been quite different for some generations, and the categories of Puritan and Yankee are simply not relevant. In order to distinguish between these two hypotheses, further investigations into the antecedents of the Norwich and Northampton settlers would be necessary; this investigation would extend at least as far back as the time of the Great Migration to New England in the 1630s.

The Northampton group may be seen as conservative in another way. We noted above that they were predominant in the formation of the Lebanon church. Although the language of the Lebanon church covenant does not inform us on the point, we may judge from other church records that this body, at least in its early years, adhered to an older
version of church membership requirements. The Lebanon church records have separate listings for those admitted to membership and those who owned the covenant; in other words, they held to the principles of the Half-Way Covenant. But in the church they had come from in Northampton, Solomon Stoddard had some years before discarded this distinction and had established much laxer standards for admission to full communion. Perhaps, then, the families who came from Northampton to Lebanon were gathered from those who disagreed with Stoddard, and who wished to maintain the stricter standards of an earlier generation. In this connection it may also be important that the move to Lebanon in 1698 and 1699 followed immediately upon a number of significant events in Northampton: an uncharacteristic (but obscure) period of political unrest in the early 1690s, a 1696 "harvest" of new church members, and a 1698 pamphlet in which Stoddard stated unequivocally his position on church membership.

The removal of this large group from Northampton to Lebanon also calls into question some of the data on emigration presented by Tracy. She has constructed a table showing the rate of emigration from Northampton by decade. For the decade of the 1690s, she had discovered only three certain emigrants and states the possibility that another thirteen may have moved during this decade. Of the three known emigrants, none went to Lebanon; in fact, for the entire century covered by the table, only two emigrants to
Lebanon were identified, one in the 1710s and one in the 1720s. But from the table in Appendix II of this study, we see that sixteen Northampton men came to Lebanon in the decade of the 1690s alone, and at least four more in the following decade.

Tracy uses her table to argue for a generally low rate of emigration, and uses this conclusion to argue further that land pressure was not an irritant in Northampton society and politics. Her failure to identify this large group of emigrants to Lebanon calls into question all the data in this table and weakens her argument for the absence of land shortage in Northampton at that time. Nevertheless, for reasons stated above, I believe that in the case of the move to Lebanon, Tracy is correct in her statement that the "desire for community" was the driving force.7

The data assembled here also bear upon the Fitch-Winthrop controversy, which looms so large in Bushman's discussions of the transformation from Puritan to Yankee.8 We have already examined the chart of interrelations among the Fitches and the Masons, the group of men who constituted the greatest opposition to the traditional authority of the Winthrops and their allies in the colonial Connecticut government. This kinship chart demonstrates that the Fitches and the Masons intermarried with one another re-
peatedly but did not form many kinship alliances with other families of somewhat lesser power and influence than themselves. This failure to broaden their power through alliances of marriage may be a partial explanation of the eventual failure of this faction to wrest power away from the Winthrop adherents.

Further evidence of the eventual failure of the Fitch-Mason group, at least in Lebanon, is provided by comparison of our migration data with two early documents from Lebanon. The first of these, a list of inhabitants of the Five Miles Square, dated in March 1703/4, is in fact an agreement signed by Captain Samuel Mason, supposedly settling the boundaries of the Five Miles Square, although these boundaries would not be settled for many years to come. The "party of the second part" to this agreement is a list of "inhabitants" of the Five Miles Square. But this list is not what it seems. First, for some of the men, there is no independent evidence that they were actually residing in Lebanon at this date, so that the list would more properly be called a proprietors' list than an inhabitants' list. Second, the list includes several names of men who owned land in the Mile, but not in the Five Miles Square, mostly members of the Fitch and Mason families. This inclusion of men from the Mile harks back to an earlier grant made by Samuel Mason, in which he gave owners in the Mile common privileges in the Five Miles Square, the right
to be called inhabitants, and the right to vote in town affairs, including the right to vote on future grants of land in the Five Miles Square. This naturally did not meet with the approval of everyone who owned land only in the Five Miles Square.

The second document, a petition of May 1704, objects to the agreement described above and is signed by twenty-four men (although some names have been lost from the bottom of the petition). Nineteen of these are from the Northampton group, the only five from Norwich and vicinity being John and Samuel Calkins, Caleb Chappell, John Tuttle, and Samuel Huntington, and we see that the first three of these were among the small band that settled Lebanon before anyone else. The General Court decided in favor of the May 1704 petitioners, and this broke the back of the Fitch-Mason faction in Lebanon. It was at about this time that Captain John Mason pulled up stakes and returned to Stonington, and some other members of this group left soon after. After 1704, the men from Northampton and related towns controlled Lebanon.

Although there is no evidence that the Northampton men were in any way allied with the Winthrop group, their interests certainly ran together, and this early settlement of the land controversy in Lebanon was, like the assumption of control of the Lebanon church, a victory of the Puritan over the Yankee. The Fitch-Mason faction were not able to
use the town of Lebanon so successfully in their fight with the Winthrops as they were able to use other towns in eastern Connecticut, such as Plainfield.  

On the methodological side, we conclude that the application of the full range of techniques of the genealogist to a series of questions about migration was at least partially successful. A clear picture was generated of the points of origin of the persons interested in Lebanon and of those who eventually made the decision to move from one town to another. Beyond demonstrating the sources of immigration to Lebanon, the analysis accomplished in the course of this investigation gave us a timetable, a schedule of when different groups moved. Some of the settlers came all at once, as a large, interrelated clan, while others trickled in one or two at a time, over the years, in a less organized rearrangement of populations.

The technique advocated here also was successful in portraying the kinship networks of those with an interest in Lebanon in these years. Although these webs of familial ties were not completely revealed, they do add to the picture of the migration and supply evidence which can help to get at the reasons for migration and the different attitudes of those involved.

As shown in Chapter VI, however, the design of this study was not adequate for answering queries on settlement
patterns, because of the narrow scope of years covered. This does not mean, however, that genealogical techniques are incapable of answering such questions.

What of the original impetus to this study, the desire to see what lay behind the revival movement that swept through parts of Connecticut and Massachusetts in the mid-1730s? Can the genealogical techniques employed for this small-scale study be of value in inquiring into such affairs?

In the first place, the scale of the inquiry would have to be much larger. It would be necessary to extend the exhaustive coverage of records for another thirty years. Since the largest category of records used in this experiment was land records, we should know that in Lebanon the fifth volume of land records would carry us through the years from 1733 to 1738, thus encompassing the revival movement of interest. Furthermore, each of the volumes after the first exceeds four hundred pages, some by a wide margin, whereas the first volume is only 376 pages. Roughly speaking, then, the extension of this probe of Lebanon to 1735 would multiply the amount of work by a factor of five, and perhaps a bit more.

Secondly, the residence of the Lebanon settlers in one or another neighborhood within Lebanon would be of importance in deciding whether the revival in 1735 affected all
districts of the town, or just a small part. From the discussion in the last chapter it is evident that another extension of labor is required, pushing beyond 1735, not with an exhaustive extraction of records as in the earlier period, but with a selective study of records of the residents of 1735, in hopes of finding evidence for location of residence.

The study of the revival of 1735 is feasible, but the effort required would be much greater than originally anticipated.

As a cautionary note, we should say that the demonstration of kinship ties and common migration patterns among the towns affected by this revival would not constitute proof of a cause and effect relationship between the migration pathways and the spread of the revival. Such a demonstration would merely indicate that such a relationship should seriously be considered, along with other possible causes. On the other hand, should there be no high correlation between migration patterns and the movement of the revival, then this possible cause could be discarded and the search turned elsewhere.

In summary, the application of genealogical techniques to a historical problem has proved useful. In addition to resolving some of the problems originally posed, some other
matters were unexpectedly cleared up along the way, such as the skewed distribution of membership in the church, or the background of the petition of May 1704. Nevertheless, the amount of work involved in applying these techniques is much greater than would be required for the techniques of family reconstitution. The historian or other social scientist who contemplates using genealogical techniques to answer some of his questions should look very carefully at his goals to determine whether or not they are worth the amount of time that would be required to attain them in this particular way.
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APPENDIX I

The brief biographical sketches in this appendix summarize what has been learned about each of the 137 individuals known to have become associated with Lebanon from 1692 to 1705. They are a distillation of references to these individuals in the early records of Lebanon, in the early records of the towns from which the individuals came, in published town and family histories, and in the genealogical periodical literature. These sketches are the basis for the analysis in Chapters V, VI and VII, and also for Table I and Appendices II and III.

No attempt has been made to describe in full each man's life. The sketches concentrate on those aspects of each man's career of greatest importance to the questions posed in this study -- town of origin, date of migration if the person moved to Lebanon, and relation to others in the list.

Brief citations have been used at the end of each sketch to save space. The sketches are, therefore, preceded by a key to titles. Some of these titles are also used in the text of this paper and appear both in this key and in the general bibliography. Sources used only in this appendix are cited in full only in this key.
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CALEB ABELL, SR. -- The elder Caleb was resident in Norwich in 1700 when he received a grant of Lebanon land, and was also of Norwich in January 1703/4 when he deeded this land to his son Caleb. He did not remove from Norwich, but his two sons Caleb and John did become Lebanon residents. The wife of Caleb Senior was Margaret Post, daughter of John and Hester (Hyde) Post. (LD 1:178, 250-1; Abell 49-52)

CALEB ABELL, JR. -- Caleb Abell was born in Norwich in April of 1677. As noted above, he received land from his father in January of 1703/4, at which time he was of Lebanon. A year later he married in Lebanon and began to raise a family. (LD 1:250-1, 239-40, 251-3, 264-5, 298-9, 307-9; LVR 1:1; Abell 58-9)

JOHN ABELL -- John Abell was born in Norwich in December of 1678. Although there is no record of a grant to him by his father, as there is for Caleb Junior, we find that John is later in possession of land which had been purchased by Caleb Senior. John married in Lebanon on 2 June 1703, the earliest record for him in the town. From the evidence presented here, the date of arrival in Lebanon of the brothers Caleb Junior and John is taken to be 1703, although they may have been present for a year or two before that as landless, unmarried young men, perhaps hiring out on someone else's farm. (LD 1:85, 309-10; LVR 1:1; Abell 59)

THOMAS ADGATE -- This man was allowed a small grant when the first Five Miles Square grants were made in November 1695. In January of 1701/2 he, as Thomas Adgate, Jr., of Norwich, sold this land, which he had been granted six years earlier. There is no evidence that he ever resided in Lebanon. Nevertheless, he is important in the Norwich kinship network. He was son of Deacon Thomas Adgate, and in 1692 he, himself, married Ruth Brewster, daughter of Benjamin Brewster, Sr. (LD 1:4-5, 196; Granberry 144-5; Brewster 48)

JOHN AVERY -- Captain John Avery resided from at least 1680 until 1708 in New London, but was connected with Stonington through his wife Abigail Cheeseborough. He was granted land in the Five Miles Square in November 1695, and, as Captain John Avery of New London, sold this land in January of 1701/2. He never came to Lebanon. (LD 1:4-5, 187; Avery 109-12)

JOHN BACKUS -- This man was son of William Backus (below). His father sold him a tract of land in Lebanon in February of 1701/2, and he resold the land five months later, both times being called of Windham. (LD 1:199, 3:289; Hale 452-5)
WILLIAM BACKUS -- Lieutenant William Backus of Windham sold land in Lebanon to his son John (above) in February of 1701/2; how he obtained this land does not appear on Lebanon records. Neither William nor John resided in Lebanon. (LD 3:289; Hale 452-5)

JOHN BALDWIN -- Sergeant John Baldwin received land in the November 1695 grant in the Five Miles Square. He received another grant of land in Lebanon in 1696 and at that time was called of Norwich. In another grant of April 1701, he is called of Lebanon. His marriage to Experience Abell (sister to Caleb Junior and John above) was recorded at Norwich in 1680, followed by the births of five children, the last being in April 1699. He was one of the nine founding members of the Lebanon church on 27 November 1700. These events would place his removal to Lebanon late in 1699 or early in 1700. (LD 1:4-5, 232, 291-2; LChR 4:3; NVR 55; Baldwin 270-1)

JOHN BARNARD -- Doctor John Barnard was of a Deerfield family and was born in November 1676, son of Joseph and Sarah (Strong) Barnard. He owned the covenant of the Lebanon church 2 January 1703 (probably 1703/4), and had children born in Lebanon in October 1704 and May 1706. On 26 December 1704 John Baldwin gave ten acres to Barnard "as encouragement for Barnard to settle in Lebanon." From the other records it is clear that he must have been living in Lebanon from late in 1703 but had not decided to stay; in fact, by 1708 he was back in Deerfield, where the rest of his children were born. (LD 1:232; LVR 1:30; LChR 4:22, 120; Deerfield 66)

JOHN BILL -- This man was variously of New London, Groton and Norwich. A deed of January 1705/6 refers to an earlier transaction at which time Bill was of Norwich, but we do not know just when that was. He had children baptized at Groton in December 1696 and in November 1702, and a child born in Lebanon in September 1703, so we may date his arrival in Lebanon as 1703. His first wife was Mercy Fowler. (LD 2:14; LVR 1:27; Bill 85-8)

DANIEL BIRCHARD -- A son of John Birchard Senior by his second wife, Daniel was born in Norwich in 1680. On 26 January 1698 he was deeded land in Lebanon by his father and mother, the latter being then of Norwich. He probably came to Lebanon with the rest of his family in 1699. (LD 1:203; TAG 17:184-7)
JOHN BIRCHARD, SR. -- Born in England about 1628, John Birchard was one of the four principal purchasers of the Five Miles Square and was the only one of the four to actually settle in Lebanon. He had lived in Norwich from the earliest settlement of that town and apparently left Norwich in 1699, for a deed in February of that year transfers his homelot to John Elderkin. By June of 1700 members of the family were active in Lebanon. John Birchard Senior died in Lebanon on 17 November 1702, and his probate is the earliest on file of a Lebanon inhabitant. His second wife was widow of Samuel Hyde of Norwich. (LD 1:4-5, 203; LVR 1:18; TAG 16:222-8)

JOHN BIRCHARD, JR. -- Son of John Birchard Senior, born 1671 in Norwich, he was a grantee in November of 1695 in the Five Miles Square. He bought more land in Lebanon in December of 1701. He had probably come to Lebanon with his parents in 1699. (LD 1:4-5, 158, 301-2; LChR 4:4; TAG 17:178-9)

JOSEPH BIRCHARD -- Son of John Birchard Senior, born 1673 in Norwich, he was a grantee in November of 1695 in the Five Miles Square. On 28 June 1700, calling himself of Lebanon, Joseph Birchard disposed of this grant in the Five Miles Square and is not seen further on Lebanon records. Afterward, he is seen briefly at Norwich, and then he moved to Norwalk. He apparently lived in Lebanon only for a year, approximately from mid-1699 to mid-1700. (LD 1:4-5, 178; TAG 17:179-84)

THOMAS BISHOP -- On 22 December 1696, Thomas Bishop of Norwich disposed of land "near Windham." This instrument was originally recorded at Norwich then re-recorded at Lebanon after the opening of the town book there. The land was apparently within what would become Lebanon bounds, but there is no indication that Thomas Bishop ever settled there. The baptism of one Rebeckah Bishop appears on Lebanon Church records in 1702, but it has not been determined whether this is the same family. (LD 1:211; LChR 4:22)

JOHN BLISS -- Born in Springfield, MA, John Bliss was of Enfield (then in MA) in November of 1703 when he and his brother Nathaniel bought land in Lebanon. The names of his three eldest children appear on the Lebanon vital records but without dates; they had, in fact, been born in Enfield. The move to Lebanon must have taken place late in 1703 or in 1704. (LD 1:224; LVR 1:29; EVR 1588, 1590, 1591; Bliss 42-3)
NATHANIEL BLISS -- For purchase of land, see under brother John above. One child, Henry, born in Enfield, appears without date on Lebanon vital records. The next child, born in Lebanon on 3 March 1704/5, was Mary. Date of arrival as for brother John. Nathaniel married in Springfield Mary, daughter of Abel and Martha (Kitcherell) Wright. (LD 1:224; LVR 1:29; EVR 1591; Bliss 43)

SAMUEL BLISS -- Samuel Bliss bought land in Lebanon in January 1701/2 and sold it in May 1712, in both cases calling himself of Norwich. He does not appear elsewhere in Lebanon records and there is no indication that he resided elsewhere than in Norwich during this period. He was first cousin to John and Nathaniel above and had married Anne, daughter of Deacon John Elderkin of Norwich. (LD 1:184, 2:235-6; Bliss 40)

JOSEPH BRADFORD -- Joseph Bradford, son of Major William Bradford and grandson of Governor William Bradford of Plymouth Colony, was born in Plymouth in 1675. He may have come to Norwich with his widowed sister Alice, when in 1687 she married Captain James Pitch, eldest son of Reverend James Fitch. He was one of the earliest settlers in Windham, which was his residence in 1696 when he bought land in what was to become Lebanon. He was also a grantee in the Five Miles Square in November 1695. His marriage to Ann Fitch, daughter of Reverend James Pitch and his wife Priscilla, took place in Lebanon in 1698, and his oldest children are recorded there, so he must have moved from Windham to Lebanon in 1697 or 1698. (LD 1:4-5, 153, 211, 212; LVR 1:20; LChR 4:22; Bradford 11)

BENJAMIN BREWSTER, SR. -- Captain Benjamin Brewster Senior was one of the four purchasers of the Five Miles Square, but remained in Norwich and granted his land to his two sons, Benjamin Junior and William. (LD 1:4-5, 151, 242; Brewster 37-8)

BENJAMIN BREWSTER, JR. -- Born in Norwich in November 1673, he was resident in Lebanon as early as 1697, when his eldest child was born there. He received his land from his father in April of 1701 but had certainly been residing on it for some years before. (LD 1:154, 242; LVR 1:21; LChR 4:120; Brewster 49-50)
WILLIAM BREWSTER -- Born in Norwich in March of 1669, William may have been one of the earliest settlers of Lebanon, since the Five Miles Square grant of November 1695, while not granting land to William, twice refers to his house within the Five Miles Square. This conclusion, of course, assumes that the grant of November 1695 was not later amended. The alternative is that he came to Lebanon about 1701. (LD 1:4-5, 138, 151, 156; LVR 1:22; LChR 4:4, 22; Brewster 48)

JOHN BROWN -- Captain John Brown of Swansea, MA, was a grantee in the Five Miles Square in November 1695. He is the only person associated with Lebanon at this early date from Swansea or vicinity; this seeming anomaly is accounted for by the fact that Brown was married to Anne, daughter of Major John Mason of Norwich, and was therefore brother-in-law to Captain Samuel Mason, one of the four purchasers of the Five Miles Square. Although the deeds were not recorded, John Brown disposed of his Lebanon land and remained in Swansea. (LD 1:4-5, 264-5; Brown 17-19)

THOMAS BROWN -- Thomas Brown was among the seven who were granted the Ten Allotments within the Five Miles Square, and in 1697 was one of those who had not met his commitments and was dropped from the grant. Despite this paucity of information on a man with a common surname, it is likely that he was the Thomas Brown of Springfield and Westfield, who a few years later settled in the neighboring town of Colchester. He had married Hannah Lee, probably sister of Stephen Lee, a Lebanon settler, and was from the same area as the other recipients in the Ten Allotments. (LD 1:13; TAG 35:114)

JOHN BUELL -- John Buell was born in Killingworth but returned to the ancestral town of Windsor in 1695 to marry Mary Loomis, daughter of Thomas and Hannah (Porter) Loomis. His first two children were born in Windsor in 1696 and 1699. The Buell Genealogy claims that the next two children were born in Lebanon in 1701 and 1702, but the earliest birth recorded in Lebanon is that of Hannah in December 1703. Where he might have been in the interim is not known, but his arrival may be dated in 1703. It should be noted though that his sister Mehitable married in Lebanon in 1701 to Nathaniel Porter. (LD 1:264-5; LVR 1:30, 240; LChR 1:22; Buell 33-4)

WILLIAM BUELL -- Younger brother of John above, he was born in Killingworth in 1676. His earliest appearance on Lebanon records is in a list of inhabitants on the Five Miles Square on 10 March 1703/4, more than a year before his marriage. His arrival then could also be placed in 1703 along with his brother. (LD 1:264-5; Buell 35; TAG 23:190)
JOHN BURROUGH -- Mr. John Burroughs of New London was one of the grantees in the Five Miles Square in November 1695 but remained in New London and disposed of his land in Lebanon in two transactions, one in October 1703 and the other in April 1704; the latter was to his son-in-law John Tuttle, who did come to reside in Lebanon. John Burroughs had married Hannah, daughter of Edward Colver. (LD 1:4-5, 228, 292-3; Dutcher 34-5)

RICHARD BUSHNELL -- Richard Bushnell was a prominent man in Norwich and received a grant in the Five Miles Square in November 1695. He also owned land in many of the other nascent towns in eastern Connecticut. Although he did not come to Lebanon, his connections to other families make him of great importance in this study. His step-mother was the widow of Deacon Thomas Adgate Senior; his sister Mary married Thomas Leffingwell; he, himself, married his step-sister Elizabeth Adgate; and his daughter Elizabeth married Jabez Hyde. All of these people were involved with Lebanon lands. (LD 1:4-5; Bushnell 38-43, 56-8)

JAMES BUTTOLPH -- James Buttolph was listed among the grantees of land in the Five Miles Square, but this must be a late emendation, since the only man in New England by the name of James Buttolph would have been but ten years old in November 1695. The Buttolph entry in the 1695 grant is in fact squeezed in between two other entries. Buttolph, born in Wethersfield in December 1684, appears again in a list of inhabitants in the Five Miles Square in March 1703/4; but this is really a list of landowners, resident or not, so he may never have come to Lebanon. (LD 1:4-5, 264-5; TAG 34: 205-8)

JOHN CALKINS -- Born at Norwich in July 1661, John Calkins was son of John and Sarah (Royce) Calkins. He was a grantee in November 1695 in the Five Miles Square and was a pillar of the Lebanon church in November 1700. His first two children were born in Norwich in 1691 and 1694, and his third child in Lebanon in 1697. This would indicate that he probably moved to Lebanon in 1695 or 1696. His wife, whom he married in 1690, was Abigail, daughter of John Birchard by his first wife, Christian Andrews. (LD 1:4-5; LVR 1:44; LChr 4:3, 22; NVR 44; Calkins #5; TAG 17:48-9)

SAMUEL CALKINS -- Born at Norwich in October 1663, he was the younger brother of John above. He made purchases of land in Lebanon in April and December of 1701. His first three children were born in Norwich in 1693, 1694 and 1695, and his next child was born in Lebanon in 1699. This would place his move to Lebanon any time in the range from 1696 to 1698, but we might suppose it was closer to the earlier date, when his brother made the move. (LD 1:200, 202; LVR 1:45; NVR 41; Calkins #6)
CALEB CHAPPELL -- Caleb Chappell was born in New London in October of 1671 and married Ruth Royce in Norwich in 1694. He was included in the Ten Allotments grant of December 1697 and had children recorded in Lebanon as early as 1695. If this is correct, he would have been one of the earliest Lebanon arrivals. The actual date of arrival may be closer to 1697. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:46; LChR 4:4, 22-3; NEHGR 80:108)

DANIEL CLARKE, SR. -- Captain Daniel Clarke received two full lots in the Five Miles Square grant of November 1695 and turned them over to his son Daniel or to his grandson Moses. He was consistently referred to as of Hartford or Windsor and never came to Lebanon. His second wife was a sister of William Pitkin. (LD 1:4-5, 136, 220; Goodwin 22)

DANIEL CLARKE, JR. -- Daniel Clarke, Jr., locksmith, of Hartford, was grantee of Lebanon lands, either in his own right or as trustee of his minor son Moses. When Moses came of age, Daniel turned over all lands to him and, like his father, never came to Lebanon. (LD 1:135, 136, 276-7; Goodwin 25)

JOHN CLARKE -- John Clarke appears on the Lebanon records only as a recipient of a full allotment at Lebanon Village. When receiving the first installment of his lands in January 1701/2, he is called of Northampton. This all suggests a connection with William Clarke, who had both a brother and a nephew of that name. The former was more likely the grantee. He did not come to Lebanon. (LD 1:168, 322; Warner 128-31)

MOSES CLARKE -- Son and grandson of the two Daniel Clarkes above, Moses was born about 1683 and was given land in Lebanon in trust in 1700. On 7 February 1704/5 he was given more land by his father and at that time was called of Hartford, but when he was deeded land on 5 November 1705 by his grandfather, he was called "formerly of Hartford but now residing at Lebanon." Thus he came to Lebanon in the middle of 1705. (LD 1:136, 2:18, 20; Goodwin 26)

WILLIAM CLARKE -- The career of this man was traced in Chapter IV, which placed his coming to Lebanon in 1698 or 1699. (LD 1:7, 133, 134, 138; LVR 1:40; LChR 4:3-4; Warner[1] 128-31)

EDWARD COLVER -- Edward Colver's activities were discussed in Chapter IV, where it was shown that he must have come in 1696, give or take a year. His wife may have been Sarah Backus, a daughter of William Backus above, but this is not proven. (LD 1:4-5, 125, 140; LVR 1:45; LChR 4:4, 22; TAG 31:129-54)
EXERCISE CONANT -- Why this man should be involved in the settlement of Lebanon is something of a mystery. No one else came from Essex County, MA, but for some reason Exercise Conant, at the age of nearly sixty, removed from Beverly and came to Windham. So it was as a resident of Windham that he received his grants in Lebanon, both in the Five Miles Square and in the Ten Allotments. Perhaps he had been associated with some of the other grantees in military affairs, since he held the title of Lieutenant. He sold his houseslot in Windham in 1696 which may date his arrival in Lebanon; but he was gone by August of 1700, when he disposes of his Lebanon land, calling himself of Boston. (LD 1:4-5, 7, 131, 135; Conant 138-42)

THOMAS CUSHMAN -- As Thomas Coachman of Duxbury, MA, this man purchased land in Lebanon in April 1703. Only two months earlier he had disposed of his lands in Duxbury, so his move to Lebanon must have occurred in the Spring of 1703. (LD 1:281-2; NEHGR 72:10-16)

JAMES DEAN -- A resident of Stonington, James Dean was a grantee in the Five Miles Square in November of 1695. In May 1701, describing himself as of Plainfield, he disposed of these lands. Although he never came to Lebanon, his daughter Mary did marry Thomas Thatcher in 1704. (LD 1:4-5, 236; LVR 1:300; Savage 2:29)

DANIEL DEWEY -- A nephew of Josiah Dewey Senior, this man was in Lebanon only briefly. He had been born in Westfield in March 1680, son of Josiah's brother, Jedediah. He was of Lebanon in December 1701 when he purchased land, but of Westfield again in January 1703, when he disposed of the land. (LD 1:160, 2:27; Dewey 850)

EBENEZER DEWEY -- Third son of Josiah Dewey Senior, Ebenezer Dewey was born in Westfield in 1673 and was admitted to Lebanon church in 1701. He undoubtedly came to Lebanon with the rest of his family in 1697 or 1698. (LChR 4:4; Dewey 394-5)

JOHN DEWEY -- Second son of Josiah Dewey Senior, John was born in Northampton in 1669 and was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. He came to Lebanon with the rest of his family in 1697 or 1698. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:61; Dewey 394)
JOSIAH DEWEY, SR. -- The elder Josiah Dewey was one of the prime movers in the settlement of Lebanon. Born in Northampton, he married Hepzibah, daughter of Richard and Hepzibah (Ford) Lyman. After having two children, the couple moved to Westfield. Josiah Dewey, in company with John Woodward, somehow obtained from the four principal purchasers of the Five Miles Square the right to dispose of a large portion of this grant, known as the Ten Allotments. This grant was made in December of 1697, mostly to other men from the upper Connecticut River valley. The movement of most of these families to Lebanon can be dated in 1697 or 1698. Josiah Dewey and his four sons (Josiah, John, Ebenezer and Nathaniel) all must have come in these years, and all except Josiah Junior came from Westfield. (LD 1:7; LChR 4:3; Dewey 383-92)

JOSIAH DEWEY, JR. -- Eldest son of Josiah Senior, Josiah Dewey was born in Northampton in 1666. His first two children were born in Westfield, but his third was born in Northampton in December 1697, and his fourth in Lebanon in December 1700. He was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. Perhaps his wife had merely wintered in Northampton in 1697-8 for the birth of her third child, since her parents still lived in that town. In any case, Josiah Junior was in Lebanon by 1698. (LD 1:7, 131; LVR 1:61; LChR 4:22; NhVR 1:28; Dewey 392-4)

NATHANIEL DEWEY -- Fourth son of Josiah Senior, Nathaniel Dewey was born in Westfield in 1673 and was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. In January 1699 (probably 1699/1700) he married Margaret Burroughs. He came to Lebanon with his family in 1697 or 1698. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:60; LChR 4:4; Dewey 395)

JOSEPH DINGLEY -- In July 1702 Joseph Dingley of Windham sold land in the Mile; when and how he had obtained this land does not appear on Lebanon records. Before removing to Windham, he had been of Marshfield; there is no evidence that he ever resided in Lebanon. (LD 1:198; Savage 2:52)

JOSEPH EDGERTON -- Calling himself of Norwich, Joseph Edger- ton disposed of a tract of land in 1699 and of several more in 1701. How he obtained these lands, mostly in the Five Miles Square, is not seen; but it is evident that he was a speculator in lands and did not remove from Norwich to Lebanon. (LD 1:123, 158, 160, 161, 200)

JOHN ELDERKIN -- As a yeoman of Norwich, John Elderkin sold land in Lebanon in 1701, no indication appearing of how he obtained the land. He did not reside in Lebanon. (LD 1:157)
THOMAS FIELD -- Calling himself of Hatfield, MA, he bought land in Lebanon in December 1703. He sold the land in February 1705/6, never coming to Lebanon. (LD 1:243-4, 2:23)

DANIEL FITCH -- Daniel Fitch, son of Reverend James Fitch, owned land in the Mile (as did virtually every member of the family) but resided in Preston and Norwich. (LD 1:235; Waterman 652-3)

ELEAZER FITCH -- Youngest son of Reverend James Fitch, Eleazer Fitch was granted land in the Mile late in 1699, along with his brothers Joseph and Nathaniel, and he probably moved to Lebanon then or in 1700. (LD 1:264-5, 284-5; Waterman 649)

JAMES FITCH -- Associated with Lebanon earlier than any other man, the Reverend James Fitch did not actually move to Lebanon until the middle of 1702, the year that he died. He joined there three of his younger sons, who were then in possession of the Fitch portion of Fitch's and Mason's Mile. The Reverend James Fitch was father, also, of Captain James Fitch, the scourge of the Winthrops, and because of this and the many connections of the Fitch family with the Mason family, he serves as the focus of a large network of kin and other alliances which were central to the early history of Lebanon, and indeed all of eastern Connecticut. (LD 1:233, 233-4, 234-5, 284-5, 291-2; LVR 1:107; Waterman 648-57)

JEREMIAH FITCH -- One of the younger sons of Reverend James Fitch, Jeremiah purchased land in Lebanon in September 1698, and in April 1699 his first child was born in Lebanon. He was probably the first of his family to actually settle in Lebanon, coming late in 1698 or early in 1699. (LD 1:145, 231, 260-1, 264-5, 269-71; LVR 1:100; Waterman 653-4)

JOSEPH FITCH -- One of the co-grantees in the Mile with his brothers Eleazer and Nathaniel in 1699, Joseph did not come to Lebanon until many years later, residing instead in Stonington. (LD 1:4-5, 264-5, 284-5; Waterman 655-6)

NATHANIEL FITCH -- Receiving lands in the Mile from his father in 1699, Nathaniel was still of Norwich when he sold some of this land in January 1700/1. By the end of that year he was resident in Lebanon when he married in December 1701 Ann Abell. (LD 1:4-5, 147, 264-5, 284-5; LVR 1:101; Waterman 654-5)

SAMUEL FITCH -- One of the elder sons of Reverend James Fitch, Mr. Samuel Fitch was a grantee in the Five Miles Square in November 1695 but did not come to Lebanon. He spent his adult life at Preston. (LD 1:4-5; Waterman 651-2).
EDWARD FOBES -- Made two purchases in Lebanon in August 1703 and February 1703/4, both times calling himself of Bridgewater. In the first instance he was joint grantee with Thomas Snell. This land was sold much later, the residence of Fobes given as Bridgewater. (LD 1:245-6, 271-2, 2:428, 3:357)

JONATHAN FOWLER -- Some early deeds made reference to land held by the "heirs of Jonathan Fowler." In the early records of the Hartford Probate District is found the administration in 1696 of the estate of Jonathan Fowler of Windham, naming the widow and four children. In May 1699 Samuel Lyman married the widow. Whether the Fowler heirs lived in Windham, Lebanon or elsewhere from 1696 to 1699 is not clear, but certainly from 1699 on they are to be accounted of Lebanon. Jonathan's sister Mercy had married John Bill. (HPR 554; NVR 43; Milford 280-281)

JOHN GILLETT -- Born in Windsor in 1671, not long before the removal of his family to Deerfield, MA, John was taken captive by the Indians in 1696. He was granted land in the Ten Allotments in December 1697 and probably came to Lebanon in 1698 or 1699, for on 3 January 1699/1700 he married Experience, daughter of Josiah Dewey Senior. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:120; LChR 4:22-3, 120; NEHGR 101:43-6, 237-41)

NATHANIEL GILLETT -- Born in Windsor in 1673, he probably accompanied his elder brother to Lebanon in 1698 or 1699. Although there is no record of his marriage, his first child is recorded in Lebanon in November 1702. (LVR 1:122; LChR 4:22; NEHGR 101:241)

NATHANIEL GOVE -- In October 1703 Nathaniel Gove, "now residing at New London," purchased land in Lebanon; he purchased again in April 1704, this time calling himself of Lebanon. Nathaniel was born in Cambridge, MA, but according to a very interesting deposition made much later in life, after he had lived in Lebanon some time, we find that Nathaniel had lived in Providence, RI from 1693 to 1703, probably as a hired hand. (LD 1:228, 294-5; Gove 51-2; TAG 15:83-4)

JONATHAN HARTSHORN -- This man apparently spent his entire adult life in Norwich, for that is where the births of his children are recorded. However, his wife owned the covenant in Lebanon church in 1702, and at least two of his children were baptized there. This may be explained partially by the fact that Jonathan's wife was Mary Birchard, daughter of John Birchard Senior, so perhaps she wanted to belong to the church of her own family. Possibly, also, the Hartshorn land was in that part of Norwich adjacent to Lebanon, and attendance at the Lebanon church was more convenient than at Norwich church. In any case, this family should not be accounted as Lebanon residents. (LChR 4:22, 120; TAG 17:184)
WILLIAM HOLTON - William Holton, calling himself of Northampton, purchased land in Lebanon in August 1697, but at his next purchase, in April 1699, he called himself of Lebanon. This would indicate that he came to Lebanon in 1698. He was a founding member of the Lebanon church on 27 November 1700. (LD 1:142, 143, 224; LChR 4:3-4)

EBENEZER HUNT -- Younger brother of Thomas below, Ebenezer was born in Northampton and married at Lebanon in May 1698 Hannah Clark, daughter of William. His first child was born in Lebanon in 1699, after which he disappears from Lebanon records, returning to Northampton. (LVR 1:147; NhVR 1:29-30)

THOMAS HUNT -- Born in Northampton, MA, son of Jonathan Hunt, Thomas was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. Although his children as early as 1690 appear on the Lebanon records, he certainly did not come that early; this case is somewhat similar to that of William Clarke, whose daughter married Thomas's brother. The death of Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Hunt, is recorded in Lebanon in April 1698, one of the earliest deaths on record in the town. Thomas was almost certainly resident in Lebanon by that time. (LD 1:7, 189, 190; LVR 1:142, 145, 149; LChR 4:3, 22-3; Webster 42)

SAMUEL HUNTINGTON -- Samuel Huntington was born in Norwich in 1665 and calls himself of that town in March of 1699/1700, when he buys land in Lebanon. His sixth child, Sarah, was born in Lebanon on 22 October 1701. His arrival in Lebanon is to be dated in 1700 or 1701. (LD 1:4-5, 238-9, 277-9, 280-1; LVR 1:145; LChR 4:4, 22; Huntington 690)

JOHN HUTCHINSON -- John Hutchinson was born in Northampton about 1658 and received a grant in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. His first six children were born in Northampton from 1683 through March 1696, and his seventh child was born in Lebanon in February 1699/1700. He was one of the nine founding members of the Lebanon church on 27 November 1700. His arrival in Lebanon was in 1697, 1698 or 1699. His wife was Hannah Root. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:145; LChR 4:4, 22; TAG 23:122-3; Dunn 233; NhVR 1:28)

SAMUEL HUTCHINSON -- This man was a brother of John above, also born in Northampton, about 1666, and he too shared in the Ten Allotments grant in December 1697. His elder children were born in Northampton, the last being Sarah in June 1695. His first child born in Lebanon was Experience, on 28 March 1698. He apparently came to Lebanon in 1697. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:145; LChR 4:22; NhVR 1:27; TAG 23:122-3)
JABEZ HYDE -- Jabez Hyde was born in Norwich in 1677, youngest son of Samuel and Jane (Lee) Hyde. He was a grantee in the Five Miles Square in November 1695, sold his lands there in March 1703/4, calling himself of Norwich, and never came to Lebanon. His wife was Elizabeth Bushnell, daughter of Richard. (LD 1:4-5, 251-3; Hyde 8-9)

SAMUEL HYDE -- Older brother of Jabez above, Samuel married Elizabeth Calkins in 1690 and moved to Windham, where his first four children were born, the last in April 1699. His daughter Ann was baptized at Lebanon in 1702, and he began a series of land transactions in April 1703. His removal from Windham to Norwich, then, would have taken place in 1700 or 1701. (LD 1:237-8, 247-8; LChR 4:22; Hyde 5-6)

STEPHEN LEE -- Stephen Lee married in Westfield, MA, Elizabeth Woodward in 1691 and had two children born there in 1692 and 1695. Stephen was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697, and his first child born in Lebanon was Elizabeth, in August 1698. His arrival in Lebanon was probably in 1697 or 1698. (LD 1:4-5, 7, 163; LVR 1:176, 181; LChR 4:22; NEHGR 6:270)

THOMAS LEFFINGWELL -- Sergeant Thomas Leffingwell of Norwich sold in August of 1697 a tract of land in the Mile, but how he obtained this is not known. Through his wife, a daughter of the first Richard Bushnell, he was connected with many of the other grantees of Lebanon, but he did not leave Norwich. (LD 1:143; Bushnell 39; Granberry 268-70)

JOHN LOOMIS -- Deacon John Loomis of Windsor purchased land in the Five Miles Square in December 1700 and in January 1703/4 was granted more land by the town based on this purchase. He had married as his second wife Sarah, widow of Isaac Warner and mother of Ichabod Warner. John Loomis was admitted to the Lebanon church in 1702, and his wife in the following year. Their arrival in town should be placed in 1701 or early 1702. (LD 1:130,140; LChR 4:4; Loomis 134; Warner[2] 46)

JOSIAH LOOMIS -- Born at Windsor in 1661, Josiah Loomis was a first cousin of Deacon John. He received a grant of land in Lebanon Village in January 1701/2; his last child born in Windsor was Nathaniel, in October 1700. His arrival in Lebanon would be in 1701. (LD 1:192, 323; LChR 4:4; Loomis 138)

ISAAC LOTHROP -- Isaac Lothrop of Plymouth, MA, purchased land in Lebanon in December 1703, but he did not remove to Lebanon. (LD 1:241; Lothrop 55)
ISRAEL LOTHROP -- Born in Norwich in 1659, Israel was first cousin to Isaac. He purchased land in Lebanon in January 1703/4 but did not leave Norwich. In 1722 he deeded his Lebanon land to his son John, who by that time had moved to Lebanon. Israel married Rebecca Bliss, daughter of Thomas and Rebecca (__) Bliss; various of Israel's siblings married into the Royce, Adgate and Huntington families. (LD 1:260-1; 373-4; Lothrop 46-8)

ISAAC LYMAN -- Isaac was born in Northampton, son of Richard and Elizabeth (Coles) Lyman. In January 1704/5 he was of Lebanon when he bought land in that town. Having been a minor at the time his parents moved to Lebanon in 1698, he undoubtedly accompanied them. (LD 1:306-7; Lyman 141-2)

RICHARD LOTHROP, SR. -- Born in Windsor in 1647, son of Richard and Hepzibah (Ford) Lyman, Richard moved to Northampton and married Elizabeth Coles, daughter of John Coles of Hatfield. He received a grant in the Ten Allotments in December 1697, and his last child, Ann, was born in Lebanon in August 1698. Richard is a pivotal figure in one of the larger kinship networks in this study; at the time of his move to Lebanon in 1698, he brought with him several of his unmarried sons and undoubtedly many other relatives as well. (LD 1:7, 193, 195, 220; LVR 1:176; Lyman 57)

RICHARD LOTHROP, JR. -- Second oldest son of Richard Senior, Richard Junior was born in Northampton in 1678 and accompanied his parents to Lebanon om 1698. He soon married and began to raise a family. (LD 1:195; LVR 1:176; LChR 4:22, 120; Lyman 87)

SAMUEL LOTHROP -- Eldest son of Richard Senior, Samuel also came to Lebanon in 1698. In May 1699 he married the widow Elizabeth Fowler, by whom he had three sons. (LD 1:193; LVR 1:170; LChR 4:22-3; Lyman 57-8)

RICHARD MANN -- In July 1705, Richard Mann of Lebanon purchased land in that town. As late as April 1703 he was active in land transactions in Scituate, MA, where he had been born in 1652, married Elizabeth Sutton (a great-granddaughter of Nathaniel Tilden), and became father to at least seven children, the last born in Scituate in 1699. He must have come to Lebanon in 1704. (LD 1:303; Man 63-5)
JOSEPH MARSH -- Joseph Marsh was born in Hartford in 1671, son of John and Sarah (Lyman) Marsh; his father's mother was Anne Webster. His first two children were baptized in Hartford in 1697 and 1699, although the birth of this second child is also recorded in Lebanon. A third child was baptized in Lebanon in 1702. Joseph was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. His move to Lebanon would have taken place no later than 1700 or 1701. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:200; LChR 4:22; Marsh 115-6; Hartford 380-1)

DANIEL MASON -- Daniel Mason was son of Daniel Mason of Stonington by his first wife. When the Five Miles Square was passed to the townsmen of Lebanon, adjustments had to be made in earlier grants which were thought to be in the Mile and were now found to be partly in the Five Miles Square; Daniel and his brother Hezekiah were the most frequent participants in these adjustments. He was resident in Lebanon as early as 1699 and died there in 1705. (LD 1:4-5, 179, 264-5; NEHGR 15:119; Stonington 462)

HEZEKIAH MASON -- Younger brother of Daniel above, his land transactions followed closely those of his brother, and he can also be placed in Lebanon as early as 1699, but within a few years he had moved to Windham. (LD 1:4-5, 264-5; LVR 1:200; NEHGR 15:119; Stonington 462-3)

JOHN MASON -- John Mason, son of John Mason and Abigail Fitch and first cousin to Daniel and Hezekiah above, was one of the most important men in the early settlement of Lebanon. As possessor of half of the Mile, along with James Fitch, his is the name found most frequently on the Lebanon land records, almost always as a grantor, his earliest disposal of land there being in April 1699. His first child, a son, was born in Lebanon in 1702. There are no deeds in his name in 1704, but in 1705 the long series of land transactions resumes, with his residence now given as Stonington. (LD 1:4-5, 233-5, 142, 318; LVR 1:200; NEHGR 15:121-2; Stonington 462)

SAMUEL MASON -- This man was uncle to the preceding three and was almost as important in Lebanon affairs in the early years as was his nephew John. He was the leader among the four principal purchasers of the Five Miles Square and represented them in all matters. He never resided in Lebanon but was represented there briefly by his daughter Anne, who married her cousin John, above. (LD 1:4-5, 244-5; NEHGR 15:118; Stonington 461)
JONATHAN METCALFE -- The sequence of moves that brought Jonathan Metcalfe from Dedham, MA, to Lebanon in 1701 has been outlined in Chapter IV. (LD 1:157, 166, 179, 229; LVR 1:199; LChR 4:4, 22; DVR 1:14, 33)

JOHN MORGAN -- Lieutenant John Morgan was granted land in the Five Miles Square in November 1695 but did not come to occupy it. He was a life-long resident of New London. (LD 1:4-5; Savage 3:233)

MICAH MUDGE -- Mudge was born in New London in 1650, but in his youth the family moved to Wethersfield and then Northampton. In 1670 he married Mary Alexander, daughter of George, and the growing family soon moved to Northfield. Mudge received land in the Ten Allotments in December 1697, and in Lebanon Village in January 1701/2. He was one of the nine founding members of the Lebanon church on 27 November 1700. A New London deed of May 1697 calls Micah a resident of Lebanon; it is unlikely that he arrived much earlier than this. (LD 1:7, 124, 182; LChR 4:3: Mudge 34-47)

JOSEPH PARSONS -- The migrations of a minister or other professional person are not always the same as those of ordinary folk. Joseph Parsons was born in Northampton in 1671, son of Joseph and Elizabeth (Strong) Parsons. After attending Harvard, he preached for some time at Farmington but was in Lebanon in 1699, where he presided over the founding of the church in 1700. (Sibley 4:366-9)

ISRAEL PHELPS -- Born in Westfield, MA in 1681, Phelps was a grantee in Lebanon Village in January 1701/2, not quite having attained the age of 21. He was designated a resident of Lebanon at that time, although he could have been in residence earlier. (LD 1:144, 185; LVR 1:241; LChR 4:22; Phelps 1284-5)

JOSIAH PHELPS -- First cousin of Israel above, Josiah was of Westfield, MA, in 1701 when he purchased a tract in Lebanon, and of Colchester when he sold the land. He lived out his adult life in Colchester and did not reside in Lebanon. (LD 1:161, 2:51; Phelps 1277-9)

WILLIAM PITKIN -- He was a resident of Hartford when he obtained Lebanon land in 1704, and he did not remove from Hartford. He married Elizabeth Stanley, daughter of Caleb and Elizabeth (Coles) Stanley. (LD 1:282-4; Hartford 456)
JOSEPH POMEROY -- Joseph Pomeroy was born at Windsor in 1652, but the family soon moved to Northampton, where he married in 1660 Hannah Lyman, daughter of Richard and Hepzibah (Ford) Lyman. Pomeroy received a Ten Allotments grant in December 1697 but encountered some difficulty in retaining this land. He was of Lebanon in two deeds of 1700, although his last child is recorded as being born in Windsor in that year; this child was baptized in Lebanon in 1701, soon after which Joseph is found in Colchester. (LD 1:7, 127, 253-4; LChR 4:22; Pomeroy 144-5)

HEZEKIAH PORTER -- Son of Samuel and Hannah (Stanley) Porter and husband of Hannah Coles, Hezekiah Porter was of Hadley in January 1701/2 when he purchased land in Lebanon. He remained in Hadley. (LD 1:218; Porter 17-8; Hadley 112)

JOHN PORTER -- Younger brother of Hezekiah, John was of Hatfield in July 1702 when he obtained Lebanon land. His sixth child's birth was recorded in Lebanon in 1702 (month not given), and in 1703 John was admitted to church membership, so he must have come to Lebanon in the latter part of 1702. (LD 1:276-7; LVR 1:244; LChR 4:4; Porter 18-9; Hadley 112)

NATHANIEL PORTER -- Younger brother to the two men above, the marriage of Nathaniel to Mehitable Buell was recorded in Lebanon in November 1701, and two months later he received an allotment in Lebanon Village. He came to Lebanon as an unmarried man before either of his brothers became involved with the town, no later than 1701. (LD 1:176, 191; LVR 1:240, 247; LChR 4:22; Porter 21-2; Hadley 112)

ROWLAND POWELL -- One of the more obscure individuals in the study, Powell first appeared on Lebanon records in May 1699 when he purchased a tract of land in the Mile and called himself of Lebanon. This is apparently the Rowland Powell born in Gloucester, MA, in 1657, son of Rowland and Isabel (____) Powell, but no record of this man, or of any other member of his family, has been found between 1662 and 1699. It should be remembered that many of the early settlers of New London had come from Gloucester, so Powell may have spent some time in that town. (LD 1:123, 280-1; LChR 4:4; GVR)

THOMAS ROOT -- Born in Northampton in 1667, Root had married Sarah Clark about 1690 and had three children by her in Northampton -- in 1692, 1693 and 1696. Their next child was born in Lebanon in May 1699. Root was recipient of a grant in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. He would have come to Lebanon in 1697 or 1698. His step-mother was a daughter of the elder William Holton; two of his sisters married John and Samuel Hutchinson. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:268; LChR 4:4, 22-3; NhVR 1:26, 28; Root 103-4, 108)
JONATHAN ROYCE -- In March 1701 Jonathan and Deborah Royce purchased land in Lebanon, calling themselves of Norwich. She was Deborah (Calkins) Royce, widow of Jonathan Royce, acting in concert with her recently married son. The son, Jonathan, had children recorded in Lebanon in 1701 and 1703, indicating that he wasted no time moving into town. One of Jonathan's sisters married Caleb Chappell. (LD 1:151; LVR 1:268-9; NEHGR 80:107-9)

SAMUEL SEABURY -- In January 1701/2 and July 1702, Seabury, calling himself of Duxbury, purchased three tracts of land. He never came to Lebanon. (LD 1:196, 198, 199; New London 443-5)

JOHN SMITH -- Sometime between 1701 and 1705 John Smith obtained the third division of John Birchard Junior's grant in the Five Miles Square, and he also obtained an allotment at Lebanon Village. He never came to Lebanon but in 1714 began to sell off his Lebanon holdings, calling himself of Windsor and making reference to a brother Richard. (LD 1:63, 64, 322)

OBADIAH SMITH -- In December 1699 and January 1700/1, Obadiah Smith of Norwich purchased land in Lebanon. He sold both tracts in March 1701 and does not appear on Lebanon records again. His mother was Elizabeth Bliss, daughter of Thomas and Elizabeth (___) Bliss. (LD 1:146, 147, 151; Granberry 317-8)

PHILIP SMITH -- Calling himself of Springfield, Smith purchased land in Lebanon in September 1700. In December 1701 his son Samuel was born in Lebanon, and in deeds of January and February 1703/4, Smith calls himself of Lebanon. His arrival in Lebanon would have been in 1701 or possibly late 1700. His wife was Mary Bliss, daughter of Samuel. (LD 1:253-4, 255-6, 256-8, 295-6, 264-5; LVR 1:286; LChR 4:22; Springfield 626; Hadley 125)

THOMAS SNELL -- In August 1703 Snell was co-grantee with Edward Fobes of a tract of land in Lebanon. He sold the land years later and remained in Bridgewater until his death. (LD 1:271-2, 2:43, 210, 360, 3:357)

EPHRAIM SPRAGUE -- Eldest son of John below, he came to Lebanon with his family in 1703 and soon married. (LVR 1:288; Sprague 15; TAG 15:109-10)

JOHN SPRAGUE -- In a Plymouth County deed of January 1702/3, he called himself of Duxbury, but in March 1703 he bought land in Lebanon, calling himself of Lebanon, so the move must have taken place some time in the intervening two months. (LD 1:214, 245-6, 246-7; LVR 1:280; LChR 4:4, 22; Sprague 11-3; TAG 15:109-10)
JOHN STANTON -- Captain John Stanton of Stonington was one of the four purchasers of the Five Miles Square. Like two of his partners, Samuel Mason and Benjamin Brewster, he did not remove to Lebanon, but unlike them, he did not settle any sons on his land and simply sold it instead. (LD 1:4-5, 126, 202; Savage 4:167)

JEDEDIAH STRONG, SR. -- Jedediah Strong Senior received a grant at Lebanon Village in December 1701 and sold it to his son John in March 1701/2. Although he never came to Lebanon, he is very important to the town as a nexus of many relationships among the early settlers. He married Freedom Woodward, daughter of Henry. (LD 1:165, 180; Strong 769-71)

JEDEDIAH STRONG, JR. -- Eldest son of Jedediah Senior, this man received several grants of land in Lebanon. His last child to be born in Northampton was David, in June 1693, and his first in Lebanon was Supply, in October 1697. The Strong genealogy claims a son Eleazer born in 1695, but no birth record for this son has been found. Jedediah came to Lebanon in 1696 or 1697. (LD 1:4-5, 7, 128, 130, 133; LVR 1:286; LChR 4:3-4, 22; NhVR 1:26; Strong 772-3)

JOHN STRONG -- Son of Jedediah Senior, he was granted land by his father in March 1701/2 and died unmarried in 1709 (contrary to the report of his earlier death in the Strong genealogy). He probably came to Lebanon with his elder brother. (LD 1:180, 285-7; Strong 770; NLPD #5212)

THOMAS THATCHER -- In a deed of January 1703/4, making his first purchase of land in Lebanon, this man is called of Duxbury; but three months later, in April 1704, making his second purchase, he is called "late of Duxbury, now of Lebanon." In November 1704 he married Mary Dean in Lebanon. (LD 1:273-4, 285-7; LVR 1:300)

JOSEPH THOMAS -- Joseph Thomas was born in Hadley in 1651, married there and soon moved to Springfield. He received a grant in the Ten Allotments in December 1697, and in September 1698 and in March 1701 the births of the last two of his children were recorded in Lebanon, placing his arrival in Lebanon in 1697 or 1698. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:304; LChR 4:4, 22; Springfield 686)

NATHANIEL THOMAS -- Nathaniel Thomas of Marshfield purchased in November 1703 a tract of land. He never came and in 1722 his son sold the land, Nathaniel having died in the interim. (LD 1:246-7, 3:483)
SAMUEL THOMAS -- Eldest surviving son of Joseph above, Samuel accompanied his family to Lebanon in 1697 or 1698. By 1701 he had married and begun to raise a family. (LVR 1:300; LChR 4:22, 120; Springfield 686)

STEPHEN TILDEN -- In February 1704 Stephen Tilden of Scituate, MA, purchased land in Lebanon, where he lived the remainder of his life and died in 1727. Some years after 1704 his younger brothers Isaac and Ebenezer followed him to Lebanon. (LD 1:261-2; Neal 70-2)

JOSEPH TRUMBULL -- Born in Suffield, MA, he stopped off briefly in Simsbury to marry Hannah Higley in August 1704, and then had his eldest child recorded in Lebanon in March 1705. When making his first purchase of Lebanon land, in September 1704, he calls himself of Simsbury, but the deed is acknowledged in Colchester, so he must have arrived in Lebanon soon after. (LD 2:51; LVR 1:305; Rowley 398-9)

JOHN TUTTLE -- John Tuttle was born in New Haven in 1657. He married in New London Mary, daughter of John Burroughs, but returned to New Haven. His father-in-law gave him land in Lebanon in 1704, calling Tuttle of Lebanon; but the Tuttle family must already have been in Lebanon for some time, since he had children baptized in the Lebanon church in 1702 and 1703. A child had been baptized in New Haven in 1699, and in 1701 he was still active in land transactions in New Haven, probably selling off the last of his land, so he would seem to have come to Lebanon in 1701 or 1702. (LD 1:292-3, 294-5; LVR 1:309; LChR 4:22; Tuttle 23)

ANDREW VEACH -- The only early settler of Lebanon to come from Boston, Veach had children baptized in Boston from 1690 to 1700 and makes his first appearance in Lebanon in 1703. He purchased land there in October 1703, calling himself of Lebanon, had a daughter born in Lebanon in December 1703, and in the same year he and his wife were admitted to the church. On 18 April 1703 the First Church in Boston dismissed Andrew Veach and his wife to the church in Lebanon. (LD 1:266; LVR 1:320; LChR 4:4, 22-3; BChR 137)

ELISHA WADSWORTH -- Born in Duxbury, he was younger brother to Joseph below. In December 1703 he, calling himself of Duxbury, purchased land in Lebanon, but he never came, living all his life in Duxbury. (LD 1:262-3; Wadsworth 178)

JOSEPH WADSWORTH -- In April 1701 Joseph Wadsworth was co-grantee with Joseph Bradford of a tract of land in Lebanon. In his next deed, of January 1702/3, he calls himself of Lebanon. This would place his move to Lebanon in late 1701 or in 1702. His brother Samuel followed him from Duxbury to Lebanon some years later. (LD 1:210, 212, 215; LVR 1:338; Wadsworth 213, 228-9)
ABRAHAM WARNER -- Abraham was of Hartford when he received a grant at Lebanon Village in December 1701 and was still of Hartford in July 1705 when he sold these lands. He was first cousin to Ichabod Warner below. (LD 1:304-5, 2:4; Warner[2] 44)

ICHABOD WARNER -- In October 1705 John Mason sold to Ichabod Warner of Lebanon land in the Mile. Ichabod's mother, Sarah (Boltwood) Warner, married as her second husband Deacon John Loomis, so the younger Warner children, including Ichabod, must have accompanied the Loomises to Lebanon in 1701 or 1702. (LD 2:3; Warner[2] 44-7, 82-5)

JOHN WARNER -- John Warner was of Lebanon when he sold land in May 1701 and was active in Lebanon land transactions for many years thereafter. This is the only man in this study whose origins are not known. Efforts to find some relation to Abraham and Ichabod above were unsuccessful. (LD 1:98, 132)

GEORGE WEBSTER -- George Webster, son of Thomas and Abigal (Alexander) Webster, was born in Northampton in 1670, where he married in 1695 Sarah Bliss, probably daughter of Samuel and Mary (Leonard) Bliss. His first child was born in Northampton in 1696, and his second in Lebanon in 1697 or 1698. (LVR 1:336; LChR 4:22; Webster 29-30, 39-40)

JOHN WEBSTER -- Younger brother of George, John was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697 and had his first child born in Lebanon in October 1698. Probably came to Lebanon with his brother. (LD 1:7, 221, 222; LVR 1:325; LChR 4:4, 22, 120; Webster 40-1)

JOHN WHITTELSEY, SR. -- This man was granted land in Lebanon Village in January 1700/1 but sold it in 1703. At the time of all these transactions he was of Saybrook and is seen nowhere else on Lebanon records. (LD 1:149, 173, 226, 258, 259)

STEPHEN WHITTELSEY -- Son of John above, his career in Lebanon is precisely the same. (LD 1:148, 226, 258-9)

HENRY WOODWARD -- Born in Northampton in 1680 and son of John Senior below, Henry accompanied his family to Lebanon. His first appearance on Lebanon records is January 1701/2, when he received land in the Five Miles Square. (LD 1:187, 243-4, 281-2; LVR 1:325; Dewey 717)
JOHN WOODWARD, SR. -- John married in Northampton in 1671 Anna, sister of Josiah Dewey Senior. John was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697 and at Lebanon Village in December 1701. Although it would be logical to assume that the Woodward family came to Lebanon with the other Northampton families in 1697 or 1698, we have no indication that any one of them was in Lebanon before 1701. His daughter Elizabeth married Stephen Lee. (LD 1:7, 172; Dewey 717)

JOHN WOODWARD, JR. -- Eldest son of John Senior, John Junior was born in Northampton in 1674, and was a grantee in the Ten Allotments in December 1697. He married Experience Baldwin in Lebanon in June 1703. He probably accompanied the rest of his family from Northampton to Lebanon. (LD 1:7; LVR 1:325; Dewey 717)

BENJAMIN WOODWORTH -- Woodworth began very active purchasing of land in Lebanon in November 1703, calling himself in each case of Little Compton, then in Massachusetts. His son Caleb was baptized in Lebanon in 1704, so the family probably came to Lebanon early in that year. (LD 1:226, 256-9; LChR 4:22)

ABEL WRIGHT -- Abel was born at Springfield, son of Abel and Martha (Kitcherell) Wright. He had children born in Springfield as late as December 1698, and his first child recorded in Lebanon was born in February 1700/1, placing his move to Lebanon in 1699 or 1700. In his first purchase of land, in July 1702, he called himself of Lebanon. (LD 1:216, 320-1; LVR 1:336; LChR 4:22; Springfield 770-1; Brainerd 322)

HENRY WRIGHT -- A younger brother of Abel, Henry flitted back and forth between Springfield and Lebanon, calling himself of Springfield in January 1701/2 and in March 1704/5, and of Lebanon in October 1703 and November 1705. (LD 1:206, 221, 222, 239-40, 298-9, 320-1; Springfield 772; Brainerd 322-3)

SAMUEL WRIGHT -- Samuel Wright was of Northampton in January 1701/2 when he received a grant at Lebanon Village, and was of Springfield in March 1710/1 when he bought land in the Five Miles Square. He settled in Lebanon some time after this latter transaction. Samuel was not related to Abel and Henry above. (LD 1:170, 124, 2:254, 311, 343)
This list is an expansion of Table 1 in Chapter V. Town by town, the individuals are listed in alphabetical order. The second column gives the year of removal to Lebanon, or the range of years, where applicable. NR is placed in the second column for those who did not remove to Lebanon. For ease of comparison, the towns are listed here in the same order as in Table 1.
NORWICH
Caleb Abell Senior
Caleb Abell Junior
John Abell
Thomas Adgate
John Baldwin
John Bill
Daniel Birchard
John Birchard Senior
John Birchard Junior
Joseph Birchard
Thomas Bishop
Samuel Bliss
Benjamin Brewster Senior
Benjamin Brewster Junior
William Brewster
Richard Bushnell
John Calkins
Samuel Calkins
Edward Colver
Joseph Edgerton
John Elderkin
Daniel Fitch
Eleazer Fitch
James Fitch
Jeremiah Fitch
Joseph Fitch
Nathaniel Fitch
Samuel Fitch
Jonathan Hartshorn
Samuel Huntington
Jabez Hyde
Thomas Leffingwell
Israel Lothrop
Jonathan Royce
Obadiah Smith

NEW LONDON
John Avery
John Burroughs
Caleb Chappell
Nathaniel Gove
John Morgan

STONINGTON
James Dean
Daniel Mason
Hezekiah Mason
John Mason
Samuel Mason
John Stanton

NR
1703
1703
NR
1699–1700
1703
1699
1699
1699
1699
NR
NR
NR
1699
1697
1695(?)
NR
1695–6
1696
1695–7
NR
NR
NR
1699–1700
1702
1698–9
NR
1701
NR
NR
1700–1
NR
NR
1701
NR
NR
1699
1699
NR
NR
WINDHAM
John Backus
William Backus
Joseph Bradford
Exercise Conant
Joseph Dingley
Jonathan Fowler
Samuel Hyde

NORTHAMPTON
John Clarke
William Clarke
William Holton
Ebenezer Hunt
Thomas Hunt
John Hutchinson
Samuel Hutchinson
Isaac Lyman
Richard Lyman Senior
Richard Lyman Junior
Joseph Parsons
Joseph Pomeroy
Thomas Root
Jedediah Strong Senior
Jedediah Strong Junior
John Strong
George Webster
John Webster
Henry Woodward
John Woodward Senior
John Woodward Junior
Samuel Wright

WESTFIELD
Thomas Brown
Daniel Dewey
Ebenezer Dewey
John Dewey
Josiah Dewey Senior
Josiah Dewey Junior
Nathaniel Dewey
Stephen Lee
Israel Phelps
Josiah Phelps

SPRINGFIELD
Philip Smith
Joseph Thomas
Samuel Thomas
Abel Wright
Henry Wright
DEERFIELD
  John Barnard 1703-4
  John Gillett 1698-9
  Nathaniel Gillett 1698-9
  Micah Mudge 1697

HADLEY
  Hezekiah Porter NR
  Nathaniel Porter 1701

HATFIELD
  Thomas Field NR
  John Porter 1702

ENFIELD
  John Bliss 1703-4
  Nathaniel Bliss 1703-4

SUFFIELD
  Joseph Trumbull 1704

WINDSOR
  John Buell 1703
  Daniel Clarke Senior NR
  John Loomis 1701-2
  Josiah Loomis 1701
  John Smith NR
  Ichabod Warner 1701-2

HARTFORD
  Daniel Clarke Junior NR
  Moses Clarke 1705
  Joseph Marsh 1700-1
  William Pitkin NR
  Abraham Warner NR

SAYBROOK
  John Whittelsey Senior NR
  Stephen Whittelsey NR

NEW HAVEN
  John Tuttle 1701-2

WETHERSFIELD
  James Buttolph NR

KILLINGWORTH
  William Buell 1703
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DUXBURY</td>
<td>Thomas Cushman</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Seabury</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ephraim Sprague</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Sprague</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Thatcher</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elisha Wadsworth</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Wadsworth</td>
<td>1701-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGEWATER</td>
<td>Edward Fobes</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Snell</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCITUATE</td>
<td>Richard Mann</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Tilden</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHFIELD</td>
<td>Nathaniel Thomas</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLYMOUTH</td>
<td>Isaac Lothrop</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWANSEA</td>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE COMPTON</td>
<td>Benjamin Woodworth</td>
<td>1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDHAM</td>
<td>Jonathan Metcalfe</td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTON</td>
<td>Andrew Veach</td>
<td>1703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOUCESTER</td>
<td>Rowland Powell</td>
<td>1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>John Warner</td>
<td>1701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

The charts in this appendix are derived from material in the sources cited in the sketches in Appendix I, and are intended to support the discussion in Chapter VI. A few rules have been followed in arranging these charts. First, only relationships in existence before the association with Lebanon are included. (This rule is violated once, on Chart 2, with the marriage of Samuel Lyman to the widow Fowler.) Second, all persons of the same generation are drawn on the same horizontal level. Third, persons or couples who removed to Lebanon are placed in a box. Those who were associated with Lebanon, but did not remove there, are placed within broken lines.
Charles Tilden = Mary
1662 - 1727

Richard Tilden = Elizabeth Sutton
1652 -

John Sutton = Elizabeth House
1642 -

Stephen Tilden = Hannah Little
1629 - 1711

Nathaniel Tilden = Lydia Hockstep
1583 - 1684

George Sutton = Sarah Tilden