

THE FOUNDING OF MAINE, 1600-1640
A REVISIONIST INTERPRETATION

There has long been a standard portrait of the founding of Maine which, with minor variations, has remained remarkably durable through numerous retellings. The essential theme is as follows: In the early or mid-1500s unrecorded fishermen and traders began visiting the rugged Maine coast. Soon the traders set up year-round posts and not long after fishing interests began leaving a few men on the coast to fish through the cold winter months, collecting a substantial cargo ready to be loaded and shipped back as soon as vessels arrived from England in the spring. By 1600, the coast was dotted with small but unrecorded fishing camps and in the summers the coastal waters were alive with similarly unrecorded fishing vessels catching and curing cod, haddock and other fish to send back to Europe. Resident traders as well as individuals on the fishing ships were also busily trading European goods for furs from the local natives. It was a rugged, brawling, largely male society, a haven for ne-er-do-wells and a headache for more proper people. It took the conquest by Massachusetts in the 1650s to bring a real semblance of order and decency to the region. But even this was hampered by a society heavily dependent on fishing, lumbering and the fur trade for its existence, a society little curbed by the stabilizing force of an agricultural base, for few farmed in early Maine.¹

Over time, this portrait has become doctrine, seldom challenged, in fact seldom suspected of being anything but correct. However, recent research on early Falmouth, Maine, developed around a sociological structural-functional framework and considering such diverse elements as local geography, demography, economics,

politics, and social patterns, indicate something quite different. The picture that has developed has similarities to the traditional interpretation, but at the most crucial points, it is frequently strikingly different from the old model. As will be seen, the overall pattern of settlement and early society proposed in this paper is rather at odds with the Maine we have known so long.

The main focus of this paper is on the period from 1600 to 1640. However, it is necessary to move back briefly into the previous century in order to set the stage. The key questions are what Europeans were in the area by 1600 and what were they doing.

Although the documentation is not strong, there is enough to suggest a fair amount of European-Indian trading sometime before the seventeenth century. The trade that developed was, by and large, a peripheral part of, first, Portuguese, and then French expansion across the north Atlantic into the Gulf of St. Lawrence and along the northern shores of the Canadian Maritime Provinces. The Portuguese had arrived by the early 1520s, for at the time João Fagundes established a fishing station on the north coast of Cape Breton. Before his station expired in 1525 or 26, he had probably sailed south along the Maine coast and perhaps other New England shores.² There is no documentation stating that he ever traded with Indians of the area, but the report of a contemporaneous voyage to the region suggests that he might have. In 1524, Giovanni de Verrazzano sailed north along the American coast, carefully observing the country and the natives. When he reached Maine he met Indians seemingly familiar with European trading patterns and with a healthy distaste for him and his crew.³ Perhaps these Indians had been visited by Fagundes or other Portuguese, had traded with them and then had been somehow offended. Or perhaps their

understanding of trade and distrust of outsiders simply mirrored previous pre-historic trade and tribal patterns. We may never know.

By the 1530s, the French had replaced the Portuguese in the north and sometime after began moving south to trade along the Maine and New England coasts.⁴ Precisely when this started is lost in time and it is not until 1580 that there is evidence of such activity in the region. In that year, Captain John Walker, on a reconnaissance voyage for Sir Humphrey Gilbert, landed in Penobscot Bay where he found an Indian lodge containing four hundred dried hides.⁵ It is certainly possible that these had been accumulated by the Indians for trade with Europeans.

The next evidence of trade is presented in the classic account of John Brereton, a member of Bartholomew Gosnold's 1602 expedition to New England. They had anchored along the shore in the area of Cape Neddick, Maine when

six Indians, in a Baske shallop with mast and saile, an iron grapple, and a kettle of copper, came boldly aboard us, one of them appparelled with a waistcoat and breeches of black serdge, made after our seafashion, hose and shoes on his feet; all the rest (saving one that had a paire of breeches of blue cloth) were all naked. These people were of tall stature, broad and grime visage, of a blacke swart complexion, their eyebrowes painted white; their weapons are bowes and arrows: it seemed by some words and signes they made, that some Baske or of S. John de Luz, have fished or traded in this place.

Later, Brereton noted that the Indians were wearing great quantities of copper ornamentation as well as possessing copper drinking cups and arrow points. He assumed this was native copper — more likely it had come from trade with the French.⁶ Other explorers following Gosnold to New England shores during the first decade of the 1600s made similar observations, frequently noting European trade goods in Indian hands and indicating that the items had been obtained from the French.⁷

On the other hand, there are bits of evidence suggesting this trade was not yet thoroughly established. First, the Indians were highly intrigued with the visitors and their merchandise; second, they had still not acquired the talents of astute traders which they had thoroughly mastered by the 1620s and 1630s; third, a substantial number were using stone tools and all used bows and arrows, articles that would soon be replaced by European tools and guns once the latter were available; finally, no other Europeans were seen trading along the coast while the explorers were there.⁸ That point will be more thoroughly examined later.

So, by 1600, French traders were active on Maine shores, but apparently not in large numbers. But, what about that other group, the fleets of fishermen, so often described by historians? It turns out that they never existed but were simply the figment of overactive imaginations. How can one be sure? There are several ways. First, there is not a single extant document placing fishermen along the Maine coast prior to 1600. Brereton's report of 1602 is the earliest document that can be found by proponents of this argument and he wasn't even sure if the French there previously were traders or fishermen. The argument always trotted out at this point to explain the lack of evidence is a great conspiracy of silence maintained by all these early fishermen. Not wanting anyone else to know about the superb fishing along the New England coast, they kept it a secret. This is a perfect argument for the advocate. It allows him to ignore the fact he has no evidence and challenges his critic to try to prove him wrong. Patently specious, this argument deserves little consideration. If one is to propose fishermen on this coast prior to 1600, he had better have some proof.

Besides the fact that this line of argument is methodologically unsound, it is simply incredible. Considering the multitude of records of provisioning, voyages, accounts,

sales, etc. from the Newfoundland fisheries, it is impossible to believe that numerous vessels could be sent to New England with not one record surviving. It is much easier to believe the fishermen just were not here.

Furthermore, the observations of the early explorers clearly buttress that view. All expressed great surprise at the excellent fishing, noting its superiority to that of Newfoundland and pointing out how one could do much better by fishing these waters. The report of James Rosier, a member of George Waymouth's 1605 expedition is typical. After great success in fishing near St. Georges Island, Rosier reported that

in a short voyage [a]few good fishers [could] . . . make a more profitable returne from hence than from Newfoundland: the fishing being so much greater, better fed, and abundant with traine [train-oil]; of which some they desired, and did bring into England to bestow among their friends, and to testifie the true report.⁹

There is little doubt that these men had discovered new fishing grounds which had not previously been exploited by European fishermen. Underlining this point is the fact that these early adventurers did not know the best fishing season, Rosier claiming it to be March, April and May as did Captain John Smith in 1614. It was not until the 1620s and 1630s, that fishermen had discovered the best period, January, February and early March.¹⁰

The most significant point is that, with one exception, the early explorers saw not one other European along the coast. The one exception occurred in 1605 when there were two known explorers in the area, Samuel de Champlain and George Waymouth. Champlain was informed in July of Waymouth's having kidnapped five Indians a short time before.¹¹ Furthermore, when Rosier reported on Waymouth's explorations of the mid-Maine coast he said "we diligently observed, that in no place, about either the Ilands, or up in the maine, or alongst the

river, we could discern any token or signe, that ever any Christian had been before.”¹² With the exception of Indians, it would appear that in 1600, the Maine coast was a very empty place.¹³

In the next three decades, all this would change. Fishermen began coming and by the 1620s, large numbers were working along the Maine shores. Likewise, year-round fishing stations dotted the coast from Piscataqua to Pemaquid. English traders in western Maine and their French counterparts to the east were busily bartering with the natives as were many of the fishermen in the area. And at the end of the period, the first truly permanent settlements had been established in the region.

The most significant feature of the three decades from 1600 to 1630 was the growth of the fishing industry. From all evidence, it started slowly. By 1610, if not before, the Virginia Company had become interested in the New England fisheries and began sending a few vessels up from the southern colony and possibly from England itself.¹⁴ Likewise, the French started some small scale operations along the eastern shores of the region;¹⁵ and John Popham had continued sending annual fishing-trading expeditions to the Kennebec after the collapse of the Popham colony in 1608.¹⁶

The French presence was erased in 1613, when Captain Samuel Argall from Virginia wiped out the nascent French settlements at St. Savoir and Port Royal.¹⁷ Meanwhile the English fisheries had grown little and did not begin to flourish until 1615, when according to Captain John Smith, six ships went to New England where they may have been joined by a few vessels from Virginia. The next year the number increased to eight. Smith further indicated that thirty-seven ships sailed to New England in 1622 and forty-five in 1623.¹⁸ His figures are twice corroborated, in 1622 by a report from Plymouth

that thirty ships were fishing near Monhegan and in 1624 from a statement by Sir William Alexander that forty to fifty vessels were fishing in New England waters.¹⁹ By the mid-1620s, fishing was well established on the Maine and New England coast.

As the fishing became an important and continuous activity, year-round fishing stations were established along the shores. One of the first was at Damariscove established “at the cost of Sir Ferdinando Gorges” and

consisting of some thirteen persons, who are to provide fish all the year with a couple shallops for the most timely loading of a ship.²⁰

The following year stations were started at Cape Newagen, Piscataqua and Monhegan, and shortly after operations were begun at Pemaquid. A station started at Richmond Island in 1632 was a late comer to the group.²¹

Operating year-round, these posts brought important economies to the fishing industry. Fishing could be pursued throughout the year, including January and February, the worst months in terms of weather but the best for fishing. With men already at the station, the ships coming over only needed a normal crew without having to transport extra fishermen who would not be needed until the vessel reached the fishing grounds. Add to that the efficiencies inherent in working from a land station, the possibility of raising some of the needed food supplies at the station, and the ability to use ships more for transportation and less as fishing platforms, and it is easy to see why the stations were sprouting up along the coast. Not surprisingly, the number of ships sent from England to fish in New England waters began to decline sharply. By 1635 the number of West Country vessels fishing along the New England coast was down to fifteen,²² a dramatic drop from the forty-five in 1623, and in 1661 the last West Country ship sailed to America on a fishing voyage.²³

It must be pointed out that these stations were not permanent settlements. They were posts established, provisioned and administered by English proprietors. The men at the stations were employed for set terms after which they would renew their agreements or leave the post. The situation was such that if the proprietors withdrew their support, the station was deserted. This happened at Cape Anne in 1628 and Monhegan in 1625. At Cape Anne, when the station was broken up, the residents either sailed back to England or moved to Salem where they established small farms.²⁴ At Monhegan, the fishing-trading station was moved to the mainland because of the trade advantages. In the process, the island was deserted and would so remain for over a decade before new settlements were begun.²⁵

It is worth a moment at this point to look at the lifestyle and character of the men who were employed at the fishing stations. They have long been portrayed as rugged, hard-drinking, irreligious, rowdy souls. However, a careful analysis of the men at the Richmond Island station reveals a rather different picture. The men had very little time for rowdy behavior with their work schedule. For six days a week, they were up at dawn and not to bed until long after dark, and excepting periods of exceedingly wretched weather, this work was outside, summer and winter. The schedule was always rigorous and at the height of the fishing season became so exhausting that at times some men would fall asleep right at the table during supper (which they had only after the work was done for the day).²⁶ One has to believe Sunday was used largely for sleeping and lounging.

Supporting that idea is the fact that there was little drinking at the station, and hence probably little carousing. One of the most useless creatures a station master could have was a drunken fisherman. Thus a concerted effort was made to keep the men and the booze

separated.²⁷ The one time that the men may have obtained any quantity of liquor was when they got paid, probably once a year. If the portrait provided by John Josselyn forty years later is correct, then the next week or so was a drunken brawl and nothing got done until the men had drunk all they could or had run out of money and credit. They were then sobered up and put back to work for another season.²⁸ This is not to say the men had no liquor during the working season; Winter's own accounts show that they did. But one can be sure that John Winter, a "sober, discreet man" fully intent on getting everything he could out of his crew, was not about to allow indiscriminate drinking at his station.²⁹

Along with the tight control on drinking, another unexpected discovery was the fact that the men at Richmond Island were fairly religious. They twice offered the local minister extra funds beyond his normal annual wage, they attended services, and they expressed sadness when he left. Furthermore, two of the people who convinced him to leave the station for another post were men who had previously fished at the station.³⁰

Beyond these facts, the most impressive findings about the men at Richmond Island were not those things they had in common but the ways in which they differed. An analysis of 110 individuals proved one thing — there is no such thing as a "fisherman type." The men were a group of individuals differing radically from each other by almost every measure. Some were loyal to the station, others caused trouble or ran away; some worked hard, others did all they could to avoid work; some were clean, others clearly gave competition to the local swine population, and so on. The differences also showed up in later economic success, political careers, and patterns of behavior and misbehavior. These were simply an ordinary bunch of guys catching fish.³¹

Besides the fishing stations, a second group of small posts was established during the 1620s which were set up to exploit the fur trade. These were founded at Pejepscot (c. 1625-1630), Cushnoc (1628), Richmond Island (1628) and Penobscot (1630). Fairly small operations, these were either run by individuals with ties to English merchants or were based out of the Plymouth Colony.³² They, along with the fishing-trading posts dotting the coast, presented a strong European presence in the area and provided valuable experience for those who came later to establish permanent settlements.

This leads to the question as to the difference between a year-round station and a permanent settlement or plantation. The existence of the former continued only at the desire of the English proprietor — pull out that support and the station folded with the residents going elsewhere. A permanent settlement was one which was made up of people who had come to stay, and who viewed it, at least for the time being, as home. It is this kind of settlement that began to appear on the Maine coast about 1630.

The first permanent plantations may have been established in the late 1620s at Damariscove and Pemaquid where fishing-trading operations had been set up some time before. However, in western Maine the first such communities, York, Saco, and possibly Cape Porpoise, were founded in 1630. These were followed by settlements at Kittery (1631), Scarborough (1633), Casco (1633), North Yarmouth (1636), and Wells (1640).³³

As the outlook and purposes of settler communities were wholly different from those of the fishing stations, it is not surprising that their makeup was likewise radically different. These communities were settled not by single men but by families, generally young or middle aged and often with young children.³⁴ They came straggling into

the nascent communities and were granted fifty to one hundred acre tracts of land by the local proprietors, or, later, by the towns. Thus settlements were strung out along the coast and rivers, usually having no real center as did their Massachusetts neighbors.³⁵

These early settlers were mostly farmers. In a detailed analysis of the founders of Casco, it was found that most raised crops and livestock for a living, and of those who identified their own occupation, nearly all called themselves yeomen.³⁶ Furthermore, it appears that Casco was in no way exceptional. Charles E. Banks found early York had likewise been settled largely by farmers.³⁷ Nearby Saco was already exporting wheat by the 1640s.³⁸ Even Pemaquid, supposedly the bastion of fishing, had so strong an agricultural base that by 1640 a load of cattle and feed was exported to Boston to sell to the many English immigrants arriving on Massachusetts shores.³⁹

Actually, it is perfectly logical that the earliest permanent settlers of Maine would be farmers first and foremost. There was no convenient or reliable source of food other than what they could grow, and only if they tilled the soil and raised livestock could they be reasonably sure of having something to eat year-round. Furthermore, a solid agricultural base had to be established before the inhabitants were capable of supporting more specialized individuals such as fishermen and artisans. This was the pattern in early Casco, for it was not until the late 1640s and 1650s that both fishermen and artisans began settling in the town.⁴⁰ The same pattern developed in early New Hampshire as the first settlers turned to farming ignoring practically everything else until they had their food supply secured.⁴¹ Also, a study of Massachusetts immigrants revealed much the same trend, with some of the artisans who arrived in the colony actually dropping their trades and taking up agriculture during the first years.⁴²

This brings us to the question of the relationship of the fishing-trading stations and the settler plantations to the early settlement of Maine. As noted above, stations dropped by their owners prior to settlement simply ended. Once settlements were established, the withdrawal of support did not necessarily cause desertion of the station. If the Richmond Island station is indicative, the operation would suffer a decline but would then continue at a reduced level. It took some time to establish new trade ties and make administrative adjustments, but during this period the stations could depend upon local settlers for agricultural goods and some trade.⁴³ In terms of reciprocity, Falmouth's early settlers certainly benefited from the presence of the Richmond Island station⁴⁴ and probably the same was true for those at Damariscove and Pemaquid although the evidence is just too sparse to know for sure. However, unlike the fishing stations, the agricultural settlements could exist without any direct supervision and administration from England. Furthermore, many turned quickly to Piscataqua and Boston for supplies and markets. They had become independent bodies with identities of their own.

Now for a final but key question. What sort of people were these settlers and what kind of life did they lead. As they were overwhelmingly farmers with families, it might be suspected that they would have the desires typical of such people, desires for order and stability, for a decent place to raise their kids. And it appears from extant evidence, that these were indeed the desires of Maine's early colonists.

A key element in the attainment of an orderly society is the establishment of governmental institutions. Almost as soon as the early settlements had enough people they began establishing local "combinations," electing local officials, and holding periodic meetings.⁴⁵ Likewise, the settlers proved amenable to the introduction of provincial

government in 1640, their only hesitancy arising from fears that the new government meant to “draw them and theirs into slavery.” Once that fear was calmed, they willingly accepted the new regime.⁴⁶

The local governments seemed to have served two major roles — the assurance of the communities’ economic viability and the inculcation of moral principles among the inhabitants. The provincial government likewise had two important functions — the enforcements of the colony’s moral and behavioral codes and the resolution of disputes arising in the province. These duties of the two levels of government will be considered later in the text with the exception of the role of arbiter, so that function will be examined now. The problem with early Maine society and government was its fragility. The threat of political, economic or social disruption left the people very unwilling to test the limits of the government’s ability to maintain control. It might lose.⁴⁷ Thus every effort was made to resolve disputes with the minimum of rancor. Arbitration was a tool frequently used, the goal being to reach a settlement agreeable to both sides.⁴⁸ The other major mechanism was jury trial and here care was taken to provide each side full opportunity to present its case, with depositions and witnesses to buttress its arguments.⁴⁹ Only once, was there a flagrant challenge to the court. It was forcibly squelched, but once control was regained the case was promptly put to arbitration to smooth ruffled feathers. The purpose was obvious — don’t make waves.⁵⁰

Economic security was also vital to an orderly society, and fundamental to that was the acquisition of clear and exact title to a piece of property. The reason is obvious. Land provided the colonists with their basic necessities and their chief form of wealth. For these transplanted Englishmen, it was the bottom line to economic security and the foundation of organized society. Not surprisingly, land transactions were traditionally constructed, carefully

prepared and legally validated.⁵¹ This concern for economic stability and order also showed in later actions by local governments as they became established. Towns went out of their way to promote the construction of saw mills but they also made sure that the town and inhabitants would benefit from their establishment. They also ordered that trees not be felled indiscriminately, livestock be kept under control, and people who might become economic burdens be kept out.⁵²

A major desire of the early settlers was for a morally upright society. This desire is graphically and at times pathetically demonstrated in efforts of the towns to secure a minister. There was complete agreement that with the aid of a minister, the people would become “hearers and doers of the word and will of God” and would live lives far more sacrosanct than if he was not present. However, the communities along the Maine coast were poor and ministers few. Those that were available frequently received invitations from several communities. Some came only to leave shortly for better positions back in Massachusetts. Others came only to prove wretched examples of their profession. The Reverend George Burdett, who was busy seducing several York women, is without question the most reprehensible of the lot. Some communities, including Saco and Wells, employed local figures to lead their services until they could acquire ministers. While it can be pointed out that these early Maine communities were frequently without preachers it was not for lack of trying.⁵³

The views and attitudes of Maine’s early inhabitants are strongly suggested in efforts to obtain ministers; they are most clearly and concisely expressed in the *Maine Province and Court Records*. If there is any group of documents that historians have consistantly misinterpreted, it is these. The standard procedure has been to look at all the misdeeds

recorded in the *Records* and to exclaim what a terrible lot of people the Maine settlers were. If these individuals had checked the records of Essex County, Suffolk County, or the Plymouth Plantation, they would have found the same sordid list of wrongdoings. If one used the type of analysis used for Maine on seventeenth century Boston, that Puritan city would have been a society of deadbeats, drunkards, morally loose and irreligious riffraff as well as worse deviants.

In point of fact, the transgressions being punished in the Maine courts provide an accurate catalog of those behavioral patterns which were not tolerated by the society. Therefore, what the records reveal is a society that punished slander, drunkenness, profanity, neglect of public worship, sabbath breaking, trespass, assault, fornication and adultery, the same types of misdeeds punished by other New England courts. More importantly, there is a strong correlation between the various courts in terms of the ratio of transgressions.⁵⁴ Thus it appears from the court records that Maine society may have been surprisingly similar to that of the Bay Colony and Plymouth Plantation in terms of the beliefs and behavior of the inhabitants.

The thesis that Maine's early settlers were anxious to achieve social and political stability fits well with the preponderance of extant evidence. Still, it is diametrically opposed to traditional interpretations, and there are a number of contemporary descriptions and incidents which seem directly contradictory, items indicating a rowdy, disorderly society, or at least a sizeable number of disruptive individuals in the area. These items must be examined in order to see how they relate to the above thesis.

Upon analysis it becomes immediately apparent that several of the descriptions, including the most spectacular, are thoroughly suspect. For example, Sir Ferdinando Gorges complained that in the early 1620s, English

fishermen were running wildly amuck along the New England shore “behaving worse than the very savages.” It just so happens that this was the exact time when Parliament was attacking his fishing monopoly in New England and he was arguing that his monopoly would allow him to assert the strong control over the area needed to tame the fishermen’s excesses. Massachusetts, the Plymouth Colony, and the Royal Commission all used similar tactics, describing the terrible state of Maine settlements to justify taking over political control of all or part of the region.⁵⁵

The oft-quoted remarks of John Winter of the Richmond Island station concerning the “lawless country” and the need for government also prove self-serving upon examination. He wanted law and government for one purpose, to keep his fishermen from running away from his station to work for themselves. If he had paid them more he would have had far fewer desertions. Furthermore, when the provincial government later failed to do as he wanted, he immediately rebelled.⁵⁶

Then there is Cotton Mather’s classic statement that the “Main End” of northern New Englanders “was to catch fish” and not to practice religion. Few more personally interested statements have ever been written. Mather was in the midst of explaining why the Bay Colony was so successful, and excusing some of the colony’s past religious excesses. It was, in a word, propaganda. As for his specific comment about the fishermen, the story was at least second or third hand and more probably just a popular folktale, a probability heightened by the implication that the incident supposedly occurred during the early years of settlement, two-thirds of a century earlier, and before he had even been born.⁵⁷

There is no denying the self-interest behind all the above mentioned derogatory descriptions of early Maine

and northern New England, and that must be taken into account when considering them. Still, it would be presumptuous to assume that there was absolutely nothing to what these individuals were saying, that they produced their accounts from whole cloth. In fact, while conditions were certainly not as gruesome as portrayed, there were incidents of rowdiness, lawlessness and felonious behavior that cannot be simply explained away. These are incidents that would seem representative of a society with little government and order and basically different from the numerous cases of debt, trespass, fornication, slander, etc. that fill the records of every early New England court. It is to these incidents we now turn. They have been grouped under three rather general headings for ease of presentation. These are (1) unruly competition, (2) disruptive individual activities along the coast, and (3) individuals using Maine as a refuge from punishment.

There are numerous incidents of unruly fur trade competition along the early Maine coast. John Pory in 1622, Christopher Levett in 1623 and Emmanuel Altham the year after all noted aggressive rivalry for the trade as well as the sale of guns and powder to the Indians in attempts to capture their business.⁵⁸ Conditions had not improved much a decade later; in 1634 John Winter wrote that "the traders do on[e] under sell another & overthrow the tradinge with Indians altogether."⁵⁹ Events became even more violent, for in the same year, John Hocking of Piscataqua and a Plymouth trader were killed when Hocking tried to break the Plymouth Colony's hold on the Kennebec fur trade.⁶⁰

The same rowdy behavior occurred in the fishing industry during the 1620s and 1630s. There were a number of instances when fishermen tore down the stages of their rivals and at least a couple recorded instances of fishing masters trying to entice fishermen into their service from other vessels or stations.⁶¹

The Maine coast also had its share of disruptive figures who did little to bring peace and quiet to the region. One of the first of these was Captain George Waymouth who in 1605 captured five Indians and carried them to England, an action that poisoned English-Indian relations from then on.⁶² Another individual who did little for the peace along the early Maine coast was Walter Bagnall, who set up a trading post on Richmond Island. He misused the Indians so badly in his trading activities that in 1631 they killed him in retaliation.⁶³ Two years later the coast was haunted by the presence of pirate Dixy Bull, who had raided the trading post at Pemaquid and who, it was feared, might strike at other settlements.⁶⁴ The next significant disruption occurred in the summer of 1645, when Robert Nash and comrades landed on Stratton Island in Casco Bay and got the local fishermen drunk. The men then started firing their guns and causing a general uproar. Mainlanders, hearing all the firing, were convinced the French were staging an attack in the area.⁶⁵ Finally in October, 1654, on Monhegan Island, crewman Gregory Cassell hit boatmaster Mathew Cannidge over the head with a hammer during one of their "many fallings out." Cannidge lived for a few days and before he died he said he wished he had Cassell "where ther . . . was government" so he could "have the law against him."⁶⁶

The final category to consider is that of people escaping punishment in Massachusetts by running to Maine. In 1636 John Baker of Newbury dashed off to Maine in fear of what was in store for him if he stayed as did Reuben Cuppy of Salem in 1640 and Ann Crander of the Bay Colony in 1648.

As can be seen, there was a substantial number of disruptive incidents and individuals along early Maine shores; however, when viewed as a group, a pattern emerges which fits very comfortably with the above

findings about early Maine settlers and their aspirations for law and order.

It is evident that during the early years of the 1600s, there was a lawless, rowdy element along the Maine coast, the results of which included rough and frequently violent competition, and a number of severely disorderly acts. It is also evident that at least some saw Maine as a haven from law and order. But by the 1630s, a change was occurring. As small settlements began dotting the western and central Maine coast, there was a growing desire for stability in the region. Family based communities needed economic and social order to prosper and mature, and residents of these plantations certainly felt community pressures to behave.

There was a growing stability in the fishing industry as well. Increasingly, the fishing business was being conducted by communities and fishing stations along the New England coast. As this happened, fewer and fewer English ships sailed across the ocean to compete with local operations. Many of the rowdies of the 1620s and 1630s were working off such ships as these, and as this pattern of fishing died, there was a drop in the number of these undesirables along the Maine coast.⁶⁸

Similarly, there was growing order in the fur trade. It had become increasingly confined to the Kennebec/Androscoggin, Penobscot, and St. Johns river systems with the Plymouth Company and a number of other English traders controlling the first, and the French holding the latter two by the mid-1630s. The French then began trading their furs with Boston merchants via Pemaquid or directly, thereby greatly reducing the major potential for violent competition and conflict. There was still some competition for the trade but it usually centered around the river focal points, involved well-financed and politically supported adversaries, frequently took place under a patriotic guise (i.e. anti-English or anti-French),

and was never allowed to get out of hand (after all one did not want to destroy the trade). Local inhabitants along the Maine coast did some trading with nearby Indians but this was a fairly sedate business and the colonists frequently took their furs to Pemaquid or stations on the Kennebec. A few freebooters still operated (usually out of Boston). They cruised along the central and eastern Maine coast trying to intercept a portion of the trade, but for all practical purposes the old free-wheeling, price-cutting trading wars of the 1620s were forever in the past.⁶⁹

The most important element in stabilizing the region was Thomas Gorges's establishment of an active provincial government in 1640. In that year, Thomas Lechford reported that Maine "hath had an ill report by some, but of late some good acts of Justice have been done there." John Winthrop made a similar remark about the same time and Thomas Gorges himself stated that "Justly hath [Maine] . . . bin termed the receptacle of vicious men. But [now]civill government is . . . in its infancy of [. . .] [&] I doubt [not] by the assistance of God but sins head shall be cut of[f] to the comfort of the good people and to the terror of others."⁷⁰

Gorges moved resolutely to resolve disputes and punish wrongdoers and there is little doubt that he radically reduced lawless behavior in western Maine. In fact, when Robert Nash and companions had their gun-firing brawl on Stratton Island near Falmouth, it was obviously an extraordinary event, frightening and angering the nearby mainlanders.⁷¹

Thomas Gorges and Edward Godfrey also set up a continuing policy of sending back undesirables who ran to Maine to escape punishment elsewhere. When Rueben Guppy arrived in 1640/1, and Ann Crander eight years later, they both found themselves immediately bundled right back to Massachusetts.⁷²

Conditions had improved on the mainland from Kittery to North Yarmouth after the 1620s; however, the rowdy element did not wholly disappear but seems to have moved out to the islands along the coast, where a transient population with little governmental control seemed to ebb and flow with the seasons. By the 1640s, the majority of incidents involving raucous behavior, savage acts, and just general lawlessness were concentrated on the islands off the Maine shores.⁷³

There also seems to have been a rowdy element along the Maine coast from the Kennebec River to Pemaquid; however, the precise situation is not clear. The local population included both farmers and fishermen although the ratios between the two groups varied significantly from one settlement to the next. In some, farming was clearly the predominant occupation; in others, it was fishing. The latter communities also frequently entertained a substantial number of transient fishermen during the fishing season (mostly from the Bay Colony). Undoubtedly those communities concentrating on farming and made up largely of permanent settlers would have been more orderly and stable than those predominately fisheries-oriented with substantial transient seasonal populations. The situation was certainly not clear, for during the same period some observers lauded the region whereas others saw it as one of the more despicable places on earth. It would appear that here was a society that had yet to congeal into a definable form or, if it had, was one with significant local differences. Whatever the case, travelers along those shores could see pretty much what they wanted to.⁷⁴

Clearly this model is incomplete. Hopefully, with further research some of the gaps can be filled, relationships more thoroughly understood and inaccuracies corrected. Still, for all its shortcomings, I think the model probably comes closer to reality (as much as one can

identify reality) than the stereotypic society and two-dimensional people that have so long served as the stage and the cast of historians writing about Maine's first beginnings.

— NOTES —

Since Mr. Churchill's dissertation, "Challenges on the Frontier: The History of Falmouth, Maine, 1624-1675," is not yet completed, citations are made only to the relevant chapters in which the information can be found once the dissertation becomes generally available.

¹ The following represents just a sample of the numerous works accepting all or much of the traditional interpretation: Charles M. Andrews, *The Colonial Period in American History*, vol. 1: *The Settlements* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934), pp. 94-97 (hereafter cited as Andrews, *Colonial Period*); Charles K. Bolton, *The Real Founders of New England* (Boston: F.W. Faxon Company, 1929), pp. 1,8,10-13, 27-29, 113-14, 137; Charles E. Clark, *The Eastern Frontier* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), pp. 13,15,22,33 (hereafter cited as Clark, *Eastern Frontier*); Roy V. Coleman, *The First Frontier* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), pp. 117,306,309,316-17; Benjamin F. Decosta, "Norumbega and Its English Explorers," in *Narrative and Critical History of America*, ed. by Justin Winsor, vol. 1 (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1885), pp. 178-79; John E. Pomfret, *Founding of the American Colonies, 1583-1660* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1970), pp. 171-72; Ida S. Proper, *Monhegan, the Cradle of New England* (Portland, Maine: The Southworth Press, 1930), pp. 54-56,69,134-35, 178; J. Wingate Thornton, "Ancient Pemaquid, An Historical Review," *Maine Historical Society, Collections*, 1st. ser., 5 (1857): 155,163-64, 183-86,197,204,219.

² Samuel E. Morison, *The European Discovery of America: The Northern Voyages, A.D., 500-1600* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp.

228-33 (hereafter cited as Morison, *Discovery of America*); Harold A. Innis, *The Cod Fisheries: The History of an International Economy* (New York: Yale University Press, 1940), pp. 14-15 (hereafter cited as Innis, *Cod*).

³ Giovanni de Verrazzano, "The Voyage of Verrazzano . . . Made in 1524 to North America," in *Voyages of Giovanni de Verrazzano, 1524-1528*, by Lawrence C. Wroth (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), pp. 140-41.

⁴ Innis, *Cod*, pp. 23-25; William I. Roberts, "The Fur Trade of New England in the Seventeenth Century," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1958), pp. 1-2.

⁵ Morison, *Discovery of America*, p. 48.

⁶ John Brereton, "A Briefe and True Relation of the Discoverie of the North Part of Virginia . . . Made this Present Yeare 1602," in *Forerunners and Competitors of the Pilgrims and Puritans*, ed. by Charles H. Levermore (2 vols.; Brooklyn: The New England Society, 1912), 1: 32 (hereafter cited as Brereton, "Discoverie of North Part of Virginia," and Levermore, *Forerunners*, respectively).

⁷ Samuel de Champlain, "The Voyages of Sieur de Champlain," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 1: 119-20 (hereafter cited as Champlain, "Voyages"); Robert Juet, "The Third Voyage of Master Henry Hudson," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 2: 39; John Smith, "A Description of New England," in *Travels and Works of Captain John Smith*, new ed. by Arthur G. Bradley (2 vols.; Edinburgh: J. Grant, 1910), 1: 200 (the full work hereafter cited as *Travels and Works*); John Smith, "New England Trials," in *Travel and Works*, 1:267 (hereafter cited as Smith, "New England Trials").

⁸ Brereton, "Discoveries of North Part of Virginia," pp. 35,47; Champlain, "Voyages," pp. 114,118-19,122; Martin Pring, "A Voyage . . . for the Discoverie of the North Part of Virginia, in . . . 1603," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 1:63,66 (hereafter cited as Pring, "Voyage to North Part of Virginia"); John Rosier, "A True Relation of the . . . Voyage Mage this Present Year 1605, by Captain George Waymouth," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 1: 323,327-28 (hereafter cited as Rosier "Voyage by Waymouth").

⁹ Rosier, "Voyage by Waymouth," p. 348. Similar reports can be read in Brereton, "Discoverie of North Part of Virginia," pp. 32-33; Pring, "Voyage to North Part of Virginia," p. 61; Champlain, "Voyages," pp. 93-94; James Davies, "The Relation of a Voyage to New England [in] . . . 1602, by Captn. Popham and Captn. Gilbert," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 1: 361-62,365.

¹⁰ Rosier, "Voyage by Waymouth," p. 23; Smith, "Description of New England," p. 198. By 1620 Smith had learned of the best fishing season. (Smith, "New England Trials," p. 244). That it had become general knowledge by the 1620s and 1630s can be seen from letters by Emmanuel Altharn in 1623 (Sydney V. James, ed., *Three Visitors to Early Plymouth* [Plymouth: Plimoth Plantation, 1963] p. 33) and John Winter in 1634 (James P. Baxter, ed., *The Trelawny Papers*, vol. 3 of the *Documentary History of the State of Maine* [Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1884], p. 26 [hereafter cited as *Trelawny Papers*]).

¹¹ Champlain's remark concerning Waymouth is found in Champlain, "Voyages," p. 130. No other explorer from John Walker (1580) to James Davies (1607) reported any other Europeans along the coast. The first reported encounter between Europeans along Maine shores occurred in 1611 when French Captain M. Plaister was chased off the coast where he had been fishing by two English vessels. (Alexander Brown, ed., *The Genesis of the United States* [2 vols.; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1891], 2: 533-35.

¹² Rosier, "Voyage by Waymouth," p. 342.

¹³ Both Richard Preston and John Reid, scholars of early northern New England state that the fisheries started in the early 1600s (Richard Preston, *Gorges of Plymouth Fort*, [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953], pp. 153-54; John G. Reid, "Acadia, Maine and New Scotland: Marginal Colonies in the Seventeenth Century [Ph.D. dissertation, University of New Brunswick, 1976], pp. 54-56). Likewise, Raymond McFarland and Harold Innis, the foremost authorities on the New England fisheries, mark the beginning from the early 1600's (Innis, *Cod*, pp. 70-71; Raymond McFarland, *A History of the New England Fisheries*, [Pittsburg: University of Pennsylvania, 1911], pp. 33-34.

¹⁴ Samuel Argall, "The Voyage of Captain Samuel Argal . . . 1610," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 2: 428-37; Pierre Biard, "Relation De La Nouvelle France," in *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, ed. by Reuben G. Thwaites, vol. 3 (Cleveland: The Burrows Brothers Company, 1897), p. 275 (hereafter cited as Biard, "Relations" and *Jesuit Relations* respectively).

¹⁵ Pierre Biard, "Father Pierre Biard's Relation of New France," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 2: 446-48, 460-61.

¹⁶ Smith, "Description of New England," p. 189; John Smith, "The General History of New England, 1606-1624," in *Travels and Works*, 2: 697. Richard Preston provides a good brief summary of the activities of the Virginians, the French, and Popham on the Maine coast. (*Gorges*, pp. 150-53).

¹⁷ Samuel Purchas, "Captain Argall's Attack on the French Settlement in 1613," in Levermore, *Forerunners*, 2: 563-66; Marc Lescarbot, *The History of New France*, trans. and ed. by W. L. Grant (3 vols: Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1914), 3: 63-66; Biard, "Relation," pp. 275-83; Joseph Jouveny, "An Account of the Canadian Mission," in *Jesuit Relations*, 1: 227-35.

¹⁸ Smith, "A Description of New England," pp. 175; Smith, "New England Trials," pp. 240-42; John Smith, "Advertisement for the Unexperienced Planters of *New-England*," in *Travels and Works*, 2: 141-43.

¹⁹ Edward Winslow, "Good News from New England: or a True Relation of Things Very Remarkable at the Plantation of *Plimoth* in *New-England*," in *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers of the Colony of Plymouth from 1602 to 1625*, ed. by Alexander Young (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1841), pp. 292-94; William Alexander, "An Encouragement to Colonies," in *Sir William Alexander and American Colonization*, ed. by Edmund F. Slafter (Boston: The Prince Society, 1873), pp. 195-96. In his voyage along the Maine coast in the fall of 1623, Christopher Levett noted specifically that the previous season six ships had fished at the Isle of Shoals, two at Sagadahock, and nine at Cape Newagen. He did not provide figures for other spots on the coast, only mentioning that "divers ships" had fished at Casco, many fish had been caught at Saco, and no one fished near Agamenticus or Cape Porpoise. All in all, his figures seem generally in line with the other reports. (Christopher Levett, "A Voyage Into New England, Begun in 1623 and Ended in 1624," in *Christopher Levett of York, the Pioneer Colonist in Casco Bay*, ed. by James P. Baxter [Portland: The Gorges Society, 1893], pp. 89-90, 92-93, 98-99, 101 [hereafter cited as Levett, "Voyages to New England"]). Only one individual indicates a number of vessels out of line with the others. In 1623, Emmanuel Altham said that "about 400 sails" fished along the Maine coast. There seem only two reasonable conclusions: one, he was counting everything including each little fishing shallop, or two, he was grossly exaggerating. Either is possible, but it should be noted that his writings are studded with exaggerations; this would not be the only instance. (James, *Three Visitors to Early Plymouth*, p. 25).

²⁰ James, *Three Visitors to Early Plymouth*, p. 15.

²¹ Levett, "Voyage to New England," pp. 101-103; James, *Three Visitors to Early Plymouth*, p. 46; Charles W. Tuttle, "Memoir of Captain John Mason," in *Capt. John Mason, The Founder of New Hampshire*, ed. by John W. Dean (Boston: The Prince Society, 1887), pp. 18-20; William Bradford, *Bradford's History "Of Plymouth Plantation"*, (Boston: Wright &

Potter Printing Co., 1901), p. 185 (hereafter cited Bradford, *Plymouth Plantation*); Nathaniel Adams, *Annals of Portsmouth* (Portsmouth: Published by the author, 1825), pp. 9-11; Matthew R. Thompson and Ralph E. Thompson, *Pascataway, De Facto Capital of New England, 1623-1630* (Monmouth, Oregon: published privately, 1973); Charles F. Jenny, *The Fortunate Island of Monhegan* (New Bedford: Raynolds Printing, 1927), pp. 17-20 (hereafter cited as Jenny, *Monhegan*); Samuel Maverick, "A Brief Description of New England and the Several Townes Therein, Together with the Present Government Thereof," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, 2d ser., 1 (1884-1885): 231-32; Edwin A. Churchill, "Introduction: Colonial Pemaquid," in *Archaeological Excavations at Pemaquid, Maine, 1965-1975*, by Helen Camp (Augusta: Maine State Museum, 1975), pp. ix-xix; *Trelawny Papers*, p. 18.

There are numerous assertions of pre-1620s fishing stations and/or settlements on the Maine coast. However, these are consistently undocumented or have stretched known information far beyond credibility. (Some of these items are listed in footnote 1 above). Actually, there are several documents that strongly indicate just the opposite, that is, the absence of any stations or settlements prior to the 1620s. In 1614, Captain John Smith stated that the New England "Coast is yet still but ever as a Coast unknown and undiscovered." ("Description of New England," p. 189). Two years later, Sir Ferdinando Gorges sent Richard Vines to Saco to spend the winter on the coast of Maine and thereby disprove the general belief that New England winters were too severe for settlement, hardly something one would do if there were already people in the area on a year-round basis (Ferdinando Gorges, "A Brief Narration of the Original Undertaking of the Advancement of Plantations into the Parts of America. Especially, Shewing the Beginning, Progress, and continuance of that of New England," in *Sir Ferdinando Gorges and His Province of Maine*, ed. by James P. Baxter [3 vols.; Boston: The Prince Society, 1890], 2: 17-19 [hereafter cited as Gorges, "Brief Narration"]). Finally, William Hubbard wrote that prior to the Pilgrim settlement in 1620, there were no permanent settlements in New England. (*A General History of New England*, Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 2nd ser., 4[1815]: 14. [hereafter cited as Hubbard, *History of New England*]). These, coupled with positive contemporary statements dating the beginning of several early stations in the 1620s (see sources above), leave little doubt that year-round habitation on the Maine coast did not begin until the third decade of the seventeenth century.

²² Innis, *Cod*, p. 80.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 116.

²⁴ John White, "A Brief Relation of the Occasion of Planting the Colony," in *Chronicles of the First Planters of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, from 1623 to 1636*, ed. by Alexander Young (Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1846), pp. 1-16 (hereafter cited as Young, *Chronicles of Massachusetts*); Herbert B. Adams, "The Fisher Plantation at Cape Anne," Essex Institute, *Historical Collections*, 19 (1882): 82-90.

²⁵ Richard Mather, "Mather's Journal," in Young, *Chronicles of Massachusetts*, p. 470; *The Letters of Thomas Gorges: Deputy Governor of the Province of Maine, 1640-1643*, ed. by Robert E. Moody (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1978), p. 100 (hereafter cited as *Gorges Letters*.)

²⁶ Nicholas Denys, *The Description and Natural History of the Coasts of North America (Acadia)*, trans. and ed. by William F. Ganong (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1908), pp. 323-24, 329-33. (hereafter cited as Denys, *History of North America*); Jonathan Downing, "Downing's Account of Fish, 1676," *Baxter Manuscripts*, ed. by James P. Baxter, vol. 4 of *The Documentary History of the State of Maine* (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1889), pp. 372-73.

²⁷ Denys, *History of North America*, pp. 3-4, 317-18; "Biddeford Town Records," transcribed by Ida Twombly, microfilm at Maine State Archives, p. 111. It was not always possible to keep liquor from the crews. Later in the century, when due to technological changes men were going out on two or three month voyages rather than one or two day trips, transport vessels loaded with wine would meet the fishermen on the banks and sell them the liquor, generally to the detriment of the voyage. (John Josselyn, "An Account of Two Voyages to New-England," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 3d. ser., 3 [1833]: 351 [hereafter cited as Josselyn, "Voyages to New-England"]). Also, in 1671 shoreman Richard Bedford of Marblehead kept himself perpetually drunk while stationed on Monhegan during a fishing voyage. Beside ruining a substantial quantity of fish, he also tried to get everyone else to drink with him. He clearly went too far, for he ended up in court because of his actions (*Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 5 [Salem: Essex Institute, 1916]: p. 6; Jenny, *Monhegan*, p. 35).

²⁸ Josselyn, "Voyages to New-England," pp. 351-52.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 229. For Winter's attitudes toward his men and efforts to make them work, see *Trelawny Papers*, pp. 108-109, 122, 136-37, 141, 164, 171, 204.

³⁰ *Trelawny Papers*, pp. 27, 86-87, 91, 158, 160, 168, 194, 196; "Grant of the Glebe in Portsmouth," *Provincial Papers: Documents and Records*

Relating to the Province of New Hampshire, vol. 1, ed. by Nathaniel Bouton (Concord: George E. Jenks, 1867), p. 113.

³¹ The list of 110 laborers employed at the Richmond Island station can be found in Sybil Noyes, Charles T. Libby and Walter G. Davis, *Genealogical Dictionary of Maine and New Hampshire* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1972), pp. 4-5 (hereafter cited as Noyes, *et al.*, *Genealogical Dictionary*.) The demographic and social data on the individuals was compiled largely from Noyes, *et al.*, *Genealogical Dictionary*, the *Trelawny Papers*, and the *Province and Court Records of Maine*, ed. by Charles T. Libby, vols. 1 and 2 (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1928-1931), with some materials coming from the *Baxter Manuscripts*, vol. 4, the *York Deeds*, various editors (18 vols. in 19; Portland [vols. 1-11] and Bethel [vols. 12-18]: various publishers, 1887-1910 [hereafter cited as *York Deeds*]), and a variety of minor sources. The analysis of the men for this section comes from Churchill's dissertation, "Challenge on the Frontier: The History of Falmouth, Maine, 1624-1675," ch. 3, (hereafter cited as Churchill, "Falmouth").

³² Henry W. Owen, *History of Bath, Maine* (Bath: The Times Company, 1936), pp. 29-31; George A. Wheeler and Henry W. Wheeler, *History of Brunswick, Topsham, and Harpswell, Maine* (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1878), pp. 7-8; Henry S. Burrage, "The Plymouth Colonists in Maine," *Maine Historical Society, Collections*, 3d ser., 1 (1904): 116-46; Charles E. Banks, "Walter Bagnall," *Maine Historical and Genealogical Recorder*, 1 (1884): 61-64; John Winthrop, *The History of New England From 1630 to 1649*, ed. by James Savage (2 vols; Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1853), 1: 75 (hereafter cited as Winthrop, *New England*); Thomas Morton, *The New English Canaan*, ed. by Charles F. Adams (Boston: The Prince Society, 1883), p. 78; William Wood, *New England's Prospects*, ed. by Charles Dean (Boston: The Prince Society, 1865), pp. 67-68.

³³ Charles E. Banks, *History of York, Maine* (2 vols.; Boston: The Calkins Press, 1931-1935), 1: 41-42 (hereafter cited as Banks, *York*); Edwin A. Churchill, "The First Settlement at Saco," 1976, MS at Maine Historical Society; George Folsom, *The History of Saco and Biddeford* (Saco: Alex C. Putnam, 1830), pp. 30-32 (hereafter cited as Folsom, *Saco and Biddeford*); Gorges, "Brief Narration," pp. 49-54, 57-58; Raymond B. Stewart, "Kennebunkport, Our 300th Year, 1653-1953," in *Annual Report of the Town of Kennebunkport Formerly Arundel, Maine, 1952* (Saco: Community Press, 1953), p. 4; Melville C. Freeman, *History of Cape Porpoise* (Cape Porpoise: n.p., 1955), p. 12; Everett Stackpole, *Old Kittery and Her Families* (Lewiston: Lewiston Journal Company, 1903), pp. 18-21 (hereafter cited as Stackpole, *Kittery*); William S.

Southgate, "The History of Scarborough from 1633 to 1783," *Maine Historical Society, Collections*, 1st ser., 3 (1853): 10-13 (hereafter cited as Southgate, "Scarborough"); Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 1; William Willis, *The History of Portland from 1632 to 1864*, 2nd ed. (Portland: Bailey & Noyes, 1865), p. 38 (hereafter cited as Willis, *Portland*); William H. Rowe, *Ancient North Yarmouth and Yarmouth, Maine, 1636-1936: A History* (Yarmouth: Southworth-Anthoensen Press, 1937), p. 8 (hereafter cited as Rowe, *North Yarmouth*); Edward E. Bourne, *The History of Wells and Kennebunk* (Portland: B. Thurston & Company, 1875), pp. 9-13; *Gorges Letters*, p. 17.

³⁴ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4. The information on the early settlers came from the following sources: Noyes, *et al.*, *Genealogical Dictionary*; Charles E. Banks, "Pioneers of Maine," 2 vols., MSS at Bangor Public Library; *Province and Court Records of Maine*, vols. 1 and 2; *Trelawny Papers*; Willis, *Portland*; Charles E. Banks, "Some Facts About Richard Tucker, the First Settler of Machegonne (Portland)," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 53 (January, 1899) 84-87. William Rowe noted the same phenomenon of family settling rather than that of single individuals. (*North Yarmouth*, p. 19).

³⁵ Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, pp. 65-66; Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 7; Willis, *Portland*, pp. 89-98.

³⁶ *Trelawny Papers*, 28-29, 32, 110, 136-37, 171-72, 182, 193-94, 200, 242, 280-81, 346, 351-54; *Province and Court Records of Maine*, 1: 78 and 2: 472-73; *York Deeds*, vol. 1, part 1, folios 90, 97, part 2, folios 1-2; *Ibid*, vol. 12, part 2, folio 299; Noyes, *et al.*, *Genealogical Dictionary*, p. 463.

³⁷ Banks, *York*, 84.

³⁸ *Trelawny Papers*, pp. 351-54.

³⁹ Winthrop, *New England*, 2: 400-401.

⁴⁰ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 7. Other sources used are essentially the same as those cited in footnote 34 above.

⁴¹ David E. VanDeventer, *The Emergence of Provincial New Hampshire, 1623-1741* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), pp. 9-10, 85.

⁴² T.H. Breen and Stephen Foster, "Moving to the New World: The Character of Early Massachusetts Immigration," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d ser., 30 (April, 1973): 216-17.

⁴³ The economic decline and later stabilization of the Richmond Island station are handled in detail in Churchill, "Falmouth," chs. 3 and 7 (first part). Most of the data comes from the *Trelawny Papers*, especially from John Winter's account. An important group of documents

relating to a 1651-1652 voyage were also useful from this study. These include: "Materials Relative to the Jordan-Ridgeway Fishing Voyage of 1651-1652," MSS, Suffolk County Court Files, no. 236, vol. 2, pp. 32-35; "John Ridgeway's Account of Provisions, etc. received from Robert Jordan for a Fishing Voyage, 1652," MSS, Massachusetts Historical Society, Misc. Bound (1652).

⁴⁴ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 2. The material for this point came largely from the *Trelawny Papers*.

⁴⁵ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4. Information was compiled from Mary F. Farnham, *The Farnham Papers, 1603-1692*, vol. 7 of *The Documentary History of the State of Maine* (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1910); *Province and Court Records of Maine*; *York Deeds*; "Biddeford Town Records"; "Kittery: The First Book of Records from 1648 to 1709," MSS, microfilm at Maine State Archives; several minor primary sources. The *Gorges Letters* provided important insight into the development of local government and were supplemented by John F. Sly, *Town Government in Massachusetts, 1620-1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930); Charles E. Banks, "The Administration of William Gorges, 1636-1637," *Maine Historical Society, Collections and Proceedings*, 2d ser., 1 (1890): 125-31; Banks, *York*, vol. 1; Folsom, *Saco and Biddeford*; Stackpole, *Kittery*; Southgate, "Scarborough."

⁴⁶ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4. A fair number of items came from the *Province and Court Records of Maine*, however, the *Gorges Letters* form the heart of the material, providing insights into early Maine government previously not possible.

It should be noted that provincial courts did not die in western Maine because of Thomas Gorges leaving in 1642. Excepting periods of upheaval (very short in the Kittery to Wells area; at times longer for the region from Wells to North Yarmouth), provincial courts were pretty steadily in operation. Also, although their form was at times altered, their basic functions remained unchanged. Central Maine (Kennebec to Pemaquid) had a far more difficult time establishing provincial courts, a feature not at all helpful for maintaining order. The political upheavals are detailed in John G. Reid, *Maine, Charles II and Massachusetts: Governmental Relationships In Early Northern New England* (Portland: Maine Historical Society, 1977), chs. 2-6 (hereafter cited as Reid, *Maine, Charles II, and Massachusetts*) and Robert E. Moody, "The Maine Frontier," (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1933), chs. 4-5. The continuity of basic functions through the numerous crises is illustrated by the records of the various courts in the *Province and Court Records of Maine*, vols. 1 and 2. Other pertinent secondary sources included Robert

E. Moody, "Thomas Gorges, Proprietary Governor of Maine, 1640-1643," *Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings*, 75 (January - December, 1963): 21-23 (hereafter cited as Moody, "Thomas Gorges"); Charles T. Libby, "1661-1664: Two Attempts by Ferdinando Gorges Esq., to Govern Maine," in *Province and Court Records of Maine*, 1: 181-94; Charles T. Libby, "Preface," in *Province and Court Records of Maine*, 2: ix-xi.

⁴⁷ Michael Zuckerman, in *Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), chs. 2 and 4, points out the need for accommodation and consensus in the towns of eighteenth century New England because of the inability of the central government to coerce. He sees this as a new phenomenon in the eighteenth century; however, at least for Maine, the problems of keeping peace and stability without a strong central government was present from the beginning.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 146-49; Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4; *Province and Court Records of Maine*, 1: 57,78,80-81; *York Deeds*, vol. 1, part 1, folio 86.

⁴⁹ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4; Moody, "Thomas Gorges," pp. 15-17; *Province and Court Records of Maine*, 1: 44-45,64-65,67-75.

⁵⁰ *York Deeds*, vol. 1, part 1, folio 86; *Trelawny Papers*, pp. 315-20; *Gorges Letters*, pp. 31-32, 54, 73-75.

⁵¹ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4; Reid, *Maine, Charles II and Massachusetts*, pp. 16-22,82-83; Moody, "Maine Frontier," pp. 84,87-91,101-102. Besides these sources, numerous Maine deeds were consulted in *York Deeds*.

⁵² Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4. Primary sources included *York Deeds*, *Province and Court Records of Maine*, "Kittery Town Records," "Biddeford Town Records." Useful secondary items are Richard M. Candee, "Merchant and Millwright: The Water Powered Sawmills of the Piscataqua," *Old-Time New England*, 60 (Spring, 1970): 131-33; Richard M. Candee, "Wooden Buildings in Early Maine and New Hampshire: A Technological and Cultural History, 1600-1720," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976), pp. 103-30; Charles F. Carroll, *The Timber Economy of Puritan New England* (Providence: Brown University Press, 1973), pp. 70-71,101-19.

⁵³ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4. The story of religion in early Maine has yet to be systematically studied and not surprisingly it is one of the most myth-laden topics concerning the region. Part of the problem is the fact that the source material is scattered. It proved a major task just finding out the basic desires of the people and following the efforts of the towns to acquire ministers, although Calvin Clark's *History of the*

Congregation Churches in Maine, vol. 2 (Portland: The Congregational Conference of Maine, 1936) did provide some leads. Other sources include the *Winthrop Papers*, Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections*, 4th ser., 7 (1865); Thomas Hutchinson, *The Hutchinson Papers*, (2 vols.; Albany: The Prince Society, 1865); *Gorges Letters*; "Biddeford Town Records"; numerous town histories; and Noyes, *et al.*, *Genealogical Dictionary*.

⁵⁴ Churchill, "Falmouth," ch. 4. Charles Andrews (*Colonial Period*, 1: 428) is probably the most eminent of many scholars to condemn Maine settlers by reviewing the misdeeds brought to court. Robert Moody noted the similarity between the records of Maine and other New England courts ("Maine Frontier," pp. 293-294) and my own perusal of Essex County and Plymouth Colony courts produced the same conclusion. The idea of viewing the transgressions punished by courts as socially unacceptable behavior is one that is also shared by John Demos. (*A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1970], p. ix).

⁵⁵ Gorges, "Brief Narration," pp. 40-43; Preston, *Gorges*, pp. 238-39; Richard Preston, "Fishing and Plantation: New England in the Parliament of 1621," *American Historical Review*, 45 (October, 1939): 29-43; Winthrop, *New England*, 2: 212; *Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay*, ed. by Nathaniel B. Shurtleff, vol. 4: (i) (Boston: Press of William White, 1854), pp. 305-306, 338; *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies* vols. 1 and 5, ed. by W. Noel Sainsbury (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1860 and 1880), 376, 401 and 5: 145, 265, 313, 341-48, (hereafter cited as *Calendar of State Papers*.)

⁵⁶ *Trelawny Papers*, pp. 108-109, 136-37.

⁵⁷ Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana: The Ecclesiastical History of New-England*, introduction and notes by Thomas Robbins (2 vols.; Hartford: Silas Andrus & Son, 1853), 1: 64-65.

⁵⁸ James, *Three Visitors to Plymouth*, pp. 16-42; Levett, "Voyages," pp. 106-10.

⁵⁹ *Trelawny Papers*, pp. 29, 58.

⁶⁰ Bradford, *Plymouth Plantation*, 2: 174-89; Winthrop, *History of New England*, 155-56, 162-63; A. L. Russell, communicator, "Affray at Kennebeck, 1634," *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, 9 (1855): 80.

⁶¹ James, *Three Visitors to Plymouth*, pp. 43-44; *Trelawny Papers*, p. 22; *Province and Court Records of Maine*, 1: 51-52.

⁶² Rosier, "Waymouth's Voyage," pp. 334-35. Although no other kidnapping reportedly occurred along the Maine coast during this early period, Captain Edward Harlow captured two Indians along the Massachusetts coast in 1608 and Captain Thomas Hunt kidnapped twenty-four others along the same shores in 1615 which he promptly took to sell at Malaga, Spain (Smith, "History of New England," 2: 696-699); Hubbard, *History of New England*, pp. 37-39; Gorges, "Brief Narration," p. 20; Bradford, *Plymouth Plantation*, 1: 203-204. The standard work on the subject of the kidnapping of Indians is Almon W. Lauber, *Indian Slavery in Colonial Times Within the Present Limits of the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1913), see especially pp. 155-61.

⁶³ Winthrop, *New England*, 1: 75; Wood, *New England's Prospects*, pp. 67-68; Morton, *New English Canaan*, p. 78; Banks "Walter Bagnall," pp. 61-64.

⁶⁴ Roger Clap, "Captain Roger Clap's Memoirs," in Young, *Chronicles of Massachusetts Bay*, pp. 362-63; Hubbard, *History of New England*, p. 160; Joshua Scottow, "A Narrative of the Planting of Massachusetts Colony," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections* 4th ser., 4 (1858): 308-309; *Trelawny Papers*, p. 23; Winthrop, *New England*, 1: 114-16. The best secondary sources are Charles E. Banks, "The Pirate at Pemaquid," *Maine Historical and Genealogical Recorder*, 1 (1884): 57-61 and George F. Dow and John H. Edmunds, *The Pirates of the New England Coast, 1630-1730* (Salem: Marine Research Society, 1923), pp. 20-22.

⁶⁵ *Baxter Manuscripts*, 4: 5-8.

⁶⁶ *Records of the Court of Assistants of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay*, ed. by John F. Cronin, vol. 3 (Boston: County of Suffolk, 1928), pp. 59-63.

⁶⁷ Winthrop, *New England*, 2: 35; *Winthrop Papers*, pp. 335-36; "Edward Godfrey and Basill Parker to John Winthrop, 1648," Maine Historical Society, *Collections*, 1st. ser., 9 (1887): 337-38 (hereafter cited as "Godfrey and Parker to Winthrop"); Noyes, *et al.*, *Genealogical Dictionary*, p. 73.

⁶⁸ Innis, *Cod*, pp. 80, 116.

⁶⁹ Bradford, *Plymouth Plantation*, 2: 133-35, 206-14; *Calendar of State Papers*, 5: no. 952; *Trelawny Papers*, pp. 50-51; Burrage, "The Plymouth Colonists in Maine," pp. 116-46; George A. Rawlyk, *Nova Scotia's Massachusetts: A Study of Massachusetts-Nova Scotia Relations, 1630 to 1784* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1973), pp. 4-7, 12-15, 18, 20-22, 25, 35-36; Roberts, "The Fur Trade of New England," pp. 44-46, 83-89, 96-106, 113-33, 170-201.

⁷⁰ Thomas Lechford, "Plain Dealing: or Newes from New England," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Collections* 3d ser., 3 (1833): 99; Winthrop, *New England*, 2: 11-12; *Gorges Letters*, p. 17.

⁷¹ *Baxter Manuscripts*, 4: 5-8.

⁷² *Gorges Letters*, pp. 45-46; *Winthrop Papers*, pp. 335-36; "Godfrey and Parker to Winthrop," pp. 337-38.

⁷³ For references to the Nash, Carrell and Bedford incidents on Stratton's and Monhegan Island, see footnotes 27, 65, and 66. It might also be mentioned that the Isles of Shoals have been traditionally portrayed as having a raucous, lawless population (e.g. John S. Jenness, *Isles of Shoals: A Historical Sketch* (New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1873), pp. 135-42; Clark, *Eastern Frontier*, pp. 27-33. Although these descriptions tend to be overstated, there is some evidence to support this view. In 1653 and again in 1682, requests were sent to Massachusetts asking that it establish courts on the Isles for the better ordering of the people. (*Baxter Manuscripts*, 4: 53-55; *Province and Court Records of Maine*, 3: 25). Furthermore, in the 1660s and 1670s, there were a series of incidents including disputes over mooring rights and fishing room, and in 1673, six inhabitants on the islands were cited for being absent from their wives. (*Province and Court Records of Maine*, 2: 115; Noyes, *et al.*, *Genealogical Dictionary*, p. 39).

⁷⁴ Josselyn, "Voyages to New England," p. 345; Samuel Maverick, "A Brief Description of New England and the Several Towns Therein, Together with the Present Government Thereof," Massachusetts Historical Society, *Proceedings*, 2nd ser., 1 (1884-1885): 231-232; William Hubbard, *The History of the Indian Wars in New England . . . to 1667*, ed. by Samuel Drake (2 vols.; Roxbury: W. Elliot Woodward, 1865), 2: 75; *Calendar of State Papers*, 1: 376-401 and 5: 313, 347-48; John Gyles, "Memoirs of Odd Adventures, Strange Deliverances, etc., in the Captivity of John Gyles, Esq., Commander of the Garrison on St. Georges River, in the District of Maine, Written by Himself," in *Held Captive by Indians, Selected Narratives, 1642-1836*, ed. by Richard Van Der Beets (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1973), pp. 93-94.