

in Wenham where he lived until 1642 when he died.

"This Salem record seems to dispose of the claim that the Wethersfield Samuel Smith first settled in Salem. That he was in Watertown is borne out by the fact that in September of 1634, which must have been soon after his arrival from England, he was a freeman and an early proprietor in that town but with no evidence that he was a resident. (see Bonds History of Watertown, p. 1017.) Some have conjectured that he immediately went to Wethersfield Connecticut. This writer doubts this because no permission was so early given by the General Court for removal thence and being a freeman and therefore a church member in good and favorable standing and with rights to vote in the town it is improbable that he would have risked so much with his family of wife and four small children in the face of so many other dangers and difficulties. He could, however, have ventured alone leaving his family with friends or relatives on the seaboard while making an exploratory trip and as we shall see later this writer suspects that this is what he did. The General Court gave its approval on May 6th and June 3rd of 1635 for removal of people from Watertown "to any place they shall think meet to make choice, provided they continue still under this government" and it was after one of these dates that it seems reasonable that Samuel Smith and his family departed. Adams and Stiles in their monumental "Ancient Wethersfield", say on page 300 of Vol I that they came "in 1635 or late 1634".

"How he made the journey is not known. He could have done it, as many did, by overland route over Indian trails or he could have gone by water which in some ways was more hazardous because of storms and uncharted channels which took their toll of coastal craft. Some sent their house-hold goods by water but brought themselves, their horses, cattle and hogs by land. Winthrop's "History of New England", page 140 Vol. I, tells of a party of sixty men, women and little children going overland to Connecticut in September of 1635 with their cows, horses and swine, and arriving safely. Wethersfield is said to have been discovered by John Oldham and three others in the autumn of 1633. Those who came in 1635 and 1636 according to "Bonds History of Watertown, Massachusetts", as listed on page 29 of Adams and Stiles "Old Wethersfield", include Samuel Smith and Lieutenant Robert Seeley. There is a strong implication that Samuel may have gone ahead of his family. On page 30 - 31 of Adams and Stiles "Ancient Wethersfield" is given a list of new arrivals in Wethersfield between 1636 and 1640 "no later than 1645". In that list is Rev. Henry Smith and "his sons Samuel and Philip". Since Rev. Henry had no son Philip and his son Samuel was not born until 1638 or 39(see page 628 of Vol. II of Stiles "Ancient Wethersfield") and Samuel did have sons of both names whose ages in 1636 were 11 and 3 respectively (see page 647 of Vol. II of Stiles "Ancient Wethersfield") it is quite certain the Samuel and Philip listed were sons of Samuel rather than of Rev. Henry. If this be true then here to evidence of them arriving later than their father who came in 1635 or 36, thus solving the question of how he could have housed them that first year in the Wilderness of Pyquag the Indian name of the settlement before it was renamed Wethersfield. Being there ahead of them he could have built a home for their arrival the following year. A map of old Wethersfield with layout of streets and lots, 1633,_34, shows the Samuel Smith homestead as lying on Broad Street between the households of Thomas Killbourn on the north and John Edwards on the south. The household of Rev. Henry Smith, the first pastor of the Wethersfield Church, also the