

Table of Contents

[The Origins of Joseph ALLEN of Windham, Connecticut](#)

[Identifying the Best Candidate Father of Joseph ALLEN of WindhamCT](#)

[The Two Samuel ALLENs of BridgewaterMA, Sr and Jr](#)

[Possible Fathers of Samuel Sr of Bridgewater](#)

[The Case that Samuel Allen Sr of BridgewaterMA was the son of George1 of Sandwich](#)

[The Case that Samuel Allen Sr of BridgewaterMA was the son of Samuel1 of Braintree](#)

[The DNA Evidence of Relationship Between George1 of Sandwich & Samuel1 of Braintree](#)

[The Genealogical Evidence for George1 & Samuel1 Also Points to their Close Relationship](#)

[Three ALLEN Freeman of Newport, RI, 1638](#)

[The Early History of Weymouth, in Massachusetts Bay Colony](#)

[The ALLENs of WeymouthMA](#)

[The Early History of Braintree \(Mt. Wollaston\), a Suburb of Boston](#)

[Samuel1 ALLEN of Braintree \(and Mt. Wollaston\)](#)

[What Would Samuel1, George1, and Ralph2 ALLEN Have Been Doing in RI in 1638?](#)

[The Removal of George1 and sons to Plymouth Colony and Beyond](#)

[Possible English Origins of ALLEN Patrilineage 2](#)

[The Accumulating Benefits of Additional DNA Testing](#)

## Two New England Patriarchs of ALLEN Patrilineage 2: Samuel1 of Braintree, and George1 of Sandwich

2

My purposes in this paper are three:

- (1) to validate the ancestry of several members of [the ALLEN Patrilineage 2 project](#)<sup>[1]</sup> from their common ancestor, Joseph ALLEN of Windham, Connecticut, back to the immigrant ancestor of their line, Samuel1 ALLEN of Braintree, Massachusetts;
- (2) to argue therefore, in consideration of the yDNA test results, that Samuel1 of Braintree was necessarily a close relative of George1 ALLEN of Sandwich, Massachusetts, an already proven patriarch of ALLEN Patrilineage 2.<sup>[2]</sup>
- (3) to adduce genealogical evidence of relationship between George1 and Samuel1.

The key evidence referred to here, with source citations, will be found in [this evidential timeline](#).

I use the word “proven” somewhat loosely in proposition (2), as there is no such thing as proof, properly speaking, of any historical proposition. However, I think it not extravagant to claim that the case for George1 of Sandwich (Plymouth) Massachusetts as a patriarch of ALLEN Patrilineage 2 would be adjudged true beyond reasonable doubt by a panel of competent genealogists. Not only has the underlying research on George1's immediate descendancy been thorough to the point of exhaustive, beginning with the work of Robert Charles Anderson in his sketch on George and his conjugal family in *The Great Migration: Immigrants to New England, 1634-1635*, “George Allen Sketch”, and continuing with the extensive research of Jack MacDonald, but also two members of the ALLEN Patrilineage 2 project have independently traced their lines back through very different histories to two different sons of George, while their DNA results in themselves guarantee that they have a common ALLEN patriarch roughly contemporary with George.

Since I am also arguing here that Samuel1 of Braintree is a patriarch of the ALLEN Patrilineage 2 line, the only doubt might be that one of these two George1 genealogists has erred and hooked in to a descendancy of Samuel1, but since their lines diverge from each other immediately, through different sons of George1 whose careers have now been well-documented, the chances that both could be wrong are just vanishingly small.

---

<sup>1</sup> DNA testing a number of males of a particular surname (in this case ALLEN) on certain standard sets of microsatellite STR markers on the male Y-Chromosome (ySTR DNA testing), can definitively determine whether those tested belong to the same [genealogical patrilineage](#). Thus, all the members of the ALLEN Patrilineage 2 project are known to be patrilineage cousins—descendants through the male line from a common patriarch who lived some time in the last 200-700 years. It is necessarily left to conventional genealogical research to determine who that patriarch that might be. The specific yDNA test results can at best supply only a very crude estimate of how far back in time that common patriarchal ancestor might lie; they can, however, in some cases, mark certain descendants as belonging to particular family branches.

<sup>2</sup> The descendancy of George has been very extensively researched by professional genealogist Jack MacDonald, whose conclusions are posted [here](#). As the administrator and genealogical consultant to the ALLEN Patrilineage 2 project, I have carefully examined the ancestral pedigrees and evidence submitted by the members, and have done considerable research on this ALLEN patrilineage myself, and I have validated many of MacDonald's conclusions.

### The Origins of Joseph ALLEN of Windham, Connecticut

To return to proposition (1), above, the ancestries of three yDNA tested members of Patrilineage 2 have been credibly traced back to the Joseph Allen of Windham, Connecticut who married in NorwichCT on 29Apr1729 Rebeckah Fuller of Preston (an adjoining town), through two of Joseph's sons, Barnabas and Asahel.

A search of the online NEHGR database for birth/baptismal records for a Joseph Allen born between 1695-1710 turns up the following:

Joseph Allen born 10Oct1695 to Edward & Ann of NantucketMA  
Joseph Allen born 11Feb1697/8 to Joseph & Abigail of SalemMA  
Joseph Allen born 25May1697 to Benjamin & Hopestill of RehobethMA  
Joseph Allen born 13Jan1701 to Samuel Jr & Mary of BridgewaterMA  
Joseph Allen born 1702 at FairfieldCT  
Joseph Allen born 27Apr1704 to Joseph & Rachel of DartmouthMA  
Joseph Allen born 26Apr1709 to Silence & Esther of BostonMA

The vital records of New England for this period are largely complete and it is probable that one of the above is Joseph of WindhamCT. Ideally, all of these candidates should be researched thoroughly enough to find what evidence there may be for the identification, or to rule them out, one by one. I've done this below only cursorily, though what I've come up with may be sufficient in this case.

There is besides, one positive piece of evidence that some might say is conclusive in itself. However, I have come to believe that the strongest cases for historical propostions are made by thickening the circumstantial webs as much as possible.

### Identifying the Best Candidate Father of Joseph ALLEN of WindhamCT

All but one of the eight Josephs listed above were born in Massachusetts, and that one was born in Fairfield on Connecticut's southwest coast—a much less likely feeder area for Norwich in the inland north central part of the state than Rhode Island and PlymouthCoMA due east. It's a curious fact that most migration during the period of American settlement proceeded either as closely as possible on an east to west line, except where barred by impassable mountains or rivers, or where settlement proceeded upstream along major rivers.

Another consideration is that Joseph of Windham (as I shall call him henceforth, for simplicity) was married in 1729, at the age of 28. Academic studies have shown,<sup>[3]</sup> and experience researching New England families confirms, that the mean age of New England men of the middle colonial period at the time of their first marriage was about 25, most were married by 30, and very few men married before age 21. Most likely, then, Joseph of Windham was born between 1699-1707, and the overall best candidates are those highlighted below

Joseph Allen born 10Oct1695 to Edward & Ann of NantucketMA  
Joseph Allen born 11Feb1697/8 to Joseph & Abigail of SalemMA  
**Joseph Allen born 25May1697 to Benjamin & Hopestill of RehobethMA**  
**Joseph Allen born 13Jan1701 to Samuel Jr & Mary of BridgewaterMA**  
Joseph Allen born 1702 at FairfieldCT  
**Joseph Allen born 27Apr1704 to Joseph & Rachel of DartmouthMA**  
Joseph Allen born 26Apr1709 to Silence & Esther of BostonMA

---

<sup>3</sup> See David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (Oxford University Press, 1989), 75-76.

The published vital records of Rehobeth show a 1695 marriage of Benjamin to Hopestill Leonard, then a regular succession of children born to Benjamin and Hopestill, from Joseph (their firstborn), through Martha (their last, born in 1711). The next ALLEN vital record for Rehobeth is a 1718 marriage record for Square (“Squire”?) Allen & Rebecca Hunt, then a 6Oct1720 marriage record for Joseph of Rehobeth & Sarah May of BarringtonMA. Children are later born in Rehobeth to Squier & Rebecca, though nothing further is heard of there regarding Joseph & Sarah.

To follow up on this Joseph & Sarah couple, and also to look for other Joseph marriages for the relevant period, I searched the NEHGR database for all vital records for Joseph Allens from 1720 thru 1733, and found a 1722 birth record for a child of Joseph & Sarah in Swansea (adjacent to Rehobeth), but no further items for this couple. They may well have moved on to Rhode Island (across Swansea’s western border), the one area where the vital records of this period are somewhat spotty. In any case, this already married Joseph would seem an unlikely candidate for remarriage in CT in 1729.

I also picked up in this search a 1720 marriage for a Joseph of Salem, a 1721 marriage for Joseph of Dartmouth, a 1725 marriage for Joseph Jr of Dartmouth, and a 1724 marriage for Joseph of Fairfield, which would seem to account for all the other candidate Joseph’s who seem at all likely.

Thus, even this very cursory search of the reasonably complete vital records of New England leaves the Joseph born 13Jan1701 to Samuel Jr & Mary Allen of Bridgewater, as the most likely candidate to be Joseph of Windham.<sup>[4]</sup> And there is one further piece of circumstantial embedded in the onomastic child-naming patterns of these New Englanders.

A study of naming practices in the MA town of Concord during the colonial and early American period, reported on by noted historian (and genealogist) David Hackett Fischer,<sup>[5]</sup> found that before 1770 about 80% of Concord fathers named a son for themselves, usually the first son. The data also show that 46.3% of Concord families who had children during the 1730s (the decade when most of Joseph of Windham’s children were born) also named a son for the father’s father. And this pattern appears to mesh perfectly with the hypothesis that Joseph of Bridgewater was Joseph of Windham.: the former’s father was named Samuel, and the latter named his first two sons Joseph and Samuel.

I come now to the one piece of positive evidence that points to Joseph Allen born in BridgewaterMA on 13Jan1701—a date which is, of course, ambiguous, since it should be double-dated either 13Jan1700/1 or 13Jan1701/2. We may reasonably dismiss the latter date, though, since Joseph’s next younger brother, Benjamin, would have been born just 8 months after Joseph, while otherwise the shortest birth interval in his father’s families was 21 months.<sup>[6]</sup>

There is [a gravestone in WindhamCT](#) for Joseph Allen, carved in the 18<sup>th</sup> century style, that says that he “departed this life 1Jan1777 in the 76<sup>th</sup> year of his age”, and the old stone of his wife Rebeckah stands next to it. This fits perfectly the birth date of the Joseph born 13Jan1700/1 in BridgewaterMA, and none of the other candidate Josephs above.

### The Two Samuel ALLENs of BridgewaterMA, Sr and Jr

The vital records of Bridgewater by themselves support complete and convincing reconstruction of the conjugal and natal families of the Samuel Allen Jr who was the putative father of Joseph Allen of WindhamCT. And since all the ALLEN vital records of Bridgewater before 1700 appear to concern

---

<sup>4</sup> Though probably not descendants of Samuel1 of Braintree, these Josephs of Dartmouth & Rehobeth are both likely descendants of George of Sandwich.

<sup>5</sup> David Hackett Fischer, “Forenames and the Family in New England: An exercise in historical onomastics”, in *Generations and Change: Genealogical Perspectives in Social History* (MaconGA: Mercer University Press, 1986), 215-241. The relevant tables of data are found on pp225-226; the compilers of the data are credited in a footnote on p217.

<sup>6</sup> See [“The Samuel Allen Families of Bridgewater, Massachusetts, Vital Records”](#) for the specific VR evidence.

Samuel Jr, his putative father Samuel Sr, and Jr's siblings, one readily concludes that Samuel Jr was the Samuel born to Samuel Sr on 4Dec1660, as his first born son (following the most common New England onomastic practice).

### Possible Fathers of Samuel Sr of Bridgewater

James Savage, whose *Genealogical Dictionary of the First Settlers of New England* (1860-1862; reprint, GPC, 1965) constitutes a pretty complete inventory of the 17<sup>th</sup> century denizens of New England, at least insofar as the surviving records provide evidence of same, identifies Samuel Allens: of BraintreeMA; of NewportRI; of WindsorCT; of NorthamptonMA; of BridgewaterMA (two, father and son); of ManchesterNH; of SudburyMA; of BarnstableMA; and of PortsmouthNH. All but the Samuel of Newport, about whom nothing is said, can reasonably be dismissed as identical to Samuel Sr of Bridgewater, because they all had separate and parallel careers in their respective towns. Savage himself identifies Samuel of Bridgewater as the son of Samuel of Braintree but offers no evidence for the proposition. He also attributes many children to George of Sandwich, but no Samuel. Thus, he might have assigned Samuel of Bridgewater to Samuel of Braintree by default.

### The Case that Samuel Allen Sr of BridgewaterMA was the son of George1 of Sandwich

Robert Charles Anderson, in his Great Migration publications, is the new Savage, bringing to bear all of the extant accumulated evidence in order to reconstruct the identities of all the New Englanders within the compass of his study. Except that by limiting his compass to the first comers (through 1635, so far) and their conjugal families, Anderson (and those who have helped him with his GM research), have been able to do a much more thorough and thoughtful job than their predecessor. Also, of course, genealogists today have far more data to work with, and it has mostly been published in indexed form. The most important improvement that Anderson has made over Savage, though, is that instead of requiring others to just trust him and rely on his authority and formidable reputation, Anderson has undertaken to document his data and hypotheses with specific citations to his sources, to provide more detailed analysis for problematic areas, and to note the important and credible secondary sources, especially when they disagree with him.

Thus, for George Allen of Sandwich who arrived in 1635, Anderson has made a far more credible and complete reconstruction of George's conjugal family than Savage was able to do 150 years ago and Anderson's reconstruction of the conjugal family of George1 requires a son Samuel who was born say 1633—right in line with the estimated birth date of Samuel of Bridgewater.

Finally, Anderson has noted solid evidence that Samuel2 (George1) was a resident of Boston selling land inherited from his father in 1656:

In his undated will, proved 7Jun1649 “Georg[e] Allen the elder late of Sandridge...” bequeathed “for my land & the rest of my meadow I give unto my sons Henry and Samuell”<sup>7</sup>

On 10Jul1656, “Henery and Samuell Allin of Boston ... joint heirs of a piece of land ... in the bounds of Sandwich ... with certain meadow ground thereunto adjoining and appertaining, which was the proper possession of our father George Allin deceased, and by him given to us ... with the consent of our mother, to say now Katheren Collins

---

<sup>7</sup> GM: *Immigrants to New England, 1634-1635*, “George Allen” sketch, 30, citing Plymouth Colony probate 1:1:84, and two secondary source versions of this document

**Two New England Patriarchs of ALLEN Patrilineage 2:  
Samuel1 of Braintree, and George1 of Sandwich**

6

who hath interest therein during her life,' sold this land 'unto George Alline of Sandwich aforesaid'.<sup>[8]</sup>

This deed was executed just about the time that Bridgewater was founded, and what could be more natural than that a young man with a bit of capital should seek to become a proprietor of the latest new town, established not far from Boston, where his mother and brother resided. And as Anderson has also noted, no further records have been found for this Samuel2 (George1), which cries out for an explanation, and the one ready to hand is that this 1656 Samuel of Boston was the same Samuel who first appears in the records of Bridgewater about 1660.

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 27-28, citing *Mayflower Descendant* 25:136-137, citing Plymouth Colony deeds 3:7.

**The Case that Samuel Allen Sr of BridgewaterMA was the son of Samuel1 of Braintree**

Fortunately, evidence that has been newly brought to my attention<sup>[9]</sup> makes this case conclusive:

Will (2Aug1669) of “Samuel ALLEN of Braintry”

(proved 16Sep1669; Samuel died 5Aug1669)

Bequests: Samuell ALLEN, £20 - £10 within 1 year of my decease; the remaining £10 within 3 years of the first payment; Other bequests to James ALLEN; Josiah STANDISH [m.dau Sarah]; Nathaniel GREENWOOD [m. dau Mary]; dau Abigail; Joseph ALLEN

Exors: wife(unnamed), son Joseph

Margaret ALLEN and “eldest son Joseph ALLEN” qualify<sup>[10]</sup>

undated deed (acknowledged 16Nov1672) of “Margaret ALLEN, the late wife of Sammuell ALLEN now deceased, and Joseph ALLEN my son, both of the town of Brantry of the government of Massachusetts, in consideration of £20 given and appointed to be paid by the abovesaid Sammuell ALLEN, deceased, to his son, Sammuell ALLEN of **Bridgewater** in the government of New Plimouth ... to the abovesaid Sammuell ALLEN”, 12a in Brantry on the Monatticut River

Witnesses include Nathaniel GREENWOOD [son-in-law of Samuel1 ALLEN]<sup>[11]</sup>

Since all of the Bridgewater records for ALLENs from its beginnings in 1656 until at least 1700 appear to pertain to this Samuel of Bridgewater or to his children and grandchildren, there is really no room for doubt that the Samuel Jr of Bridgewater born to Samuel Sr on 4Dec1660, and father to Joseph Allen born in Bridgewater 13Jan17[0/]1 are descendants of Samuel1 of Braintree.

**The DNA Evidence of Relationship Between George1 of Sandwich & Samuel1 of Braintree**

As noted above, if the ancestral pedigrees of the five DNA-tested descendants of these two patriarchs are sound, the exceptionally close DNA matches between these descendants make it virtually certain that the two patriarchs were closely related. Unfortunately, the DNA evidence cannot tell us either what the exact relationship may have been between them, or how far back in time or generations, the common patriarchal ancestor of both might go. It can, though, provide us with a rough, probabalistic estimate of how many generations back their common ancestor goes, and the answer is: most likely one or two.

I am speaking here of [TMRCAs \(Time to the Most Recent Common Ancestor\)](#) for which the testing company, Family Tree DNA, provides a calculator to work out the probabilities that two descendants will have a common ancestor 1, 2, 3, or n generations back. Unfortunately, these TMRCAs calculations typically show a distribution of appreciable probabilities that extends over several hundred years—way too wide a range to be genealogically useful. However, there are ways to significantly tighten up these probability estimates: first by testing and comparing many haplotypes all together; and second, by extending those tests out from the standard 37 markers to the maximum 111. The ALLEN Patrilineage 2 project is an exceptionally large project, with 22 members as I write, and counting, so although almost none of these members have yet extended to 111 markers. Nonetheless, the accuracy of TMRCAs

---

<sup>9</sup> By Susie Hartman, who has researched her ancestral line back to Samuel of Braintree and descendency extensively in both primary and secondary source, and who has supplied me with photocopies or transcriptions of many of the key documents for her line.

<sup>10</sup> Judith McGhan, *Suffolk County Wills* (GPC, 1984)

<sup>11</sup> [SuffolkCoMA Deeds 8:22](#); FHL Film 493934; transcriptions [online \(images 21-22\)](#) at FamilySearch in *Suffolk County Deeds*, Liber 8—a series of county volumes (or libers) published in the 1890s, one for each original deed book.

estimates for a set of member haplotypes is exactly proportional to the product of the number of haplotypes, and the number of markers in those haplotypes, so a very rough TMRCA estimate can be made.

If we confine the sample to just the haplotypes with proved descents from one of these two patriarchs, the average [genetic distance](#) between them is 2.2, and the expected, or most likely, birth date for the common ancestor of these is 1750. Although this estimate is way too recent, the chances are good that if we had more samples that have diverged since the generation of the immigrants, and/or if we extended all these haplotypes to 111 markers that the estimate would come closer to the minimum that the genealogical evidence tells us there must be. Or we could select one of these haplotype pairs that has a GD of 2 between them, and run FTDNA's calculator while instructing it that there can be no common ancestor for the last 10 generations (at least) that separate them, and we are told that the probability that they have a common father is 43%, that their common ancestor extends back no farther than their grandfather 68%, great grandfather 81%, great great grandfather 90%, and so forth.

That's about the best the DNA can do for us (with our genealogy knowledge still carrying most of the load), although expanding the number of haplotypes of known descendants, or extending them all to 111 markers would improve the accuracy of these estimates.

Still, in light of what we know of the first comers to New England, and of the evidence regarding these two immigrant patriarchs that I'm going to discuss below, this is enough to conclude with a very high probability that they came from the same town or area in Britain, and that they knew of each other, and exactly how they were related. Genealogical considerations make it extremely unlikely that they were father and son, though they may possibly have been brothers, and were otherwise probably either uncle and nephew, or first or second cousins.

### The Genealogical Evidence for George1 & Samuel1 Also Points to their Close Relationship

As noted above, all of the salient evidence for these two men is summarized in this [evidential timeline](#) for them and their conjugal families. The only item that may not pertain to one of these two is the 6May1635 record of freemanship for Samuel Allen of Massachusetts Bay Colony. Most of this evidence for George1 I have extracted from Robert Charles Anderson's "George Allen" sketch in *The Great Migration: Immigrants to New England, 1634-1635* (1999), 27-35, and I have found his reconstruction of George's conjugal family persuasive as well. A careful study of Anderson's evidential material and his analysis is essential because, as he says: "At one time or another just about every young Allen male in southeastern New England has been placed as a son of George Allen."

My own abbreviated reconstruction of [George1 of Sandwich and his conjugal family](#), and part of their descendancy, is modeled closely (but not blindly) on that of Anderson, and here too, for convenience of reference is the reconstruction of [Samuel1 of Braintree and his conjugal family](#). The lines followed down to the present are those of the known DNA-tested descendants of these men.

The earliest record that can be associated either with George1 or Samuel1, is the departure of George1 from England, with part of his family, as documented in one of the few surviving passenger lists of this period. Here's an abstract of relevant parts of this list from the evidential timeline:

20/30Mar163[4/]5

The *Marygould* sails from Waimouth [Dorsetshire] carrying the company of "Joseph HALL [HULL] of Somersit, minister, aged 40 years", including

(passenger#s 46-51) "George ALLIN, aged 24 years [sic]; Katherin ALLYN, his wife, aged 30 years; George ALLYN, his son, aged 16 years; William ALLYN, his sonne,



## Two New England Patriarchs of ALLEN Patrilineage 2: Samuel1 of Braintree, and George1 of Sandwich

9

aged 8 years; Mathew ALLYN, his sonne, aged 6 years; Edward POOLE, his servant, aged 26 years”

(passenger #13) Musachvill BERNARD, of Batcombe, clothier, in the county of Somerset, age 24 years; and 3 others said to be of Batcombe [Taylor]; (passengers) #66-71 “Thomas HOLBROOKE, of Broadway, aged 34 years”

This is a well-known ship of settlement to New England genealogists because it not only sailed from Weymouth, Dorsetshire, in England, it also resulted in the founding of Weymouth, in the Bay Colony. Despite the name of the new town, though, the minister who led this party, Joseph Hull, and many of the families on the ship (besides those whose origins were noted, above) are known to have emanated from the area of Broadway, in south Somersetshire, where Hull was for some years a radical Puritan minister. It is therefore highly likely that the ALLEN family of Patrilineage 2 also hailed from these parts.<sup>[12]</sup>

Apart from the obviously erroneous age for George,<sup>[13]</sup> the father of this partial ALLEN family, the names and ages of the wife and children who traveled with him, align reasonably well with the New England evidence for George1 of Sandwich and his conjugal family.

The next record in the evidential timeline is the 6May1635 record of the freemanship of Samuel Allen. Unfortunately, the other names on this list of freemen provide no clues to the town of residence of this Samuel, and the fact that freemanship required membership in one of the established churches is no help either, because there is no supporting church record.

This 1635 freemanship record, in fact, is the sole subject of Anderson’s “Samuel Allen” sketch a few pages after his “George Allen” sketch. Anderson’s attempt to identify this Samuel definitively with one of the three Samuels who first appeared in 1638 or 1639 (Samuel of WindsorCT, Samuel of Braintree, and a Samuel of NewportRI) bore no fruit, and I cannot disagree with his conclusion that the available evidence fails to clearly establish this freeman’s identity.

### Three ALLEN Freemen of Newport, RI, 1638

In the course of this discussion, though, Anderson touches on the 2Jul1638 record of freemanship of three Allens in Newport, RI, by the name of Samuel, George, and Ralph (listed consecutively, in that order, in the original record), and although he passes over this item lightly, it is, I believe, the lynchpin for any reconstruction of the careers of this pair of ALLEN Patrilineage 2 patriarchs.

Besides this unique early association between a Samuel and a George Allen, this is the only appearance of a Ralph Allen at this early date, and even Savage suggests that this Ralph, whom he identifies with the Ralph who turns up in 1643 in Rehobeth, and then in Sandwich, and in 1659 was imprisoned as a Quaker (but was somewhat ironically released on the order of Restoration King Charles II), might be a son of George1 of Sandwich. At any rate, this is the only Ralph Allen who appears in Savage’s compendium of New Englanders through 1692.

That this Ralph was indeed the son of George1 is established by Anderson, both circumstantially, from the fact that both spent the latter part of their lives in Sandwich, where Ralph had many children,

---

<sup>12</sup> The anomalous interpretation of the double date of this ship’s sailing—20Mar163[4/]5, rather than 20Mar1635/6—is predicated on the fact that Governor John Winthrop made reference to the arrival of Hull and company in his contemporary chronological journal, and because of the participation of many of these passengers in the founding of Weymouth in the year 1635. Meanwhile, a Weymouth port list provides the ship’s name and a date of 30Mar1635.

<sup>13</sup> There are other known errors on this passenger list transcribed by Hotten, some like this one egregious.

but mostly because of an inventory of WeymouthMA land of about 1642, in which Ralph ALLEN and John ALLEN held land “first granted to George ALLIN”.<sup>[14]</sup>

Anderson goes on to identify and differentiate a second Ralph Allen of Sandwich, who seems almost certain to be a member of this same extended family. This second Ralph first appears for sure on 14Mar1651 when the birth “Experience Allin the daughter of Ralph Allin mason” was recorded in Sandwich, and there is an earlier birth record dated 1646 for another child of this Ralph, though this might be retrospective. Other records show that Ralph the mason died about 1659.

George1's son, Ralph, on the other hand, died after 18Dec1691 when he made his will, and he is otherwise differentiated in the records as Ralph Allen Sr, wheelwright, from Ralph Allen Jr, mason. Anderson has made this Ralph the third son of George1 (by his first wife who died in England), and estimated that he was born say 1617,<sup>[15]</sup> which would make Ralph Sr (the wheelwright), but not Ralph Jr (the mason) eligible to be the 1638 freeman of Newport.

Here is my abstract of the Newport freemanship record, again from the [timeline](#):

### 2Jul1638

Samuell, George, and Ralph ALLEN admitted freemen of Newport, Rhode Island  
The list is headed “Inhabitants admitted at the town of Nieu-Port since the 2th of the 3rd 1638”, but appears to consist of a long initial list, with two shorter, dated addenda, all presumably for 1638. The entries include: “Mr. Robert LINTELL ... John MERCHANT, July 2 ... Enoch HUNT ... Samuel ALLEN, George ALLEN, Ralph ALLEN ... Mathew GRIDELL, Aug 6” {RICR}<sup>[16]</sup>

I've included the names that head each of the additionally dated lists. The second of these has only the name of Mathew GRIDELL, who is the last entry on the overall list.

Anderson notes that many of those on the list were Weymouth men, and in an article on Weymouth he notes that Robert Lenthall was a minister who played a role in the history of Weymouth church. I've listed Enoch Hunt (an ancestor of mine) because I know that he ended up in Weymouth. John MERCHANT was one of those granted a great lot in Braintree on the same day 24Feb1639[/40] as Samuel ALLEN.

The 41 names on this list are actually the first fully fledged citizens of Newport, which some sources (e.g. Wiki) claim wasn't founded until 1639, when many followers of the Anne Hutchinson movement split off from that group in PortsmouthRI.

There are no further RI Colony records for these ALLENS

If this is indeed the first appearance of George1 and Samuel1 in the records of New England, as I strongly suspect, by the next year, 1639, they have returned to Massachusetts, George1 to Sandwich, in Plymouth Colony, Samuel1 to Mt.Wollaston (Braintree), in the Bay Colony. The several records below from 1641 to 1643 reflect the first appearances of three of George1's oldest sons: John2, Ralph2, and George2, in Weymouth, adjacent to Braintree:

### 5Mar1638/9

George ALLEN propounded for freeman of Plymouth Colony

---

<sup>14</sup> Anderson, “George Allen” sketch, 27, citing George Walter Chamberlain, *History of Weymouth, Massachusetts*, 4 vols (Weymouth Historical Society, 1923), 1:184, 188.

<sup>15</sup> I've estimated that George's Ralph was born say 1612, after considering the analysis in [BOWEN](#) at NEHGR 155.

<sup>16</sup> *Records of the Colony and State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*, ed., John Russell Bartlett (BostonMA: NEHGR, 2003 CD edition)

Two New England Patriarchs of ALLEN Patrilineage 2:  
Samuel1 of Braintree, and George1 of Sandwich

11

**3Sep1639**

George ALLEN admitted freeman of Plymouth Colony; appointed constable

**30Mar1639**

Sarai, born to Samuel & wife Anne ALLEN of Braintree

**17Sep1639**

Braintree church formally gathered

**24Feb1639[/40]**

a great lot of 28a granted to Samuel ALLEN for 7 heads, at 3s/a

“The like [“a great lot”] is granted to Samuel Allen, of the same [at “the Mount”, i.e. Mt. Wollaston], for 7 heads [persons], 28 acres there, upon the same covenant of 3shillings per Acre”

**6Apr1640**

George ALLEN received 6.5a in the division of meadow at Sandwich

**Mar1640[/1?]**

Thomas Appelgate of Weymouth” sold to “George Allen of Weymouth, my house and home lot in Weymouth”

**Early 1641**

“George Allen of Weymouth in New England, planter, aged about twenty-one years”  
deposed regarding the lading of a ship.

**29Sep1641**

Anne, wife of Samuel ALLEN died {VRs, 1630-1644, in *NEHGR* 3(Apr1849):126}

**abt1643**

Inventory of Weymouth land in the town meeting records: both John ALLEN and Ralph ALLEN held land “first granted to George ALLIN”;  
also, George ALLIN owned 3a originally granted to Robert LOVELL

To appreciate the circumstances surrounding the first few years of this pair in New England, which link them at least loosely together, it’s necessary to turn to the close analyses that Robert Charles Anderson has made of early history and records of Weymouth and Braintree.<sup>[17]</sup>

The first thing to understand about Weymouth, Braintree, and also Bridgewater, is that they were adjacent to each other, although the area that became Bridgewater in 1656 was in Plymouth Colony, while the areas that became Weymouth and Braintree were adjacent in Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Weymouth was organized in the months after the arrival of the ship from Weymouth, Dorset, bearing George1 ALLEN and family, while Braintree was formally constituted as a town on 13May1640.

---

<sup>17</sup> In his long running quarterly, *The Great Migration Newsletter*. The first 15 years of this indispensable New England genealogical and historical resource have been conveniently gathered, indexed, and reprinted as *The Complete Great Migration Newsletter, Volumes 1-15* (NEHGS, 2007), and these and later volumes are also available [online by subscription](#). “Focus on Braintree” is on pages 311-314 of this book, and “Focus on Weymouth” on pages 155-158.

However, settlers had been living in both places since the 1620s,<sup>[18]</sup> and the town of Boston, which had direct jurisdiction over the Braintree (it was called Mt. Wollaston until 1640), began making grants in that area as early as 1634.

### The Early History of Weymouth, in Massachusetts Bay Colony

Anderson's historical analysis of Weymouth, its church, and its records, shows that the Rev. Joseph Hull, who led the company that sailed in Mar1635 from Weymouth, Dorset, organized the first recognized church of WeymouthMA in the year of his coming, but he had left for Hingham by the end of 1637, and the church fell into unorthodoxy and disorganization with no settled minister for a couple of years thereafter. One of the candidates for minister of Weymouth church in 1638, was Robert Lenthall, but of him Governor Winthrop reported in his journal of 30Jan1638/39 that "he was found to have drank in some of Mrs. [Anne] Hutchinson's opinions",<sup>[19]</sup> and as a result, Lenthall was forced to publically repent, and was denied the ministership of Weymouth church, which consequently remained in disorganization until the calling of the Rev. Samuel Newman in 1639.

No consolidated proprietorial record of Weymouth land ownership (or "book of possessions") survives, but there are a number of surviving lists of grantees that allow much of the picture to be filled in. They extant Weymouth vital records are in a similar state of disarray, as the first few town clerks were derelict in their duties. There is one batch of early records that was compiled as of 1Mar1643[4] to be forwarded to the clerk of SuffolkCo (or actually two partially overlapping versions of this), but the continuous records don't begin until 1655. Moreover, the early batch of records was compiled retrospectively, and only from those families still resident in the town. Thus, the absence of any early Weymouth vital records for ALLENS, does not mean that there were none resident before 1Mar1643/4, or none thereafter.

### The ALLENS of WeymouthMA

The passenger record for George1's son, George2, indicates that he was 16 in 1635, and about 21 in 1641 when "George Allen of Weymouth, in New England made that deposition regarding the lading of a ship. Thus, son George2 had just come of age and was a resident of Weymouth in 1641.

Furthermore, the Weymouth land inventory of 1643 showed that both John and Ralph Allen owned land in Weymouth originally granted (by 1636) to George Allen. This land must have been granted to the *father*, George1, since George2 would have still been underage in 1636. The logical inference, therefore, is that George1 was the father of John and Ralph as well as George2, who also bought a house and lot in Weymouth in early 1641, about the same time that he deposed.

Meanwhile, from Mar1639 to Feb 1639/40, at the same time that several of his older sons had established themselves in Weymouth, George1 (the only other George ALLEN in the colony) had become a freeman of Plymouth Colony, been appointed constable of Sandwich, and purchased land there. Thus, the father had apparently originally settled in Weymouth, along with the Rev. Joseph Hull, on whose ship of settlement out of Weymouth, Dorset, ALLEN and part of his family traveled, and George1 was presumably one of the original proprietors of Weymouth when the town was founded by that company a couple of months after the arrival of the ship

Nonetheless, for reasons that so far remain obscure, George1 decided sometime during the next several years to remove to Plymouth Colony, leaving two of his oldest sons behind in Weymouth, in possession

---

<sup>18</sup> There was a good anchorage in the inlet leading into Weymouth, and it functioned as a secondary port to Boston.

<sup>19</sup> [Anne Hutchinson](#), and her husband William Hutchinson's brother-in-law, the minister [John Wheelwright](#), were threatening to create schisms in the Bay Colony churches in what became known as the [Antinomian Controversy](#).

of his land there; and his fourth son, George1 (according to Anderson's reconstruction of this family in his "George Allen" sketch) had decided to join them early in 1641.

However, all three of these sons were soon to leave Weymouth for good soon thereafter: John2 settled initially in Rehobeth, then adjacent Swansea, in westernmost Plymouth Colony on the border with Rhode Island, while Ralph2 and George2 soon joined their father in Sandwich, Plymouth Colony. Thus, apparently, all of the ALLENS were gone from Weymouth by 1Mar1643/4 when the town clerk canvassed the families resident in the town retrospectively for their accumulated vital records.

### **The Early History of Braintree (Mt. Wollaston), a Suburb of Boston**

Let us turn our attention now to Mt. Wollaston before it was constituted the town of Braintree in 1640. In 1634 Boston, which had direct jurisdiction over the lands at "the Mount", began making land grants there, many of them to wealthy and prominent Bostonians, like William Hutchinson, the husband of the notorious Anne. Because the land at Mt. Wollaston was thus parceled out piecemeal, as with Weymouth, there is no consolidated proprietorial record of it, or "book of possession" as there was for most Massachusetts towns.

Despite the somewhat disorderly origins of Braintree, there was interest on the part of those who lived at "the Mount" in organizing a town and a church as early as 1636, but the Boston authorities were afraid that this would drain off too many "chief men", and nothing came of it. However, by October of that year, when the Antinomian Controversy was in full swing, it appears that an attempt was made to diffuse and dilute the movement by relegating the Hutchinsonian minister John Wheelwright to Mt. Wollaston to gather a church there. But this only had the effect that the Boston authorities had earlier feared: it pulled many of the followers of this movement, including other prominent men, into the Hutchinsonian orbit. Less than a year later, says Anderson, Wheelwright and his followers were banished from the Colony and a recognized church wasn't organized at Mt. Wollaston until 17Sep1639, under the guidance of more orthodox ministers. Hutchinson and many of her followers repaired first to the western part of Plymouth Colony, but upon further pressure being applied, they moved further west and founded PortsmouthRI in 1638.

However, The vital records of early Braintree, like the land records, are incomplete and in a confused state, that fortunately, Anderson has sorted out for us in three closely reasoned pages of his article, "Focus on Braintree". It seems that the first two Braintree clerks, covering the period, 1640-1654, were derelict in recording vital records, and missed the majority, even of births. However, two partial retrospective sets of vitals were gathered, the first as of 1Mar1643/4 when the town clerks of Suffolk and Middlesex counties were required to submit to their respective county clerks, copies of all the vital events (births, marriages, and deaths) that had occurred in their towns since their founding. Compliance to this order was reasonably complete for the majority of towns that submitted their records at all, but for Mt. Wollaston, which has been settled many years both before its official founding on 13May1640, and before the gathering of its first recognized church on 17Sep1739, the date upon which vital events were deemed to have occurred in Braintree is subject to interpretation. Anderson's analysis shows, however, that except for 8 vital events out of the 105 submitted, the Braintree clerk took the date the church was gathered to be the starting date, on the theory that before that most Braintree settlers would have had their vital events noted in Boston, or one of the Boston churches.

From Mar1643/4 until 10Aug1654, when the third Braintree clerk, John Mills, took over, vital records are sparse. Fortunately, though, Mills, realizing that, undertook to compile vital records family by family retrospective even to the 1630s., but only for families that were in 1654 still resident in the town.

### **Samuel1 ALLEN of Braintree (and Mt. Wollaston)**

There are just three vital records for Samuel1 in Braintree: the 30Mar1639 birth of his daughter “Sarai” (also the first record of Samuel in Braintree); the 29Sep1641 death of his first wife, Anne; and the 15May1650 birth of his youngest son, Joseph. The first two of these records come from the Mar1643/4 retrospective compilation submitted to the SuffolkCo clerk, and the third comes from page 19 of the original vital records book, which Anderson has identified as one of the pages compiled retrospectively by John Mills in 1654 of all the vital record that had occurred in Braintree for the families still resident there in 1654.

Meanwhile, the only other records associating Samuel with Braintree before 1654 are his grant on 24Feb1639[/40] of 28a at Mt. Wollaston, for 7 heads (persons in his household), and his purchase on 19Apr1648 of 90a and a house from John Webb.

Putting this all together suggests the following. First, the absence of a birth record in Braintree for Samuel’s known daughter Abigail means that she was probably born say 1648 (before her brother, Joseph) and not in Braintree. Samuel’s second wife, Margaret (FRENCH) LAMB, was the widow of Edward LAMB of Boston, and Samuel may have moved his family there after the death of his first wife in 1641. I also suspect that his purchase of the house and large property in Braintree in 1648 was motivated by the fact that his sons were old enough to help him work the land there, and meanwhile, he was beginning a new family. Samuel had evidently disposed of his original grant of 28a by the time he made his will in 1669, and he may have sold it much earlier, in the early 1640s, if he indeed removed to Boston.

When Samuel received his grant at Mt.Wollaston in Feb1639[/40] his household consisted of 7 heads, mostly likely 5 of whom were his children. Since apparently only children Samuel, James, Mary, and Sarah were alive at the time Samuel made his will, I have interpolated an unknown child by his first wife, born say 1638.

Finally, and most importantly for our present purposes of tracking Samuel1 to see how he might have been associated with George1 of Weymouth/Sandwich, consider the lone birth record for daughter Sarah in early 1639, part of the batch of retrospective births in Braintree submitted about Mar1643/4 by the town clerk? Recall that Anderson noted that only 8 of the 105 vital events submitted occurred in Braintree prior to the gathering of Mt.Wollaston church on 17Sep1639. He also found that several of these 8 records were for families whose only appearance in the Boston records was when they received a grant of land at Mt.Wollaston after the gathering of the church there, and from this he concluded that most likely these were families who had been resident there already that did not have roots in Boston.

The 30Mar1739 record of the birth of Sarai Allen was one of these 8 records, and the absence of any earlier birth records for Samuel’s known children suggests that he had not long been resident at Mt. Wollaston either when Sarah was born. The clerk did, after all, include 5 vital events from 1638, and one from 1637. And when the third town clerk, John Mills, made his retrospective compilation in 1654 of births that had occurred in Braintree/Mt.Wollaston for families still resident in Braintree in 1654, he included many births from 1636 (although he omitted the birth of Samuel’s daughter Sarah in 1639—just possibly because it had already been recorded?) Since Samuel’s known children, Samuel (born say 1633), James (about 1635), and Mary (say 1636), and the unknown one (whom I’ve guesstimated was born say 1638) would have presumably been resident with Samuel when the earlier town clerk made his rounds in Mar1643/4, presumably he, at least, would have noted the births of one or more of these if they had indeed been born in the area of Mt. Wollaston.

### What Would Samuel1, George1, and Ralph2 ALLEN Have Been Doing in RI in 1638?

George1, as we have seen, arrived with part of his family in 1635, part of a company let by the Rev. Joseph Hull, who proceeded to found the town of WeymouthMA, and George became a proprietor of

the town—one of the set of founders entitled to a share of its land, proportioned to the size of his family, and to his relative socioeconomic status.

Samuel1 may have been the Samuel ALLEN granted freemanship of Massachusetts Bay 6May1635, and if so, he probably arrived a bit earlier than George1, though not on the same ship. Anderson considers the case for identifying Samuel the Massachusetts Bay freeman with Samuel of BraintreeMA, Samuel of WindsorCT, or Samuel the 1638 freeman of Newport, and finds insufficient grounds for any of these, but I am arguing here that the first and third of these Samuels are the same man, and all the other records pertaining to Samuel of Windsor are in CT, and there is no reason for him to have been interested in becoming a freeman of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. By default, then, it is highly likely that Samuel of Braintree was here as early as 1635, and that he arrived within a year of his close relative George1 ALLEN of Sandwich.

So far so good. But then there is a gap of more than two years before we meet with these men again—in NewportRI of all place. In fact, they were among the founders of Newport since they and Ralph ALLEN, who can only be George1's son, are on a list of the first 41 inhabitants of Newport, which most sources say was founded in 1639. Where did these founders of Newport come from, and what were they doing there?

I can vouch for a couple of them myself, since they are ancestors whom I've researched.

My ancestor, Richard SMITH (on the list) was a merchant adventurer and Indian trader, and according to an affidavit by Roger WILLIAMS (also an ancestor), who was essentially the founder of Rhode Island, Smith built the first house in RI—a trading post on the road from New York to Boston, in the midst of some 20,000 Narragansett Indians. Smith also had extensive landholdings on Long Island, and commercial interests in New Amsterdam, of which he was for a time a member of the governors advisory council, the “counsel of eight”. The John Smith who was also on the 1638 Newport freeman's list was probably Richard's brother.

Focusing more narrowly on the addendum list dated July 2 that features eight names besides the three ALLENS, we find my ancestor Enoch HUNT who was from Weymouth, or at least he was to die there in 1652, leaving a will. Enoch was a blacksmith, but at least one of his sons, and other descendants were sea captains and merchant adventurers. Nathaniel ADAMSs on this sublist was also, like George1, a proprietor of Weymouth, though I do not know what became of him later. John MERCHANT was, like Samuel1 ALLEN, one of the handful of men who received grants in Mt.Wollaston on 24Feb1639[/40] although there is no prior record of them in Boston, which, remember, in making grants at Mt.Wollaston, was essentially parceling out its own lands to the Boston residents who desired to settle there.

Remember, also, that one of the large grantees of Mt.Wollaston was William Hutchinson, husband of Anne, and that next door, in Weymouth, the Hutchinsonian, Robert Lenthall had been called to be the minister of Weymouth church some time before 30Jan1639/40 when Massachusetts Governor Winthrop wrote about him in his journal, but who didn't pass muster with the Boston authorities on account of his heretical views. Mr. Robert Lenthill is another of the names on the main list of 1638 Newport freemen.

In 1639, Newport was supposed officially founded by a group led by a group of Hutchinsonians led by William CODDINGTON, John CLARKE, and others, who had splintered from the Hutchinson company that founded PortsmouthRI in 1638, but it appears to me that there was no particular priority to the towns of Newport and Portsmouth, and that this area, sparsely settled before 1638 by religious mavericks like Roger Williams (also an ancestor of mine), and merchant adventurers like Richard Smith, became suddenly flooded with Hutchinsonian refugees who began to develop political factions.

It also appears that in general, the Boston authorities had sought to defuse the Hutchinson movement by pushing it out into the Boston suburbs of Mt.Wollaston (where the Hutchinsonian minister Robert

Lenthall was temporarily detailed), and Weymouth (where Anne's brother-in-law, the Reverend John Wheelwright was proposed as minister), and when that didn't work, the ringleaders and other diehards were expelled from the Colony, and they drew a number of other followers with them, many from Weymouth and Mt. Wollaston, including the three ALLEN freemen of Newport. But as the original spiritual and evangelical flame began to disintegrate into mere political controversies, many of those followers went back to their old stomping grounds in Massachusetts, and that the ALLENS and several of their fellows from Weymouth and Mt. Wollaston, were among these renegades.

### **The Removal of George1 and sons to Plymouth Colony and Beyond**

For the ALLENS, though, the attraction to a more personal, non-hierarchical, form of religion seems to have remained, as many of George1's sons became Quakers. I suspect that this why, first George1, then his oldest sons, John2, Ralph2, and George2, all gave up their Weymouth lands in the early 1640s and moved on to various locations in the somewhat more religiously tolerant Plymouth Colony. George1 as we have seen, seems not to have returned to Weymouth, since he is found in Sandwich within the year that he was recognized as a freeman of Newport, and he was joined within a few years by Ralph2 and George2. John2, and briefly Ralph2, initially removed to Rehobeth in western Plymouth Colony (after 1685 BristolCo), and after Ralph2 joined his father in Sandwich, John then made one more move to the adjacent town of Swansea on the Rhode Island border. Descendants of Ralph2 and others settled in Dartmouth on the southwest coast of Plymouth, and some later moved on to Rhode Island, New Jersey, and eventually the Valley of Virginia.

As further circumstantial evidence of the association between the patriarchs George1 and Samuel1, it may not be coincidental that Samuel1's son James2 also settled in Sandwich, where he had daughters born in 1663, 1665, and 1667, though James ended up on Martha's Vineyard.<sup>[20]</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Richard LeBaron Bowen Jr, "Notes on George Allen of Weymouth and Sandwich", in *NEHGR*, 155(2001):212-214, citing Charles Edward Banks, *History of Martha's Vineyard*, 3 vols. (EdgartownMA, 1935),3:3-7, 2:25-28.



### Possible English Origins of ALLEN Patrilineage 2

Although I am aware of no evidence linking George1 and Samuel1 to any particular town or parish, the odds are strong that they came from Somersetshire, much of which is covered by [this map](#).

Following in the traditions of the *Mary & John* company of 1630, the first ship of settlement into Massachusetts Bay,<sup>[21]</sup> and several others that followed it over the next few years, the ship, probably the *Marygould*, that sailed from Weymouth, Dorset, in 1635, was largely passengered by parishioners and others who had fallen under the spiritual influence of the company's leader, the Rev. Joseph Hull.<sup>[22]</sup> Born at Crewkerne, Somerset (about 5 miles SE of Ilminster), and educated at Oxford, Hull was the minister at Northleigh, Devon, (about 4 miles NW of Colyton, and 12 miles SSW of Ilminster) from 1621-1632, and at Broadway, Somerset (about 2.5 miles NW of Ilminster) from 1633-1634.<sup>[23]</sup> Annotations on the ship's passenger list indicate that some families, like that of my ancestor, Thomas HOLBROOK, were from Broadway, and others from Batcombe (about 27 miles NE of Ilminster, near Bruton). Moreover, HOLBROOK is known to have married in 1616 at Glastonbury (about 15 miles west of Batcombe, and 20 miles NE of Broadway).

This is a pretty wide-ranging area, and several of the secondary sources of for Samuel1 ALLEN claim that he came from Bridgewater, Somerset (which as the map shows, is not out of the picture), but none of the sources I've seen present any evidence to back up this claim, which I suspect is based on some half-baked idea that since Samuel's son, Samuel2, appears to have been one of the founders of Bridgewater, Plymouth, in 1656, that this in some way provides a clue to his English origin. Since the parish records of Bridgewater St Mary's go back as far as 1558, they are certainly worth having a look at for matching ALLENS, and most likely some ALLENS will be found because it is such a common name. If any of these secondary sources, or whomever they are copying from had actually done this, and found a close enough circumstantial match, I expect that details would have been proudly attached to their derivative accounts. Color me skeptical that Bridgewater, Somerset, is the true place of origin for ALLEN Patrilineage 2.

There is need to canvass the records of the many parishes in this area and the logical starting point is Broadway. But unfortunately, the records of Broadway go back only to 1678, so much of what we would like to know about the Rev. Joseph Hull's company is probably lost forever.

A point in favor of Broadway is that George1's fellow 1635 *Marygould* passenger, Thomas Holbrook, who died in Weymouth in 1678, was a witness to the 1669 will of Samuel1 of Braintree. This is particularly striking given that Thomas was a resident of a different (albeit adjacent) town, and that he was a shipmate in 1635, not of Samuel1 himself, but of George1 (another association besides the 1638 Rhode Island freemanship list, linking these two). This witness record strongly suggests a close family relationship between these HOLBROOK and ALLEN families, one that may go back, not just to Broadway, where the parish records are lost, but perhaps to Glastonbury

---

<sup>21</sup> The *Mary & John* which sailed from Weymouth, Dorsetshire, bearing the radical Protestant minister, the Rev. John Warham, and a company of followers who had attended his preaching mostly in the triangular area of Somersetshire defined by Broadway, Chard, and Crewkerne, arrived in Massachusetts Bay about April of 1630, a few weeks ahead of the Winthrop Fleet, and settled in the Dorchester area of south Boston, adjacent to later Weymouth and Braintree. Many of this company moved on in 1635-1636 to found Windsor, the second settlement in CT, on the Connecticut River.

<sup>22</sup> "GEORGE HULL" Sketch, in *GM, 1634-1635*, 457, quoting from John Winthrop, *The History of New England from 1630 to 1649*, 2 vols, James Savage ed. (Boston, 1853), 1:194: "[8Jul1635][a]t this court Wessaguscus was made a plantation, & Mr. Hull, a minister in England, & 21 families with him allowed to set down here".

<sup>23</sup> "GEORGE HULL" Sketch; the annotated passenger list is found in Hotten.

**The Accumulating Benefits of Additional DNA Testing**

A final word about the prospects for further DNA testing of descendants of this important early American ALLEN Patrilineage 2.

We have a clear pattern for definitively identifying any and all of the descendants of George1 of Sandwich, or of Samuel1 of Braintree, and for differentiating them from the distant ALLEN cousin who apparently settled first in the Maryland Chesapeake region, perhaps as early as the 1600s.

And we also have, so far, the makings of differential mutations in the extended portion of Family Tree DNA's full 111-marker Ystr DNA panel, that I expect will allow us to differentiate at least some of Samuel1's descendants from the descendants of George1, simply through DNA testing. Further extensions by members are in the works, and the implications of these test results will be updated as they are processed on [the ALLEN Patrilineage 2 web pages](#).