

Samuel Johnson Tract Balltown

300 Acres In Balltown from Sheepscoot East to Travel Pond straddling the Whitefield/Jefferson Line 1 mile by 1/2 mile

William D Romanski
wdromanski@hotmail.com
April 2019

* * *

1777: Resided Balltown

1790: Resided Balltown

1791: Assessed for 300 acres, 2 of which were improved.

1792: Acquired quitclaim deed of 300 acres on the east side of the Sheepscoot in Balltown "in consideration of the sum of five shillings lawful money...and for divers other good causes and considerations." Extended from the river to Travel Pond, straddling the present Whitefield/Jefferson line.

1792: Assessed for 150 unimproved acres, 50 acres unimproveable, 1 acre tilled, 2 acres mowed

1797: Not assessed

1801: Not assessed

1801: Quitclaim deed with Joseph Trask to Abijah Grant, 25 acres between the river and the road, abutting Abraham Heath, for \$100.

1801: Quitclaim deed with Samuel Johnson Jr to Isaac Davis, 100 acres in Jefferson, for \$100.

1807: Quitclaim deed to Samuel Gilman 50 acres on the west side of the road, for \$100.

1810: Not assessed

1811: Assessed not rateable, not supported by the town.

1812: Town appoints Samuel Gray to administer on the estate of Samuel Johnson

1816: Town appoints Eliakim Scammon to administer on the estate of Samuel Johnson

* * *

Introduction & Overview

The history of Samuel Johnson's land in Balltown can also be seen as the story of his poverty, his attempt to rise out of it, and his failure to do so. Moving to the Sheepscoot valley and settling on disputed land could have made Samuel a pioneer, an adventurer, or even a speculator. But it probably just reflected a need to move from the well-settled and more expensive southern communities in New Hampshire, where he probably was born, to the then-frontier of the District of Maine. To better his situation, he moved to the Maine back country, married, volunteered in the Continental Army, worked a farm and bought a large tract of land. Yet, even with three sons and a large lot of land, he was not able to prosper enough to pass that land on to his children. After his children moved away, Samuel died without any property and probably in debt. And for the remainder of her life, his wife Lydia lived as a pauper.

After the French and Indian War concluded, land west of the Appalachian Mountains was reserved for the native tribes. The Proclamation of 1763 forbade settlement by whites between the Mississippi River and the divide created by the Appalachians. The frontier then became the unsettled parts of New England and New York, at least for those in the northeast.

The mere fact that he chose to settle in the Sheepscoot valley speaks to the fact that Samuel was poor.

Had he been any better off, he would have been able to afford to travel to and to settle on more fertile land in Vermont or New York. Or he would have stayed in the place of his birth and purchased land there, at a higher price, no doubt. His father was probably still living when Samuel left home, and it was likely that he had no land to offer him. This suggests Samuel was probably one of the older sons. If he was to make his own way, he would have to do it away from his father's farm.

The earliest mention of Samuel Johnson in the Sheepscot region was the record of his 1773 marriage intention to Lydia Remick. He was living at Newcastle at the time, and Lydia in nearby Pownalborough. David Quimby Cushman, a historian of Newcastle, claimed a Samuel Johnson occupied one of the Tappan Lots in that town with several others, possibly around 1772. The Lincoln County Registry Books do not contain any indication that Samuel bought any land in Newcastle, but he may have possessed a lot by other means, such as a claim, renting, or simply the deed was not registered. How long he remained in Newcastle is unknown, but we do find Samuel on a list of men eligible for military service in Balltown in 1777.

Lydia Remick's family was poor too. Her father died during the French and Indian War. Her mother Mary Grover Elwell Remick was widowed twice by 1749, left with 5 young children. That year, the York County Court of Sessions put the family in the care of her father Matthew Grover. After his death, Mary left York, following her daughter Mary Elwell Otis to New Hampshire, but she apparently did not live with her. In 1765 she and Lydia were warned out of Madbury, so as not to become charges of the town. By the time of her marriage in 1773, Lydia was living at Pownalborough, probably with her brother Joseph. He had gone north to Brunswick as early as 1768, and was chosen one of the Surveyors of Lumber and Cullers of Staves in Pownalborough in 1775. If their mother was still living this late, I doubt she would have travelled with them, and would have remained in New Hampshire. Joseph and Lydia had probably moved to mid-coast Maine for the same hopeful reasons Samuel Johnson did.

Backcountry Maine would have been appealing to Samuel and the Remicks due to the vast, unpopulated wilderness, with plentiful game and better soil than the coastal towns. One could stake a claim, carve a farm out of the forest, and eventually pass prosperity in the form of improved land onto one's children. As a general rule, settlers believed that occupation and improvement of land was where title began. So when Samuel went to Balltown in the 1770s, his possession and improvement of land would make him the owner. We are not sure whether the land he was on in the 1770s and the land he purchased a claim to in 1792 were the same. Seeing as he left with the army for two years, he may have abandoned any improvements he had made. We do know that the claim he purchased in 1792 from Charles Glidden and Daniel Plummer, who were possibly small-time land speculators, was the farm he held until his death.

Apart from the chance to pass on his legacy to his sons, there were other ideological reasons to settle in the wild backcountry of Maine. Subsistence farming held the appeal of freedom from wage laboring. Simply raising livestock and growing crops could keep you from being bound to an employer. Land possession would also keep you from that other fear of Maine settlers, tenancy. Settlers believed that the Great Proprietors who claimed vast stretches of the Maine wilderness were interested in establishing lordships, similar to those in Ireland and England, with the settlers as their vassals. Freehold title of one's own farm, however, would free the yeoman from having others hold sway over their land or their labor on that land. Your improvements would add value to the property. And importantly, being a landowner would raise your social status and qualify you to vote.

The increase in settlements in the Maine backcountry, like Balltown, coincided with the Revolution. For the few settlers who volunteered with the Continental Army, the Revolution was not an ideological

endeavor. They were not fighting for independence from the Crown, philosophical democracy, self-rule, representation, or even Freedom. They simply believed that vacant land should be available to the poor and needy, as long as they were willing to improve it. Furthermore, since the Great Proprietors were Loyalists, the settlers believed that their military service in the name of the United States would rightfully win them free land, or title to the land they held. Samuel was one of the 8 Balltown residents who enlisted with the Continental Army. He joined in 1777 and served for nearly 2 years, wintering near Valley Forge, fighting at the Battle of Rhode Island, and eventually deserting after the failed Penobscot Expedition. His military career did not serve him though, and it can be argued that leaving his farm and young family for such a long time did more harm than good, despite the immediate cash it brought him.

After the war, the mid-coast Maine patents of the Great Proprietors were not confiscated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as was hoped. Although there were petitions entered for many years to have the land taken, the Commonwealth failed to do so, and eventually upheld the claims of the Proprietors. Despite the ostensible democratic republic created as a result of the Revolution, the backcountry settlers failed to benefit. The back lands of Maine had no incorporated towns, so no elected representatives could speak on the settlers' behalf in the General Court. And when towns were finally founded, they usually couldn't afford to send a representative to Boston. Without ownership of the land, settlers couldn't vote anyway, although that rule seems to have been ignored, especially in the backcountry.

The influence, connections and political power of the Proprietors outmaneuvered the settlers at every turn. Soon the settlers turned to action to make their voices heard. Whenever the Proprietors would send surveyors into the backcountry to delineate their claims, organized bands of settlers would rough them up, destroy their equipment, and chase them off. Supporters of the Proprietors would find their livestock let loose and their barns or crops burned. The increased settlement of the area drove up land prices, and the Proprietors demanded greater and greater payments for titles to the land the settlers inhabited. Resistance was widespread and Balltown was the center of it. Nearly all of the settlers resisted the demands of the Proprietors. Some of those who were identified and prosecuted escaped. Other settlers simply left the area for less turbulent places. Before the revolt was settled, though, Samuel had sold off his land, and his children had moved to more stable places.

It was more than a decade after his settlement at Balltown until Samuel acquired a quitclaim deed for his farm, for 5 shillings and "divers other good causes and considerations." Perhaps it took him those 13 years to settle the arrangement with the previous claimants Glidden and Plummer. Whatever the case, by 1797 he was not even assessed for the land, nor did he appear in the assessment of 1801. The last deed of disposal of parcels of the land occurred in 1807, but he appeared to only quit his claim to the land. In 1810, he was taxed only for a poll. His land seemed to have been out of his possession for quite a while before the deeds were made.

What little data we have about the land in Balltown indicates that the lot was not the 300 acres that the original deed claimed. It was probably 200 acres or less, 50 acres of which was not improveable. In 1791 Samuel had improved 2 acres, and by 1792 3 acres. By that time his sons were nearly adults, so would have been helpful in clearing and maintaining a farm. But for some reason that's not how it went.

The Johnsons may have been an ambitious family who simply failed to rise up, or a lazy family whose failure was their own doing. There is no way to know. But the deck was stacked against them. Title for land was uncertain. Cash was scarce. Infestation of grasshoppers and other insects ruined crops in 1779

and 1793. Late springs and early frosts lowered crop yields. There was even a famine in 1789. And Samuel was away for nearly two years with the army, time that could have been spent improving his farm.

Samuel died in late 1811 or early 1812. The town of Whitefield decided to settle his estate in town, instead of letting the Lincoln County Probate Court oversee it. He had debts to pay off, but his creditors probably lived in Whitefield, and maybe were even town officials. Also, the town probably anticipated widow Lydia becoming a pauper, and sought to get what they could for the little personal property he may have possessed at the time. Although he still claimed land in town, it had become clear that he could not have continued to possess it without a title. There was a 14 acres parcel of his farm which Samuel was claiming at the time of his death. The lot was referred to as Widow Johnson's lot or the Widow's Third, and Lydia may have lived for a while as a widow. But without children, or the ability to hire laborers, not to mention her age, if she did stay on the farm, she didn't stay for long. Beginning in 1819 and continuing to her death around 1825, she was bid off as a pauper to the lowest bidder. In 1812, Lydia was only 66 years old, still young enough to be useful as a household servant. If it was the case that she worked as a household servant after Samuel's death, we can estimate her decline into old age began in 1819, when she was bid off.

In 1816, the town was still looking for property that would "Beneficial to the Town." That year, the Kennebec Company sold off the remainder of its assets, and the company was dissolved. Samuel Cony Esq bought the ungranted land between the Sheepscot River and the Whitefield/Jefferson line. It was probably not a coincidence that the town looked into Samuel's estate again. Cony granted titles to all the owners of the parcels Samuel had sold of his original farm. Was the town trying to allow Lydia to buy title to the parcel she still claimed? There is no more mention of Samuel in the town records, and there were never any deeds suggesting Lydia owned the parcel. Her last mention in the town pauper records was in 1824, so we expect she died about that time.

* * *

Acquisition & Disposal of the Lot

In 1792 Samuel Johnson acquired a quit claim deed for 300 acres in Balltown. The price was "five shillings lawful money" and "divers other good causes and considerations." The land presumably ran 1 mile from the eastern branch of the Sheepscot River to Travel Pond, then southward a width of 1/2 a mile. Samuel had lived in Balltown as early as 1777, but it is unclear if he had occupied this lot at that early time. The year before the deed, in 1791, the town's assessment indicated that Samuel's farm was 300 acres. So he was certainly improving the land before he acquired a deed.

Johnson's Balltown tract fell within the claim of the Kennebeck or Plymouth Company. The Company was granted the land in the 17th Century by King James, and was roughly described as 15 miles on each side of the Kennebec River, including the Sheepscot valley. It was sparsely settled before the mid-18th century, and few grants were given. Samuel was among the squatting settlers who had moved up from the coastal towns (Samuel was from Newcastle) to stake their claim in the back country, on wilderness land that had never been cleared.

This migration to the back country coincided with the Revolution. Although Maine saw little military action compared to other parts of the country, participation by the inhabitants was nearly universal, and loyalty was minimal. It was generally understood by the settlers who volunteered that their service would earn them free land to settle and improve. The victory of the American colonies, they hoped, would lead to the confiscation of the lands of the giant companies (which were largely owned by high-

profile Loyalists) such as the Kennebeck Company, the redistribution of these lands by the Massachusetts General Court to the veterans and settlers, and titles for those settlers. Of a list of men in Balltown 16 years and older, nearly 3/4 can be found on muster rolls of soldiers during the Revolutionary War. Despite their service and their hopes, the dream of land fought for, and wrested from the corporations, would not come true.

Settlement of the Sheepscot valley began in earnest at the end of the Revolution, with most families coming from the coastal towns in Maine, or from populated areas further south in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. Land around commercial centers was scarce and expensive. The more well-off of those who wished to acquire cheaply-priced land moved to Vermont or New York, while the poorer went to mid-coast Maine. Maine had plenty of wilderness, the more valuable being claimed by the Proprietors. Maine settlers could legitimately acquire a quit claim deed from one of the companies at their terms, a prospect that most of these Jeffersonian farmers saw as anathema to their fight and toil. Or they could take their chances and squat on a lot of their choosing, often at a nominal price paid to a small-time land speculator who had claimed the lot previously. Finally, they could stake a claim, and move in. Whether you claimed land, or bought someone else's illegitimate claim, you risked being sued by the Proprietors. Despite the specter of eviction, the prospect of free land was too great to pass up.

Samuel's claim was purchased from Charles Glidden and John Plummer, who had previously claimed his 300 acre lot on the river. I could find no evidence of a deed of their acquisition of the tract, so they probably cut a simple "possession fence" around the lot, claiming it, and then sold Samuel that claim. None of these men ever had title on the land. And they believed that they could fend off any assault by the Kennebeck Company. Glidden, whose sister would marry a son of Samuel's, had claimed further land north of Samuel's lot, in the area later called Coopers Mills. Glidden's son William-among others-would later operate a mill on that spot. Having only spent 5 shillings in cash for the lot, Samuel probably worked for Glidden or Plummer in some capacity to make the other "valuable considerations" that the deed indicated.

Despite the fact that the commonwealth had sided with the Kennebeck proprietors only a few years before his deed, confirming their right to the vast tracts of land, Samuel decided to take his chances on purchasing the claim and improving the land. Balltown soon became the central point of the resistance in the Sheepscot valley. The Massachusetts General Court affirmed the Kennebeck claim in 1788. In 1795, the Kennebeck Company began sending parties of surveyors to run out the boundary lines of the southeast portion of their claim, which happened to be the southeast corner of Balltown. Several times in October, November and December of that year, the settlers (always armed and sometimes with grease blackened faces) congregated to interrupt the survey and run the surveyors out of the country. These acts of resistance continued into the 1810s. There were numerous occurrences of retaliation as well, where the settlers would loose livestock, destroy crops, and even burn the houses and barns of anyone who supported the proprietors in any way.

Resistance and retaliation occurred regularly in the back county through the 1790s, 1800s, and early 1810s. The Liberty Men, or White Indians, as these bands of settlers called themselves, effectively repelled surveyors, land agents, and law officers sent to serve writs on interlopers. Ideally, the settlers wanted to remain on the land they occupied and had improved, and obtain title from the General Court, to completely side-step the claims of the Proprietors. Practically, they would eventually settle for somewhat favorable legislation. Despite the attacks on the outsiders entering the back country, no one was harmed, although some livestock gave their lives to the cause. Even the burning of barns and houses and the knocking down of fences did not meet the legal threshold of insurrection. So the militia was never mustered in response.

Violence did increase over time, with a couple of severe instances in 1807 and 1808, and a murder in 1809. The resistance began to crumble after these events. Few people had been brought to court or convicted for their rebellious acts during these decades, but charges of murder raised the profile of the whole fight. Leading men who had supported the Liberty Men began to espouse the idea of resolving the differences with legislation. All this, coupled with the rise of the agrarian Jeffersonian politics in Maine, led to the Betterment Act.

The Act was passed in 1808 allowing the settlers to keep their improvements, but pay the Proprietors for wild land. On the surface, this seemed like a good solution: the settlers would get their titles, the Proprietors would get some revenue on their claim. The sticking point was how the wild land was priced. The settlers insisted that the price be the same as before any settlement had occurred. While the Proprietors wanted the current going rate, which was based on the proximity of the lands that the settlers had improved. Some of the settlers had been on their land for 20 years or more by this time. Samuel may have been there for as long as 30 years. Many took advantage of the Act, and an 1810 bill that extended the term of payment to 3 years, leading to settlers taking out mortgages in many cases. The cost and gamble of resistance was not worth losing your improvements.

Samuel Johnson did not avail himself by the Act. Since he was a Revolutionary veteran on claimed land in the Kennebeck Patent, he and his sons probably took part in the resistance actions in Balltown in the 1790s and 1800s. But he was poor, and had not invested too much apart from time in his tract. In 1791 he had cleared only 2 acres of land, most of which was for hay grown to keep his single cow through the winter. (His pig probably survived on the few scraps the family produced.) By the next assessment the following year he had not made any further headway. He was not mentioned in the 1801 assessment. (Was this an oversight? His neighbor Abraham Heath was listed. His sons were both of age for the poll tax too.) Although he was assessed in 1811, he was not recorded as having any livestock. It appears he gave up on keeping the Revolution alive. This was reflected in his disposal of the 300 acres, which was split up and sold off in quick succession.

In 1801, Samuel sold off his first parcel, later called Lot 8 in the Survey by David Rose Esq, which was done around 1816. It was an approximately 25 acre piece, the southwest corner of the original tract on the Sheepscot River. Samuel wasn't the only grantor on the lot. Joseph Trask was also a seller. Seeing as there was no evidence of Samuel selling any interest in the parcel to Trask, his name may have been added to the deed to secure the payment of a debt, or to settle some other arrangement. In any case, we are left to wonder if Samuel was able to pocket any of the \$100 selling price. The buyer was Abijah Grant, who resold the land in 3 weeks to Jonathan Trask. The two Trasks and Grant were related, as Grant's wife was Dorcas Trask. Jonathan Trask was Jonathan Trask Esq m Elizabeth Hodge s Thomas Trask m Lydia Sylvester, a first cousin to Dorcas Trask m Abijah Grant. She was the daughter of Joseph Trask m Martha Webber. Either this Joseph or his son Joseph could have been the seller. There is no further evidence of Jonathan Trask Esq exercising his claim on the lot. In fact, another settler Nathaniel Place had taken up on the lot by 1818, and the Place family owned the lot at least until 1915.

There were also 2 names on the deed for the next parcel sold the same year, the second being that of Samuel's son Samuel Jr. The purchaser was Isaac Davis. The parcel was 100 acres or so, situated in the part of Balltown that would become Jefferson. Davis, who was the brother of William Davis who originally surveyed the tract, was a surveyor for the Kennebeck Company who lived in Jefferson, but never on this lot. He was the leader of a surveying party that included Paul Chadwick, who was assassinated by White Indians in 1809. I wonder what Samuel's neighbors thought of him doing business with an agent of the Kennebeck Proprietors. But considering the price that Samuel got for the

land--a sizable profit over his investment for a quit claim lot--he was probably due a bit of respect. The lot passed through several hands before Capt John Plummer purchased in in 1823 and settled there.

The next parcels to go were Lots 4 & 5 in 1805. They were on the northeast corner of the original tract, adjacent to the mill which had been constructed in around 1804. The buyer was Samuel Place, the father of the above mentioned Nathaniel Place, who probably lived on Lot 4. Place and his descendants owned and occupied Lot 4 for several decades. He sold Lot 5 soon after he acquired it, and it eventually came into the possession of Leonard Cooper, for whom the area Cooper's Mills was named.

Lot 7, located on the western side of the road, on the river between Lot 5 and Lot 8, was sold some time before 1806. No record of Samuel's sale survives, but the buyer was probably Eli Putnam, who sold the lot in 1806. Putnam was the first to build a mill at the site of Cooper's Mills, on the lot above Lot 5. Samuel Webber and Nehemiah Turner owned the lot in turn by 1812. It is unclear if Turner sold his claim or abandoned the lot. In any case, it was purchased by Marcus Howe in 1818. Although parts of the lot were sold off over the years, the Howe family lived here for many decades.

The final lot that we have record of Samuel Johnson selling is Lot 6 in 1807. This lot appears to be the parcel that his farmhouse was standing on, situated between the old road and the new road. Lot 6 was cut up in several pieces over the years, and gained some land over the Jefferson line. By th 1830s, a few families may have been living here, including Samuel Place Junr and George T Bran. Ira D Glidden eventually owned large pieces of Lot 6. The Place and Glidden families occupied Lot 6 for many years.

In 1816, the Kennebec Company sold off the remainder of its assets, and the company was dissolved. Samuel Cony Esq bought the ungranted land between the Sheepscot River and the Whitefield/Jefferson line. By 1818 Cony was selling warranty deeds on the divisional lots of Samuel Johnson's tract. By this time, Daniel Rose had probably completed his survey and subdivision of the lots by the numbers we recognize. Lots 5 & 6 were granted to John Plummer and Leonard Cooper; Lot 7 to Marcus Howe; and Lot 8 to Nathaniel Place. The residents of Jefferson settled with the Commonwealth and were able to obtain title on their land at a reasonable price. This is likely how the quit claim deeds on the Jefferson parcel turned into warranty deeds. Once all these lots were surveyed and deeds were granted, a gore of unclaimed land remained between the Jefferson lot and Lot 6. These 20 acres were granted to James and Alexander Cooper, and were eventually merged with Lot 6.

Two of the divisional lots remained ungranted, Lot 4 and Lot 9. Samuel Place of Lot 4 was the only original settler who remained on his lot by the time of Cony's purchase. The registry books don't contain a deed of Cony granting him title, but there may have been a private agreement. it could be that his original possession of the lot was recognized by Cony. The other lot changed hands several times after Johnson sold them, and the then-current owner acquired them. The other ungranted piece of land was Lot 9 which was claimed by the widow Johnson.

We are lucky to have a deed that mentions the Johnson farm house. An 1824 deed for a piece of Lot 6 mentioned that the westernmost corner of the parcel was "a little to the westward of where the old Johnson house stood." From this description, it seems that the house may have sat on Lot 6. But, seeing as the description was not very clear, the house could have been on Lot 9, the lot Lydia claimed. We do know that the house was situated between the old road and the new road, and that the house was down by 1824. A brook running nearby was known as the Johnson Brook.

Samuel died before the April 1812 Whitefield town meeting, when a committee was formed to administer on his estate. By that time one son had died, one had moved to Canada, and his daughter had

moved away. The town had to someone to take in his widow Lydia, who would have been 67 years old at the time, and could not have operated the farm to sustain herself. Samuel probably didn't have any debt at the time of his death, since his estate wasn't handle by the Lincoln County Probate Court. His property consisted only of his claim on the remainder of his original lot, and his personal items. What little money could be gotten for this meager estate would go to the town to support Lydia. This may have been enough to sustain her for a few years, because she doesn't show up in the poor rolls of the town until 1819.

It is possible that Lydia even remained in her home until 1819. A few deeds made in 1818 referred to Lot 9 as "land claimed by Widow Johnson." Samuel Cony sold the rest of his divisional lots in 1818, but waited until 1825 to sell this particular piece of land. Perhaps he had some compassion for the widow clinging to the last piece of her property. In 1819, Lydia moved in with Moses Peaslee's family, who lived below King's Mills. The last claim of the Johnson's on land in Balltown was given up. She probably never returned to the property.

Samuel Johnson never attained the Revolutionary dream of settling land, improving it, and passing it on to his children. We do know that he got about \$330 for the piece he sold off, and his widow may have been able to sustain herself for a few years after his death. But we don't know what that price cost him. Some of that cash may have been able to allow his son Samuel Jr to escape the uncertain life of land speculation in mid-coast Maine. We know Samuel Jr had settled in St Andrews by 1804, and we can guess that the growing economy there as well as the prospect of land ownership free and clear sent him there. We don't know the extent of his involvement in the resistance against the Kennebec Proprietors in the Sheepscot valley. But his fleeing to Canada coincided closely with John Bamford being broken out of jail, and his own flight to New Brunswick. Was Samuel Jr involved with Bamford's misdeeds? With the jail break? In any case, the same forces that pushed Bamford out of Maine, and drew him to New Brunswick, affected Samuel Jr. The failure of Samuel Sr's farm may not have been the direct result of the resistance, but the effects changed sent the Johnsons' story in another direction.

* * *

Bibliographical Notes

The historical address

p 32

Charles Glidden moved from Damariscotta in 1772 and took up the land bounded on the south by the road leading from Jefferson to Cooper's Mills, on the west by the Sheepscot river, on the north by the present town of Somerville, and on the east by Travel Pond. At the time of settlement he was six miles from any public road. He had two sons, Charles and William. William built the saw and grist mill at Cooper's Mills.

<https://www.familysearch.org/search/catalog/352440?availability=Family%20History%20Library>

Land records, 1761-1912; indexes to land records, 1761-1901

Authors: Lincoln County (Maine). Register of Deeds

Land records v. 30-31 1793-1794

Family History Library

United States & Canada Film

11373

8296951

<https://www.familysearch.org/search/film/008296951?cat=352440>

[388/579]

Volume 31 Page 82

Charles Glidden [m Thankful Rogers s Charles Glidden m Abigail Weathern] and Daniel Plummer [s John Plummer m Mary] yeoman both "of a place called Ballstown" [See Charles Glidden for deeds index. Plummer deeds index on file from c 1770-1790s] [Gliddens came from Exeter, NH, Plummers from Rowley, Mass. The Gliddens must have some connection to Rowley, as Charles Glidden's father's death was recorded there.]

Know all men by these presents that we Charles Glidden and Daniel Plumer both of a place called Ballstown in the County of Lincoln & Commonwealth of Massachusetts yeomen in consideration of the sum of five shillings lawful money paid us in hand by Samuel Johnstone of the same place called Ballstown yeoman, the Receipt whereof we do hereby acknowledge and for divers other good causes and considerations hereunto moving do our selves & our heirs remise release sell and forever quitclaim unto the said Samuel Johnstone a certain tract of land situated in said Ballstown and bounded as follows beginning on the eastern side of Sheepsctt River at the North Northwest corner bounds of land now owned by Abraham Heath from thence running south southeast one mile to stake & stones from thence running East North East fifty rods to stake and stones from thence running North North west to Sheepsctt River aforesaid from thence running by said River to the bounds first mentioned, together with all the Estate, right title Interest use property, claim & Demand whatsoever of ours the said Charles & the said Daniel which we now have or at any time heretofore had, of in & to the aforementioned premises with the appurtenances or to any part therefor which at any time heretofore has been held used occupied or conjoynd as part or parcel of the same.~To have and to hold all the aforegranted & bargained premises with the appurtenances to him the said Samuel Johnstone & to his Heirs and Assigns forever, with the Reversion & reversions remainder and remainders thereof; or any part or parcel thereof forever. So that neither we the said Charles & said Daniel or either of us nor our Heirs, nor any other person or persons claiming from or under us or them or in the name right or stead of us or them, shall or will by any way or means have claim challenge or Demand any estate right title or Interest of in & to the aforesaid premises with the appurtenances, or any part or parcel thereof forever. In witness whereof we the said Charles Glidden & Daniel Plummer have hereunto set our hands & seals this third day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred & Ninety two.
Charles Glidden [His mark & a seal]

Daniel Plummer [& a seal]

Signed sealed & delivered in presence of
Orchard Cook

Lincoln SS April 3d 1792

then the above named Charles Glidden & Daniel Plummer acknowledge the above Instrument to be their Act & Deed before me Orchard Cook Justice of Peace

Recd Novr 26 1793 & entered & examined

by Thos Rice Regr

Book 31 Page 264 Saml Johnston's Plan

The above figure describes a tract of land run out for Samuel Johnson containing 300 acres butted and bounded as follows

first beginning at a hemlock tree marked on 4 sides at Abraham Heath's NW corner

from thence running ESE 320 poles to a ash tree marked on four sides

from thence running NNE 150 poles to Travel Pond to an Ash tree marked on 4 sides

from thence running NNW to the River to a white maple tree marked on 4 sides

from thence down the river to the bound first mentioned

bounds run out in the year 1790 by William Davis, Sworn Surveyor of Land

Recd Nov 26th 1793 & entered & examined

Orchard Cook: [Newcastle/Pownalborough/Wiscasset; m Mary Hodge s Jonathan Cook m Mehitable Grant]

Abraham Heath [m Mary Bran]

* * *

<http://www.mainething.com/fow/nov03/Henry%20Waters%20Book%202.htm>

KINGS MILLS WHITEFIELD, MAINE

Volume Two of a Continuing History of the Town of Whitefield, Maine

By Henry C. Waters July 1983

PROPRIETORS TO SAMUEL CONY

Recorded in the sixth Book of Grants — Folio z — 1816

We the heirs and assigns of the said Antipas Boye, Edward Tyng, Thomas Brattle and John Winslow, of and in all said lands on Kennebec River aforesaid and legal proprietors thereof, at our meeting held at Boston this second, day of February AD 1816 called, and regulated according to law, have voted, granted and assigned to Samuel Cony of Wiscasset In the County of Lincoln, Esquire, his heirs and assigns forever, certain tract of land. In Whitefield in said County, bounded, westwardly by the Sheepscot River, northwardly, eastwardly and southwardly by the lines of said Town of Whitefield and to comprehend all the land within the limits of said town on the eastern side of Sheepscot River containing by estimation five thousand acres, more or less, saving and excepting therefrom such lots and parcels thereof as may have been granted, or conveyed by this proprietary to any person or persons. In consideration of one thousand, dollars, being the sum at which said land was sold to said. Cony at public auction on the 22nd of January, 1816.

* * *

Kennebeck or Plymouth Patent

History of Gardiner, Pittston and West Gardiner, with a sketch of the Kennebec Indians, & New Plymouth purchase, comprising historical matter from 1602 to 1852; with genealogical sketches of many families

by Hanson, J. W. (John Wesley), 1823-1901

Publication date 1852

January 13, 1629, the Kennebec or Plymouth Patent was granted to new Plymouth. It was from the old Plymouth colony to William Bradford and his associates as follows

...

and the space of fifteen English miles on each side of the said river commonly called the Kennebeck river

...

* * *

A History of Farmington, Franklin County, Maine, from the Earliest ...

By Francis Gould Butle

The meetings of the [Plymouth] Company continued to be held regularly from 1749 to 1816, when they sold the balance of their lands in Boston at auction in 1816, and the company dissolved.

* * *

The Kennebeck proprietors, 1749-1775: "gentlemen of large property & judicious men"

Gordon E. Kershaw
New Hampshire Pub. Co., 1975

p xv

No longer a secure investment opportunity nor an impetus to frontier expansion, the Kennebeck Purchase Company began to fade into the background and was finally dissolved in 1816.

* * *

See also

A History of Whitefield, Maine by Rundlette Kensell Palmer, February 1978.

Ballstown-West 1768-1809: An introduction to the history of the town of Whitefield, Maine by Linwood H Lowden 1984.

Liberty Men and Great Proprietors: The Revolutionary Settlement on the Maine Frontier 1760-1820 by Alan Taylor 1990.

* * *

Note on Charles Glidden.

Samuel Johnson bought his 300-acre Balltown lot in 1792 from Charles Glidden. Glidden seems to have been cozy with the proprietors, or at least not as radical as the Liberty Men of the region.

The Riot at Damariscotta Bridge

Lawrence M. Sturtevant

The New England Quarterly, Vol. 60, No. 2 (Jun., 1987), pp. 264-278

Minutes of the various embarrassments & obstructions met with, in an attempt to run a line between the Plymouth companies lands and that of the Commonwealth, eastward of Kennebec River, in March and April AD. 1806 in conformity to Instructions given by the Agents of the Commonwealth and a Committee of the Plymouth Company, grounded on a Resolve of the Legislature passed Feb 27th, 1806
By Cha. T

p 268

From that time untill Saturday morning 22d of March, Mr Jonathan Bartlett rode night & day through Balltown & Patricktown to prevail with the Setlers to cease their opposition-& on Saturday morning joined us as did also Mr. Charles Glidden & Charles Glidden Jun both of Balltown to assist accompany & guard us.

* * *

Maine Communities and the War for Independence: A guide for the study of local Maine history as related to the American Revolution. Edwin A Churchill. 1976

p 13

The people in eastern Maine had their own particular problem. The dozen or so communities east of the Penobscot were denied legal incorporation by the Crown unless they renounced the right to send representatives to the Massachusetts General Court, a body the King felt was trouble enough without adding any more rebellious deputies. They refused and remained unincorporated. Thus they could not validate their land titles, legally organize a local governments, or elect constables to control local rowdies.