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ABSTRACT

In the 1760s, some 5,000 New Englanders established fourteen townships on the former Acadian farmlands of northern and western Nova Scotia and the sheltered bays and inlets of the colony's south shore. Drawn to the area by the promise of free land and access to cod-rich fishing banks, they founded both farming and fishing communities. Although the full treatment of New England settlement in Nova Scotia must consider both types of community, reconstructing the initial stages of settlement in an agricultural township serves as a beginning. Among the agricultural townships, Horton may be considered representative, if not typical. It was the focal point of the four Minas Basin townships which received the bulk of the New Englanders. It was among the first townships to be settled. Its resource base — dyke, upland, forest, and fish — was essentially the same as that of the other townships.

The story of New Englanders at Horton raises fundamental questions about the process of settlement, the foundations of economy and society, the nature of the family and the evolution of the landscape. To explain how Horton's development unfolded, this thesis follows the lives of 89 men and their families who came to Horton as proprietors and after surviving the first years of hardship became the core of a permanent society. It covers the period from 1760 to 1830, from the time these grantees arrived in Horton until their deaths. The study focuses primarily on landholding and inheritance patterns and agricultural
development and how they affected the lives of individuals and families and the evolution of community. It discovers that despite the relevant abundance of land in the new settlement, local landholding practices led to restricted access almost immediately. This had a profound effect on the fortunes of Horton families and the development of agriculture and community. This conclusion argues against existing theories of rural community development which maintain that land scarcity evolved only after several generations of increased population, partible inheritance, and extensive agricultural practices.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Nova Scotia is defined as much by its rural communities as its urban centres. In the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, remote and isolated settlements were fashioned out of its wilderness by diverse ethnic groups drawn to the area by the availability of land and accessibility to fishing grounds. Several facets of these immigrations have received scholarly attention. In broad terms, the numbers involved, and the timing and location of their settlement are known; immigration has been studied in the context of political and intellectual events, and the contributions of the various groups to the cultural landscape of the province have been assessed. Yet the ways in which settlers took up land and created livelihoods are poorly understood; and the precise nature of the relationship between people and place remains a mystery. By studying in detail a Nova Scotia township settled by New Englanders in the late eighteenth century, this thesis provides a unique perspective on one dimension of Nova Scotia's multi-faceted settlement geography and offers a basis of comparison to the historical evolution of rural communities elsewhere.

Horton Township was settled in the early 1760s as part of a campaign by the Nova Scotia government to attract New Englanders to the colony. Just a few years before, and after almost one hundred and fifty years of habitation, the colony's resident French Acadian population had been forcibly deported and the land lay empty. The familiarity New Englanders
had with the colony because of generations of fishing near its shores, engaging in a sometimes clandestine trade with its towns and the expedition against Louisbourg in 1745, generated substantial interest at a time when New England was expanding northward. In 1758, the fall of Quebec ended a quarter-century of hostilities between England and France in North America, which had prevented a growing New England population from spreading into new territory. Overcrowding and soil exhaustion in the older-settled towns of Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island led to the mass migration of land-hungry settlers to the unoccupied land of northern New England. In the fifteen years following 1760, seventy-four towns were established in Vermont, one hundred in New Hampshire and ninety-four in Maine.³

The pattern of settlement there differed dramatically from the colonization of the first New England frontier in the seventeenth century. Townships, bought and sold on the open market, were settled by diverse elements seeking unoccupied land rather than by a ready-made community bound together by shared religious beliefs and social values. There was widespread granting of townships, rampant speculation, spotty colonization and delayed maturation. Settlers located primarily according to land suitability, on dispersed family farms rather than in compact villages.

To draw New Englanders to his colony, Nova Scotia's Governor Charles Lawrence offered enticements of free land grants and easy settlement terms to prospective settlers.⁴ Although he aimed to encourage agricultural settlement with his descriptions of the vast quantity and superior quality of various land types, New England interest was more diverse. Recognizing the advantages of a location closer to the cod-rich fishing
banks of Nova Scotia, several hundred families migrated from the fishing ports of Cape Cod to Nova Scotia's southwestern coast in the early 1760s. On this rugged, indented shore soils derived from the granitic spine of Nova Scotia are thin and rocky; foggy, damp summers further limit agricultural potential. The seaward orientation of the three townships founded there was immediately apparent; it was later confirmed by the first census in 1767.⁵

Prospective emigrants from the agricultural areas of New England were more sensitive to the opportunities outlined in Lawrence's advertisements. They formed free associations and their agents negotiated agreements with the Nova Scotia government to colonize vacant Acadian farmlands. Acadian settlement had followed the rivers of the Bay of Fundy and had concentrated at Chignecto, Cobequid, Minas and along the Annapolis River. Using traditional dyking techniques, they had transformed large tracts of saltmarsh built from the sediment deposited by the tides of the Bay of Fundy into some of the most fertile land in the colony. Their settlements were remarkably prosperous, supporting a healthy mixed economy based on farming and supplemented by fishing, hunting and trade. The Acadians enjoyed a comfortable standard of living, raised large families and usually lived to old age. Despite little inmigration, between 1713 and the early 1750s the Acadians probably doubled their numbers every twenty years.⁶

The largest concentration of population was in the area of Minas and focused on the expansive Grand Pré marsh. Between 1710 and 1747 the village of Grand Pré grew from less than one thousand people to more than four thousand. Here, in what later became the heart of Horton Township, households had five to ten acres of dyked and tilled farmland each and an
orchard on the adjoining upland. In addition to providing for their families, the farmers of Grand Pré exported cattle, sheep, pigs and poultry to Louisbourg.

Between 1760 and 1764, approximately 5000 New Englanders took up free grants of land ranging from 250 to 1000 acres in fourteen townships of approximately 100,000 acres each which had been surveyed and laid out in western Nova Scotia and the Isthmus of Chignecto (Fig. 1). The pattern and scale of this process of settlement and the nature of the source materials on the period together argue strongly for an historical investigation that builds from "the bottom up", which makes the community its focus. The microscopic examination of one place over time reveals more clearly than more abstract aggregate analysis both the basic characteristics of, and the subtle changes in, the lives that were lived and the land that was settled in these small, rural, isolated and for the most part relatively dispersed communities.

Clearly, the full treatment of New England settlement in Nova Scotia must be two-pronged. Agricultural and fishing villages were radically different in origins of settlers, economic base, and morphology, and reconstructing the initial stages of settlement in an agricultural township serves as the beginning of this investigation. Among the agricultural townships, Horton may be considered representative, if not typical. It was the focal point of the four Minas Basin townships which received the bulk of the New Englanders. It was among the first townships to be settled. Its resource base - dyke, upland, forest, and fish - was essentially the same as that of the other townships. It also warrants attention because it was the shiretown of King's County.
The New England Townships in Nova Scotia

fig. 1.
Horton first received settlers in 1760. That spring, individuals and families from a relatively few towns in southeastern Connecticut began to arrive in the Minas Basin to stake their claim to part of what had once been the heart of Acadia, Les Mines. At that time, the landscape still held traces of an Acadian presence: abandoned orchards and kitchen gardens and burned-over dwellings on the uplands; overgrown ox cart paths along the shore and criss-crossing the dykeland. Dykes damaged by powerful storms but still intact, stood as monuments to Acadian agricultural practices. When it was surveyed, Horton Township's twelve square miles comprised woodland on the South Mountain which formed the township's southern border, scattered pockets of upland of varying elevation and quality, and a fringe of saltmarsh to the east along the Basin and along the northern border of the Cornwallis River separating Horton from the adjacent township of Cornwallis. Another river, the narrow Gaspereau, cut through the township from west to east near the base of South Mountain and emptied into the Basin. Small tidal islands of red clay and saltmarsh stood offshore.

Situated at the eastern end of the Annapolis Valley, the soils of Horton Township were generally well-suited to farming. The outstanding feature of the township though, was the 1200-acre low-lying Grand Pré dykeland which had once been the focus of Acadian agriculture. Although it had been damaged by a severe storm in 1759, the Grand Pré was salvageable and the Nova Scotia government agents expected it to be the basis of the agricultural system of the New Englanders.
To this land the New Englanders came as proprietors, to transform what they had been given according to their individual aspirations and their collective responsibility to create a town. Their story raises fundamental questions about the process of settlement, the foundations of economy and society, the nature of the family and the evolution of the landscape. Who were the people who became Horton's permanent residents? How did grantees divide the township land and utilize their individual holdings? Where did they build their houses, mills, and gaols? Did speculation and absentee ownership exist, and if so, how did they affect landholding patterns and the existence, design and implementation of proprietetal regulations? What was the nature and extent of agricultural activity in this late eighteenth-century Nova Scotia community? Was there opportunity to pursue vocations other than farming? How did individuals differ in their relationships to the land? What types of lifestyles evolved and how were they influenced by the nature of that relationship? What roles did females and the landless play in Horton society? How did decisions about transmitting property to the next generation affect the lives of family members? How was local society shaped by relationships within and among families and by communal relationships that may have extended beyond the boundaries of the township?

This study addresses these questions by examining central themes of demography, land ownership, occupation and use, economic development, family structure and inheritance and the nature of community. To explain how Horton's development unfolded, it follows the lives of 89 men and their families who came to Horton as proprietors and, after surviving the first years of hardship, became the core of a permanent society. Against
the backdrop of local and external events and the contrasting life experiences of latecomers, it covers the period from 1760 to 1830, from the time when the first generation of settlers arrived in Horton until their deaths. Families were reconstituted in order to understand the full significance of the actions of household heads and to measure their success in providing for their families. The study emphasizes the relationship of individuals to their land, which in an agrarian society is the source of personal and collective economic success and which, in a significant way, influences the fate of succeeding generations.

The question of community was central to this study of a place. Was Horton a community in the sense that it was a group of people bonded together by shared problems and a common purpose? Here, the documentation is particularly intractable. But if the discussion that follows is essentially a study of individuals and groups of individuals in which the broader image of community is weak, this is likely a reflection of the fact that Horton was not a community in the traditional sense of a closely-knit colonial town.

The analysis uses all extant sources but relies primarily on deeds and wills, Court of Quarter Sessions papers, the Agricultural Census of 1770, the Poll Tax of 1791 and genealogical material. In a limited way, it draws on some of the methodologies and themes developed in the extensive literature of New England local studies. More often though, those techniques serve as the basis for new methods which are more useful for the narrow time span under study and the dearth of quantifiable information on the period. In addition, the economic and social circumstances of New England at mid-century described in these studies provides a general
background of the shared experience of most New Englanders who moved to the Nova Scotia frontier.

As well, because it was settled as an offshoot of New England, the colonization of Horton must be understood in the context of New England settlement theory. Bumsted and Lemon have synthesized the findings of a number of New England local studies into a rural settlement model that identifies three sequential phases of community development, each lasting a generation or so. According to this model, the initial phase was marked by unsettlement, disorientation and great fluidity as settlers found ways to organize their new environment. Large amounts of free or relatively cheap land were available and communities were open. There was the simplification of old social forms as the inhabitants imposed social arrangements that better suited their new environment and altered circumstances but bore little resemblance to their previous experience.

As society became more settled and population more dense, it entered a second phase of stabilization. Economic strength grew, social institutions, structures and values became more clearly defined and entrenched. Society became more complex. If economic growth continued, this phase became one of replication as emerging elites imitated the old established societies from which they came. But if the community did not continue to grow, if commercial agriculture or industrialization did not occur, the community passed into a phase of stagnation. Eventually, increased population pressure on limited resources led to lessening opportunity and social upheaval.
This study of the first generation or so of settlement in Horton Township argues against this model by challenging its underlying assumption of the widespread availability of abundant land. A detailed examination of the relationship of people to their land reveals both restricted access and the fundamental importance of the role of the land in directing the lives of the inhabitants and the character of their evolving society.
Footnotes


4 For details of the two proclamations Lawrence published in 1758 and 1759, outlining the advantages of Nova Scotia and the terms of settlement, see "Royal Proclamations, Proclamations By the Lord Justices and the Governors of Nova Scotia, 1748-1823", in R.G. 1, v. 346, series G.


7 Ibid., p. 27.

8 In 1774 two travelling Englishmen stated that the "Gramperre" consisted of 2600 acres of dykeland (John Robinson and Thomas Rispin, "A Journey Through Nova Scotia in 1774", in P.A.N.S. Report, 1944, pp. 26-57). This figure is likely an estimate of total dykeland acreage at Horton including "size". Computations discussed in chapter 2, footnote 36 put the total at less than half this.

CHAPTER 2

Occupying The Land

In the late 1750s, the Nova Scotia Government focused its colonization efforts on establishing permanent agricultural communities and left the fishing townships to develop more or less on their own. This was hardly surprising under the circumstances. Farming communities held greater promise of achieving permanent self-sufficiency than those based on an extractive resource; they also offered the potential of a food supply for the military garrison at Halifax. In any case, executing an organized settlement plan would have been difficult on Nova Scotia's southwest coast where the rugged terrain and the nature of the resource would fragment settlement as it stretched out along the shoreline and clustered in sheltered coves.

According to the Government's plan, the Minas Basin area was to be colonized as block settlements. A "block" settlement was one in which the area to be colonized (in this case a township) was granted to a group who had joined together prior to the move with the purpose of "planting" a community. Each of the four Minas townships was granted to a group of families and individuals, most of whom came from a few neighbouring towns in Massachusetts, Connecticut or Rhode Island. They were expected to move to Nova Scotia as a community and to occupy the land at least initially, in common. In 1759, collective township grants were issued to 197 proprietors in Horton, 150 in Cornwallis, 100 in Falmouth, and 68 in Newport (in 1764) and settlers began to arrive the following spring.
Nova Scotia was only one of several unoccupied areas being colonized by New Englanders at the time, and like the others it had difficulty ensuring that those who claimed shares kept their promise to settle. Forfeitures, vacancies, and the influx of non-grantees confused a process already complicated by the speculative land interests of self-serving Halifax officials. In the end, 202 grantees received Horton land and formed the basis of its evolving settlement, but the composition of this group was decided neither quickly nor easily.

Only 64 of the 197 persons named on the 1759 Grant were in Horton by May 1761 when absentee proprietors were threatened with forfeiture of their grants.\(^1\) Circumstances were similar in Cornwallis and the other Bay of Fundy townships. Anxious that the former Acadian lands should not remain long without settlement, the Government had established criteria for forfeiture.\(^2\) Grants had to be settled by proprietors or their representatives and improvements begun within two years of the date of issue or the grants were subject to cancellation. When the Government acted against delinquent grantees in 1761, the resulting shuffle in the shareholder membership of Horton invalidated the township grant. Proprietors who had arrived in Horton kept their grants. An undisclosed number of absentee proprietors had 37.5 shares saved for them by requesting a continuance of their grants and receiving a revised settlement deadline.\(^3\) Twelve more, who had delayed moving to Horton until after 1761, were listed on the town plan in confirmation of their intention to settle.\(^4\) Both of these groups claimed their grants between 1762 and 1764. The rest of the non-arrivals, representing 121 shares, lost their grants. This encouraged other residents of Connecticut to emigrate to Horton in the hope of acquiring one of the
suspended rights.

In May 1761, 78 individuals having no previous claim to a Horton share joined the resident grantees in a new collective grant. The second or "Effective" Grant distributed 131.5 of the township's 200 shares to 142 individuals (plus one share for the first minister, 600 acres for a glebe and 400 acres for the school for a total of 134.5 shares). Over the next few years, proprietors of the first grant whose claims were saved, arrived in Horton and received their shares in private grants. Other arrivals from Connecticut competed with Nova Scotians for the township's remaining rights. By 1764 all shares were distributed.

The 200 shares of Horton Township were allocated to proprietors in grants of .5, 1, 1.5 and 2 shares. Social status had determined grant size and structured the social organization of seventeenth-century New England towns, but it was of limited value to an eighteenth-century community founded on economic principles. True, Horton's 2-share rights of which there were five, were patronage awards, but more often entitlement was determined by the proprietor's "ability to cultivate". "Ability", it seems, was loosely based on age and family size. It may be argued that those who were older were more likely to have attained social prominence and so the apparent criteria of age may have actually concealed the less obvious distinction of status. But not every esteemed citizen received a large grant, whereas most older men with large families did. And if all who obtained the larger grants were prominent, some quickly fell into obscurity at Horton. They were neither acknowledged as the town leaders nor became particularly successful landowners or farmers. Thus, age (and perhaps the wisdom and experience it suggested) was judged to be a better
measure of farming skill than social position. Consequently, the oldest household heads with completed (and therefore often larger) families received most of the 750-acre 1.5-share grants; young, single or newly-married men were given the 250-acre .5 shares, and those in between obtained 500-acre 1-share grants. The shares were divided among 202 individuals in the following proportions: 5 grants of 2 shares, 41 grants of 1.5 shares, 97 grants of 1 share and 59 grants of .5 shares.

Three components can be recognized in the final selection of Horton grantees: 177 New Englanders (168.5 shares), 14 soldiers (16.5 shares), and 11 placemen (13 shares). The soldiers received land grants as reward for past service. Most were captains and lieutenants and at least three came from the same regiment. "Placemen" describes a mixed group consisting of powerful members of Halifax's social elite, influential businessmen, politicians, and high-ranking government servants who obtained their grants through favour. Patronage and position influenced the granting of 2 shares to Rev. John Breynton, leader of the Anglican Church in Nova Scotia and rector of Halifax's St. Paul's Church, and 1 share to William Nesbitt, a prominent Halifax politician. It was also a factor in the issue of smaller grants to businessmen and their families. Halifax merchants Joseph Gray and Charles Proctor, for example, held diverse colonial business interests. They received 1 and 1.5 shares respectively. Three other shareholders, Capt. John Taggart, Charles Morris Jr., and Isaac Deschamps had served the government in the initial settlement of the Minas townships.
Yet most of the grantees—perhaps 88% of the 202 proprietors—were New Englanders, and if the origins of the 79 New England grantees for whom we have data are typical, members of this largest group came from a compact area in southeastern Connecticut focusing on the port of New London (Figure 2). Originally occupied as part of the expanding Massachusetts frontier more than a century before, New London and neighbouring counties in the eastern highlands were well settled. Generations of extensive and wasteful farm practices had exhausted the more accessible lands and a growing population was placing increasing pressure on the limited supply of good land remaining in the vicinity of the shiretown. Here, as elsewhere in the older settled agricultural areas of New England, land scarcity and soil exhaustion restricted the farming opportunities of the descendents of the earliest settlers. The hardest hit were young sons who came of age at a time when fathers had little to offer them as a start in life. Without a patrimony, it was almost impossible to get established in these subsistent and semi-subsistent communities where there were few alternatives to farming. Much of Connecticut was yet little influenced by an incipient West Indian market for the colony's agricultural products. Local economies had not diversified and opportunity was limited. By New England standards, the land was overcrowded; wealth based on land ownership was unevenly distributed and the quality of life had worsened as society became stratified. Communities that once had been egalitarian, homogeneous and open were stratified, differentiated and closed.

To escape these restrictive conditions, settlers moved to northern New England in search of land. Emigration began in the late 1600s, when this frontier separated settled New England from the enemy territory of
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French Canada. Sporadic outbursts of warfare in the first half of the 18th century checked the advance of frontier settlement and often wiped out existing communities. Between the wars, the coastal areas of Maine and New Hampshire were tentatively settled, but the interior and Vermont were not opened up until the French threat was completely removed with the fall of Quebec in 1760.

As part of this northern expansion of New England, emigrants were drawn to the unoccupied territory in the adjacent colony of Nova Scotia. The promise of free land not only lured the young sons of New England, it attracted older, family-oriented men as well. In fact, partial reconstruction of the families of fifty Horton grantees reveals that fewer than one third of these men were single in 1761 and that at an average age of 20, all but three came to Nova Scotia with their parents. Of the married male grantees, three-quarters were over 30 years old and one third were older than fifty. Their families were young though, and could be counted on as a labour supply on the frontier. At an average age of 37, twenty-five wives whose birthdate is known were an average of five years younger than their husbands and many had not finished bearing children in 1761. At least five women were pregnant when they made the three-week sea journey to Horton. Couples brought as many as ten, but most often four (and an average of five) children under age 21 to the new land; many families included one or two sons aged 16 to 21 who were not grantees and could labour on family farms.

There is no evidence that the patterns revealed by sample family reconstruction differed appreciably from the demographic characteristics of the other grantees. Almost half (59) of the remaining 123 New
Englanders were known to have brought wives and children or to have come to Horton with at least one member of their immediate families. Only 12 grantees are known to have been unmarried.

Some grantees were connected through extended kinship ties. Brothers Asa and Ephraim Harris were accompanied to Horton by a cousin, Lebbeus Harris and a nephew, Daniel Harris, and proprietor William Coldwell was married to the sister of grantee Jedidiah Jordan. Other Horton grantees had relations in nearby Cornwallis. For instance, Zebadiah Wickwire's brothers Christopher and Peter, and Obadiah Stark's brother, Zephaniel were Cornwallis grantees; Benjamin Beckwith's cousins Samuel and John Beckwith also lived there.

Little of the economic background of Horton's New England grantees can be known without reconstructing their lives prior to emigration. While it is very unlikely that the extremely rich or the very poor came to Horton, the sparse evidence suggests that the grantees represented a broad economic spectrum. Such men as prominent Connecticut landowner Robert Denison, Yale-educated lawyer Nathan Dewolf, and Col. Charles Dickson who personally financed a military company for the siege of Beausejour came to Horton, but other settlers could not survive the first few years without food and grain subsidies from the Nova Scotia Government. Although almost every man called himself a yeoman farmer when he claimed a Horton share, the New Englanders brought a variety of skills to the new land. A small number identified themselves as blacksmiths, carpenters, cordwainers, weavers, and traders while others relied on informal training to build their houses and provide their families with the basic possessions they had not brought with them. Women contributed domestic skills including
weaving and spinning and produced household goods such as soap and candles.

Because all Horton shares were allocated in the early 1760s, it is possible to offer a profile of the founding society. It was a culturally-homogeneous population consisting primarily of former residents of southeastern Connecticut. Although they were of a wide range of ages, they shared a common culture and religion. They were primarily families with relatives living nearby to provide companionship during good times and support and comfort during bad.

At the same time, where the formal structures of community were absent or rudimentary, and where social organization was dominated by kinship, communal interdependence among the inhabitants of the place was probably weak. To be sure, every able-bodied man served the community in the militia and on the township's road committees. But underlying the founding of Horton was the powerful yearning of most of its grantees for individual landholdings on which they could practise family agriculture. This factor proved critical to Horton's development; it directed methods of land distribution and influenced basic patterns of life on the land.

The Cadastre

In May, 1760, government troops erected Fort Montague near Horton Landing to provide shelter and protection for grantees and their families and livestock. The first houses built that summer were probably situated at town plot near the protection of the fort. Although they planted some root crops and corn, the settlers depended on government provisions of flour, corn, and mackerel to sustain them through the first Nova Scotian winter. With the spring thaw, salmon from the township's rivers and
streams supplemented a meagre food supply. Since overland travel was exceedingly difficult, Horton Landing became the focus of arrivals and departures in the summer of 1761. In May, alone, a government vessel brought salt to cure fish, and oats and potatoes for planting; Captain Rogers arrived from New London with a small shipment of seed corn; and New Englanders bound for Cobequid stopped in at Horton. Quickly the proprietors began to provide the infrastructures of settlement: they constructed a bridge across the lower Gaspereau River, established a ferry link to Cornwallis, erected a grist mill (and most likely at least one sawmill) and began to set off individual shares. In the next three years all of the township's land except the size lots and the remote wildlands were laid out and distributed. By 1770 virtually all lands were allocated and the settlement pattern was established.

Although official grants were often delayed several years, shareholders participated in the distribution of township land as soon as they became residents. The Nova Scotia township grants gave the proprietors control over the division of their shares "... into one or more lots to each share as shall be agreed upon by the major part of said grantees...." In Horton, as in the other agricultural townships, grants consisted of dykeland, marsh, upland and woodland.

Horton was surveyed in typical New England form. Blocks of land of different types were laid out in lots of various sizes around a compact town plot. The divisions of the Horton survey described the type or location of land and broadly, the sequence of survey: first division dyke, first division farm, second division farm, island lots, size or equivalent lots, and third division farm (Figure 3). If the procedure for laying out
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the third division farm lots was typical, the proprietors established the
acreage per share for each division (except the equivalent lots), by
dividing the total acreage of a land type by the number of shares to be
distributed. The acreage for 1.5-share and .5-share entitlements were
then calculated proportionately. Two-share disbursements were measured
differently: they were treated as two one-share allotments so that the
composition of the grant was actually that of two separate shares. Having
two-shares' worth of any of the various land types was to own two distinct
and possibly widely-separated lots instead of contiguous acreage as in the
case of 1.5-share tracts.

Further adjustments were made in acreage per share in two of the
upland divisions to compensate for variable quality. For the first divi-
sion farm lots this was expressed in variable acreage per share; for second
division lots it was in the addition of one or more "size" lots of marsh,
dyke, upland and/or woodland to each right to make up the equivalent of
inferior quality.

The lots of the Horton survey, ranging in size from .5 to 3 shares in
some divisions, were laid out and numbered, and chosen by drawing corre-
spondingly-numbered papers from a hat. The larger two and three-share lots
of the first divisions of dyke and upland were parcelled out to two or more
grantees. For example, the first division farm lot numbered "N°3 3 shares
first tier Grand Pre" was divided among three grantees who together owned
a total of 3 shares: the north half or 1.5 shares was drawn by Samuel
Copp; the south half was apportioned to John Burnham who owned the middle
1-share lot and John Whitney Jr. whose .5 share bordered north on
Burnham's land and south on the King's Highway. Similarly, Charles
Dickson Sr. obtained a .5-share strip at the east end of the 2-share lot "N° 29 first tier Gaspereau River"; John Allen Sr. owned 1 share adjoining Dickson's lot and the .5-share western strip belonged to John Dickson. As long as the total combined shares corresponded with the share size of the lot, grantees could choose their neighbours in a subdivided lot by "drawing in company". Although owners almost always later divided common plots into individual holdings, initially this arrangement permitted a man to farm alongside someone he knew and trusted. Relatives, especially fathers and sons, frequently chose this variation of the ballot. No one was given preference in the assignment of lots and all the proprietors shared equally in the costs of the survey.

In June, 1760, before most grantees arrived, Nova Scotia Chief Land Surveyor Charles Morris Jr. measured off a compact town plot designed for commerce and defence (Figure 4). Bordered to the north by the marshy fringe of Grand Pré, the 144-acre rectangular grid was located on cleared upland just south of Horton Landing on a bend near the mouth of the Gaspereau River. It consisted of three 44-acre squares each surrounding a 4-acre parade square and intersected by streets at right angles. In New England communities, wealth, social status, family size and participation in the initial settling often determined if a settler was given a home lot and its acreage, but in Horton every grantee and proposed grantee received a 250' x 100' .5-acre tract (Figure 5). Grantees probably took possession of their lots as they arrived in town, but the method of distribution is unknown. There were more extra lots surveyed at town plot than in any other division; perhaps the surplus was intended for the tradesmen Morris anticipated would settle there.
Town Plot, 1760 (Chief Surveyor Charles Morris)

Plan of the Town of Horton in Nova Scotia surveyed and laid out in June from 1760.
Town Lots Allocated to Horton Grantees

fig. 5.
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The rest of the township was laid out by the Horton survey team. The survey team of seven or eight men, but of no fixed membership consisted of a surveyor to lay the bounds, committee men to represent the proprietors, and chainmen to carry axes and the Gunter measurement chain. In 1761, they laid out the first division of dykeland northwest of the town plot on the Grand Pré. The survey plan, with nine alphabetized divisions of 40 to 184 acres resembled a patchwork of squares and rectangles (Figure 6). It divided the approximately 800-acre Grand Pré into one hundred 8-acre tracts. These 2-share lots could have as many as four owners, but by the draw each proprietor was aware of which section he owned.

The first division farm lots were also measured off in 1761 on the cleared upland south of the Grand Pré. Four tiers of .5 to 3-share lots, appropriately named the first and second tiers next the Grand Pré and the first and second tiers next the Gaspereau River lay between the Grand Pré and the Gaspereau River. The allocation of individual shares divided most lots into rectangles bordering on a road or the Grand Pré (Figure 7). The central section of the middle tiers was known as the town common. The common was the core of New England towns, but in Horton the term was anachronistic; the area locals called the "common" was actually upland size that had been divided into lots and was privately owned by a handful of grantees.

To the east, 50-acre lots "east of the lower bridge near the pear trees" provided another tract of first division farmland. Similarly, the cleared upland south of the town plot and the wedge of wetter ground on its northern boundary, were used for twenty-six .5 to 1.5-share lots. East of the town plot, five 3-share lots of at least 48 acres apiece,
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appropriated a chunk of firmer ground on the peninsula known as "the Neck". All together, the first division farmland totalled 1947 acres, but depending on the soil quality of each section, the allotment per share varied from seven to twenty-four acres.

By 1763, 32 at least some lots were measured off on the three islands, so-called, that were actually elevated land accessible on foot at low tide but surrounded by water at the flood tide (Figure 8). An access road divided the largest island, Long Island, into north and south tiers. With 4 acres to a share, each tier consisted of narrow 1.5 and 2-share strips. A small plot at the island's western end was reserved to provide soil for dyke construction.

Few of those who obtained shares after the collective grant (and hereafter referred to as subsequent grantees) received lots on Long Island whereas they preponderated on Oak and Boot Islands. Since those listed on the 1761 Effective Grant drew their lots before the others, this seems to indicate that Oak and Boot Islands were only divided after all Long Island lots had been distributed. The island was the only division that contained fewer than 200 shares of land, and yet some island lots were never claimed. Perhaps the land was worthless in those spots, but whatever the reason, 48 four to twenty-four-acre island equivalent lots scattered on the upland on the south side of the Gaspereau and in the western section of the township were offered in lieu to the remaining subsequent grantees (Figure 9).

Between 1762 and 1764, 33 the second division farm lots were laid off in four sections lying west of the first division farm lots, on the south bank of the Gaspereau and the shores of the Piziquid (Avon) Rivers, and along the Horton-Falmouth Road. Rows of 100-acre rectangles were divided
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fig. 8.
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east to west in 50-acre shares (Figure 10). To compensate for variable soil quality appraisers assessed each lot against the highest prized lot, A No 10, and awarded proprietors pecuniary tickets to be exchanged for "equivalent" lots of equal value at the recipient's leisure. In this way, proprietors pitched one or more lots on the residual marsh, dykeland, intervale and woodland of the township. Unlike arbitrary ballot selection, pitching meant that individuals chose the location of their lots. Consequently, size land was usually a jumble of lots of many shapes and sizes (Figures 11a and 11b).

Some proprietors exercised their choice of size land in the late 1760s, but most chose earlier and by 1770 attention was focused on the final allotment of land. By the third division, almost 90,000 acres of remote and inaccessible forest were set off in half-share tracts of 225 acres each (Figure 12). With this final division, and exclusive of the size acreage, the total acreage of all divisions exceeded by more than 2000 acres the putative 100,000 acres allocated the township in 1759 (Table I).

Because the Horton proprietors wished to ensure that each and every share in the township contained a portion of all kinds of land, they had no choice but to divide the land into scattered holdings. Still, in pitching size lots their selections perpetuated this randomness. They favoured no particular type of land, nor did they choose acreage of every kind; there was no attempt to consolidate lots in a single location and grantees rarely selected plots near their other holdings. This apparent disregard of the benefits of agglomeration and the inconveniences of long distances between holdings suggests what may have been accepted and indeed, preferred agricultural practise: farming small plots and
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### TABLE I. Acreage Distribution of Land Types in Horton Township

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>ac. Granted</th>
<th>ac./ Share</th>
<th>No. of Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town plot</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First division dyke</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First division farm:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First tier Grand Pré</td>
<td>388.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tier Grand Pré</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tier Gaspereau</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First tier Gaspereau</td>
<td>443.75</td>
<td>442.75</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of the lower bridge</td>
<td>243.75</td>
<td>243.75</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of the town plot</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of the town plot</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the Neck</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of first division farm:</strong></td>
<td>2242.00</td>
<td>1741.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second division farm:</strong></td>
<td>9800</td>
<td>9150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Island lots:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Island</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Island</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island equivalent</td>
<td>577.25</td>
<td>577.25</td>
<td>12.5-16</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total island division:</strong></td>
<td>1167.25</td>
<td>1102.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third division</strong></td>
<td>87975</td>
<td>86850</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total exclusive of size</strong></td>
<td>102128.25</td>
<td>99748.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
travelling a few miles between lots. If this is true, a pre-disposition toward dispersion would significantly influence landowning patterns once proprietors began to re-structure their holdings by buying and selling lots. The spatial arrangement of individual holdings on the land and the type, variety and quality of the soils they contained would in turn, profoundly affect the nature of the agricultural system and levels of productivity that were obtainable in Horton.

The original Horton Grant implied the transfer of a single group from Connecticut to Nova Scotia, but shares in the township were actually taken up by a diverse group of proprietors. Contrary to the Administration's plan for a block settlement and the instant community that that implied, most of Horton's proprietors came alone or in small groups from south-eastern Connecticut hoping to improve their material circumstances by obtaining free land. Unlike their Puritan forefathers who proceeded cautiously in developing a new town to ensure that local society was structured to foster community, the Horton grantees immediately focused on exploiting the opportunities of the frontier. A deep-seated desire to own land of one's own and an impulse to acquire as much of it as they could, led the proprietors to divide the entire township into individual holdings in the first decade. No land reserve or communal property remained; even the so-called town "common" was privately owned. Providing land for future generations - which once had been a community responsibility - became the private duty of each landowner. A basic aspiration for individual economic success gained through the accumulation of land was the fundamental principle underlying the initiation of settlement at Horton. Economics motivated New Englanders to move to this new land and economics shaped the
evolving character of the communities they established there.
Footnotes

1 There is no surviving account of the initiation of settlement at Horton, but the "Warrant for the Erection of the Township of Horton, 1759" (R.G. 1, v. 222, #3), the 1761 collective grant for Horton Township (Micro: Places: Nova Scotia: Land Grants, 3-35), Appendices A-C, and the town plan described below can be used to reconstruct the process of taking up shares at Horton. The plan of Horton town plot surveyed and laid out by Charles Morris Jr. in 1760, lists the owner of each lot. To determine who actually came to Horton and when, the list has been analyzed according to appearance or non-appearance on a grant and it is divided into the following classifications:

1. Individuals found on the 1759 Warrant only;
2. Individuals found on the 1759 Warrant and the 1761 Effective Grant;
3. Individuals found on the 1759 Warrant who became grantees after 1761 (hereafter referred to as subsequent grantees);
4. Effective grantees whose names do not occur on any previous list;
5. Individuals who became grantees after 1761, but who are not found on a previous list (also called subsequent grantees);
6. Individuals who later settle in Horton but who are not grantees;
7. Those who petition for a grant but lose or sell it without settling in Horton;
8. Those who are mentioned on the town plan but in no other Horton document;

The analysis suggests that the names were probably inserted on the map sometime between 1760 and 1763. The original plan is hanging in the Acadia University Archives, Wolfville, N.S.; a reproduction can be found as Figure 11, in Douglas Eagles, A History of Horton Township, Sarnia: 1970).

2 Letter from Montagu Wilmot to the Board of Trade, Aug. 24, 1766, in "Dispatches From the Governors to the Board of Trade and Plantations", R.G. 1, v. 37, Oct. 26, 1760 - Nov. 25, 1781.

3 See category 2, "Settlers Recommended by the Committee..." in Appendix A.

4 Twenty-seven grantees of the 1759 Warrant who were not listed on the second grant of 1761 received lots at town plot. Why their places were saved is unknown, but it may have been simply because they notified the Nova Scotia Government of their continued interest in settling in Horton. Only twelve became subsequent grantees (Appendix C). If the others listed on the plan came to Horton, they left before they received grants. It is doubtful that they ever arrived though, since even a temporary visit (as in the case of a few Effective grantees who sell their grants in 1762 and
leave the township soon after) would probably confirm their shares. There is no further reference to these individuals in Horton documents.

5 "Land Grants", ibid.

6 See Appendix B for a list of most of the soldiers and placemen who received Horton grants.


8 Origins are derived from genealogies and deeds. See bibliography.


10 A letter from Charles Morris Jr. to the Executive Council, June 30, 1760, states that the first transports arrived in the Minas Basin from New London after a twenty-one day sea journey, "Minutes of the Executive Council" (R.G. 3, v. 188, Aug. 17, 1757 - Aug. 21, 1766). No explanation is offered for why the journey took so long.

11 Unfortunately, in these cases, there is insufficient documentation for reconstitution. In addition, 28 of the 123 never became permanent residents, which further reduces the number of individuals whose disposition is unknown.

12 There is no surviving record of township meetings for Horton, but if any meetings were held during the 1760s, they were likely for the purpose of establishing the infrastructures of settlement, as was the case in Newport. See: John V. Duncanson, Newport, Nova Scotia: A Rhode Island Township (Belleville, Ont.: 1985).

13 The number of houses built is unknown; see "Dispatches ...", R.G. 1, v. 37, Dec. 12, 1760.


17. Ibid.

18. Letter from the Provincial Secretary to Thomas Handcock in "Letter Books ...", April 14, 1761.

19. The intricate procedures for issuing land grants combined with the overwhelming number of petitions for land in Nova Scotia in the early 1760s caused the official grants to be delayed as long as 7 years after an individual staked a claim.

20. The Horton Township Grant, ibid.

21. In the Partition of the Township of Horton in 1770, the unimproved or third division lots were laid out and shareholders drew numbered lots by ballot in the order that they appeared on the 1761 Grant, and the others generally by the date of their grants, (R.G. 1, v. 361, #21). The boundaries of each lot were recorded in the Horton Partition Book (R.G. 1, v. 362). Earlier, deeds of the mid-1760s commonly referred to the third division lots as being "not yet divided or set off ... in the Division late agreed upon by the Propriety of 225 acres to one half share ..."). (See, for example, Lebbeus Harris to Joseph Gray, R.G. 47, v. 1273, book 1, p. 150). Jedidiah Williams to Charles Dickson (ibid., book 3, p. 7, Sept. 8, 1761) refers to a first division farm lot as being "drawn by lottery". The sequence of numbered lots on the township plan implies that lots were laid prior to the draw.

22. The Horton Partition Book lists the particular lots drawn by each grantee.

23. For instance, of 16 pairs of fathers and sons whose combined shares did not exceed the 2-share lot size of the first division dyke lots, 11 shared the same lot.

24. The only exceptions were Israel Harding's 950 acres and Col. William Forster's 1000 acres at New Minas.
All survey bills were submitted to the Court of Quarter Sessions and the totals were audited and divided by 200 to arrive at the assessment rate per share.

Letter from Charles Morris Jr. to the Executive Council, in "Minutes of the Executive Council", June 1, 1760.

The only exceptions were 9 marshy lots in the northeast corner of the town plot which were 200' x 53'4" or 83'43".

"Minutes of the Executive Council", ibid.

The date of survey and the type of land surveyed is sometimes listed in survey bills and petitions (M.G. 1, v. 181, nos. 12, 53, 81, 83, 210, 211, 270, 278-280, 293, 305, 307; v. 182, no. 39. In deed descriptions of the 1760s, land is often distinguished before a survey as being "common and undivided" and afterwards by descriptions of stakes and stones boundary locations. The sale of first division farm lot No. 2D on Nov. 2, 1761 is the first mention of a bounded first division farm lot in Horton documents (R.G. 47, v. 1273, p. 196, #51).

See footnote #37 for an explanation of how a total of 800 acres was calculated for the Grand Pré.

Five of the six Horton deeds recorded in 1761 involve sales of bounded first division farm lots. It is unknown if the survey of that division was completed that same year.

In Sept. 1761, Oak Island, at least, was still "common and undivided", (R.G. 47, v. 1273, book 3, p. 7). The first mention of the division of island lots is a survey bill of June, 1763, M.G. 1, v. 181, #81.

On Oct. 5, 1761, at least "C" division of the second division farm lots was still "common and undivided", (R.G. 47, v. 1273, book 3, p. 200). A June, 1764 survey bill accounts for charges "to Beginning of Laying out the Size of the Second Division farm lots", M.G. 1, v. 181, #92, which implies that the lots were laid out by that date.

How soil quality was determined is unknown.

There is no correlation between the location of a second division farm lot in any particular section or area and the location of its size which would indicate that particularly poor soil was compensated with a specific type or area of size.
In the grants, deeds and on the township plan, size lots are identified by a number and the letter and number of an individual's second division farm lot (e.g., N°1B14). Although lots ranged from 1 acre of dykeland to 100 acres of woodland, specific acreages were only cited consistently for woodland (total: 2433 acres). Thus it is impossible to determine the average acreage per individual or the total size acreage at Horton.

The acreage in each division was calculated by multiplying the acreage/share by the total number of shares that were laid out in lots on the township plans. It should be noted that while lot size occasionally seems to vary on the plans, deeds for some of the smaller sized lots indicate that they contained the same acreage.

There is a slight underestimation of total acreage because in some divisions there were a few lots that were not distributed. Although in laying out the town plot Charles Morris implied that there may be a reserve of land to be used to entice tradesmen to the community, there is no evidence that Horton proprietors had this intention in surveying the other divisions. For instance, there is no record of any newcomer selling land for which there is no record of purchase, nor were any grants issued after the 1760s. It is likely that land remaining after all shares were allocated was either unfit for cultivation or was used to compensate landowners for township roads routed through their property.
CHAPTER 3

Land and Livelihoods

By the mid 1760s, the geography of New England settlement in Nova Scotia was firmly established. On the south shore, ephemeral fishing enclaves had finally attracted permanent residents. And agricultural communities along the Bay of Fundy had taken root despite the departure of some grantees. In Horton, the property surveys of the 1760s organized the land for settlement. But even as land was allotted, proprietors restructured and used their assigned holdings according to their individual aspirations. Because land shaped the economic and social character of agricultural communities, the ways in which Horton shareholders utilized their grants - i.e., how they responded to the opportunity of owning free land in Nova Scotia - was critical to the fate of the settlement and the prosperity of the individuals living there. Reconstructing patterns of land ownership and use in the 1760s reveals the actions of the inhabitants during Horton's formative years. From a close analysis of this person to land relationship it is possible to deduce the motivations, values and goals that guided this behavior. This consciousness, sometimes called métalité, and its connections to opportunity, structured by the local environment, determined Horton's course of development.

The Connecticut settlers came to Nova Scotia with a background that increasingly emphasized commercial farming, agricultural specialization and the accumulation of land for economic power; they also evinced an optimism that associated opportunity with the frontier. By 1760,
population growth and extensive and wasteful farming practices had increased the demand for land, raised land prices and led agriculture on to marginal lands that were better suited to dairy farming than to grain production. A West Indian market absorbed the colony's agricultural surplus. Although it still consumed more than it exported, and many local economies had yet to diversify, by the mid-eighteenth century, Connecticut was passing from an internal to an external economy. Entrepreneurial values were of increasing importance to the inhabitants. Profit, not yearly subsistence, was the goal. The key to it was in accumulating land. Although access to land was restricted in much of older settled New England, emigration to new frontiers afforded the prospect of economic success through land ownership.¹

The importance of owning land was reinforced by circumstances in Nova Scotia. After the first New England townships were established, the Nova Scotia Government was bombarded with petitions for the colony's remaining ungranted land. Between 1763 and 1768 approximately 3,500,000 acres were granted to Nova Scotians, Britons and New Englanders who promised to settle themselves or entire communities in the colony.²

In the drive to accumulate, even some of those who had already obtained grants requested land. Among them were Horton proprietors who twice asked the Executive Council for additional land as compensation for a shortage of viable acreage in their township grant. In 1764 they requested lands on the north side of the Minas Basin; three years later they wanted land near Yarmouth.³ Both petitions were turned down. Although the reasons for their rejection are unclear, the claim that land was in short supply in Horton seems to have been the invention of
petitioners eager to acquire as much land as they could at an opportune time. The township contained more than the 100,000 acres promised the grantees. And their contentions of scarcity were made less convincing by their choice of Israel Harding as their spokesman. With 1000 contiguous acres at New Minas, Harding owned one of the largest tracts in Horton. Moreover, due to the poorly-developed state of agriculture in the new township, there was little chance that an additional grant could have been brought into cultivation for some time.

A similar demand for land existed in the local land trade. In the 1760s, 80% of all Horton grantees participated in the land market; more than 53,000 acres changed hands through 480 deeds. Although more than three quarters of the grantees registered fewer than six deeds for the decade, in many instances more than one and as many as ten lots changed hands in a single transaction. Consequently, the land trade was probably busier than the figures suggest. In all, at least 777 parcels of Horton land changed hands. Deeds record the transfer of 191 pieces of size; 141 pieces of first division farm; 103 parcels of first division dyke; 94 town lots; 93 second division lots; 79 third division tracts; and 76 island and island equivalent lots. Town lots and farmland on the northern boundary of town plot were the most expensive acreage during the 1760s. Properties in these categories that changed hands averaged £4 and £3.3.0 per acre respectively (Table II). Over 40% of all transactions involved first division farmland and size lots. The latter were often part of a package in multiple-lot sales and in the less common barter exchange of lots.
TABLE II.  Average Land Prices in Horton, 1760 - 1770*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Type</th>
<th>Price Per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Lot</td>
<td>£4.0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots &quot;north of town plot&quot; (first division farm)</td>
<td>£3.3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First tier Grand Pré (first division farm)</td>
<td>£2.32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First division dyke</td>
<td>£2.28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tier Gaspereau (first division farm)</td>
<td>£2.17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North tier Long Island (island lots)</td>
<td>£1.25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First tier Gaspereau (first division farm)</td>
<td>£1.20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tier Grand Pré (first division farm)</td>
<td>£1.6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots on &quot;the Neck&quot; (first division farm)</td>
<td>£1.5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South tier Long Island (island lots)</td>
<td>£0.34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third division farm</td>
<td>£0.6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boot Island</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Island</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent (size) lots</td>
<td>Not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:  King's County, N.S. Deeds (P.A.N.S. R.G. 47, #1273)
Landowning behavior between 1760 and 1770 suggests that acquisitiveness, expressed both in the pursuit of immediate profit and in property accumulation, motivated landowners. The land trade provided one of the few opportunities to raise capital on the Nova Scotia frontier and during the 1760s, one half of Horton’s resident grantees engaged in transactions that brought them a profit. Astute landowners capitalized on the land without reducing the size of their own shares by selling individually-purchased lots as a package deal. More often, though, immediate profit was only realized by the reduction of a shareholder’s improvable acreage. Defined broadly, "improvable" acreage was land easily prepared for cultivation. In the 1760s this meant accessible township land rather than the undivided third division. Exclusive of "size" land, grants of .5 to 2 shares contained from 31 to 145 improvable acres.

Three-quarters of the grantees who made money from their shares reduced their farm area. On average, this reduction amounted to 31 improvable acres (Appendix A). Clearly, some conceived of their land as a commodity of exchange in the cash-short economy of eighteenth-century Nova Scotia. They sold off some parcels to obtain funds necessary to improve and stock the remainder.

For others, less committed to setting up a farm in Horton, emigration to Nova Scotia was temporary. Whether engulfed in debt, discouraged by pioneering hardships, or caught up in the speculative fever sweeping the colony, 38 shareholders sold their rights by 1770, putting more than 17,000 acres up for sale. Most of those who departed early in the 1760s sold their land before leaving Horton, but by mid-decade the majority of grants sold were the property of settlers who had returned to New England.
The price varied according to whether a proprietor sold before or after leaving Horton, the buildings and improvements to be included, or if the grant was sold by a disinterested heir, but generally, one share of 500 unimproved acres could be purchased for approximately £100.

The willingness of many grantees to sell at least part of their shares made it possible for anyone with capital to buy land in Horton. A few Halifax businessmen who invested heavily in the lands of the outsettlements took advantage of this opportunity. For instance, in a single purchase, Thomas Cochran, merchant, paid £300 for 138 improvable acres, several size lots and 450 acres of third division wildlands to become the twenty-eighth largest landowner in Horton. Similarly, John Cunningham purchased 272.5 improvable acres, size and island equivalent lots for £253.10.0 and was ranked ninth among Horton landowners. But these men were not typical newcomers. Of 35 non-grantees who purchased land in the 1760s, most owned less than 25 acres; as a group they acquired only 15% of the township's improvable acreage.

Most of the lands sold in the 1760s became the property of proprietors eager to augment their original shares. One quarter of the resident grantees invested substantial sums in the local land market to increase their holdings by an average of 66 improvable acres (Appendix B). A trend towards concentrated land ownership developed. By 1770, the top 20% (40) of Horton landowners controlled one half of the township's improvable acreage; 10 of these landowners owned three times the total acreage of the 78 smallest property holders (Table III). In effect, the balance of population and land was shifting in their favour. Future access to land would be severely limited if these few individuals were not inclined to
### TABLE III. Distribution of Land Among Horton Landowners in 1770

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>by grant ca. 1760</th>
<th>% in 1760</th>
<th>Acreage in 1770</th>
<th>% in 1770</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6296.00</td>
<td>38.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 40%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6388.75</td>
<td>39.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 40%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3611.25</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td>16296.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sell. Only six ranked in the top 20% without purchasing any land. They had been given the larger 1.5 and 2-share rights and by not selling any land, owned some of the largest holdings in 1770. All of them were non-residents. In 1770, seventy-five absentee grantees owned one third of Horton's improvable acreage. Most never ever lived in Horton and their shares were subsequently sold by heirs.

And yet, non-residency did not have to mean inactivity. In 1770, Horton's largest landowner was Halifax merchant and government servant, Joseph Gray. A shrewd businessman, Gray not only consolidated several substantial farms, he purchased a large chunk of third division wild-lands, perhaps speculating on the future value of the properties as tenant estates. Between 1765 and 1769 Gray acquired 94 third division lots at a cost of £5178. He also owned 344 improvable acres, including the 197-acre "Mud Creek Farm" in the "A" tier of the second division farm lots and 170 acres south of the town plot fronting on the Gaspereau River called the "Pear Trees Farm". By 1770, Gray had increased his original 1-share grant of 517 acres to 21,494 acres (Fig. 13).

Gray's closest rival as a Horton landowner was local resident, Charles Dickson. In 1755, Colonel Dickson led a company of New Englanders to Nova Scotia to fight at Beausejour. Five years later he returned with his wife and five children to claim 1.5 shares at Horton. There he became a prominent merchant, politician and landowner. Unlike Joseph Gray, Dickson's land dealings favoured Lower Horton. By 1770 he owned 1475.25 improvable acres, more than four times Gray's improvable acreage and more than three times the improvable property of Horton's third-ranked landowner. His largest improvable tract was the 322-acre farm he owned
on the "Neck" (Figure 14). By the time he died fifteen years later, Dickson had made twice as much money as he had invested in local land and still owned 5418.25 acres, although by that time primarily in the third division. 17

Few of the others who accumulated land emulated Joseph Gray and Charles Dickson. In fact, there seems to be no general pattern to the property acquisitions of the 1760s. Some grantees purchased one or two pieces adjoining, or near, one of their other lots, but few attempted to acquire the most fertile land or to consolidate their holdings into contiguous fields. Land seemed to be acquired for the sake of owning it. As a result, the dispersed land system that had been initiated by the township survey, and perpetuated by the process of pitching size, was entrenched on the landscape by 1770. Horton landowners left their farms spread over several miles, a few acres here, a few more there.

This, in turn, affected the settlement pattern. To compensate for fragmented holdings or to concentrate on what remained of their grants, inhabitants began to build their homes on one of their upland lots. Even in the 1760s settlement began to drift westward, drawing families away from a communal town plot to homesteads often widely separated from each other by the empty fields of absentee proprietors (Figure 15).

Simeon Dewolf's residential mobility illustrates how people moved within the township. A blacksmith from Lyme, Dewolf arrived in Horton between 1761 and 1764 and erected a dwelling, barn, smithy and assorted outbuildings on the town lot of his 1-share grant. By 1768, he had built a frame house on a piece of upland size adjacent to his first division farm lot and moved his family and forge to that site just west of town.
The Lands of Charles Dickson, 1770
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plot. Although he was not Horton's only blacksmith, Dewolf must have believed that his business would not suffer by moving away from the center of town and closer to his farmlands. In fact, his new location on the well-travelled "road to the lower bridge" may have made him more accessible to others who had moved out of town. In 1770, Dewolf moved again. He purchased a house and 100 acres in the second division along the king's highway to Annapolis. In 1779, five years before he died, Dewolf moved for the last time to a dwelling farther west along this road (Figure 16).

There were others who shared Dewolf's wanderlust, but most inhabitants who moved probably did so only once or twice. Although the evidence is impressionistic, it appears that as soon as they could build frame dwellings, most settlers left the crude shelters they had hastily erected at town plot. If they rebuilt at another site, it is likely that their first dwelling was sold or rented, although occasionally the building was moved or torn down so that the lot could be used for agricultural purposes.

Dispersed settlement implies that individuals were concerned more for their families' well-being than for their community. Indeed, separateness may have intensified family bonds. In one extreme example, Andrew Davison's family endangered local inhabitants and challenged township authorities by refusing to remove Andrew Jr. from Horton when he contracted smallpox. As the town constable approached the Davison home, Andrew Sr. and his two sons, Thomas and Asa, threatened to "shoot his brains out" to prevent him from executing his duties. Young Asa added that he would "fight 'till he died in his [brother's] defence". Visits from other local officials met with similar warnings. In the end, Andrew Sr. capitulated by moving his namesake out of Horton until Andrew Jr. recovered from his
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threatening disease. Such displays were rare; nevertheless they illustrate the primacy of family bonds.

Even so, Horton families were not completely introverted; isolation and remoteness were not the inevitable consequences of dispersed settlement. Most farmsteads were accessible by the township's principal roads and community tasks drew Horton's families together. Townsmen served on juries, built and repaired roads, constructed the county courthouse and gaol and repaired the dykes. Farmers enroute to their fields exchanged greetings - and occasionally blows - in the road. Those who shared lots by "drawing in company" had regular opportunities to encounter friends and relatives. While women visited a friend's house, men gathered in groups in each other's homes or at a local inn for a bowl of rum and hearty discussion. During the 1760s most social gatherings were probably this casual; it would take time for formal community structures to emerge.

Unlike neighbouring communities, Horton citizens refused the religious services of Anglican missionary, Joseph Bennett once they could solicit a dissenting minister from Connecticut. Due to the poor economic conditions of the 1760s, however, the inhabitants were unable to sustain ministerial support. Eventually they accepted Presbyterian minister James Murdock who settled among them in 1769. And while the township acquired teacher Elisha Barton in 1767, there was no school built during the first decade of settlement.

In some ways, communal networks extended beyond Horton. Business connections with New England merchants and mariners and sea traffic between Horton and Connecticut must have perpetuated links between Horton residents' and their former homes. News of the outside world reached
Horton through the *Halifax Gazette*, which printed news from England, Boston, Halifax, and even occasionally the outsettlements. But without more detailed information regarding everyday life in eighteenth-century Nova Scotia outsettlements, it is impossible to unravel the web of social and economic connections that may have existed among the townships. Certainly, business transactions, civil duties, and kinship ties cut across township boundaries, but perhaps these exchanges were limited; in the 1760s nearly all Horton marriages were local matches.

Population estimates for 1770 can be derived from the nominal Horton census of 1770 supplemented by family reconstitutions. The Census lists the size and composition of each family according to numbers of men, boys, women and girls. It offers basic demographic information on more families than it is possible to reconstitute from genealogical evidence, but by itself it is an incomplete assessment of Horton's population. The census total of 593 underestimates Horton's population by omitting 32 landowners who were known to have lived in Horton in 1770. As well, it fails to indicate the age at which an individual was classified as an adult which makes census designations of adult and child virtually useless. Thus family reconstitutions supplement the census data by completing the census total and by providing a sample for analyzing the age and sex structure of the population in 1770.

The analysis shows that at the same time as access to land was narrowing in Horton, the population was on the rise. If census figures are accurate, the population had increased from 689 in 1763 to approximately 743 by 1770. A reconstituted sample of 50 families reveals that the population was young and therefore held potential for substantial future
increase. Slightly more than one quarter (28.82%) of the inhabitants were under 11 years of age, more than one half (54.87%) were less than 21 years old and three quarters were no older than thirty. The ratio of males to females was approximately equal.

Comparing census data and genealogical information reveals that for the most part, seventeen was the age at which both males and females were listed as adults on the census. As well, in fifteen instances there are discrepancies in family size between the two sources, and the census figure is usually higher. For example, Caleb Bennett's family of five is recorded as eleven; instead of six, Lebbeus Harris is said to have had eleven in his family; and Charles Dickson's family of five was doubled on the return. If inflated family sizes reflect a deliberate attempt to exaggerate Horton's population, it is unlikely that some townsmen would have been left off the return. As well, some of the largest variations occur in the families of some of Horton's largest landowners, including the top three residents. When the difference was less significant, it is most often in the addition of an extra girl to the family. Since all family members are accounted for, these numbers suggest the presence of servants or slaves in Horton. It is conceivable that some families had a servant girl, while more substantial households could afford one or more adult men and women to do domestic chores or work in the fields. If this is true, the census figures measure household and not family size. It also means that a small number of households had access to a limited labour supply outside their families.
Because most of Horton's surviving documentation is at least indirectly linked to landholding, it is difficult to assess the extent of landlessness in Horton, but during the early years of settlement, numbers were probably small. The financial costs of establishing the infrastructures of settlement probably intensified the widespread intolerance of citizens towards the parasitic wandering poor.  

Tenancy further reduced the number with no access to land. In Horton, there was the opportunity to cultivate one or more lots or an entire farm "at the halves". According to English travellers Robinson and Rispin, writing in the early 1770s, this agreement allowed a poor man to take a farm, stocked by the landlord, for which the latter receives for the rent, half its produce; or, for every cow, thirty pounds of butter, half the cheese; and so on in proportion of whatever else the farm produces.

By renting land, destitution could be avoided. But by the same token, rental obligations probably prevented tenants from scraping together enough to buy land of their own. Seven men with no record of owning land or having family connections in Horton registered agricultural returns on the Horton Census of 1770. Although their agricultural productivity was comparable to middling landowners, none of these men gained a foothold in the community. There is no evidence that they ever purchased land and they are all missing from the 1791 Poll Tax.

Horton farmers initially practised an unspecialized agriculture. In Horton, as in all Fundy townships, land uses overlapped: the Grand Pré dykeland grew both hay and grain and it became a common pasture in the
Fall; the uplands provided the main pastures but they also produced Indian corn and root crops. Only the low salt marshes which supported coarse grasses and the common woodlands of the third division were restricted to one land use.

Not surprisingly, early agricultural productivity fluctuated. In 1763, the King's County townships overcame problems of drought and insects to raise modest amounts of wheat, rye, corn, root crops and a variety of livestock including cows, neat cattle, sheep and swine. Four years later, the aggregate agricultural census of Horton indicated growth and diversification. Wheat yields had almost tripled and farmers harvested five times the amount of rye grown in 1763. In addition, peas, barley, oats, flax and hemp had been added to the fields and the numbers of all types of livestock had multiplied. According to the census, Horton ranked fourth behind Lunenburg (which had twice the population), Windsor (the home of many country estates of wealthy Haligonians) and Cornwallis in production of most crops and livestock.

In 1770, however, production was lower. Generally yields had decreased and there were fewer animals; only wheat and flax production and numbers of sheep had increased (Table IV). These fluctuations in production could be indicative of nothing more than the incidence of a late spring, poor summer weather, or an inclement harvest in the particular year selected for comparison. What is significant is that this narrowing of production suggests a trend toward specialization. The Horton census of 1770 reveals that roughly two thirds of the farmers raised at least 20 bushels of both wheat and flax, while fewer than half the producers cultivated any other crop listed on the return. And if they were found on
### TABLE IV. Aggregate Agricultural Production in Horton by Census Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Rye</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Roots</th>
<th>Pease</th>
<th>Barley</th>
<th>Oats</th>
<th>Beans</th>
<th>Hemp Seed</th>
<th>Flax Seed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>4613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>593 (Census)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3259</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hemp</th>
<th>Flax</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Oxen</th>
<th>Cows</th>
<th>Young Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Swine</th>
<th>Salmon</th>
<th>Dried Cod</th>
<th>Fishing Boats</th>
<th>Grist Mills</th>
<th>Saw Mills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1767</td>
<td>83cw</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>346</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1770</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3010</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>92q.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
fewer farms than cows, sheep were nevertheless kept in appreciably larger numbers than any other livestock.

What did these aggregate production levels mean for the ability of Horton farmers to provide for their families? Did a tendency toward specialization indicate that at least some farmers raised a surplus? There is no data on production and consumption to estimate subsistence levels at Horton. Annual consumption levels, calculated by extrapolating the needs of an average family from widows' allotments in probate inventories, cannot be determined from Horton dowers which usually list only furniture and other personal household goods. The only extant nominal agricultural return for the Horton before 1850 is the Census of 1770. It lists family size, crop production and livestock totals by household head but it does not provide yields per acre per farm which is necessary to measure production by farm. Because of the multiplicity of land uses and the unknown state of cleared land by farm, it is also impossible to correlate reconstituted landholdings with crop yields to determine production levels.

Still, farm size can provide an interpretative framework for analyzing nominal agricultural data. The individuals listed on the 1770 census were divided into three groups (top 20%, mid 40%, bottom 40%) according to the size of their landholding in improvable acres. Averaging farm size and crop yields for each of the three groups resulted in three distinct farm types. The characteristics of these "types" were compared to American estimates of the minimum acreage required to produce a basic food supply. Admittedly, this procedure is crude; however, it does make an attempt to correlate farm size and agricultural production and it provides at least
an impressionistic statement of Horton's agricultural system.

In his study of eighteenth-century Pennsylvania, James Lemon estimated that a minimum of 27 acres could provide adequate subsistence. Of the food crops found on the 1770 Horton Census, Lemon calculated the requirements for a Pennsylvania family of five as 60 bushels of wheat, 50-100 pounds of flax, 25 bushels of rye, 45 bushels of oats, and 20 bushels of barley and malt. According to these requirements, most families were still struggling to obtain life's basic necessities ten years after they arrived in Horton. For example, farmers in the bottom 40% of Horton landowners possessed on average, slightly less than the minimum acreage identified by Lemon as necessary for adequate subsistence, and their meagre crop yields reflected their primitive agricultural practices (Table V). An average farm consisted of a town lot, 2.5 acres of Grand Pré dykeland, 5 acres of first division farmland, 4.5 acres in an island lot and only 11 acres in a second division farm lot. These farmers had an average of 6 sheep, but they owned fewer cows and neat cattle. And while all farmers raised wheat, yields were not only far less than Lemon's basic estimate, they also represented less than one quarter of the total production for the township.

Many pioneers who struggled with this hard-scrabble existence were inexperienced young men trying to get established in a new land. Samuel Denison, for instance, was only fifteen years old when he came to Horton with his family to receive his own one-half share in the 1761 Effective Grant. His father's death five years later left Samuel with the family dwelling and two adjacent lots at town plot, £14 and an additional £5 to be paid in currency or stock. But the benefits of this legacy and £40
### TABLE V. Average Farm Size and Crop Yields in Horton in 1770

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Landowners on 1770 Census</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Distribution of Acreage</th>
<th>£ value of farm</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 40%</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>0.50 2.57 5.05 4.51</td>
<td>£ 24.02</td>
<td>1.48 86</td>
<td>1.62 67</td>
<td>3.38 86</td>
<td>2.76 67</td>
<td>6.43 67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 40%</td>
<td>74.23</td>
<td>0.58 2.97 7.73 4.88</td>
<td>£ 74.23</td>
<td>1.18 70</td>
<td>2.03 73</td>
<td>3.58 97</td>
<td>4.03 85</td>
<td>10.24 67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>346.69</td>
<td>12.11 17.78 56.47 18.43</td>
<td>£346.68</td>
<td>3.71 90</td>
<td>5.64 90</td>
<td>8.86 100</td>
<td>8.64 90</td>
<td>26.29 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Landowners on 1770 Census</th>
<th>Wheat (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>Rye (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>Pease (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>Barley (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>Oats (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>Beans (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>Flax Seed (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
<th>Flax (bu.)</th>
<th>% of Total Producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 40%</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid 40%</td>
<td>32.58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38.03</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>99.43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49.29</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
revenue from the sale of his wildlands did not prompt Samuel to increase or improve his holdings in the next five years. Although he called himself a yeoman, in 1770 Samuel owned two horses and two cows; his only crop was ten bushels of wheat.

Generally, middling landowners did not fare much better than young Denison. Farmers in the middle 40% of Horton landowners owned three times the mean improvable acreage of their counterparts in the bottom two fifths of society, but their holdings differed only in the larger size of their second division farm lots. Crop yields were only slightly higher than those of the bottom 40% and they were still well below comparable American subsistence estimates. While more farmers raised livestock, only sheep were kept in appreciably larger numbers than on the smaller farms. Some men, such as John Bishop Sr., had sold off part of their share and clearly, they were not interested in farming on a grand scale. At age 60, John had only his wife and a girl to support on the 54 improvable acres remaining of his 1.5 share and his 1770 census return of 100 bushels of flax and a handful of livestock probably reflected his semi-retirement. And yet there were a few men like Benjamin Peck Jr., who strove to better themselves from the beginning. At the age of 21, Peck had obtained .5 share at Horton in 1761. By 1770, he had married, started a family, added 33 acres to his property (and thereby moved from the bottom to the middle 40% of landowners). He grew moderate amounts of a variety of crops, including wheat, rye, pease, oats and flax, but he focused more on livestock. His production in this area was impressive by local standards: with 10 swine, a flock of 35 sheep, and herds of 11 cows, 12 neat cattle, and 4 oxen and bulls, he had acquired more livestock than any other middling
More often, Horton's most successful husbandmen were its principal landowners. Yet, on average, the agricultural output of the top 20% of Horton's landowners only barely met basic subsistence requirements although they held thirteen times the required minimum acreage.

No rates of clearing Horton land have survived; yet even at the pace of farmers who levelled a thick Ontario forest to clear 5 acres a year, sufficient acreage could have been cleared and prepared for planting in the first ten years to allow Horton farmers to produce more prodigiously. The reasons why they did not do so remain unclear. It is evident, however, that dispersed holdings, scarce labour, difficulties in obtaining stock and seed, poor markets and the problems of adjusting to farming a new land were common hardships of eighteenth-century Nova Scotia farmers. Together they stood in the way of efficient agriculture.

Because of the struggle for subsistence during the 1760s, it is remarkable that some farmers produced a surplus. One tenth of all producers raised extra wheat, averaging twice as much (233 bu.) as required for home consumption. In addition, thirty-two farmers raised more than the 8 sheep needed for subsistence: 43 nine had herds of between 10 and 20; nine others raised between 21 and 30; and seven owned from 31 to 58 sheep. Lebbeus Harris owned the largest herd of 90 sheep. While the top wheat producers were also Horton's principal landowners and farmers, the leading sheep herders also included the less successful small and middling farmers. This might indicate that sheep products provided a dietary supplement for farmers who produced less food than they needed. In any case, due to the generally low productivity and the distance to external markets,
the surplus was undoubtedly consumed locally.

Since agriculture during the 1760s produced such a meagre food supply, it is unlikely that Hortonians lived by farming alone. Evidence of non-farming activities is scant, but it is reasonable to assume that settlers used all local resources. Perhaps they practiced an occupational pluralism, making ends meet by fishing and hunting, and occasionally going to the mountain for loads of wood to sell.

In 1770, the settlement at Horton was still in its infancy. Most of the township's wooded interior was inaccessible, accessed land was underutilized, agriculture was primitive and the formal structures of community did not exist. Still, it is clear that even at the outset, the characteristics of the socially and economically-stratified communities of Connecticut were being replicated in Horton. Access to land was not an equalizing factor that pared away all economic and social distinctions among the inhabitants to yield a homogeneous and egalitarian society. Rather, economic polarization had begun in the first decade. By 1770, a small group owned one half of the township's improvable land and raised a surplus of wheat and sheep, despite environmental and economic impediments to productivity.

The "lesser sorts" imitated the leaders in limited ways. Some accumulated land, some raised extra sheep, and a few did both, but most were forced to seek a more immediate if ultimately less rewarding source of profit through the sale of their lands. To be sure, ambitious men like Benjamin Peck Jr. still found opportunities for advancement, but as the gap between rich and poor narrowed, such occasions would become narrowly restricted.
A relatively small group of men motivated more by personal success than communal goals shaped Horton's character. They followed a strategy that in Connecticut had been associated with economic success: land accumulation, agricultural specialization and surplus production. That is not to say that they were totally consumed by the pursuit of profit, only that it formed the central aspect of their outlook or mentalité. Thus, instead of a ready-made community of "planters", Horton was settled by individuals and families who behaved as such by dispersing from a protective nucleated settlement to practise family-oriented agriculture on homesteads scattered throughout the township.
Footnotes

1 For a discussion of the Connecticut literature, see chapter 2, footnote 9.


3 Minutes of the Executive Council, R.G. 3, v. 211, p. 340, April 9, 1764; v. 212, pp. 64-65, July 15, 1767, October 12, 1767.

4 The following analysis of Horton landholding patterns uses all deeds recorded in R.G. 47, King's County, reels 1273, 1274. It should be noted that Horton's extant registered deeds are not a complete record of all land transactions. For example, in reconstituting individual landholdings it was discovered that there are deeds for the sale of one or more lots for which there was no record of purchase.

5 The average number of deeds recorded by grantees from 1760 to 1770 was 4.5. Non-grantees have been excluded from these calculations because otherwise they could be included by making a single purchase in the late 1760s, which would skew the general trends. Unlike Chebacco, Mass. in Christopher M. Jedrey, The World of John Cleveland. Family and Community in Eighteenth Century New England (New York: 1979), pp. 65-66, there is no difference in landowning behavior between those with more than and those with less than five transactions.

6 The following discussion of landowning behavior is based on an analysis of the dates, locations, acreages and prices of all lots bought and sold by every known landowner in Horton between 1760 and 1770.

7 Resident and absentee grantees are examined separately because their landholding practices were markedly different. Net profit/deficit is calculated as the difference between the prices cited for lots purchased and those sold during the decade. It excludes the monetary values of that portion of the original grant still owned in 1770, and therefore it does not measure the cash equivalent of total wealth in land.

8 Documentary references to "size" lots often do not specify acreages. For this reason, "size" is not included in calculations of "improvable" acreage in this discussion, although it may have been among the most valuable and frequently cultivated acreage any farmer owned. See chapter 2, footnote 35.
The other one quarter are discussed above as that group of landowners who made a profit without reducing the size of their landholding.

That one quarter of the complete removals of Horton grantees occurred in 1760 and 1761 argues strongly for speculation as a motive behind some New Englanders obtaining Nova Scotia land grants.

Only two grantees who left Horton for good remained in Nova Scotia. Amos Fuller moved to Cumberland and Benjamin Woodworth settled in Cornwallis. Known New England destinations for grantees who left Horton between 1760 and 1770 are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connecticut</th>
<th>New Hampshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New London</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonington</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glosenbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Thomas Cochran's Horton deeds of the 1760s, see R.G. 47, reel 1273, v. 3, p. 152.


There is no evidence to suggest how non-residents might have contributed their required share of capital and labour needed to establish the infrastructures of settlement. Perhaps, as in Sackville Township, N.B., local agents agreed to meet the obligations of non-residents (see James Snowdon, "Footprints in the Marsh Mud: Politics and Land Settlement in the Township of Sackville, 1760-1800" (University of New Brunswick, Masters thesis, 1975, p. 89) since only a few Horton absenteees were reprimanded on this account. Censure usually resulted from delinquent dyke rates or unpaid survey bills.

Although the final disposition of Gray's Horton lands is unknown, he probably profited from this strategy; as early as the late 1770s, settlers were carving farmland out of the township's wooded interior. As well, Gray had tenants on his farms known as "The Pear Trees" and "Mud Creek" discussed below.


For mention of Simeon Dewolf's houses, see R.G. 47, reel 1273, v. 1, pp. 56, 214; v. 2, p. 116; v. 3, p. 296; reel 1274, v. 4, p. 97.

In eighteenth-century societies it was customary to quarantine smallpox cases by moving them away from the community to prevent the spread of the contagion. The Davison smallpox case can be found in the Records of King's County Court of Quarter Sessions, M.G. 1, v. 183, #1, #2, #4, #5.

For references to the various civic responsibilities, see the Records of the King's County Court of Quarter Sessions, M.G. 1, v. 181ff.

According to Records of the Court of Quarter Sessions, it was not uncommon for assaults to occur in the highway, which indicates that residents often encountered each other as they travelled the local roadways.

A letter from Horton town clerk, Nathan Dewolf to Rev. Joseph Bennett dated August 10, 1765, terminated Bennett's services in the township with the reason that the township had obtained a dissenting minister (Micro: Miscellaneous: Societies: S.P.G. reel 73, #69. For Bennett's comments on the arrival and subsequent departure of the dissenting minister, see ibid., #66, #76, #106, #127. See also the "Invitation to Settlement" issued by the residents of Horton to Rev. Daniel Fuller, M.G. 1, v. 181, #245.

For example, deeds show that Horton grantee George Stocking was in Horton in July 1765, and before 1772 he had permanently left Horton for Glosenbury, Connecticut. Another grantee, John Randal removed to Colchester, Connecticut, between May 1769 and August 1769. In 1772 he returned to Horton.
The records of the King's County Inferior Court of Common Pleas indicate the existence of inter-township business transactions. For litigations involving residents of more than one township, see for example: Charles Dickson, Horton, vs. Caleb Wheaton, Cornwallis; Robert Thompson, Horton, vs. Peter Wickwire, Cornwallis; Daniel Connolly, Windsor vs. William Dickson, Horton, R.G. 37.

Eighteen marriages (involving Horton residents) are known to have occurred in the 1760s. In all but two instances, both partners were from Horton.


"Return of the Families Settled in the Townships of Horton, Cornwallis, Falmouth, and Newport in King's County, together with the number of persons said families exhibit of and of their stock of cattle and grains and Roots raised the present year 1763", M.G. 1, v. 471, #2. Rev. Joseph Bennett estimated the population at 670 for the same year, Micro: Miscellaneous: Societies: S.P.G. reel #73, #29. In 1767, the population decreased to 634, "A General Return ... 1767", ibid.

A.W.H. Eaton in The History of Kings County, N.S. (Salem: 1910) discussed the presence of slaves in Nova Scotia and particularly in King's County, but his references are for Cornwallis Township and Halifax; although it is very possible that there were also slaves at Horton, no reference to them was found in any of the extant documents.

Although there is no evidence of the New England custom of "warnings out" of town of undesirables, Horton's Court of Quarter Sessions Records illustrate the reluctance of the inhabitants to be responsible for the community's bastard children, so it is reasonable to assume that they would not be very receptive to indigent transients. See, for example, M.G. 1, v. 183, #32, #33, #66, #87-90.

For references to rented lots see R.G. 47, reel 1273, v. 1, p. 47; v. 2, pp. 7, 90, 167; v. 3, pp. 223, 364, 431, 562, 609; reel 1274, v. 4, p. 356; v. 5, p. 32; v. 6, p. 369.

Robinson and Rispin, "A Journey ...", p. 98.

Poll Tax of Horton Township, 1791, R.G. 1, v. 444.

"Return of the Families ... 1763", ibid.

General Return of the Townships, 1767, ibid.

Although they were not included in the analysis, the 32 landowners omitted from the Census are represented by these types.


Lemon, ibid., p. 155.

The will of Robert Denison, R.G. 48, reel 550, Hants County willbook, p. 14, June 25, 1765.

In Horton, "yeoman" meant more than freeholder. In occupational identifications it seems to have been interchangeable with "farmer" and "husbandman" and it was the most commonly used of these terms in local documents.

The estimate of five acres a year is quoted in Kenneth Kelly, "The Impact of Nineteenth Century Agricultural Settlement on the Land", in J.D. Wood, ed., Perspectives on Landscape and Settlement in Nineteenth Century Ontario (Carleton Library: 1975), p. 103. In addition, 4 acres per share was located on the cleared Grand Pré; and according to Charles Morris' Map of Horton Township, 1760, the upland southwest of town plot was "cleared".

Christopher M. Jedrey, The World ..., pp. 65-66, estimates that 8 sheep were necessary for annual subsistence.
In "The Simplification of Europe Overseas", Annals, Association of American Geographers, v. 67 (1977), pp. 469-483, R. Cole Harris has argued that Europeans of diverse socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds built homogeneous and egalitarian societies in colonial settings. Social change due to changed conditions in the new environment, particularly in the availability of cheap land and poor market conditions pared away many traits unsuited to the new situation. Changes in land availability and markets over several generations led to a restratification of society. For a further discussion of Harris' theory, see chapter 5, pp. 107-108.
CHAPTER 4

Land and Inheritance

In the late 1770s Nova Scotia faced an economic recession and a small-pox epidemic; the religious fervor of the "New Light" revival swept through the colony and Yankee privateers raided Nova Scotian coastal settlements during the American Révolution. At the war's end, thousands of Loyalist refugees wanting to build a new life and expecting a tangible reward for their loyalty to the Crown flocked to the remaining British colonies of North America.

To prepare to receive a large influx of settlers the Nova Scotia Government repatriated large tracts of land granted during the land boom of the 1760s but never occupied. In peninsular Nova Scotia alone half a million of the 5.5 million acres issued since the late 1750s were escheated by 1783; in the next five years 2.5 million more were returned to the Crown. This process opened up large tracts of land in what later became Annapolis, Digby, Shelburne and Guysborough counties as well as smaller areas along the Shubenacadie River, Cobequid Bay and the Windsor Road. Still, much of the colony's more accessible and fertile lands remained in the control of New Englanders who had established townships in the early 1760s. Few Loyalists seeking a freehold settled in these communities where free land was no longer available.

All of Horton's land had been granted within a few years of 1761; there was neither a reserve for newcomers nor additional land for sons of the founding settlers. Although land was available for purchase,
circumstances may have made it difficult to acquire. Active trading in land during the 1760s had given a small group control of most of the best township lands. In the next twenty years much of this was kept out of circulation; as measured by the number of deeds registered, land transactions occurred at little more than half the rate that marked the 1760s.

Access to land was further reduced by escalating prices, driven upward by a rising demand and shrinking supply of land. Any comparison of Horton land prices over time is risky because the impact of the type of sale (i.e., private or public auction), soil quality, improvements and location on price are impossible to determine, although they surely were felt; lots of equal acreage in similar parts of the township were sold for different sums at almost the same time. In absolute terms though, prices increased. With time and the progression of settlement, buying land meant paying for improvements such as clearing, fencing, cultivation and perhaps even a house, barn and outbuildings. Because less expensive unimproved properties were not often offered for sale, the price of land was pushed out of reach of some.

As the threshold of access to land rose, the population of Horton increased. By extrapolation from the number of adult men listed on the Poll Tax of 1791, the population of Horton in that year can be estimated at 1175; this was an increase of 63% over the 1770 total. Such growth can be attributed in part to the high rate of persistence among the founding settlers and their families. Twenty-six of the 184 original Horton landholders are known to have died by 1790. Of the remaining 158, fully 120 certainly lived in Horton in 1791; the proportion may well have been higher because we do not know that some of the apparently missing 30
did not continue to live in Horton unrecorded.

Immigration was another component of population growth. Horton attracted several newcomers in the 1770s and 1780s. Fully 117 of these appeared as new names (not on the 1770 Census) on the Poll Tax: a few were Loyalists, some came from Ireland and others moved from Cornwallis and Falmouth, but the origins of most are unknown. So too are the reasons they came to Horton. Some (perhaps seven) men settled Horton land included in the dowries of their local brides. Others may have had little choice but to move to Horton or one of the other settled communities in the colony. Between 1770 and 1783 Crown lands were available by purchase; because prices were relatively high there was little settlement of unoccupied land and newcomers gravitated into established towns in search of other opportunities. Even the relatively well-to-do British migrants of the 1770s came, as Governor Legge observed not "with the expectation of having lands granted to them", but "to purchase, ... perhaps to become tenants" or "to labour".

This was certainly the pattern followed by many of those who settled in Horton after 1770. Only one fifth purchased land in the next twenty years and only half ever acquired real property. In 1791 two thirds made their living as wage labourers. Revealingly, less than half of those registered as farmers on the Poll Tax owned land. To farm they had to rent land. Tenancy had become an important facet of the economic structure of the community.

Tenant farmers were only slightly better off than the landless. True, they were husbandmen but still they laboured largely for the benefit of someone else. The lease between Joseph Gray and John Wallace for the
Pear Trees Farm was typical of agreements that outlined responsibilities of landlord and tenant in greater detail than the alternative "renting at the halves". The Pear Trees Farm was located southeast of town plot along the north shore of the Gaspereau River. It consisted of 103 acres of upland and 67 acres of marsh. In 1773 Gray leased the land, house, barn, farming utensils and one yoke of oxen to Wallace. The rent in the first year, was £6 and Wallace had to bear the expense of keeping four yearling heifers and five calves for two years; thereafter the rent was £8 and Wallace had the cost of feeding livestock each ensuing year for three years after the marsh in front of the farm was diked (the lease did not specify who was responsible for diking or precisely when it was to be done), at which time the lease expired. In addition, Wallace was responsible for fencing and the general upkeep of the farm. Unless he made enough money above and beyond these obligations to make significant strides toward economic independence in the three or more years that he worked the Pear Trees, renting was a dead end for Wallace because when his lease ended he returned everything to his landlord.

As land grew scarce in Horton, everyman's opportunity to own a farm diminished. Between 1770 and 1791 the number of farmers in Horton decreased by one third (Tables VI and VII). There were also fewer artisans and professionals on a proportional basis, and by 1791 labourers comprised almost half (47%) the workforce. They were not simply farmers' sons; Hortonians of the second generation accounted for only one quarter of this occupational group. Of the remainder, only one quarter had lived in Horton in 1770. Once landowners, they had sold their property for one reason or another, but continued to seek a living there. The rest were
TABLE VI. Occupations of the Adult Male Workforce, 1770 and 1791

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th></th>
<th>1791</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquire</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer/Yeoman</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.59</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>38.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>47.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwright</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordwainer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeon/Doctor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolmaster/Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innkeeper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of vessel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat owner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE VII. Composition of the Adult Male Work Force by Occupational Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>1770</th>
<th>1791</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esquire</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** The breakdown of occupations in 1770 is derived from deeds, wills and Court of Quarter Sessions Records; the source for 1791 is the Poll Tax.
newcomers to the community. Although it is difficult to tell what kinds of labour were performed, scattered references suggest that men were hired for a variety of unskilled and semi-skilled tasks, most of them farm-related.

It was in this climate of economic hardship that a religious revival swept through Nova Scotia. Led by Falmouth "New Light" itinerant preacher Henry Alline, Nova Scotia's "Great Awakening" corresponded with Alline's career, lasting from 1776 to 1784. It was strongest in the area around the Minas Basin where Alline confined his activities. Most interpretations of this evangelical movement have been concerned with intellectual origins, particularly the connection between the dilemma of mixed loyalties New Englanders in Nova Scotia are assumed to have experienced during the American Revolution, the consequent identity crisis that transformed Yankees into Nova Scotians and this expression of religious unrest. Arguing that religious enthusiasm seemed to build only after the military threat declined, J.M. Bumsted has diverged from this conceptual approach in suggesting the importance of the economic dimension and frontier conditions to understanding the Nova Scotia revival. According to Bumsted, "the discontent born of immediate economic hardship ... [and] the psychological uneasiness born of having pulled up roots elsewhere to settle in Nova Scotia ... made almost all rural Nova Scotians susceptible in various degrees of revivalism." Conditions at Horton support Bumsted's contention of hard times in the outsettlements. Indeed, economic hardship was not only a result of frontier conditions as Bumsted has suggested, the stratification of early Horton society on the basis of landed wealth may have caused even greater
discontent for inhabitants who were worse off than others. Whether socioeconomic disparity in the community found expression as religious revivalism can be assessed only with further analysis of the impact of "New Light" evangelism on Hortonians. This investigation should begin by reconstructing the economic background of the membership of the "New Light" Church founded at Horton in 1778. As well, since criticism of his religious doctrine eventually forced Alline to focus his ministry in the scattered and isolated communities of the Minas Basin area, the relative importance of the New Light Church to Horton society, i.e., whether most of the community or only an impassioned few experienced a "great awakening", also must be measured.

If there is a correlation between immediate financial distress and participation in the Revival, it is unlikely that Horton's "New Light" Church drew its membership from among the maturing sons of Horton's founding settlers. Seventy-three males who reached their majority between 1770 and 1791 were included on the Poll Tax. They ranged in age from 21 to 49; thirty are known to have been married in 1791 and had from one to seven children at that date. Had they depended solely on their own resources, these young men would have shared the struggles and the fates of most newcomers to the township. Instead, they fared much better. By 1791, one half owned at least a few acres, and barely a quarter were wage labourers. Even these men had reasonable prospects of improving their status; all but seven second generation males eventually acquired land.

That Horton's sons did better on average than newcomers, suggests the economic importance of parental support. So far as we can tell, relatively few sons were "settled with a farm" or otherwise directly
provided for by their fathers; most were not given total autonomy. Rather, farmers allowed one or more of their sons to occupy part of the family's holdings informally for years with the understanding that title would be transferred to him or them at their decease. Rarely were marriages and families significantly delayed by these arrangements; investing their labour on land that would one day be theirs, young men took brides, had families and quite probably applied any profits from this farming to the purchase of a few acres of their own. In this way the second generation escaped the hardships experienced by other Hortonians. Still, they were locked into a prolonged dependence on their fathers. Only with the deaths of their fathers and the settlement of their estates did sons acquire financial freedom.

Few men were inactive in transmitting their worldly goods to the next generation. Of those estates whose transfer was recorded only 10% were distributed by the Probate Court. In these cases the pattern was well established. The deceased's real and personal property went to the widow; debts were paid; the residue was divided according to the number of surviving children; a double share went to the eldest son and one share to each of the others.

In all other instances, the transfer between the generations was carefully laid out in a last will and testament. The wills of forty males who died between 1762 and 1831 reveal the variety of generational bequests in Horton. Drawn from the spectrum of all but the wealthiest landowners and representing almost every occupation in Horton, these individuals died between the ages of 56 and 97 and left completed families ranging from one to twelve but averaging eight persons.
Daughters, who received a dowry from their parents when they married, did not figure prominently in their fathers' wills. In Horton, as in many other communities, they usually received a share of the household furniture at their mother's decease and occasionally a small cash legacy. Some were given remote third division wildland. A few whose fathers held substantial property received more valuable bequests of land. Rocksdel, second daughter of Benjamin Cleaveland received a farm valued at £75. Similarly, Amelia Bishop received extensive holdings of upland, marsh and woodland on the Windsor Road, Gaspereau River, Boot Island and Grand Pré from her father John Jr. But generally, eighteenth-century custom excluded daughters from an inheritance of family land because marriage transferred the bride's property to her husband unless other legal provisions were made.

In the minds of individuals as well as in those of the community, the ability to provide sons with a landed inheritance measured the success of a lifetime directed toward establishing an enduring family patrimony. One half of the testators divided their land among two or more of their sons. As elsewhere, Horton testators used their wills to direct the lives of family members and the promise of a landed inheritance was a profound force shaping the lives of a testator's children. Obadiah Benjamin, for instance, spent a lifetime building a legacy which he could pass on to his four sons. In 1761, thirty year old Benjamin had come to Horton with his wife Mary and two young sons from Preston, Connecticut to receive one share in the township grant. Shortly afterward, he erected a sawmill on the upper Gaspereau River. This may have been financed by the sale of some of his property in the early 1760s. Although Bishop's Mill located
further downstream and closer to the focus of early settlement probably offered stiff competition, the Benjamin Mill prospered. Benjamin identified himself as a yeoman and raised livestock. In 1770 he owned 20 sheep, 16 oxen, 2 cows, 2 neat cattle, 4 swine and 1 horse. His only crops were 50 bushels of flax and 4 bushels of oats. By this time his family included five sons and two daughters. In the next sixteen years, he invested a substantial sum in consolidating second division farm lots and woodlots in the area of his mill as well as in acquiring marshland on Boot Island. Despite his apparent prosperity, Benjamin never gave or sold land to any of his three sons who married during this time, nor did he help them to buy land on the open market. Not until 1802, three years before his death in 1805, did Benjamin deed land to his two eldest sons, Stephen and Caleb. If these bequests were similar to that conferred on their younger brother Abel (who received the land "on which his dwelling stood" in his father's will), the elder sons likely lived on their properties for many years before acquiring official title to them. By 1802 they were approaching middle age. Stephen, who had been married for twenty-one years, was forty-five years old and had a family of nine, when his father gave him 160 acres in the vicinity of the sawmill. Caleb was forty-one years old and had seven children from his marriage of eighteen years before he received title to 164 acres. Since turning seventeen, both sons had spent upwards of twenty-five years dependent on their father's goodwill for their livelihood and the support of their families. In receiving their portions late in life, Benjamin's sons were typical of their generation.
Settlers less successful than Obed Benjamin, who did not climb from the low or middling economic position they acquired in 1770, faced more difficult decisions about the transmission of real property to the next generation. Forced to recognize even in the 1790s that the limits of good agricultural land had been reached in Horton and that the rising threshold of accessibility put land at a premium, they rarely subdivided their holdings. Almost one half (43%) of Horton testators bequeathed all of their real estate to one son. In some cases this represented the last of several disbursements that had begun many years before, rather than deliberate primogeniture. Even so, many of these testators had sizeable holdings, property which could have been divided among all of their offspring. By choosing to favour only one, these men preserved the integrity of the family farm in a way probably calculated to ensure the family's social and economic position in a farming community.

Just as gender influenced the inheritance of land, so birth order generally affected the timing and quality of that inheritance. When families included more than one or two children, older sons likely knew that the interests of themselves and their families were best served by their receiving an advance on their inheritance. One of the younger sons could expect, in time, to own the family farmhouse and adjoining fields.

But those who inherited all, or the best of, parental lands, paid a personal and financial price. Besides the long wait to receive legal title to the lands they occupied, principal heirs were often obligated to provide cash legacies for the female, and sometimes male heirs. This could mean that sons who inherited the bulk of the estate paid dearly for a small or middling property inheritance.
Horton testators often attempted to ease this financial strain by staggering payments over several years. Alpheus Harris, for example, was required to pay a total of £14 in legacies one year after the decease of his father, Lebbeus Jr. and £13 in the next year. When his mother died, he had to pay an additional £7 over the first two years and £5 in the third year. Similarly, James Lockhart's son Daniel became responsible for a payment totalling £68 when he inherited all his father's real estate. Ten pounds of this was payable one year after his father's decease; £8 was due two years later; and the rest came due after his mother's death when he received the residue of the estate. Then Daniel paid £10 a year to each of the heirs for the next five years.

Another obstacle to an unencumbered inheritance was the debt a testator accumulated during his lifetime. In late eighteenth-century Horton, goods and services were purchased with promissory notes, by assuming another man's debts, or on account at long term credit. At death, a man was invariably indebted to several of his neighbours. Of course, they were probably indebted to him as well, but in those cases in which lists of both debts and assets have survived, debits consistently outweighed credits. Sometimes the principal heir was expected to assume his father's debts but usually the estate was liable for payment. Executors sometimes auctioned off the personal estate, and then as much of the real estate as necessary to meet demands against the estate. Although only three auction bills exist for the testators under examination, frequent mention of auctions in estate inventories and deeds suggests that they were often used to untangle a testator's finances prior to the administration of his estate.
Of thirty-three couples for whom both dates are known, more than three quarters (79%) of the wives outlived their husbands. In last wills and testaments the size and composition of the wife's bequest varied but generally it reflected the testator's concern for the widow's subsistence and not her economic freedom. Nine husbands willed their widows one third or one half of their estate, and in effect made the community responsible for the widow's welfare. As with intestate settlements, Court-appointed appraisers determined, in consultation with the widow, the form the support would take. As might be expected, the items women chose for their dower reflected their pre-occupation with the home and their dependence on others to supply life's necessities. Typically, they selected one or more beds with bedding, a few pieces of furniture, linen and most of all, kitchenware. Rarely did they pick livestock, tools or harvested crops. The detail offered in the dower descriptions show that the Court protected the widow's rights from any threat of legal challenge from any other heir. Lydia Peck's Decree of Division, for example, defined the boundaries of her lots, designated her rooms in the family dwelling, determined rights of way for her horses and even gave her "the privilege of a comfortable seat in that very necessary little Building at the South East angle of the Garden".

Half the testators specified annual cash allowances or annuities of food, firewood, and provisions for their widows. Seven husbands made the comfort and support of their widows a condition of the inheritances willed to one or more of their sons. Half the testators specified annual cash allowances or annuities of food, firewood, and provisions for their widows. The other half arranged for their widows to be supported from the rents
and profits of their real estate. This tied the widow's financial security to the farming skill of the son who assumed management of the family farm.

To provide for the widow's living arrangements, one half of the testators divided the dwelling into east-west apartments by specifying rooms or a fraction (one third, one half) of the dwelling for the widow's use. Andrew Davison was typical of these testators in giving his wife Eunice:

the use and improvement of the Northwest bedroom and other Bedroom adjoining therto [sic], the west Parlour in my Dwelling house, the privilege of using the Back Kitchen, one third part of the cellar under said house and one Chamber with full right and Liberty of passing and repassing to and from the said Several apartments in the said house as she shall and may have occasion [sic] and whenever she pleases.24

In all but a few cases, the property a widow received through her husband's will for her natural life or widowhood was intended for her use but not her disposal. Samuel Griffing's directions echoed the intentions of many testators in this regard:

It is my will that my s'd wife shall not sell or diminish any of s'd Interest on or by will mortgage or in any way unnecessarily dispose of it [the property] during her s'd lifetime.25

At death, the widow's legacy reverted to the husband's estate and his will included instructions for its subsequent distribution. Consequently, in the legal sense at least, most women owned little more than the clothes on their backs.26
This was true even when it appeared that women were given greater freedom and control. Six husbands left their wives "all the whole of my world". Most of these men had adult sons who could have become custodians of the family estate. Instead they chose to entrust all their real and personal property to their wife's care. These husbands confirmed their confidence in their wives' ability to maintain or even possibly to augment the family's patrimony by leaving sizeable legacies to the children which were to be distributed at their mother's decease. Yet, in so indicating their faith in their wives, these men defined the boundaries of the widow's authority. In their good judgement, husbands who specified the final allocation of the family's worldly goods, must have believed either that their wives were incapable of making these decisions or that it was not their place to do so. Despite what she may have contributed to building the family's stake during her husband's lifetime or how she coped as caretaker after his death, the widow had only as much say in how the estate was passed on as her husband allowed her to have. The significance of her inherited role as household head was further diminished by the fact that the widow's success or failure in maintaining the estate would have little real impact on the lives of grown children who had already received their portion.

When it came to transmitting their worldly goods to the next generation, Horton testators were governed for the most part by a pragmatism that reflected the modest accomplishments of frontier settlement. Some endowed all male offspring but only after most sons served lengthy apprenticeships as farm labourers, and then only with as much land as could be parcelled out without jeopardizing the viability of the family
farm. What is remarkable about Horton's inheritance patterns is the high incidence of all real property being settled on one son for primogeniture was rarely practised in New England when settlements were new. There, characteristically large landholdings accommodated the first settlers who wished to distribute their land among all their sons. But after a few generations severely reduced the size of the family's landholdings by this practise, partible inheritance was no longer realistic. Still, rather than give land to some sons and not to others, men stubbornly clung to some form of partible inheritance long after it was a feasible method of transmission.  

Perhaps the attitudes of Horton testators signify a conservative reaction to their earlier experiences in Connecticut. There, as in all of older settled New England, growing population pressure on a limited land supply, aggravated by generations of partible inheritance, severely reduced family landholdings and left fathers incapable of providing adequate patrimonies for their grown sons. This dilemma provided at least part of the impetus for some of these sons to leave Connecticut for Nova Scotia. These were the men who became Horton landowners and later found themselves forced to make hard choices that affected the lives of their own sons. Because their own youth had been unsettled, these men must have been sensitive to the situations their sons faced when they reached manhood. But, at the same time they were keenly aware of their struggle to establish a patrimony and what sub-dividing the farm into small parcels would mean for the family's chance of keeping a foothold in the community for future generations. As a result, decisions regarding the transfer of property to the next generation were influenced more by priorities of
maintaining the family landholding and ensuring the patriarch's economic security in old age than by the affection testators may have felt for their children and their instincts to provide for them.

Even so, whether guided by sentiment or a recognition of the value of the family as the primary unit of production, testators displayed a deep concern for the family. When children were unmarried, men used their wills to advise the family on the importance of staying together and to offer them inducements to follow his wishes. Benjamin Peck Jr. summed up the enticements in his will:

It is my will that nothing necessary for the comfort of my family now living together should be moved off the place while they continue together.  

When sons were grown, fathers kept them nearby by allowing them to build their homes on family land so that marriage and children were not delayed. Most importantly, by the terms of their wills, men re-structured the family so that the operation of the homestead farm could be carried on successfully after the death of the household head. In anticipation of the transfer of property outlined in the will, the son who was to inherit the homestead remained there, marrying and raising his children in the company of his aged parents. Since it evolved over several years, the transition was probably a smooth one.

Even by 1791 the increasing population pressure on the limited land supply, and a system of inequality rooted in the control of land ownership pushed Horton Township to its limits. The countryside could not support all inhabitants who wanted to farm. Nevertheless, the size of farms
remained viable and there was a large (and therefore inexpensive) pool of farm labour to work them. As transportation began to improve and markets opened up with the influx of Loyalists to the region, Horton would be well-placed to expand agricultural production for export.
Footnotes
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Males married at the average age of 25; females wed at the mean age of 22. The average age of marriage was calculated from reconstituted Horton families. See the bibliography for the sources used in this process.
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22 The number of wives outliving their husbands is calculated from genealogical information, references in wills in instances where the date of probate follows soon after the date the will was written and mentioned the wife; and evidence of widows remarrying.
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27 Benjamin Peck Jr.'s will in R.G. 48, reel 712, #203.
CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

This study of New Englanders taking up land in Horton Township, reveals that the most powerful dynamic underlying the settlement process was the lure of the land. The promise of free land drew the New Englanders to Horton in the beginning and their lives there were directed by a drive for modest economic success in which land was the primary commodity of exchange. The story of their lives and livelihoods and the society they created indicates that life in this frontier community was a struggle, but it was not so much one of taming the land as of acquiring and keeping it.

Almost immediately, all the township's land was divided among the proprietors, but the amount each received varied according to distinctions of status, family size and "ability to cultivate". Disparities on the basis of land granted gave some proprietors an initial advantage over others and all grantees were considerably better off than any latecomers who wanted to own land. This was the basis of inequality in the social structure of a community where land was both the symbol and essence of wealth.

Land changed hands quickly and often during the first decade of settlement. Some proprietors quickly sold off their shares early and left the township and usually the colony. Others made a profit by selling portions of their grants and remaining in Horton. This temporary fluidity in the land market enabled a small group of non-proprietors (who were
often the sons of grantees) to settle on Horton land. More importantly, most of the land passed into the hands of only a few grantees. Many of these had been given the larger grants when they first settled in Horton because they had the resources to improve the land. These resources allowed them to appropriate even more land and the gap between the largest and smallest landowner widened. As early as 1770 the top ten landowners controlled three times the acreage of the seventy-eight smallest property holders.

This imbalance in the distribution of land persisted for at least the next two decades. The existing pattern of ownership changed little and only one fifth of those who made their homes at Horton between 1770 and 1791 were able to buy land. Theoretically, the township contained more than enough acreage to provide all household heads with farms, but the drive to accumulate and the consequent reluctance to sell on the part of the landowners who controlled the lion's share created an artificial scarcity. This shortage meant that the community supported fewer farmers in 1791 than twenty years earlier and the number of landless labourers increased substantially.

Less is known about the market for agricultural products at Horton but scant evidence suggests that a nascent commercial economy existed from the beginning. Although they had yet to produce a subsistence in all crops in 1770, 43% of farmers raised extra sheep to drive to the market at Halifax. As well, it is reasonable to assume that commercial ties between the leaders of Horton society and the Halifax elite must have generated, or perhaps were the result of other business transactions for which documentary evidence no longer exists. Even so, in the early years,
commercialism was still more of an aspiration than a reality. In effect, the market for land replaced the market for agricultural products as the mechanism for economic differentiation.

These characteristics of the early development of Horton diverge sharply from the first phase of the rural settlement model discussed in chapter one. According to the model, in a new community land was abundant and accessible, socioeconomic distinctions nonexistent and the first few generations of settlers more than adequately endowed with land. In these settings, the focus of life was to provide for families and to ensure communal harmony through collective control of local resources. Certainly this was true of some New England towns. Seventeenth-century Andover and Dedham Mass., for instance, were small, cohesive, stable Puritan commonwealths. Collective control of the distribution of land meant that these conservative, subsistence farm communities used up their acreage only gradually over several generations, and until a crisis of land shortage occurred, their societies were open, homogeneous and egalitarian. It was only by the mid eighteenth century that they began to suffer from overpopulation, economic stratification and political factionalism.¹

Implicit in this model is the absence of a market economy and a commercialistic outlook on the part of the inhabitants. Instead, lineal family values, James Henretta has argued, formed the core of the "deeply held values" or mentalité of the agricultural population in colonial America.² He maintains that an imbalance in land ownership could evolve simply because most people were not interested in accumulation. They only wanted what they needed to sustain their families. Yearly subsistence and the long-term continuity of the family were their goals. When the market
for commodities was weak, only subsistence agriculture was possible; economic goals reflected geographic realities. Where markets existed participation was nevertheless circumscribed by social values. Primacy of kin, forgiveness of debt, cooperative work practices and the absence of "innovative risk-taking behavior" all inhibited the free play of market forces.

In assuming that land was acquired only for its use value, Henretta ignores the importance of accumulation for purposes of exchange and status-enhancement. And yet these motivations are crucial to understanding the dynamics of land ownership at Horton and its impact on the community's evolving character. The flurry of trading in land during the 1760s greatly outpaced agricultural development. Whether or not they wanted to participate in the drive to accumulate, all residents were affected by it. Few resisted re-shaping their landholding in some way. This process identified the leaders and lesser sorts and had ramifications for other aspects of community life. Economic differentiation, which was in place from virtually the beginning of settlement, was as important as the limitations of the Nova Scotia environment in determining the direction and extent of community development. Success, measured according to the size of one's landholding, was not available to everyone.

As a result, when time came to transfer their worldly goods to their children, the first generation of Hortonians practised an unusually high rate of primogeniture. Only a sizeable landholding could ensure the family's place in the community. The perpetuation of status was guaranteed by passing on the family farm intact to one heir.
Because of its socioeconomic relationships based on land ownership, Horton more closely resembled the commercialized areas of rural New England than the subsistence farm communities of Andover and Dedham. Springfield, Mass., for instance, was established in 1636 as a fur trading post and quickly became the major merchandising centre in the upper Connecticut Valley. It was a highly commercialized developmental community whose society was characterized by inequality, bankruptcy and social conflict from the beginning. In Springfield, as in Horton, "patterns of unequal land distribution appeared with the town's founding and intensified as the century progressed". In both communities, this initial inequality led to a high rate of land tenancy and economic stratification. Those having the financial wherewithal took advantage of their initial opportunities to achieve economic and social dominance in the community. In Springfield, the Pynchon family controlled virtually every aspect of community life through a sophisticated network of financial dependence. In Horton, power was likely shared among a handful of the most influential landowners. The largest of these, Joseph Gray, never gained a stranglehold on the community as the Pynchons had. Perhaps weaker market potential, poorer infrastructure, and the underdevelopment of Horton's resources left Gray with fewer opportunities to entrench his power than he would have had in Springfield.

Some of the wider implications of the experience of places like Springfield and Horton seem clear. Acquisitiveness was the motor of colonization and formed the central tendency in the mentalité of the settlers who founded these communities. In Springfield, "material opportunity, not organic unity, governed the inhabitants' behavior".
Individualistic goals led to a high level of economic diversification and a weak sense of community. In Horton, acquisitiveness was more narrowly expressed in the accumulation of real property. There too, communal needs were subordinated to personal prosperity. Clearly, James Lemon's "liberal individualism" by which people were directed "toward economic growth, toward success defined by wealth ... and toward accumulation as a goal in its own right"\textsuperscript{6} was at work at Horton.

In the broader frame, the settling of Horton must be recognized as part of the colonization of North America, a continuum initiated in the seventeenth century and lasting well into the twentieth. By focusing on some of the central elements and processes involved in the settling of Europeans overseas, Cole Harris has offered a comparative analytical framework. Harris has argued that changed circumstances in new settings, particularly in the relationships among land, labour and markets, led to the emergence of drastically simplified versions of society in which most of the socioeconomic hierarchy and regional variety of local European rural life had been pared away. In essence, easier access to land permitted the realization of the deep-seated desire for private control of the land. The landscape was marked by individual family rather than collective farming and dispersed rather than concentrated settlement.

Eventually and ineluctably, population pressure on a limited supply of land and improvements through clearing and cultivation, raised land prices and restricted land-based opportunity. The poor could no longer afford to own land and became a supply of cheap agricultural labour. At the same time, as markets improved some had the opportunity to become rich and society stratified according to wealth. Nevertheless, on the
continental scale, the opportunity associated with access to land survived. Settlement rolled westward across twenty degrees of latitude and again and again the selective pressures at work in new settings influenced the initial settling.

To measure the extent to which the settlement process at Horton simplified the society of the New Englanders who moved there would require detailed analysis of the economic and social circumstances in the Connecticut towns from which they had come. What is clear from this study of Horton Township, however, is that as Harris suggests, the most important variable in the establishment of the new settlement was the role of the land. In the very beginning, the availability of land meant that all who came to Horton could be guaranteed a sizeable farm on which they could achieve family-centered independence. This profoundly affected communal relations, the structure of the economy and the settlement pattern. But Horton diverges from the cycle as outlined by Harris because of the significance of land speculation to the community's development. Speculation quickly changed the terms of access to land so that land-based opportunity became restricted, stratification and inequality were created, and simplification tendencies were blunted.

It remains to be seen if the pattern of development directed by speculation and concentrated land ownership in the first few decades of settlement had far-reaching effects on the evolution of Horton. Were the large landholders successful in translating their holdings into tenant estates? Did some eventually sell at a substantial profit? If so, did the implicit re-distribution of lands lead to greater equality among landowners? Or alternatively, if these property holders died with their
estates intact, did their heirs perpetuate the pattern of concentrated ownership, or did they have other priorities? How did the community change as the advancement of agriculture and the expansion of markets gave cultivated land greater value than speculative real estate that lay idle?

The settling of Horton Township was essentially the movement of a group of like-minded individuals to a new land. They moved to the Nova Scotia frontier to get ahead by exploiting the opportunities of the new land. The community that evolved reflected this interplay between people and land. It is significant to our understanding of the historical geography of Nova Scotia that at Horton, one of Nova Scotia's most viable agricultural districts, there is a closing off of opportunity within the first generation of settlement.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

An Account of the Shares in the Township of Horton*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shares</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Settlers On the Spot</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Settlers Recommended by the Committee who formerly had Rights and desire a continuation of them</td>
<td>37½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Promised by the Late Governor Publick lots</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Horton 200 shares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shares granted and proposed remains vacant</th>
<th>176½</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The full report made special note of the vacant shares in Horton, Cornwallis and West Falmouth. Although the document is undated and unsigned, a request for a return of the vacant lots was sent by the Executive Council to Isaac Deschamps before Nov. 9, 1761 (see Minutes of the Executive Council), and it is believed that this was the reply, found in "Land Papers - Kings County, 1760-1842, R.G. 20 Series "C", v. 89, #1.
APPENDIX B

"State of the Settlement of Horton
With Regard to Rights of Land in Said Township"

Rights granted by a General Grant consisting of

Rights granted by private Grants viz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colonel Forster</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. James Wall</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Edward Hughes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut. Alexander Monroe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Alexander Hay</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Edward Ellis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac Deschamps Esq.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Gray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hendrick</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut. James Stewart</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut. Patrick West</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Burbidge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Best</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieut. Francis Fitzsimmons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Jonathan Belcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Nesbitt Esq.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                         | $22\frac{1}{2}$ |

Rights to be Granted as per List annexed for persons who have built and improved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights in Suspence</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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\[\text{two of these shares were allocated in one-share grants to Matthew Jackson and James Kennedy, but their land was included in Col. Forster's farm at New Minas.}\]

\[\text{two of these shares were allocated in one-share grants to James Wall and William Wall.}\]

\[\text{Source: R.G. 20 Series "C", V. 89, Land Papers, King's County, 1760-1842, #2.}\]
APPENDIX C

"State of the Settlement of Horton
With Regard to Rights of Land"

Rights in general grants  134½
Rights in private grants  22½
Rights to be granted to the following persons  43

makes in the whole  200 rights

| 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 1  |
| ½ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ½ | Benjamin Beckwith | ½ | Thomas Lee | ¼ | Elisha Blackman | ¼ | Daniel Dickson | ¼ | Francis Perkins | ½ | Benjamin Cleveland | ½ | Charles Dickson Jr. | ¼ | Jonathan Barber | ½ | Gordon Dennison | ½ | John Bishop Jr. | ½ | William Bishop |
|   | Silas Peck |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Daniel Hovey |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Joseph Woodworth |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | John Copp |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | William Pride |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Charles Proctor |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Jonathan Darrow |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   | Joseph Elderkin |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Andrew Dennison | 1  | David Johnston |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | John Eagles |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Walter Waltrous |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ½ | Alex Morris alius C.M. Jr. | 1  | Daniel Monet Dfl | 1  | John Clark |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | John DeWolf |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Nathan DeWolf |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Jeremiah Calkins | ½ | John Turner | ¼ | Patrick Murray | ½ | John Dickson | ¼ | John Allan Jr. | ¼ | Timothy Goodwin | ½ | Peleg Ransom Harris | 1  | Andrew Lisk | ½ | Isaac Lothrop - absent | ½ | Benjamin Peck - G - |
| 1  | Heirs of Timothy Buel |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | James Anderson |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Eleazor Chappel |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | James Billings - absent |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Jeremiah Calkins Jr. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Jacob Brown - grant made |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Shearman Dennison |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1  | Simeon DeWolf |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
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09 April 1764

Chas Morris  
Com

Henry Newton

*Source: R.G. 1, v. 222, no. 21.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage ca. 1760</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage in 1770</th>
<th>Difference in Acreage</th>
<th>Net Profit*</th>
<th>3rd Div. Sold</th>
<th>Purchases</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Exchanges</th>
<th>Total no. of Land Transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silas Crane</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-17.5</td>
<td>+£480</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Peck</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-109</td>
<td>+£335</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Harding</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-122.5</td>
<td>+£300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Fuller</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>+£270</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemuel Harding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-74.5</td>
<td>+£223</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Calkin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>-29.5</td>
<td>+£220</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Lisk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-19.25</td>
<td>+£213</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Clark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>+£207.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Miner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>+£177</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Harris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-48.5</td>
<td>+£168</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Graves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>+£166</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bishop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>+49.5</td>
<td>+£160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jedidiah Williams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>+£142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Hacket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>+£131.17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Anderson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-45.5</td>
<td>+£123</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Caldwell</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>+£120</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Darrow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td>+£117</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Harding</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-29.5</td>
<td>+£113.14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon Dewolf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>+35.5</td>
<td>+£111</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Burnham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+£110</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Whitney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>+£100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>+£96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Burbidge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+£90?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Allan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-66.5</td>
<td>+£90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zadock Bennett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-58.5</td>
<td>+£85</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolen Rogers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
<td>+£56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Pride</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>121.25</td>
<td>117.75</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>+£51</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Griffing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-59.5</td>
<td>+£50.12.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix D cont’d.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage ca. 1760</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage in 1770</th>
<th>Difference in Acreage</th>
<th>Net Profit*</th>
<th>3rd Div. Sold</th>
<th>Purchases</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Exchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>- 57</td>
<td>+£ 50</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>- 11</td>
<td>+£ 44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>- 31</td>
<td>+£ 42-10.0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>- 17</td>
<td>+£ 40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>- 0.5</td>
<td>+£ 40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+£ 35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>+£ 34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>- 28</td>
<td>+£ 34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>+£ 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 63</td>
<td>+£ 28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
<td>+£ 28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>- 3.5</td>
<td>+£ 27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>+£ 26.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>- 54.5</td>
<td>+£ 21.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>+£ 35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>117.75</td>
<td>98.75</td>
<td>- 19</td>
<td>+£ 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5+0.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>- 16.5</td>
<td>+£ 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>+£ 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>+ 0.6</td>
<td>+£ 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+ 41</td>
<td>+£ 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>+£ 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>- 12</td>
<td>+£ 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>- 6.75</td>
<td>+£ 5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>+ 2.5</td>
<td>+£ 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>+£ 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>+£ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>+£ 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>- 6</td>
<td>+£ 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>- 5.5</td>
<td>+£ 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is impossible to assess the value of size land and to deduct it from the price when it has been included in a transaction involving more than one lot. Thus, while calculations of total acreage do not include size, their cash value cannot be deducted from quoted prices.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage ca. 1760</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage in 1770</th>
<th>Difference in Acreage</th>
<th>Net Deficit</th>
<th>3rd Div. Sold</th>
<th>Purchases</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Exchanges</th>
<th>Total no. of Land Transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bishop Jr.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>111.75</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>+ 331.25</td>
<td>-£411</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Witter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.25</td>
<td>289.25</td>
<td>+ 216.75</td>
<td>-£209</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Turner</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>156.5</td>
<td>+ 58.5</td>
<td>-£175</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebbeus Harris</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>387.25</td>
<td>+ 278.75</td>
<td>-£148</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caleb Bennett</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>- 60.5</td>
<td>-£137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Avery</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>126.45</td>
<td>+ 38.45</td>
<td>-£124</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Lee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>+ 113</td>
<td>-£118</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah Calkin Jr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>+ 50.5</td>
<td>-£117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Copp</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>124.5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>+ 36.75</td>
<td>-£113</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Fuller</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>106.25</td>
<td>121.25</td>
<td>+ 15</td>
<td>-£102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obed Benjamin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.25</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>+ 36.25</td>
<td>-£ 80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Caldwell</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>+ 64.75</td>
<td>-£ 80</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Dickson</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>120.75</td>
<td>1475.25</td>
<td>+1354.5</td>
<td>-£ 78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Davison</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>+ 26</td>
<td>-£ 77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Denison</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>96.75</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>+ 51</td>
<td>-£ 76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Peck Jr.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>+ 64</td>
<td>-£ 75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Cleveland</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>+ 38.75</td>
<td>-£ 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silas Crane Jr.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
<td>-£ 55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos Rathburn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>- 6</td>
<td>-£ 43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Murray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>+ 18</td>
<td>-£ 34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Whipple</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>- 20</td>
<td>-£ 31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>- 24</td>
<td>-£ 27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvanus Miner</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>+ 6.5</td>
<td>-£ 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Beckwith Jr.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>-£ 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dickson</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>-£ 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shares</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage ca. 1760</th>
<th>Improvable Acreage in 1770</th>
<th>Difference in Acreage</th>
<th>3rd Div. Sold</th>
<th>Purchases</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Exchanges</th>
<th>Total no. of Land Transactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brotherthon Martin</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>106.25</td>
<td>150.5</td>
<td>+ 44.25</td>
<td>-£ 14.15.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Peck Sr.</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>126.50</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>- 25</td>
<td>-£ 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebudiah Wickwire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>78.50</td>
<td>+ 13</td>
<td>-£ 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Godfrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>+ 4.5</td>
<td>-£ 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Hamilton</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>- 87</td>
<td>-£ 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Forsyth</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>137.5</td>
<td>+ 14</td>
<td>-£ 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Beckwith</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>152.5</td>
<td>+ 33.5</td>
<td>-£ 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Copp</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>- 85.5</td>
<td>-£ 1.10.0 X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elderkin</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>112.25</td>
<td>212.5</td>
<td>+ 100.25</td>
<td>no price</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is impossible to assess the value of size land and to deduct it from the price when it has been included in a transaction involving more than one lot. Thus, while calculations of total acreage do not include size, their cash value cannot be deducted from quoted prices.*